UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_156496

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OUP—881—5-8-74—15,000.

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 392.5 W552T Accession No. PG648

Author Westermarck, E.

Title Three essays on Sex & Marriage

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THREE ESSAYS ON SEX AND MARRIAGE



MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

THREE ESSAYS
ON
SEX AND MARRIAGE

BY

EDWARD WESTERMARCK

PH.D., HON. LL.D (GLASGOW AND ABERDEEN)
LATE MARTIN WHITE PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1934

COPYRIGHT

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, EDINBURGH

CONTENTS

THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX

I. THE PSYCHO-ANALYTIC FOUNDATION OF THE FREUDIAN OEDIPUS COMPLEX

The Freudian definition of the Oedipus complex, p. 3.—The unconscious and its characteristics, pp. 3-6.—The reason for assuming an unconscious part of the mind, p. 6 *sq.*—The psycho-analytic method of eliciting mental facts from the unconscious part, pp. 7-10.—The Oedipus complex due to the predominantly sexual character of the unconscious, pp. 10-14.—Infantile sexuality and its incestuous fixations, p. 10 *sq.*—The period of " latency ", p. 11 *sq.*—At puberty renewed and increased activity of the repressed sexual impulses, p. 12.—The desire, springing from jealousy, to remove by death the parent of one's own sex, pp. 12-14.—Freud's conception of " sexuality " and " libido ", pp. 14-16.—His view of infantile sexuality, at first essentially the result of investigations of grown-up persons, said to be confirmed by the analysis of children, pp. 16-18.—The analysis of children's dreams, p. 18.—Children of savages analysed, p. 19 *sq.*—Dreams regarded as predominantly manifestations of erotic wishes, p. 21.—The interpretation of dream-contents as sexual symbols, pp. 21-23.—The Oedipus complex, while discovered by analytic investigation of neurotics, regarded not only as the nuclear complex of the neuroses, but as a universal human characteristic, p. 23 *sq.*

II. ALLEGED CORROBORATION FROM DIRECT OBSERVATION, CUSTOMS, AND MYTHS

Direct observation of children, pp. 25-33.—Of infantile sexuality, pp. 25-28.—Infantile masturbation, p. 26 *sq.*—The interest taken by children in the mysteries of birth, p. 28.—The Oedipus complex in children, pp. 28-33.—The Electra complex, p. 30 *sq.*—Preference given by the parent to the child of the opposite sex as an object of affection, p. 31 *sq.*—The son's dislike or hatred of his father, p. 32 *sq.*—As a result of the incest barrier the sexual object merely a substitute for the original one, pp. 33-35.—Incestuous unions between relatives among both primitive and more advanced peoples, pp. 35-40.—Between parents and children, p. 35.—Between brothers and sisters, pp. 35-39.—Marriages between cousins, pp. 40-43.—Between uncles and nieces, p. 42 *sq.*—Various customs interpreted as vestiges of the occurrence of incest on a large scale in the past, pp. 43-52.—Brother and sister marriage among reigning families, p. 43 *sq.*—The levirate, p. 44.—The sororate, p. 44.—Group-marriage, p. 44 *sq.*—The *jus primae noctis*, pp. 45-49.—Defloration by means of the phallus of an idol, p. 49 *sq.*—The " Tobias nights ",

pp. 50-52.—The universal existence of customs or laws prohibiting incest supposed to prove that there was once a strong general tendency to practise it all over the world, pp. 52-55.—Incest myths represented as vestiges of ancient incestuous practices, p. 55 *sq.*—Close relationship between the incestuous unions of celestial beings and those of royal persons, p. 55 *sq.*—The Oedipus legend, pp. 56-58.—Possibly connected with an ancient royal custom, p. 56.—The Oedipus of the legend could not have been the Oedipus of the complex bearing his name, p. 58.

III. FREUD'S THEORY OF THE REPRESSION OF THE INCESTUOUS TENDENCIES: HOW THEY WERE REPRESSED

The repression of the wishes of infantile sexuality, which brings about the period of latency, largely accomplished by education, p. 59.—The threat of castration and the castration complex, pp. 59-62.—Initiation ceremonies represented as equivalents to, or symbols of, castration, p. 62 *sq.*—Other supposed vestiges or consequences of parental castration threats, pp. 63-65.—The essence of repression, p. 65.—Freud's inconsistent views as to the repression of the incestuous desire, p. 66 *sq.*—Discussion of the question whether prohibitory rules are able to bring about such a result, pp. 67-72.—Social prohibitions unable to repress congenital inversion, pp. 67-70.—The difficulties of psycho-analysts in their treatment of inverts, p. 70 *sq.*—The author's doubt that any prohibition can extinguish a deep-rooted incestuous desire, p. 72.—His own theory of the cause of the almost universal aversion to incest, pp. 72-78.—Various objections raised to his theory, pp. 78-80.—Frazer's and Freud's difficulty in understanding how an aversion to sexual intercourse between persons who have been living together closely from childhood could have been changed into an aversion to sexual intercourse with persons near of kin, pp. 80-84.—Freud's own confusion of children's sexual love of their " fosterers " with their incestuous feelings towards their parents, p. 84.—Dr. Flugel's speculations on an innate tendency to incest and its origin, pp. 84-88.

IV. FREUD'S THEORY OF THE REPRESSION OF THE INCESTUOUS TENDENCIES: WHY THEY WERE REPRESSED

The starting point of Freud's theory of the origin of exogamy the conjecture, made by Darwin and further developed by Atkinson, that man lived originally in small family groups like the gorilla, and that the younger males, when old enough to evoke the father's jealousy, were driven off by him, pp. 89-91.—One day the expelled brothers joined forces, slew, and ate the father, pp. 91-93.—Afterwards the suppressed tender impulses towards him asserted themselves in the form of remorse, and the brothers renounced the fruits of their deed by denying themselves the liberated women; but the incest prohibition also had a strong practical foundation, p. 93 *sq.*—The prohibition of father and daughter incest not explained by Freud's hypothesis, p. 94.—The explanation of it suggested by Hose and McDougall, p. 94 *sq.*—By Dr. Flügel, pp. 95-99.—By Dr. Jones, p. 100.—His claims that psycho-analysis throws a flood of light on the almost universal horror of incest and the fierce laws devised with the object of preventing it, p. 100 *sq.*—Freud's hypothesis of a primeval parricide, p. 101 *sq.*—Supposed vestiges of it in customs and institutions, pp. 102-115.—The totem animal regarded as a substi-

tute for the father, pp. 102-107.—Totemism supposed to have resulted from the conditions underlying the Oedipus complex, p. 107.—The relation between exogamy and totemism, p. 107 *sq.*—The supposition that totemism has regularly formed a phase in every culture, p. 108 *sq.*—Robertson Smith's theory of a totem sacrament and his belief that totemism is the earliest form of religion, containing the prototype of the sacrifice at the altar, both accepted by Freud, pp. 109-111.—The man-god or divine king who is killed regarded as a father substitute, pp. 111-114.—Other supposed displacements of the father hate, p. 114 *sq.*—The institution of mother-right suggested to have been intended to deflect the son's hatred towards his father by transferring it to the maternal uncle, p. 115 *sq.*—A tendentious denial of paternal procreation suggested as another method of doing it, pp. 116-121.—The beginnings of religion, morality, and social organisation derived from the Oedipus complex, pp. 121-123.

RECENT THEORIES OF EXOGAMY

The exogamous group, p. 127.—Earlier hypotheses regarding the origin of the exogamous rules, p. 127 *sq.*—Criticism of Dr. Briffault's hypothesis, pp. 128-131.—Of Mrs. Seligman's, pp. 131-135.—Of Professor Malinowski's, pp. 135-139.—Of Lord Raglan's, pp. 139-142.—Objections raised by those writers to the author's psychological explanation of the origin of the exogamous rules, pp. 142-147.—Objections to the biological hypothesis he has suggested to account for that lack of inclination for sexual intercourse—leading, when the act is thought of, to positive aversion—between household companions of childhood to which he has traced the origin of those rules, p. 147 *sq.*—Biologists' opinion that inbreeding is generally attended with more or less injurious consequences, and the question why it is so, pp. 148-151.—Experience derived from marriages between relatives, pp. 151-156.—From inbreeding among domestic animals, p. 156.—Arrangements in the animal world helping to prevent inbreeding, p. 157 *sq.*—The said peculiarity of the sexual instinct supposed to be a result of the harmfulness of unions between the members of the same family, though, when once acquired, showing itself in the case of any persons who have lived in close intimacy from childhood, p. 158 *sq.*

"THE MOTHERS"

A REJOINDER TO DR. BRIFFAULT

I. THE BIOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF MARRIAGE

Definition of marriage as a social institution, p. 165 *sq.*—The institution of marriage probably based on a primeval habit necessary for the existence of the species, p. 166 *sq.*—The relations between the sexes and parental care among Invertebrates, Fishes, Batrachia, and Reptiles, p. 167.—Among Birds, p. 167.—Among Mammals, pp. 167-197.—Refutation of Dr. Briffault's criticism of my statements relating to several species, pp. 168-171.—His theory of " the animal family ", p. 175 *sq.*—Relations between the sexes and between parents and young, and other social relations, among monkeys, with criticism of statements made by Dr.

Briffault, pp. 176-197.—Among gibbons, p. 178 *sq.*—With the orang-utan, pp. 179-181.—With the chimpanzee, pp. 181-185.—With the gorilla, pp. 185-194.—Dr. Zuckerman's discussion of polygyny among monkeys and of the primate family, pp. 194-197.—This denial of a sexual season among monkeys, and his criticism of the author's hypothesis of a human pairing season in primitive times, pp. 197-205.—The need of marital and paternal protection among the anthropoid apes, p. 205 *sq.*—The family consisting of parents and children, with the father as its protector, presumably, for similar reasons, necessary to primitive men as a condition of survival, pp. 206-208.—Dr. Briffault's theory that the earliest human assemblages were manifestations of the maternal instincts of the female, and that primitive men were matrilocal in their habits, pp. 209-212.—His allegation that the family consisting of parents and children is even nowadays, in many instances, scarcely found to exist as a solidary and recognised group, or even as a physical association, pp. 212-217.—The family a very well-marked social unit even among the lowest existing savages, and of world-wide prevalence, p. 217 *sq.*

II. PRE-NUPTIAL CHASTITY

Dr. Briffault's supposition that individual marriage has its foundation in economic relations, which tended to establish individual sexual claims both with regard to the married women and, in comparatively advanced stages of social development, to females betrothed in infancy, p. 219 *sq.*—According to him, any authenticated instance of a primitive society, uninfluenced by a more highly developed culture, where chastity is regarded as obligatory on unmarried or unbetrothed females, would presuppose a special moral and religious revelation, pp. 220-222.—His allegation that my collection of statements has been brought together " in support of the conceptions of the moral theology of the last century ", p. 221 *sq.*—Pre-nuptial freedom among savages in various cases reported to be due to contact with civilised races, pp. 223-225.—Sexual connections between a boy and a girl very frequently a preliminary to their marriage, p. 225.—Disregard of pre-nuptial chastity not anything like a universal characteristic of the lower races, p. 226.—Reply to Dr. Briffault's criticism of my statements concerning North American and Mexican natives, pp. 226-230.—South American tribes, p. 230 *sq.*—African peoples, pp. 231-234.—Asiatic peoples, pp. 234-239.—Polynesians, p. 240 *sq.*—Australian aborigines, p. 241 *sq.*—Statements to the effect that a girl is blamed or punished for having a pre-nuptial child although sexual intimacy before marriage is not prohibited, pp. 243-245.—Suggestions as to the origin of the regard for pre-nuptial chastity, pp. 245-249.—Dr. Briffault's disregard of the economic aspect in my definition of marriage as a social institution, p. 248.

III. MONOGAMY AND POLYGYNY

Dr. Briffault's allegation that eagerness to prove primitive monogamy has led to the falsification of reports " to an even greater extent than in regard to pre-nuptial sexual freedom ", in contrast with the fact that no uncivilised people is certainly known to have monogamous institutions, p. 250.—Reply to his criticism of my statements relating to monogamy among South American tribes, pp. 250-254.—North African Berbers, pp. 254-256.—Tribes in India, p. 256 *sq.*—In the Philippine Islands, pp. 257-261.—In the Malay Peninsula, p. 261 *sq.*—Among the Andaman Islanders, pp. 262-264.—The Veddas of Ceylon, p. 264 *sq.*—

Polynesian and Melanesian tribes, p. 265 *sq.*—Australian aborigines, although I have called the reports of some truly monogamous tribes among them " doubtful cases ", p. 266.—The Central African Pygmies, p. 266 *sq.*—The Bushmen, p. 267 *sq.*—Progress in civilisation has up to a certain point proved favourable to polygyny, but has in its highest forms led to monogamy, pp. 269-270.—Causes of polygyny and monogamy, p. 270 *sq.*—Dr. Briffault's denial of sexual jealousy in women, p. 271.—His allegation that among certain tribes in the Indian Archipelago and Malacca the relations between the sexes approach to a condition of unrestricted promiscuity, pp. 271-274.—Reply to his criticism of my view that polygyny has frequently been modified in a monogamous direction by a higher social position being granted to one of the wives, generally the first one, p. 274 *sq.*

IV. GROUP-MARRIAGE AND POLYANDRY

Criticism of Dr. Briffault's opinions that in their origin marriage regulations had reference not to sexual relations between individuals but only to relations between groups, and that " in those societies which have preserved their primitive organisation in clans or intermarrying groups, recognised freedom of access between any male of the one group and any female of the other is, in fact, the rule rather than the exception ", pp. 276-330.—Sexual communism among the Gilyak, pp. 277-279.—The Tungus, p. 279.—The Aleut, p. 279 *sq.*—The Chukchi, pp. 280-282.—The Eskimo, p. 282 *sq.*—The Santals, p. 283.—The Malagasy, p. 283 *sq.*—Some tribes in the Uganda Protectorate, p. 284 *sq.*—The Akamba, p. 285 *sq.*—The Masai and kindred tribes, pp. 286-288.—Some communities in British New Guinea, p. 288 *sq.*—The Herero, pp. 289-292.—The Hawaiians, pp. 292-294.—Some Melanesiona, p. 294 *sq.*—The Marquesans, pp. 295-297.—Australian aborigines, pp. 297-308.—Classificatory terms for wives and potential wives, and terms of relationship, regarded as survivals of ancient group-marriage, pp. 307-309, 313 *sq.*—The hypothesis of a primitive group-motherhood, pp. 309-313.—Other supposed survivals of ancient group-marriage or sexual communism: the temporary exchange of wives, sexual hospitality, the sororate, the levirate, pp. 314-316.—Criticism of Dr. Briffault's view that polyandry has developed out of an earlier stage of group-marriage between clans, pp. 316-329.—The polyandrous unions of the Nayars and Dr. Briffault's erroneous supposition that they were fraternal, pp. 323-328.—His speculative arguments for the necessity of group-marriage in primitive human society, p. 329 *sq.*

V. AN AMERICAN ECHO

Several of Dr. Briffault's inaccuracies reproduced by Mr. V. F. Calverton, p. 331 *sq.*—His allegation that I, influenced by the middle-class culture of the day and the necessity of defending its institutions by every device of logic, " distorted evidence out of all proportion " and threw my whole emphasis, " to the exclusion of all contradictions ", upon those materials which tended to prove my case, pp. 332-334.—My attitude towards monogamy, p. 334 *sq.*—Towards divorce, p. 335.—Towards " the absolutistic concept of evolution ", p. 335.

AUTHORITIES QUOTED, pp. 337-342.

INDEX, pp. 343-353.

THE OEDIPUS COMPLEX

I

THE PSYCHO-ANALYTIC FOUNDATION OF THE FREUDIAN OEDIPUS COMPLEX

FREUD and his school of psycho-analysts maintain that every heterosexual person cherishes in the unconscious part of his or her mind a desire for sexual intimacy with the parent of the opposite sex, accompanied by jealousy towards the parent of the same sex and by the wish to remove him or her by death. This is generally called, by a common name, the Oedipus complex, although, when arising in the mind of a daughter in relation to her father, it is sometimes called the Electra complex. The belief in the existence of such a complex implies the following assumptions: first, that there is an unconscious part of the mind; secondly, that it is possible to elicit, by means of the psycho-analytic method, the facts which it contains; thirdly, that these facts comprise a desire for sexual intimacy with the parent of the opposite sex and a wish to remove by death the parent of the same sex. I shall discuss these assumptions separately.

Freud compares the unconscious system to a large ante-room, in which the various mental excitations are crowding upon one another, like individual beings. Adjoining this is another, smaller apartment, a sort of reception-room, in which consciousness resides. But on the threshold between the two stands a personage with the office of door-keeper, who examines the various mental excitations, censors them, and denies them admittance to the reception-room when he disapproves

of them. The excitations in the ante-chamber are not visible to consciousness, which is in the other room, so to begin with they remain unconscious. When they have pressed forward to the threshold and been turned back by the door-keeper, they are " incapable of becoming conscious "; they are then said to be " repressed ". But even those excitations which are allowed over the threshold do not necessarily become conscious; they can only become so if they succeed in attracting the eye of consciousness. " This second chamber therefore may be suitably called the preconscious system. . . . Being repressed, when applied to any single impulse, means being unable to pass out of the unconscious system because of the door-keeper's refusal of admittance into the preconscious. The door-keeper is what we have learned to know as resistance in our attempts in analytic treatment to loosen the repressions ".[1]

The unconscious, then, consists of repressed mental material. A second characteristic of it is its dynamic nature. It is not a depositary for anything passive, but a region where the most active functioning goes on. Unconscious processes are conative in kind; they are described as " wishes ". These wishes are constantly striving for gratification, and it is to this striving that the external manifestations of the unconscious are to be ascribed. The unconscious mental forces are continually active during waking life and even during sleep, and exercise a profound influence on the whole course of consciousness and conduct. " As the result of the far-reaching investigations of Freud and of his followers ", says Dr. Flügel, " it would seem indeed that we shall probably have to look to the Unconscious for an understanding of the ultimate nature of all the

[1] S. Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse* (*Gesammelte Schriften* [Leipzig, Wien, Zürich], vii. [1924]), p. 305 *sq.* (English translation [London, 1922], p. 249).

deepest and most powerful motive forces of the mind".[1]

Closely allied to these features of the unconscious is a third one: its relation to primary instincts. The unconscious is the part of the mind that stands nearest to the crude instincts as they are inborn in us, and before they have been subjected to the refining influences of education. Yet the results of this refining process are rarely so perfect as is generally supposed; behind the veneer of civilisation there remains throughout life a buried mass of crude primitive tendencies, always struggling for expression, and towards which the person tends to relapse whenever suitable opportunity is offered.

The splitting of the mind into conscious and unconscious regions takes place in the earliest part of childhood, probably in the first year, and is the result of a conflict between the uncivilised and non-moral endowments, with which we are born, and the inhibiting forces—some of which may be inborn, while others are acquired—that make for adjustment to the standards of society. The primordial tendencies are repressed, and much of their energy is diverted to other, social aims; from them is derived the greater part of the energy that animates conscious activities. They are compelled to lead an underground existence, manifesting themselves only by indirect and tortuous courses. The infantile character of the unconscious thus persists throughout the whole of life, giving an added signification to the old saying that the child is father to the man.

A further characteristic of the unconscious is that it ignores all reasonable and logical consideration, as well as moral standards. It has a logic of its own, but this is one of the emotions and not of reason. In

[1] J. C. Flügel, *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family* (London, 1929), p. 8.

summarising this description of the unconscious we may thus say that, so far as it goes, the unconscious is a region of the mind the content of which is characterised by the attributes of being repressed, conative, instinctive, infantile, and unreasoning.[1] There is, according to Freud and his followers, yet a sixth attribute of the unconscious, but this will be considered later.

The assumption of the psycho-analysts that there is an unconscious part of the mind has been subjected to much criticism. It has been said to involve a contradiction in terms, because a mental process means a conscious process. This argument is of course inapplicable to the view of the psycho-analyst, who does not define mental processes as conscious processes; but it cannot be denied that when he speaks, for instance, of unconscious wishes, ideas, and memories, he adopts a terminology which is contrary to that established by usage. If we assume, as certain monistic philosophers do, that a psychical process necessarily has a psychical cause—*e.g.* that the cause of a sensation is something psychical in the object which gives rise to it—we are driven to the conclusion that there are unconscious psychical facts. But that hypothesis is based upon the conception that causation implies essentially transference of energy, which, if a mental state could have a material cause, would interfere with the law of the conservation of energy; and such a conception is not justified by a comprehensive analysis of the cases in which the terms cause and effect are used. The psycho-analysts, however, do not found their doctrine of the unconscious on a metaphysical theory of that kind; they do not deny the possibility of mental facts having physiological causes in the nervous tissues of the brain. When they keep the psychical sphere separate

[1] In this description of the psycho-analytic conception of the unconscious I have availed myself of Dr. E. Jones' succinct *résumé* in his *Papers on Psycho-Analysis* (London, 1923), p. 147 *sqq.*

they do so because they look upon it as the best working theory; whereas " the conventional identification of the psychical with consciousness is thoroughly unsuitable (*unzweckmässig*) ".[1] For my own part I fail to find any clear definition of psychical processes and psychical dispositions other than in terms of consciousness. There are undoubtedly unconscious causes for them: they have physiological correlates which may be regarded as causes. But the unconscious of the Freudians is, as we have seen, something entirely different from a mere absence of consciousness.

The Freudian theories have their origin in the department of medicine. The unconscious processes were constructions devised to explain hysteria and other functional nervous disorders, which were supposed to be rooted in the unconscious part of the mind; and the aim of the physician was to release the patient from the unconscious influences by bringing them into the light of consciousness. The method by which this was done was called the psycho-analytic method. Freud has himself described this process of eliciting facts from the unconscious so as to make the patient aware of them. He writes: " The patient talks, tells of his past experiences and present impressions, complains, and expresses his wishes and his emotions. The physician listens, attempts to direct the patient's thought processes, reminds him, forces his attention in certain directions, gives him explanations and observes the reactions of understanding or denial thus evoked ".[2] In another place he writes: " A psycho-analysis is not an unbiased (*tendenzlos*) scientific research, but just a therapeutic intervention. . . . The physician gives in psychoanalysis every time to the patient the respective

[1] Freud, *Das Unbewusste* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 482.

[2] *Idem*, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 9 (English translation, p. 13).

expectation-ideas (*Erwartungsvorstellungen*) by means of which he (the patient) shall be enabled to recognise that which is unconscious and to seize it; on one occasion he gives them more, and on another less plentifully. There are just some cases that require more help than others that require less. Without such help no one can get on. What one may cure oneself of are slight disturbances, but never a neurosis which opposes the ego as something foreign. To overpower this another person is necessary, and so as this other person can help, so far the neurosis can be cured".[1]

It is no wonder that such a method of revealing the secrets of the unconscious has been criticised. It has been pointed out that it is apt to lead to errors arising from two sources. First, in the absence of objective verification a patient's statements concerning events of his past life cannot be accepted without considerable reserve, because memory is an instrument whose reliability may be grossly disturbed by a multitude of factors. The large amount of painstaking research which has been carried out by Stern and his fellow-workers has shown conclusively that a witness's report of his experience, even when given with the utmost conscientiousness, is rarely completely correct; that a proportion of the details, including even those of whose truth he is absolutely certain, are erroneous; and that both the number of details remembered and their accuracy are diminished by lapse of time, whereas the witness's belief in the truth of his evidence is but little affected. Another, very important, possible source of distortion lies in the intervention of the psycho-analyst. If the witness, instead of being asked simply to narrate what he had observed, was interrogated with regard to details, accuracy was greatly diminished, though the

[1] Freud, *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, viii. [1924]), p. 225.

range of facts apparently remembered was increased.[1] But the problem at issue is not merely concerned with memory. I take the liberty of quoting the following remarks made by Dr. Hart (who maintains that a number of the more elementary of Freud's conceptions, which were reached by a process much less open to criticism than the method described by him in his later publications, have cast more light on the problem of nervous disorder than the work of any other psycho-pathologist): " The preconceptions of the analyst, the particular moments at which he sees fit to intervene in the patient's narrative, the emphasis which he directs to certain features of the narrative, the point at which he deems a flow of associations to have reached a significant element, all these are abundantly able to produce decided alterations in the subsequent functioning of the patient's mind. It must be remembered, moreover, that psychoanalysis is a lengthy process, and that very small changes of direction in a long course may lead ultimately to a wide divergence. When the majority of the changes of direction tend to be in the same sense, as they are likely to be in investigations conducted by analysts trained in a particular system of beliefs and technique, then it is not surprising that the final pictures attained bear a close similarity. It may be noted in this connection that, while the pupils of Freud confirm by their clinical observations the findings of their master, the pupils of Jung, working with weapons forged of much the same material and in a closely similar pattern, have no difficulty in finding ample clinical confirmation for the quite disparate tenets of Jung. . . .

[1] L. W. Stern, *Beiträge zur Psychologie der Aussage*, two volumes (Leipzig, 1903-6), *passim*; Marie Borst, 'Recherches expérimentales sur l'éducabilité et la fidélité du témoignage', in *Archives de Psychologie*, iii. (Genève, 1904), pp. 298, 313, and *passim*; B. Hart, *Psychopathology* (Cambridge, 1929), pp. 70, 71, 96 *sqq.*; P. Kjerschow, *Hvilken tillit kan man ha til de menneskelige utsagn* (Oslo, 1931), p. 102 *sq.* and *passim*.

We are therefore compelled to regard the method of psychoanalysis as an imperfect weapon of investigation, and one capable of seriously distorting the facts which it elicits. Those facts, and *a fortiori* the conceptions built upon those facts, must hence be accepted only with reserve, unless other sources of confirmation are available lying altogether outside the evidence furnished by the employment of the method itself ".[1]

Of all the findings of psycho-analysis the Oedipus complex is regarded by the Freudians as the most important. It is in their opinion the core of psychoanalysis and inseparable from it, " the recognition of it has become the shibboleth that distinguishes the adherents of psycho-analysis from their opponents ". And it is said to be not only " the nuclear complex of the neuroses ", but a universal human characteristic.[2]

The Oedipus complex depends on an attribute of the unconscious part of the mind which we have not yet considered, namely, its predominantly sexual character. It " involves the culmination of infantile sexuality, which through its later effects exercises a decided influence upon the sexuality of the adult ".[3] Man began his sexual life in his earliest infancy. He experiences the first satisfaction of his sex-impulse in taking milk from his mother's breast.[4] The impulse becomes then as a rule purely auto-erotic: his sexual life consists in tactile pleasures, in thumb-sucking, in friction of the various orifices of his body or of other sensitive spots, and develops into a special interest in the activity of the excretory functions.[5] Gradually, however, the hitherto dissociated sexual impulses combine into a unity and take the ego as their object; this stage, when the individual acts as if he were in love with

[1] Hart, *op. cit.* pp. 73, 74, 78.

[2] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 101 *sq.* n. 2. See *infra*, p. 23 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 101 n. 2. [4] *Ibid.* pp. 56, 97. [5] *Ibid.* p. 54 *sqq.*

himself, is called " narcissism ".[1] But when the child is old enough to distinguish between self and non-self his sexuality seeks an object of love in another person, even though the whole of it is never transferred from the ego to objects outside itself, a certain degree of narcissism always being left.[2] Such " object love " is found in the child as early as at the age of two years.[3] The first object of it is generally the mother.[4] She gives the child pleasurable bodily feeling by kissing and caressing, by sharing the bed with him, by providing for his necessities, by administering to his comforts in many ways. But even at an early age the factor of sex preference makes itself felt. While the sex-impulse of the boy remains fixated on the mother, that of the girl tends to attach itself to the father.[5]

About the age of six a great change takes place. A period of " latency " sets in, when the tide of infantile sexuality recedes. The sensual elements of affection are then completely or mostly repressed, being driven away by the emotions of shame and disgust and by the aesthetic and moral standards of ideas, which are due partly to education but very largely also to organic heredity.[6] They certainly remain more or less strongly preserved in the unconscious, so that in a certain sense the whole of the original current continues to exist, but the repression leaves behind a profound modification in the child's relation to his parents. He still remains tied

[1] Freud, *Zur Einführung des Narzissmus* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi. [1925]), p. 159; *idem*, *Totem und Tabu* (*ibid.* x. [1924]), p. 109.

[2] *Idem*, *Eine Schwierigkeit der Psychoanalyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x. [1924]), p. 350.

[3] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 74.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 98.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 101 *sq.*; Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 345.

[6] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, pp. 52, 53, 74, 100, 101, 107 *sq.*; *idem*, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 337 *sq.*

to them, but by instincts that must be described as being "inhibited in their aim" (*zielgehemmte*). The emotions which he feels henceforward towards these objects of his love are characterised as "tender".[1] An incest barrier is erected which expressly excludes the beloved persons of early childhood, as being blood-relations, from the "object choice".[2]

At puberty, however, there is a regression in the direction of infancy. The repressed sex-impulses become active again, now strengthened by the bodily development, but they remain repressed. "The object selection is first accomplished in the imagination, and the sexual life of the maturing youth has hardly any escape except indulgence in phantasies or ideas which are not destined to be brought to execution. In the phantasies of all persons the infantile inclinations, now reinforced by somatic emphasis, reappear, and among them one finds in regular frequency and in the first place the sexual feeling of the child for the parents. This has usually already been differentiated by the sexual attraction, the attraction of the son for the mother and of the daughter for the father". But "even those who have happily eluded the incestuous fixation of their libido have not completely escaped its influence. It is a distinct echo of this phase of development that the first serious love of the young man is often for a mature woman and that of the girl for an older man equipped with authority—*i.e.* for persons who can revive in them the picture of the mother and father".[3]

Closely connected with the incestuous desire for

[1] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 75; *idem*, *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi. [1925]), p. 310 *sq.*

[2] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 100 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 101 *sqq.* (English translation by A. A. Brill [New York & Washington, 1918], p. 85 *sq.*).

sexual intimacy with the parent of the opposite sex is the other great constituent of the Oedipus complex, the desire to remove by death the parent of the same sex. The father is a rival of his son in the affections of the mother and the mother is a rival of her daughter in the affections of the father; and in either case jealousy is the natural consequence. This feeling is rooted deep in the unconscious, in the earliest stirrings of the child's affective life during the first sexual period.[1] Subsequently, in the light of the new knowledge that his own parents do as the rest of the world—have sexual intercourse—the son "begins to desire the mother herself and to hate the father anew for standing in his way; he comes, as we say, under the sway of the Oedipus complex. He does not forget that the mother has given the privilege of sexual intercourse with her to the father instead of to him, and he regards it as an act of infidelity on her part".[2] But his attitude towards the mother is now mainly a negative one, a rejecting of caresses and intimacies that up till then had been permitted. At the same time greater activity begins to be shown towards other love objects; and when the fully adult stage is reached, the incestuous attachments are abandoned and a strange love-object is found, who is loved not only with feelings of an inhibited nature, but also with those of a directly sexual kind.[3] In girls, again, we find for the most part love for the father in conjunction with jealous hostility towards the mother. That is the direction of the love sentiment whose most terrible embodiment in literature is familiar to us in the story

[1] Freud, *Über einige neurotische Mechanismen bei Eifersucht, Paranoia und Homosexualität* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 388.

[2] *Idem*, *Über einen besonderen Typus der Objektwahl beim Manne* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 193 (English translation, in *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, iv. [London, 1923], p. 199).

[3] Jones, *op. cit.* p. 664.

of Electra, who killed her mother because she loved her father.[1]

When Freud speaks of " sexuality " he often uses this word in a way which differs from that of current speech. He calls the energy of the sexual impulse " libido ", which he regards as analogous to the force of hunger, as sexual hunger;[2] but he understands by that term both those tendencies which are usually styled sexual and, as he says, " the energy of those instincts which have to do with all that may be comprised under the word ' love '. The nucleus of what we mean by love naturally consists (and this is what is commonly called love, and what the poets sing of) in sexual love with sexual union as its aim. But we do not separate from this—what in any case has a share in the name ' love '—on the one hand, self-love, and on the other, love for parents and children, friendship and love for humanity in general, and also devotion to concrete objects and to abstract ideas. Our justification lies in the fact that psycho-analytic research has taught us that all these tendencies are an expression of the same instinctive activities; in relations between the sexes these instincts force their way towards sexual union, but in other circumstances they are diverted from this aim or are prevented from reaching it, though always preserving enough of their original nature to keep their identity recognisable (as in such features as the longing for proximity, and self-sacrifice) . . . . Psycho-analysis has done nothing original in taking love in this ' wider ' sense. In its origin, function, and relation to sexual love, the ' Eros ' of the philosopher Plato coincides exactly with the love force, the libido, of psycho-

[1] O. Pfister, *Love in Children and its Aberrations* (London, 1924), p. 182 *sq.*

[2] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 7; *idem*, *Eine Schwierigkeit der Psychoanalyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x. [1924]), p. 348.

analysis, as has been shown in detail by Nachmansohn[1] and Pfister;[2] and when the apostle Paul, in his famous epistle to the Corinthians, prizes love above all else, he certainly understands it in the same 'wider' sense".[3]

The tender element of love is, as we have seen, supposed to arise in connection with that repression of the sexual element which produces the latency period; but the sensual element remains active even as repressed. All social relations are thus fundamentally heterosexual or homosexual (and tenderness towards animals would, I suppose, have to be regarded as sublimated cases of bestiality). Freud's theory that the social tendencies are only special differentiations of the sexual instinct has been severely, and in my opinion, justly criticised. It cannot be defended on the plea that he means by sex all sorts of manifestations of love. As has been pointed out, the sex manifestations described in the case-material which has been given in great detail in the Freudian literature are just what anyone else would call sex manifestations, or if they are not, are clearly meant to be equivalents of such manifestations.[4] This is the

[1] M. Nachmansohn, 'Freuds Libidotheorie verglichen mit der Eroslehre Platos', in *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, iii. (Leipzig & Wien, 1915), p. 65 *sqq.*

[2] O. Pfister, 'Plato als Vorläufer der Psychoanalyse', *ibid.* vii. (1921), p. 264 *sqq.*

[3] Freud, *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi. [1925]), p. 286 *sq.* (English translation [London & Vienna, 1922], p. 37 *sqq.*). Formerly Freud contrasted the impulses of self-preservation with the sexual impulses, describing them under the separate name of "ego impulses" (*idem*, *Triebe und Triebschicksale* [in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v., 1924], p. 449 *sq.*), but he subsequently abandoned this distinction. He was then confronted with the question whether all the impulses may not be of a sexual ("libidinous") nature. He declines to answer this question in the affirmative, although he asserts that analysis has up to now only been able to demonstrate libidinous impulses (*idem*, *Jenseits des Lustprinzips* [in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi., 1925], p. 242 *sqq.*).

[4] T. A. Ross, *An Introduction to Analytical Psychotherapy* (London, 1932), p. 82.

very corner-stone of the Oedipus complex. The intimacy towards the parent of the opposite sex would not arouse sexual jealousy to the parent of the same sex unless that intimacy were sexual in the ordinary sense of the word. The inhibitions do not refer to the tender element of love, but to the sensual element. If it were otherwise there could be no Oedipus complex at all. Nor could such a complex arise in the earliest period of childhood, that preceding the latency one, if the sexuality of that age were very different from the sexuality of later years. Freud says himself that while in his *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* the emphasis fell upon pointing out the fundamental difference between the sexual life of children and of adults, he is no longer satisfied with the statement that the primacy of the genitals is not effected in the early period of childhood, or only very imperfectly. The approximation of childhood sexuality to that of the adult goes much farther and is not limited solely to the establishment of an object attachment. " At any rate at the height of the development of childhood sexuality the functioning of the genitals and the interest in them reaches predominant significance, which comes little short of that reached in maturity ".[1]

Freud states that his view of infantile sexuality was at first essentially the result of investigations of grown-up persons, but that subsequently the analysis of special cases of nervous disorder in little children has given us a direct insight into the sexual life of infancy; and he adds with satisfaction that this direct analysis has confirmed his earlier conclusions.[2] Such confirmation must have been very welcome, for he speaks himself of the peculiar oblivion that in most people veils the first

[1] Freud, *Die infantile Genitalorganisation* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 233 (English translation, in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, v. [1924], p. 125 *sq.*).

[2] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 68 n. 1.

six or eight years of existence.[1] He observes that their memories are often fancies which have been formed later and transferred to their childhood: " They are not fixated from an experience like the conscious memories from the time of maturity and then repeated, but they are not produced until a later period when childhood is already past, they are then changed and disguised and put in the service of later tendencies, so that in general they cannot be strictly differentiated from phantasies ".[2] This is a serious confession, considering that the theory of infantile sexuality and the whole Oedipus complex are based upon psycho-analytic findings relating to that very period as to which most people's memory cannot be relied upon.

Psycho-analysts are confident that the analysis of the child himself is a safe corrective of possible mistakes. " In the analysis of children we can go back to experiences and fixations, which in analysing adults we can only reconstruct, while in children they are directly represented ".[3] But Hermine Hug-Hellmuth maintains that a regular analysis is possible only from the seventh or eighth year[4]—that is, at an age when, according to Freud, the sensual element of the child's libido has already been repressed. Yet children have been analysed at a much earlier age. The analysis of one child of two years and nine months, another of three years and a quarter, and several children of about four years old, has led Melanie Klein to conclude that in them the Oedipus complex exercised a powerful influence as

[1] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 49.

[2] *Idem*, *Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ix. [1925]), p. 394 (English translation [London, 1922], p. 35).

[3] Melanie Klein, ' The Psychological Principles of Infant Analysis ', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, viii. (1927), p. 33.

[4] Hermine Hug-Hellmuth, ' Zur Technik der Kinderanalyse ', in *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psycho-Analyse*, vii. (1921), p. 181.

early as their second year. At the age of two a little girl who was analysed " had already wished to rob her mother, who was pregnant, of her children, to kill her and to take her place in coitus with the father ".[1] The same psycho-analyst remarks that " we are often surprised at the facility with which for the time being our interpretations are accepted: sometimes children even express considerable pleasure in them ".[2] This does not sound very reassuring, so far as the accuracy of the results is concerned. The analysis of children consists very largely in a study and interpretation of their dreams. Stern, who is one of our chief authorities on the psychology of childhood, says that spontaneous recitals of dreams seldom appear before the fifth year, and that even then the child has difficulty in distinguishing between the real account of his dreams and waking confabulation. He adds: " The psycho-analysts, however, accept and make use of the dreams of two-year-old children. Their material is deprived of all value by the fact that, not content with the child's spontaneous statement, they only make of it the starting-point for an inquisitorial cross-examination by which they hope to extract from the child a still further dream-content, and, if possible, the interpretation of the dream-symbols. It in no way astonishes us that it is always possible by this method to obtain from the child himself the interpretation presupposed by the analyst ".[3] Clara and William Stern observe that " while reality and make-believe in the child are not yet distinct from one another, so also are truth and falsehood not yet distinct ".[4]

[1] Melanie Klein, *loc. cit.* pp. 26, 29.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 31.

[3] W. Stern, *Psychology of Early Childhood* (London, 1930), p. 304 *sq.*

[4] Clara and W. Stern, ' Erinnerung und Aussage in der ersten Kindheit ', in W. Stern, *Beiträge zur Psychologie der Aussage*, ii. (Leipzig, 1905), p. 194.

In recent years savage children have been analysed. This was done among the Aranda in Central Australia by Dr. Róheim, who found with them the usual infantile sexuality and the Oedipus complex, but no latency period, no period in which they do not make more or less successful attempts at coitus.[1] Some quotations from his account will enable the reader to form an idea of his "findings", which have been received with great acclamation by prominent Freudians. "Like every other human being, the Central Australian boy starts life with one primary impulse and this is the genital striving directed towards the mother".[2] "To procreate a child with the mother—that is the latent wish-fulfilment of this little Aranda boy".[3] An Aranda boy steals food. "The food he is stealing also means a child. In one sense, of course, this means that he has had intercourse with the mother and she has given birth to his child".[4] "The first thing that the child can remember about his mother is that she gave him goat's milk and the first memory about the father is that his father chased him because he cut his little sister with a knife. Here we have the envy of the boy directed against his younger sister, the sister as a substitute for the mother (knife-penis) and above all the punishing father".[5] "We find that the latent motive in the game is always and everywhere the Oedipus complex. In all the antagonists of the child's play-life we can easily recognise the shadow-images of the father, while all the objects of desire are rejuvenated replicas of the beloved mother".[6] Dr. Róheim brought out toys consisting of a monkey, a nanny-goat, and a snake. He selected a little group of four Aranda children, two boys and two girls. One of the boys, by name Depitarinja,

[1] G. Róheim, 'Psycho-Analysis of Primitive Cultural Types', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, xiii. (1932), pp. 35, 91, 98.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 55. [3] *Ibid.* p. 27. [4] *Ibid.* p. 27.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 28. [6] *Ibid.* p. 31.

about ten years old, got hold of the little goat. "He showed me how the little goat had intercourse with the monkey, while at the same time the snake was cohabiting with the goat *per anum*. The next thing the two boys took an interest in was the snake. They poked it towards the girls, who giggled and were ashamed, in a fashion that left no doubt regarding the nature of the snake. Well, and who is the monkey? I asked Depitarinja. Without hesitation he replied that it is an old woman who is actually his grandmother, and here in the camp acts as his foster-mother. His father is dead and his mother married another man. She lives far away at Alice Springs. It was therefore clear that the old woman and the monkey were representatives of the mother-imago. What happened after this was a most conclusive and straightforward demonstration of the Oedipus complex. The little boy got hold of the snake and put it to the monkey's breast. 'The snake drinks milk'. Then he rammed the snake's head in between the monkey's legs; the snake cohabits with the monkey. . . . Depitarinja himself was the snake who had intercourse with the woman whose milk nourished him, *i.e.* with his mother".[1] Children make a big rubber doll, whom they call an old man with a bald head, cohabit with a toy-monkey, "and then they finish the game by all hammering on the doll's head—the brothers in union against the father".[2] Dr. Róheim has no small opinion about the value of his "findings", and of psycho-analytical anthropology in general: "We have here a new anthropology. We can do all that the old style anthropology could do and much more besides . . . . We all believe that it will be the only anthropology of the future".[3]

[1] Róheim, in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, xiii. (1932), p. 23 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* p. 25. See *infra*, p. 91 *sq.*

[3] Róheim, *loc. cit.*, pp. 22, 6.

" Psycho-analysis ", says Freud, " is founded upon the analysis of dreams; the interpretation of dreams is the most complete piece of work the young science has done up to the present ".[1] During sleep the mental excitations in the ante-room, representing the unconscious system, may in the disguise of dreams pass the door-keeper, whose vigilance is then relaxed, without being recognised. As the unconscious part of the mind consists of impulses or " wishes " of a predominantly sexual character, so also dreams are predominantly manifestations of erotic wishes, largely infantile and mostly expressed in symbols. Now there are certainly records of dreams that are directly incestuous; but these are by far too sporadic and rare to justify the supposition that they represent a general unconscious incest-desire. When homosexuals have voluptuous dreams these are regularly of a homosexual nature, but if the voluptuous dreams of any heterosexual person have ever been proved to be generally incestuous, that person must certainly have been abnormal. It is, in fact, not the directly incestuous dreams, but symbolic ones that mainly provide the psycho-analysts with the material on which they found their theory.

In their interpretation of dream-contents as sexual symbols the Freudians have shown an ingenuity which would be truly astounding if it were not dominated by their theory of the sexual origin of dreams and their eagerness to make the facts fit in with their theory. An enormous scope is then left for the imagination of the interpreter. All sorts of dream-contents may be construed into symbols of some object of sexual desire; and even if such a construction is sometimes correct, the data of psycho-analysis are certainly much too limited to justify the assumption that a certain dream-presenta-

[1] Freud, *Einige Bemerkungen uber den Begriff des Unbewussten in der Psychoanalyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 440 (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, iv. [London, 1925], p. 28).

tion is always a symbol of the same thing or a symbol of anything at all. " All hard, elongated, tubular objects are symbols of the phallus—sticks, umbrellas, chimneys, church spires, revolvers and what not, while soft or hollow objects are likely to be the vagina, and if they can contain things, as boxes can, the uterus. There are many dreams ", says Dr. Ross, " in which this seems to be true; for it is certain that many things having no apparent connection with it can symbolise sex. It would seem, however, that to fix symbols for all people in this way is a mistake, that even if we have a generalised set of symbols, the particular interpretation, which is what we are seeking, may differ in different people ".[1]

Reference has been made to the comparative uniformity of dream-books with their particular symbols for particular things.[2] But this cannot serve as evidence of a corresponding uniformity of symbols as expressions of wishes. My study of the significance attached to dreams in Morocco has convinced me that the formulae of oneiromancy, in the vast majority of cases, are not based on wishes or experience of any kind, but are simply applications of the laws of association of ideas either by similarity or contrast.[3] It should, finally, be noticed that Freud founded his theory of dreams on the analysis of neuroses, and that the great body of dream material accumulated by him and his school is derived from such a source. Havelock Ellis points out that Stekel, who has analysed many thousand dreams, but whose study on the interpretation of dreams deals exclusively with those of the neurotic, believes that

[1] Ross, *op. cit.* p. 75 *sq. Cf.* B. Gadelius, *Human Mentality in the Light of Psychiatric Experience* (Copenhagen & London, 1933), p. 569 *sqq.*

[2] A. G. Tansley, *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life* (London, 1924), p. 141.

[3] See my *Ritual and Belief in Morocco*, ii. (London, 1926), p. 49 *sqq.*

from the structure of the patient's dream life conclusions may be drawn as to his neurosis, the hysterical person dreaming differently from the obsessed person, and so on. "If that is the case", Ellis remarks, "we are certainly justified in doubting whether conclusions drawn from the study of the dreams of neurotic people can be safely held to represent the normal dream life, even though it may be true that there is no definite frontier between them".[1]

The Freudian Oedipus complex owes its origin to analytic investigation of adults who have become neurotics. Every one of them was found to be himself an Oedipus, who had either been unable to free himself from the infantile relations of psycho-sexuality or had returned to them, in consequence of which the incestuous fixations of the libido continued to play a great part in his unconscious psychic life. The analytic picture of his Oedipus complex, says Freud, "is an enlarged and accentuated edition of the infantile sketch; the hatred of the father and the death-wishes against him are no longer vague hints, the affection for the mother declares itself with the aim of possessing her as a woman. . . . At the time of puberty, when the sexual instinct first asserts its demands in full strength, the old familiar incestuous objects are taken up again and again invested by the libido. The infantile object-choice was but a feeble venture in play, as it were, but it laid down the direction for the object-choice of puberty. At this time a very intense flow of feeling towards the Oedipus complex or in reaction to it comes into force; since their mental antecedents have become intolerable, however, these feelings must remain for the most part outside consciousness".[2] But Freud maintains that in these respects the neurotics are not sharply

[1] Havelock Ellis, *The World of Dreams* (London, 1915), p. 168 *sq.*

[2] Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 348 *sq.* (English translation, p. 282 *sq.*).

distinguished from normal human beings: " in their loving or hostile wishes towards their parents psychoneurotics only show in exaggerated form feelings which are present less distinctly and less intensively in the minds of most children ".[1]

Dr. Jones likewise believes that the findings in question have a wide validity outside the sphere of neurotic disorder, " though the actual number of individuals thoroughly investigated by means of psychoanalysis is relatively small, only a few thousand ", and " the main selecting element has been the presence of neurotic disorder in the majority, though by no means all, of the persons investigated ". He argues that those findings " are of such a fundamental character that, roughly speaking, they can only be true of mankind in general or else not true at all ".[2] But to say that they are of a fundamental nature is, of course, only to beg the question. It is significant that there are divergent opinions among psycho-analysts of different schools as to their validity even in the case of neurotics. Adler rejects the Freudian idea that the sexual instinct is the root of the neuroses, and maintains that " all forms of neurosis and developmental failure are expressions of inferiority and disappointment ".[3] Jung says he is " able to attribute as little particular strength to incestuous desires in childhood as in primitive humanity ".[4]

[1] Freud, *Die Traumdeutung* (Leipzig & Wien, 1930), p. 180.

[2] E. Jones, ' Psycho-Analysis and Anthropology ', in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, liv. (London, 1924), p. 50 *sq.*

[3] A. Adler, *The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology* (London, 1924), p. vi.

[4] C. G. Jung, *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology* (London, 1917), p. 231. *Cf. idem, Psychology of the Unconscious* (London, 1916), p. 463.

II

ALLEGED CORROBORATION FROM DIRECT OBSERVATION, CUSTOMS, AND MYTHS

IT would seem, then, that the Freudian theory of infantile sexuality with its Oedipus complex, in any case requires a great deal of confirmation from other sources than psycho-analysis before it can be accepted. As a matter of fact, in search of such confirmation various sources have been resorted to. One is direct observation of children. Instances of organic pleasure and the child's behaviour in connection with them have been adduced as evidence of sexuality. Freud argues that " he who sees a satiated child sink back and merge into sleep with reddened cheeks and blissful smile, will have to admit that the picture remains as a guide for the expression of sexual gratification in later life ",[1] when it will come back again " after the experience of the sexual orgasm "; [2] and he speaks of sucking ecstacy (*Wonnesaugen*) also in the case of other sucking activities, the sexual nature of which he considers to be proved by the fact that they lead to sleep.[3] It has been justly remarked that the Freudian theory here takes its stand entirely on the ground of element-psychology: it argues that since the complicated phenomenon, always included under the name of sexuality, contains component parts similar to those occurring in infancy,

[1] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 56.

[2] *Idem*, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse* (*Gesammelte Schriften* [Leipzig, Wien, Zürich], vii. [1924]), p. 324.

[3] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 54 *sq.*

therefore those infantile functions must be placed in the same category. But the pleasure connected with sucking is psychically something entirely different when, as in the infant, it exists entirely alone as an independent sensory-motor form and when, as may be the case in the adult's love kiss, it appears as a component part of erotic excitement.[1] So, also, tickling may be a source of acute pleasure, which in very early life is not sexual but later tends to become so in circumstances predisposing to the production of erotic emotion.[2] Professor Tansley says that the desire to caress " is always accompanied by a feeling indistinguishable from that which accompanies sexual desire in the narrow sense ".[3] Also the usual caressing of little children and pet animals ?

Among the so-called " erogenous zones " connected with the activities of primitive auto-erotism the genital zone has at first far less significance than the oral zone; yet masturbation is said to be practised by almost every suckling.[4] The accuracy of this statement must, to say the least, be exceedingly doubtful; it is an instance of the psycho-analysts' unfortunate tendency to make into the general rule isolated observations or the untrustworthy memories of neurotic adults.[5] Even in the case of masturbation the sexual nature of the infantile act has been disputed. Moll observes that the

[1] W. Stern, *Psychology of Early Childhood* (London, 1930), p. 130 *sq.*

[2] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, iv. *Sexual Selection in Man* (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 16.

[3] A. G. Tansley, *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life* (London, 1924), p. 275 *sq.*

[4] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 63. W. Stekel writes (*Onanie und Homosexualität* [Berlin & Wien, 1921], p. 8), " Die Kinder beginnen mit der Onanie in den ersten Tagen nach der Geburt ".

[5] *Cf.* Stern, *op. cit.* p. 534; W. McDougall, *An Outline of Abnormal Psychology* (London, 1926), p. 582 n. 1.

friction of the genital organs does not necessarily possess a specifically sexual character, since friction of the lobule of the ear or of some other part of the body is an equivalent act.[1] He mentions the occurrence of erection during the infant age, but says it can result from a tightening of the foreskin or an inflammatory state of the penis or a full bladder, that is, from non-sexual processes.[2] According to Professor McDougall, it is possible that in some cases of infantile masturbation we really have to do with a sexual activity; but if so, there is very good reason for regarding these cases as abnormal and quite exceptional instances of premature maturation, paralleled by rare cases of infantile development of the secondary sex-characters. On the other hand, he observes, we have much positive evidence in autobiographical descriptions of the sexual life that in the normal average child the sexual instinct first begins to play some part about the eighth or ninth year—which is quite contrary to Freud's theory of infantile sexuality followed by a latency period. In a number of those autobiographical accounts it appears that the person clearly remembers having been subjected in childhood, in some cases as late as the tenth year, to the attempts of others to excite him sexually, and that these attempts proved wholly unsuccessful, although a few years later the sexual impulse manifested itself in full strength.[3] As regards the period when sexual activities commence, Professor Stern observes that a neurotic disposition may lead to a certain precocity of instincts which, in normal healthy beings, certainly do not appear spontaneously as a rule before the end of the sixth year.[4] W. Cimbal supposes that the first seven years of childhood are a " hormically neutral " period of life, and

[1] A. Moll, *The Sexual Life of the Child* (London, 1912), p. 173.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 50.
[3] McDougall, *op. cit.* p. 565 *sq.*
[4] Stern, *op. cit.* p. 534.

calls the following years, from seven to nine, a " praepuberty period ", during which the neutral state of mind is disturbed by the upsetting effects of the sexual hormone (*Präpubertätsrausch*).[1] Professor Gadelius maintains that, if due attention is paid to the extraordinary variations in the average age for sex maturation in different races and climates, it may be said as a general rule that a puberty which occurs considerably earlier than the age of ten is a more or less abnormal phenomenon and must be regarded as a *pubertas praecox*.[2]

Freud emphasises the keen interest that children take in the mysteries of birth, the question where babies come from being one of the most absorbing problems of early years. It has been described as " sexual curiosity ".[3] But this is obviously a misnomer, if we rely upon direct observation alone, unaffected by all psycho-analytic " findings ", since the ordinary little child has no idea of anything sexual being connected with birth.

The interpretations of facts that have been adduced in support of the essential features of the Oedipus complex likewise suffer from the influence of psychoanalytic findings, and can therefore not be regarded as independent confirmatory evidence of them. Freud writes: " What does direct observation of children, at the period of object-choice before the latency period, show us in regard to the Oedipus complex ? Well, it is easy to see that the little man wants his mother all to himself, finds his father in the way, becomes restive

[1] W. Cimbal, ' Die Bedeutung der endokrinen Vorgänge für die Psychosen und Neurosen ', in *Handbuch der innern Sekretion*, iii. (1928), quoted by B. Gadelius, *Human Mentality in the Light of Psychiatric Experience* (Copenhagen & London, 1933), p. 393.

[2] Gadelius, *op. cit.* p. 393 *sq.*

[3] J. C. Flügel, *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family* (London, 1929), p. 74.

when the latter takes upon himself to caress her, and shows his satisfaction when the father goes away or is absent. He often expresses his feelings directly in words and promises his mother to marry her . . . . One might try to object that the little boy's behaviour is due to egoistic motives and does not justify the conception of an erotic complex; the mother looks after all the child's needs and consequently it is to the child's interest that she should trouble herself about no one else. This too is quite correct; but it is soon clear that in this, as in similar dependent situations, egoistic interests only provide the occasion on which the erotic impulses seize ".[1] This, of course, presupposes that there is an erotic impulse in the little child, and its existence cannot be proved by what it presupposes.

Freud argues that " when the little boy shows the most open sexual curiosity about his mother, wants to sleep with her at night, insists on being in the room while she is dressing, or even attempts physical acts of seduction, as the mother so often observes and laughingly relates, the erotic nature of this attachment to her is established without a doubt ".[2] With reference to this allegation I may quote the following remarks of so judicious a student of the sexual life of the child as Moll: " Generally speaking, when a child exhibits an intimate and caressive affection for its mother we shall not incline to think of processes of the sexual life. We cannot dispute the truth of the statement made by various authors, that in these caressive inclinations sexual elements are intermingled. But this talk of the intermingling of sexual sentiments arises in reality only from the fact that neither on theoretical nor on practical grounds are we in a position to draw a clear line of demarcation between the sexual and the non-sexual; and

[1] Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 344 *sq.* (English translation, p. 279 *sq.*).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 345 (English translation, p. 280).

we must avoid stretching the idea of intermixture of sexual elements beyond the fact that a scientifically based practical distinction is not always possible. We have to admit that above all in the mind of the child the various feelings comprised under the idea of 'sympathy' (friendship, affection for parents, love of children, sexual love) cannot always be marked off from each other after the manner of provinces on a map ".[1] As to the boy's promise to marry his mother, it may be asked what a child knows about the sexual side of marriage. He may overhear or overlook the intimacies of his parents, but would he understand them? Freud writes: " With boys the desire to beget a child from their mother is never absent, with girls the desire to have a child by their father is equally constant, and this in spite of their being completely incapable of forming any clear idea of the means for fulfilling this desire ".[2] But even the existence of such a desire has been denied by another psycho-analyst, Stekel (once a Freudian), who states that " boys never wish to be fathers ".[3]

In illustration of the Electra complex Dr. Brill records two remarks by little girls. One of them, on being punished by her mother, exclaimed, " Go away to Susic (a dead sister), I can be Papa's Mama " (meaning wife). The other girl, of about four, kissed her father and kept on repeating, " I love you so so much, Papa; let's go to the Bronx and never come home to Mama ". This girl, on being questioned, admitted that she did not love her mother.[4] I fail to find any evidence of infantile sexuality in these remarks. As a

[1] Moll, *op. cit.* p. 175.

[2] Freud, *Ein Kind wird geschlagen* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 354 (English translation, in *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, i. [London, 1920], p. 384).

[3] W. Stekel, *The Depths of the Soul* (London, 1921), p. 48.

[4] A. A. Brill, *Psychoanalysis* (Philadelphia & London, 1922), p. 344 *sq.*

boy, in his love for his mother, " is jealous of his father, jealous of one of his brothers or sisters, jealous even of a dog to which his mother pays attention ",[1] so also a girl, in her love for her father, may feel jealousy associated with every possible variety of sympathetic feeling.

Freud argues that although a mother looks after a little daughter's needs as much as after a little son's it does not lead to the same attachment to her; and that often enough a father eagerly vies with her in trouble for the boy without succeeding in winning the same importance in his eyes as the mother.[2] If these statements are correct, there may be other reasons for the preference than sexual feelings in the child. Dr. Williams says that according to his observations " the choice of which parent shall be preferred by the child depends upon their response to his needs, and that this has less to do with the oppositeness of sex than with the parent's satisfaction of his interest and play desires, which have more personal than allopsychic appeal ".[3] Even a psycho-analyst like Flügel speaks somewhat cautiously about the tendency to selection of the parent of the opposite sex as the object of affection: " This perhaps takes place to some extent in virtue of an already ripening tendency to heterosexual selection in the child. But there can be little doubt that in many cases another factor is to some extent operative in bringing about the result, *i.e.* the tendency of the child to appreciate and to return the manifestations of affection that are shown towards it. Now the parents in virtue of their developed heterosexual inclinations tend very frequently to feel most attracted to those of their children who are of the opposite sex to their own and thus (consciously or unconsciously) to indulge

[1] Moll, *op. cit.* p. 175.

[2] Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 345.

[3] T. Williams, *Psychogenic Disorders in Childhood*, quoted by McDougall, *op. cit.* p. 420.

in greater manifestations of affection towards such children; this unequal distribution of affection being in turn perceived and reciprocated by the children themselves ".[1]

That there is such an unequality on the part of the parents in all normal cases has also been asserted by Freud[2] and other psycho-analysts. According to Dr. Havelock Ellis, again, there is frequently a sexual tinge in the affection of a father for his daughter, of a mother for her son, of a son for his mother, of a daughter for her father, but " that does not mean that there is present any physical desire of sex in the narrow sense; that would be a perversity, and a rare perversity ".[3] To speak of an " incest-complex " here he calls a " terminological absurdity ".[4] Others have emphatically denied that the love between parent and child of the opposite sex is always or usually stronger than between parent and child of the same sex.[5] In Morocco natives have told me that a father is more fond of his son than of his daughter, a mother more fond of her daughter than of her son, and both a son and a daughter more fond of their mother than of their father. The father's greater affection for his son is due to the pleasure and pride he takes in having a son, the mother's for her daughter is no doubt connected with the segregation of the sexes in a Moslem country, and the children's for their mother is in a large measure the result of their fear of their father. A son's dislike or even hatred of his father, which is certainly quite common especially as he

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 15.

[2] Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 345 *sq.*

[3] Havelock Ellis, *Little Essays of Love and Virtue* (London, 1922), p. 22. *Cf.* T. A. Ross, *An Introduction to Analytical Psychotherapy* (London, 1932), p. 91.

[4] H. Ellis, ' Psycho-Analysis in Relation to Sex ', in *The Journal of Mental Science*, lxiii. (London, 1914), p. 552.

[5] McDougall, *op. cit.* p. 420.

approaches adult life, is such a natural consequence of the father's interference with the son's desires and activities, his unwillingness to allow the son to work out his own destiny in his own way (which is also admitted by psycho-analysts to be a contributive cause), that there is no need at all to appeal to an Oedipus complex with its sexual jealousy in explanation of it.

According to the Freudians, the incestous wishes of early childhood, though repressed, are never relinquished; they remain in the unconscious. As a result of the incest barrier, the sexual object is always merely a substitute for the original one, which the unconscious never surrenders the hope of.[1] "A husband is, so to speak, never anything but a proxy, never the right man; the first claim upon the feelings of love in a woman belongs to someone else, in typical cases to her father; the husband is at best a second".[2] "Every woman that later comes into the individual's life is

[1] Freud, 'Beiträge zur Psychologie des Liebeslebens', in *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen*, iv. (Leipzig & Wien, 1912), p. 49.

[2] *Idem*, *Das Tabu der Virginität* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 225 (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, iv. [London, 1925], p. 229). *Cf.* J. Sadger, *Die Lehre von den Geschlechtsverirrungen* (Leipzig & Wien, 1921), p. 47 *sq.*; Karen Horney, 'The Problem of the Monogamous Ideal', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, ix. (1928), p. 319: "What drives us into matrimony is clearly neither more nor less than the expectation that we shall find in it the fulfilment of all the old desires arising out of the Oedipus situation in childhood—the desire to be a wife to the father, to have him as one's exclusive possession and to bear him children". In support of the view that a husband is a father substitute O. Rank (*Das Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung und Sage* [Leipzig & Wien, 1926], p. 411 n. 8) mentions our custom according to which a wife adopts the name of her husband, "as she formerly bore that of her father", and quotes my statement that in Rome, in ancient times, the power which the father possessed over his daughter was by marriage transferred to the husband, a wife being thus *filiae loco*, that is, in law her husband's daughter. Even a pun seems to be good enough to serve as evidence.

unconsciously compared to the mother image in our unconscious ".[1] But the repressed tendency may, by the help of the mechanism of " displacement ", be modified in such a manner that its original object is abandoned in favour of a new one that meets with less resistance. As an instance of this Freud mentions a case already referred to, namely, the preference that young men show for mature women as mother substitutes; and as another, the choice of a woman in regard to whom another man has some right of possession, whether as husband, betrothed, or near friend, who then represents the hated father as " the injured third party ".[2] A very frequent and important form of displacement is said to be the transference of erotic love from the parent to some other member of the family—a son's love of his mother to his sister, a daughter's love of her father to her brother; the tendency towards filial and parental incest being thus exchanged for that towards brother-sister incest, which even to-day is much less taboo than the former.[3] As a further stage of development the original parent love may be displaced on to some more distant relative, such as a cousin (a brother or sister substitute), or an uncle or aunt (more directly parent substitutes).[4] It has also been said that a man who has incestuous intercourse with his daughter

[1] Brill, *op. cit.* p. 342.

[2] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 103; *idem*, *Über einen besonderen Typus der Objektwahl beim Manne* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), pp. 187, 191.

[3] Jones, ' Mother-Right and the Sexual Ignorance of Savages ', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, vi. (1925), p. 126; Flügel, *op. cit.* pp. 27, 89; Rank, *op. cit.* p. 407 *sq.*

[4] K. Abraham, ' Die Stellung der Verwandtenehe in der Psychologie der Neurosen ', in *Jahrbuch fur psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen*, i. (Leipzig & Wien, 1909), p. 113; W. Stekel, *Dichtung und Neurose* (Wiesbaden, 1909), p. 32: " Die Kusine ist das typische Kompromiss zwischen Inzestgedanken auf die Mutter oder Schwester und deren Abwehr "; Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 92; Rank, *op. cit.* p. 390 n. 9.

shows a tendency to choose as the object of his love a woman who fits into the image of his mother.[1]

In support of the theory of children's incestuous affection for the parent of the opposite sex and its transference to some other member of the family, Freudians have referred to the frequent occurrence of temporary or permanent unions between near relatives among both primitive and more advanced peoples. The occurrence of such unions is beyond dispute, and I do not know that any one has given longer lists of peoples among whom they have been found than I have done myself. We hear of non-matrimonial incestuous intercourse between parents and children from many corners of the world.[2] In Europe they seem to have been more frequent in certain epochs than others, as in the period of the French Rococo.[3] Mundt states that in the middle of the last century it was not very uncommon for French fathers to live in concubinage with their own daughters; and he thinks that, generally, the French nature is not repelled to the same degree as the German by the idea of sexual unions between persons nearly related by blood.[4] We even hear of marriages between parents and children among certain peoples. But in several of these cases they are expressly said to be disapproved of; and it seems very doubtful whether such unions have ever been sanctioned by the customs of any people, except perhaps in royal families.[5]

The occurrence of brother-sister incest is presumably more frequent. "At the present time among civilised people", says Mortimer, "incest is not very

[1] Hentig, quoted by Rank, *op. cit.* p. 50.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. (London, 1921), pp. 82 *sqq.*, 200.

[3] I. Bloch, *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit* (Berlin, 1919), p. 663.

[4] Th. Mundt, *Pariser Kaiser-Skizzen*, i. (Berlin, 1857), p. 141 *sq.*

[5] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 82 *sqq.*

rare, especially among the lowest classes in large cities . . . . And in the higher classes of our community intercourse between boys and girls of the same family is not so infrequent as most parents and guardians suppose; indeed I have heard of several cases amongst brothers and sisters of twelve and a few years older, though after puberty the instances become much rarer".[1] There are also on record many cases of marriage between brother and sister. But I have pointed out that most of these statements, if not obviously erroneous, are of a more or less doubtful character, especially because it is uncertain whether they refer to full brothers and sisters or to such as have only one parent in common; marriage with a half-sister is not infrequent, at least in the case of one who has the same father as her brother.[2] The best authenticated instances of customary brother and sister marriage are, generally, found in the families of kings or ruling chiefs, although in many of these cases also it is uncertain whether the parties are full brothers and sisters, while in other cases the queen is definitely said to be the half-sister of the king.[3]

That sexual unions between brothers and sisters and between cousins are due to a displacement of filial affection for parents is, of course, not a fact based on direct observation, but only a psycho-analytic hypothesis. Nor does the occurrence of such unions prove that there is a sexual desire for them in preference to other unions. They may spring from quite other motives. We do not look upon royal marriages in Europe as typical love-marriages; yet the brother and sister marriage in royal families among more primitive peoples is mentioned by psycho-analysts as evidence of their incest theory, being "in the nature of a privilege

[1] G. Mortimer, *Chapters on Human Love* (London, 1898), p. 71.
[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 83 *sqq.*
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 91, 93 *sqq.*

denied to the common herd".[1] I think there can be little doubt that it is mostly carried out with the aim of maintaining the purity of the royal blood and at the same time of avoiding a *mésalliance*. The suggestion has also been made, by McLennan, Frazer, and others, that these marriages were introduced for the purpose of giving the king's son the right of succession which, under a system of female kinship, was enjoyed by the son of the king's sister or by the husband of the king's daughter.[2] But as a general explanation this one has the disadvantage that it presumes the earlier existence of the system of female kinship among peoples who are not known to have had it; whereas the desire to ensure the purity of the royal blood is a well-known fact. From ancient Egypt there is plenty of evidence that later Pharaohs married their sisters or half-sisters, and the Ptolemies followed the precedent of the Pharaohs. But in the Roman age marriage of half-sisters and full sisters also occurred frequently in the families of cultivators of the soil and artisans. The suggestion has been made that such marriages were equally or even more common in earlier periods, but no convincing evidence has been produced for it. Those marriages among the common people in Egypt have been explained as a method of keeping property, and especially landed property, together in the family.[3] So also we are told

[1] Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 347. Among the Banyoro, in Central East Africa, when princes married their sisters, there was no binding marriage contract, and a princess was free to leave her brother to go to some other prince, if she elected to do so; such marriages were "more of the nature of love matches" (J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu* [Cambridge, 1915], p. 36 *sq.*).

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 202.

[3] U. Wilcken, 'Arsinoitische Steuerprofessionen aus dem Jahre 189 n. Chr. und verwandte Urkunden', in *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1883, p. 903; J. Nietzold, *Die Ehe in Aegypten zur ptolemäisch-römischen Zeit* (Leipzig, 1903), p. 13 *sq.*; J. G. Frazer, *Adonis Attis Osiris*, ii. (London, 1914), p. 215 *sq.*

that the extremely rare instances of brother and sister marriages among the Maori of New Zealand " generally arose from the desire to keep lands belonging to the woman in the same line as that of the man ".[1]

Greek writers state that the ancient Persians married near relatives, even their mothers, sisters, and daughters. These statements have been severely criticised by Parsi scholars, and West maintains that, so far as can be ascertained from the extant fragments of the Avesta, they are perfectly justified in believing that their religion did not originally sanction marriages between those who were next of kin. But when we descend to the Pahlavi translations and writings of the better class, which in their present form probably range from the sixth to the ninth century, we find many allusions to marriages between the nearest relatives, which are defended and advocated " with all the warmth and vehemence that usually indicate much difficulty in convincing the laity "; and the priests in the later years of the Sasanian dynasty and for some centuries subsequently also strongly advocated such marriages, though probably, we are told, with little success.[2] As to the practice of next-of-kin marriage in ancient Persia, West observes that there were evidently two reasons for its establishment and continuance. One was the eager desire for offspring that could, unfettered by duties towards any other family, maintain the indispensable periodical ceremonies for the souls of those passed away. The other was the wish to prevent any risk of religious perversion consequent upon marrying into a family of strangers or infidels. Both of these reasons, he adds, must have become intensified as the Mazda-worshippers diminished in numbers; hence the increasing vehemence of

[1] E. Tregear, *The Maori Race* (Wanganui, N.Z., 1904), p. 298. See also E. Shortland, *Traditions and Superstitions of the New Zealanders* (London, 1854), p. 119 *sq.*

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 86 *sq.*

priestly advocacy, until the foreign conquerors probably interfered and put a stop to the practice.[1]

Moreover, incestuous unions between relatives may be due to lack of other partners, just as homosexual practices are very frequently due to the absence of available women.[2] That may be the cause of the incest practised in small isolated communities, like those of some Brazilian Indians, the Chukchee, and the Bushmen, if certain reports of them are true.[3] The brother and sister marriages which, though highly reprobated, are said to be not unfrequent among the Wateïta in East Africa, are attributed to the difficulty experienced by young men in procuring the proper number of cows for the purchase of a wife.[4] In Europe at the present day, according to Bloch, "incest occurs almost exclusively as the result of chance associations—as, for example, in alcoholic intoxication, in consequence of close domestic intimacy in small dwellings, in the absence of other opportunity for sexual intercourse".[5] Stekel tells us that in all cases of incest between children of the same family which he has come across those who committed it had grown up in seclusion from children belonging to other families.[6] That incest, however, in particular exceptional instances springs

[1] E. W. West, 'The Meaning of Khvêtûk-das or Khvêtûdâd', in *The Sacred Books of the East*, xviii. (Oxford, 1882), p. 429. *Cf.* W. Geiger, *Civilization of the Eastern Iranians in Ancient Times*, i. (London, 1885), p. 66 *sq.*; A. Rapp, 'Die Religion und Sitte der Perser und übrigen Iranier nach den griechischen und römischen Quellen', in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xx. (Leipzig, 1866), p. 113.

[2] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. (London, 1917), p. 466 *sq.*

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 84, 88, 200.

[4] J. Thomson, *Through Masai Land* (London, 1887), p. 51.

[5] Bloch, *op. cit.* p. 662.

[6] W. Stekel, 'Der Abbau des Inzestkomplexes', in *Fortschritte der Sexualwissenschaft und Psychanalyse*, ii. (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 238.

from sexual preference is undeniable, although the relations between the nearest relatives are as a general rule remarkably free from erotic feelings.

While marriages of the kind that we regard as incestuous are not known to have been the customary ones among any of those peoples who have them at all, except, sometimes, in royal families, the case is different with marriages between cousins. Many people consider that marriage with a cousin is the most proper marriage, or that a man has a right to his cousin's hand, or even that it is his duty to marry her. This, however, nearly always applies to certain cousins only, not to all cousins indiscriminately.[1]

The ancient Arabs held that a man had a right to wed the daughter of his father's brother; such a marriage strengthened the kinship tie[2] and kept property in the family.[3] The same right is still recognised in the Mohammedan world. Among the Arabian bedouins the price paid for the cousin is always smaller than that demanded from a stranger,[4] and the same is often the case in Morocco. Moreover, marriages between cousins are popular there also because they keep the property in the family, and, especially in shereefian families, because they preserve the blood pure. They are said to be conducive to domestic happiness; while marrying a strange woman is like drinking water from an earthenware bottle, marriage with a cousin is like a drink from a dish—you are aware of what you drink. Such a marriage gives the husband greater power over his wife

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 68 *sqq.*

[2] J. Wellhausen, 'Die Ehe bei den Arabern', in *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, 1893, p. 437 *sq.*

[3] *Kitāb al-aġānī*, quoted by I. Goldziher, 'Endogamy and Polygamy among the Arabs', in *The Academy*, xviii. (London, 1880), p. 26.

[4] J. L. Burckhardt, *Notes on the Bedouins and Wahábis* (London, 1830), p. 154.

since, if she runs away, her father or brother will bring her back. It has further the advantage that she cannot curse her husband by cursing his ancestors without implicating herself in the curse, since a curse upon ancestors is understood to involve all their descendants as well. It confers religious merit on the man; whereas it is wrong of a man to leave his own cousin unmarried by taking another woman for wife.[1] Indian Mohammedans sometimes say that the object of cousin marriage is to keep the family as free as possible from foreign blood, and to retain in the family the property inherited by the couple.[2] The same economic motive for marriage between brothers' children prevails in Madagascar, where such a marriage is called " inheritance not removing ".[3]

In many cases the most proper marriage is considered to be that between a man and his father's sister's daughter or his mother's brother's daughter, a so-called " cross-cousin marriage ", while at the same time marriages between other cousins may be strictly prohibited. The latter are prevented from intermarrying by the rule of clan-exogamy, if they belong to the same clan—as is very often the case—or otherwise on account of the too close social relationship in which they stand to each other. Cross-cousin marriage may then be resorted to for the same reasons that in other cases lead to customary marriage between brothers' children. It may serve the objects of keeping together related families, and this object is particularly important where the families belong to different clans;[4] even in

[1] E. Westermarck, *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco* (London, 1914), p. 53 *sq.*

[2] E. A. Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. (India), Report (Calcutta, 1913), p. 252.

[3] J. Sibree, *The Great African Island* (London, 1880), p. 248.

[4] J. S. Polack, *Manners and Customs of the New Zealanders*, i. (London, 1840), p. 136.

civilised society it is not unusual to find friends endeavouring to strengthen the bond between them by encouraging marriages between their respective children. Cross-cousin marriage also prevents dispersion of the family property.[1] Hence in a society where inheritance runs through females a father who wishes to provide for his son out of the ancestral property would marry him to his sister's daughter (if not to his own sister), and a father who wishes to provide for his daughter would marry her to his sister's son, who is his own heir.[2] Among various peoples a marriage with a cross-cousin is expressly said to be cheaper than one with a non-related person;[3] or no bride price at all is paid for the daughter of a maternal uncle.[4] We may thus trace the custom of cross-cousin marriage to various motives without assuming, as certain writers have done, that it is merely a survival which has no meaning except as the vestige of an old social order.

In some cases the most proper kind of marriage is that between a man and his sister's daughter, and in other cases between a man and his brother's daughter. The

[1] *Cf.* J. Ch. Moloni, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xii. (Madras), Report (Madras, 1912), p. 107; E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero* (Berlin, 1906), p. 34.

[2] C. Hill Tout, *The Far West, the Home of the Salish and Déné* (London, 1907), p. 145 *sq.* *Cf.* F. J. Richards, 'Cross Cousin Marriage in South India', in *Man*, xiv. (London, 1914), p. 196 *sqq.*; Gait, *op. cit.* p. 257.

[3] C. Hayavadana Rao, 'The Gonds of the Eastern Ghauts, India', in *Anthropos*, v. (Wien, 1911), p. 794; Ch. Grant, *The Gazetteer of the Central Provinces of India* (Na'gpu'r, 1870), p. 277 (Gonds); E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (Madras, 1906), p. 56 (Yerukalas); J. Kohler, 'Indische Gewohnheitsrechte', in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, viii. (Stuttgart, 1889), p. 144; A. Schotter, 'Notes ethnographiques sur les tribus de Kouytcheou (Chine)', in *Anthropos*, vi. (Wien, 1911), p. 320.

[4] Hayavadana Rao, *loc. cit.* p. 811 (Irulans of the Gingee Hills); W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, i. (Cambridge, 1914), p. 184 *sq.* (Hiw, of Torres Islands).

origin of these kinds of marriages seem to be similar to that of cross-cousin marriages, with which they alternate, the economic motive resulting from a reduced or excused bride price being specially prominent.[1] It is sometimes said that when people are rich the maternal uncles marry their nieces out of affection for them, and that when they are poor such marriages take place out of necessity for both parties.[2]

There are thus various reasons for marriages between cousins and between uncles and nieces, quite apart from any particular sexual attraction. But it is obvious that sexual preference also may be the cause of marriages between such persons on account of the fact that they know each other better than other marriageable persons, especially where the separation between the sexes is so strict as it often is in Mohammedan countries.

In discussing the customs relating to marriage between relatives I have considered it the more necessary to go into all those details on account of the fragmentary, indiscriminate, and uncritical manner in which the subject has been treated by psycho-analysts in their search for corroboratory evidence for their theories outside their special domain. And I must adopt the same method in my discussion of their interpretation of various customs as vestiges of the occurrence of incest on a large scale in the past. One of those customs is the brother and sister marriage among some reigning families.[3] I have tried to show above that there are quite special reasons for it, and must consider it a very flimsy argument to say that

[1] Hayavadana Rao, *loc. cit.* p. 811 (Irulans); V. R. Thyagaraja Aiyar, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xxi. (Mysore), Report (Bangalore, 1912), p. 100 (Meda caste).

[2] V. N. Mandlik, *The Vyavahára Mayúkha*, ii. (Bombay, 1880), p. 425 (Mysore).

[3] Rank, *op. cit.* p. 391; Flügel, *op. cit.* pp. 91, 195.

" primitive customs, it is now generally agreed, are apt to persist in the case of royal families long after they have ceased to be observed by the common people ". It seems to me simply absurd to look for remnants of a primitive state of incest among the royalty of so highly civilised peoples as the ancient Egyptians and Peruvians, if it has been suppressed already in the very lowest grades of savagery. As other survivals of ancient incest are mentioned the levirate, the sororate,[1] group-marriage,[2] and the *jus primae noctis*.[3]

The levirate is the custom of marrying a dead brother's widow, and the sororate is the custom of marrying a living or dead wife's sister. Some writers believe that the levirate is a relic of polyandry, or that the levirate and the sororate are relics of ancient group-marriage; but they may be so naturally explained by existing conditions that I can find no reason to look upon them as survivals of something else in the past.[4] In any case, the idea of a connection between those customs and marriages between blood-relations is so utterly remote that, as far as I know, it has never occurred to any anthropologist, although anthropologists have often shown themselves to possess a very vivid imagination in their search for survivals. Group-marriage, again, means that a certain group of men are married to another group of women. The men are generally brothers and the women are in some cases known to be sisters, but we are not acquainted with any case in which the latter are sisters of their common husbands,[5] as psycho-analysts believe that they used to

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* pp. 93, 195.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 90, 195; Rank, *op. cit.* pp. 342, 408 *sqq.*

[3] A. J. Storfer, *Zur Sonderstellung des Vatermordes* (*Schriften zur angewandten Seelenkunde*, xii. [Leipzig & Wien, 1911]), p. 17; Freud, *Das Tabu der Virginität* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v.), p. 225 *sq.*; Rank, *op. cit.* p. 341 *sqq.*; Flügel, *op. cit.* pp. 143, 195.

[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 94-97, 207-220, 261 *sqq.*

[5] *Ibid.* iii. 223 *sqq.*

be or, in some instances, even are at present. They refer to Morgan's hypothesis of "the consanguine family", consisting of a body of kinsfolk within which there prevailed communal marriage between all men and women of the same generation—a hypothesis which was a mere guess unsupported by any known facts. Yet Rank alleges that it has persisted in the South Sea Islands and among many American tribes; and he attaches such importance to group-marriage that he devotes more than half a page under this heading to the sexual relations of the Nayars of South India, who had no group-marriage at all.[1]

The *jus primae noctis* has been the object of considerable speculation among psycho-analysts. Freud has set forth a hypothesis based upon the analysis of neurotics. The first act of coitus is a disappointment to the woman, who remains cold and unsatisfied. This frigidity may be connected with actual enmity against the man, and the future husband would be the very man with most reason to avoid drawing down upon himself this animosity.[2] But there is another motive reaching down into yet deeper strata, on which can be seen to rest the chief blame for the paradoxical reaction towards the man. From the analyses of many neurotic women it appears that the women go through an early phase in which they envy their brothers the token of maleness and feel themselves handicapped and ill-treated on account of the lack of it. This "envy of the penis" leads to that embitterment which many women display against men, and may, in particular, arouse hostility towards the man with whom a woman has her first coition. Thus "analysis of the causes of unhappy marriage . . . shows that the motives impelling the woman to revenge herself for her defloration are not entirely

[1] See *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 136 *sqq.*

[2] Freud, *Das Tabu der Virginität* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v.), p. 222 *sqq.*

extinguished even in the minds of civilised women ".[1] As for the person who performs the act of defloration instead of the husband, Freud agrees with Storfer that it was originally performed by the father of the woman, as a right belonging to him. But, he adds, " primitive custom appears to accord some recognition to the existence of the early sexual wish by assigning the duty of defloration to an elder, a priest, or a holy man, that is, to a father substitute. This seems to lead directly to the much-contested *jus primae noctis* of mediaeval feudal lords ".[2]

I think that the psycho-analysts are in the right when they attribute the so-called *jus primae noctis* to fear of defloration felt in consequence of the danger with which it is supposed to be attended. But as to the nature of this danger our opinions differ. Their theory rests upon findings derived from analysis of neurotic women, my own upon a study of the circum-

[1] Freud, *Das Tabu der Virginität* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v.), p. 226 *sqq.* (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, iv. 230 *sqq.*). According to K. Abraham (' Manifestations of the Female Castration Complex ' [1920], in *Selected Papers* [London, 1927], p. 345 *sq.*), who says that he knows several cases in which women after being deflorated had an outburst of affect and hit or throttled their husbands, " the retaliation is found to refer ultimately to the injustice suffered at the hands of the father. The unconscious of the adult daughter takes a late revenge for the father's omission to bestow upon her a penis either to begin with or subsequently; she takes it, however, not on her father in person, but on the man who in consequence of her transference of libido has assumed the father's part. The only adequate revenge for her wrong—for her castration —is the castration of the man. This can, it is true, be replaced symbolically by other aggressive measures; among these strangling is a typical substitutive action ". Flügel suggests (' Polyphallic Symbolism and the Castration Complex ', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, v. [1924], p. 175) that defloration, involving, as it does, the destruction of an organ, may be regarded as a symbolic castration (hymen = penis), and this in turn may give rise to a desire for revenge on the part of the woman.

[2] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 225 (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, iv. 229 *sq.*); Storfer, *op. cit.* p. 17.

stances connected with the custom where it is found, and upon our knowledge of primitive ideas.

The first fact that attracts our attention is the reluctance on the part of the bridegroom either to deflower the bride or to do so in the manner indicated by nature. In other cases girls are artificially deflowered before marriage by somebody else than their future husband—by the girl herself, by her mother, by some old woman, or by a man. Among various peoples young women or girls are deprived of their virginity 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 avoid: it may be executed by a person who is hired for the purpose or by a friend, and not infrequently a foreigner is employed for doing it. Among certain peoples it is said to be the custom for a father to deflower his daughter;[1] this has been represented as a right belonging to him,[2] but more probably it serves the object of making his daughter acceptable to her husband.[3] The supposition that the act was originally performed by the father, and that others are merely father substitutes, is a psychoanalytic hypothesis unsupported by any ethnological facts. The frequent occurrence of artificial defloration does not make it more probable.

[1] G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften*, i. (Semarang, etc., 1912), p. 217 (Alfurs of Tonsawang in Minahassa, some Battas of Sumatra); E. Ketjen, 'De Kalangers', in *Tijdschrift voor indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xxiv. (Batavia & 's Hage, 1876), p. 427 (Kalangs of Java).

[2] A. Herport, *Eine kurtze Ost-Indianische Reiss-Beschreibung* (Bern, 1669), p. 178 *sq.* (Sinhalese); N. von Miklucho-Maclay, 'Ethnological Excursions in the Malay Peninsula', in *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1878, no. 2 (Singapore), p. 216 (Orang Sakai of the Malay Peninsula, Eastern Moluccas).

[3] *Cf.* W. Hertz, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (Stuttgart & Berlin, 1905), p. 218; H. Ploss–M. Bartels, *Das Weib in der Natur- und Völkerkunde*, i. (Leipzig, 1905), p. 691.

Why, then, 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; but although this explanation gains some support from statements made by a few first-hand authorities it can at most have a very limited application. The chief reason for his reluctance is no doubt fear of the hymeneal blood, which is very generally considered to be a mysterious seat of danger. That other men nevertheless can be induced to perform the act is not difficult to understand, even apart from the fact that they are often paid for it. A bridegroom is commonly held to be in a state of danger, extremely susceptible to evil influences, especially such of a more or less supernatural kind; hence an act that is supposed to be dangerous to him may be supposed to be even quite harmless to other men. Sometimes, as already said, the defloration is executed 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 other persons. Moreover, the operation may be entrusted to him because it is supposed to be good for the bride or a blessing for the married couple, sexual intercourse with such a person being frequently held to be highly beneficial. So also benefits may be expected 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* which among various peoples is granted to a priest is, largely at least, based upon similar ideas; what is or has been merely a habit may be interpreted as, or actually become, a right. The same may be said of the *jus primae noctis* of a chief or a king, whose services may be sought for on grounds alike those which have led to defloration by priests: sometimes it is actually said to be incumbent on the king to perform the act. At the same time it

could never have come to be looked upon as a right unless it 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.

These are the main conclusions on the subject which I have arrived at on the basis of facts that I have stated in detail elsewhere.[1] As for the nature of the danger which is supposed to attend the act of defloration, it may be said that even if primitive men had by direct observation anticipated the findings of psycho-analysts, it is extremely unlikely that they would have been so sensitive as to refrain from the act for fear of the wife's possible hostility springing from her disappointment or " envy of the penis ". Besides, they might as well have noticed another effect of defloration mentioned by Freud, who states that, instead of leading to hostility, it may also, on the contrary, be followed by a very special and lasting attachment to the man who performed the act.[2]

In this connection I may still add two supposed remnants of earlier father and daughter incest. Freud observes that it is only in accord with our expectations " to find divine figures, too, among the father surrogates to whom defloration is entrusted. In many districts of India the bride was obliged to sacrifice the hymen as an offering to the wooden lingam; and the same custom obtained in Roman marriage ceremonies, though toned down to the extent that the young wife had only to seat herself upon the gigantic stone phallus of Priapus ".[3] Now it is obvious that defloration in a temple by the

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 166 *sqq.*

[2] Freud, *op. cit.* pp. 212, 221.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 226 (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, iv. 230).

medium of a holy object may have served the object not only of removing the danger of the first coitus, but also of securing another advantage similar to that gained by intercourse with a holy man. We are expressly told that in India virgins or brides were deflowered by means of the phallus of an idol in order that their marriage should 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 Priapus or, as Lactantius expresses himself, *in sinu pudendo* of Tutunus, who was identical with Priapus.[3] But Arnobius informs 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] In those customs there is nothing that suggests a father substitute.

Freud refers to Storfer's view[5] that the custom of the "Tobias nights" is an acknowledgment of the prerogative of the patriarch, as Jung had suggested before him.[6] That continence has to be observed for a longer or shorter time after marriage is a custom of which instances may be quoted from all parts of the world.[7] With reference to the Vedic practice Oldenberg believes that its original meaning must be sought

[1] W. Schouten, *Ost-Indische Reyse* (Amsterdam, 1676), p. 161.

[2] A. C. Burnell, in *Voyages of J. H. van Linschoten to the East Indies*, i. (London, 1885), p. 224 n. 3. *Cf.* Schouten, *op. cit.* p. 161.

[3] St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, vi. 9. 3; vii. 24. 2 (J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus*, xli. [Parisiis, 1841], coll. 188, 215); Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, i. 20 (*ibid.* vi. [1844], col. 227); A. Rossbach, *Untersuchungen über die römische Ehe* (Stuttgart, 1853), p. 369 *sqq.* See also W. Hertz, *op. cit.* p. 272.

[4] Arnobius, *Adversus gentes*, iv. 7 (Migne, *op. cit.* v. [1844], col. 1015).

[5] Storfer, *op. cit.* p. 17 n. 1; *idem*, *Marias jungfräuliche Mutterschaft* (Berlin, 1914), p. 33.

[6] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 226.

[7] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 547 *sqq.*

in the fear of spirits who, in the act of copulation, might slip into the woman and endanger her offspring, or might even themselves impregnate her, but were supposed to be misled by a pretence of omitting the consummation of marriage.[1] Frazer, again, suggests that the intention of that widespread custom was rather to leave the demons free scope for making love to the bride in the absence of the bridegroom;[2] and a similar explanation has previously, and in more positive terms, been offered by Von Reitzenstein.[3] This conjecture is, so far as I know, directly supported only by one statement, more recently made by Professor Karsten with reference to the Canelos Indians of Ecuador, and he tells us that " the consequence of intercourse with the demon will be that the woman will either fall ill and die or give birth to a monstrous child ".[4] Storfer and Freud might perhaps regard the demon as a father substitute.[5] For my own part I am of opinion that anthropologists are often apt to look for too much reasoning at the bottom of primitive customs. Many of these are based on vague feelings rather than on definite ideas. It is not surprising if sexual intercourse, which is in many cases considered a mysterious cause of evil, is held to be dangerous to bride and bridegroom, who are particularly exposed or sensitive to evil influences, and is therefore abstained from while the danger lasts.

[1] H. Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda* (Berlin, 1894), p. 271.

[2] Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the Old Testament*, i. (London, 1919), p. 520.

[3] F. von Reitzenstein, ' Der Kausalzusammenhang zwischen Geschlechtsverkehr und Empfängnis in Glaube und Brauch der Natur- und Kulturvölker ', in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, xli. (Berlin, 1909), pp. 656, 661, 676.

[4] R. Karsten, *Contributions to the Sociology of the Indian Tribes of Ecuador* (*Acta Academiae Aboensis*, Humaniora, i. no. 3 [Abo, 1920]), pp. 74, 69.

[5] *Cf.* Freud, *Eine Teufelsneurose im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*, III. *Der Teufel als Vaterersatz* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x. [1924]), p. 419 *sqq.*

But to speculate on the specific nature of the danger and of the evil influences causing it, or on the way in which continence is supposed to avert the danger, is, in the absence of direct evidence, the more precarious as it is very doubtful whether the people themselves have any clear theory on the subject.

Psycho-analysts will probably ignore my criticism of their attemps to explain all those customs as evidence of the previous existence of incestuous practices, and from their point of view they can do so—nay, can even afford to admit that the criticism is well grounded—without prejudicing their main thesis. For they have adduced yet another argument to prove that incest was once very generally practised all over the world, namely, the well-nigh universal existence of customs or laws that prohibit it.[1] If you have evidence of ancient incest both in the cases when it is allowed and in the cases when it is prohibited, you may be quite sure that it was once universal.

In that major argument the psycho-analysts have the support of a great outsider—no less an anthropologist than Sir James Frazer. Freud quotes with much appreciation the following remarks in Frazer's criticism of my hypothesis that the prohibition of incest is due to the aversion against sexual intercourse between persons who have been living closely together from the childhood of one or both of them, as is normally the case with parents and children and brothers and sisters: "It is not easy to see why any deep human instinct should need to be reinforced by law. There is no law commanding men to eat and drink or forbidding them to put their hands in the fire. Men eat and drink and

[1] Freud, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x. [1924]), p. 150; *idem*, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 347; Flügel, *op. cit.* pp. 35, 91, 195, 200, 202, 206 *sq.*; Rank, *op. cit.* p. 405; E. Jones, 'Psycho-Analysis and Anthropology', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, liv. (London, 1924), p. 54 *sq.*

keep their hands out of the fire instinctively for fear of natural not legal penalties, which would be entailed by violence done to these instincts. The law only forbids men to do what their instincts incline them to do; what nature itself prohibits and punishes, it would be superfluous for the law to prohibit and punish. Accordingly we may always safely assume that crimes forbidden by law are crimes which many men have a natural propensity to commit. If there was no such propensity there would be no such crimes, and if no such crimes were committed what need to forbid them? Instead of assuming, therefore, from the legal prohibition of incest that there is a natural aversion to incest, we ought rather to assume that there is a natural instinct in favour of it, and that if the law represses it, as it represses other natural instincts, it does so because civilised men have come to the conclusion that the satisfaction of these natural instincts is detrimental to the general interests of society ".[1]

This argument implies a curious misconception of the origin and nature of legal prohibitions. Of course, nobody would ever have dreamt of making a prohibitory law if the idea of its transgression had not presented itself to his mind. We may reverse the words of the Apostle and say that where no transgression is, there is no law. When Solon was asked why he had specified no punishment for one who had murdered a father, he replied that he supposed it could not occur to anybody to commit such a crime (that wise man was not acquainted with the Oedipus complex!);[2] and Plato observed that an unwritten law defends as sufficiently as possible parents from incestuous intercourse with their children and brothers from intercourse with their sisters, no thought of such a thing entering at all into

[1] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. (London, 1910), p. 97 *sq.*

[2] Diogenes Laertius, *Solon*, 10; Cicero, *Pro S. Roscio Amerino*, 25.

the minds of most of them.[1] But though the prohibition of a certain act presupposes that it is considered possible, that it has occurred and is thought more or less likely to occur again, it does not imply that there is a widespread natural propensity to do it. Nor does the rigour of the law indicate the strength of the temptation to transgress it. Do the severe laws against bestiality prove that a large number of men have a natural inclination to copulate with animals? How, then, could the severe laws against incest prove that there is or has been a general and strong tendency to incest? The great variability of the sexual instinct and the fact that there are circumstances in which a natural aversion may be blunted or overcome, are sufficient to account for its occurrence, and it is this that people are anxious to prevent. Customs and laws express the general feelings of the community and punish acts that shock them; but they do not tell us whether the inclination to commit the forbidden act is felt by many or by few.

I notice with satisfaction that Dr. Havelock Ellis shares my opinion. He writes in a review of my book: " It is the simple fundamental impulses of normal life which all our customs and institutions and laws formulate and often emphasise. Human ingenuity sometimes moulds them into extravagant shapes and camouflages them with fantastic designs, but it is the fundamental natural impulses beneath them which are the driving force. This is what Dr. Westermarck in general clearly sees. He is thus easily able to refute Sir James Frazer's rejection of his view. Frazer thinks that laws exist to forbid men to do the things their natural instincts incline them to do. Laws, it seems, are brought down to men, by the Mosaic method, from some inaccessible Sinai. Strange that so brilliant an investigator, whose researches have often elucidated superstí-

[1] Plato, *Leges*, viii. 838.

tions, should himself fall a victim to a superstition so gross!"[1]

To the evidence from anthropology psycho-analysts add facts from mythology, which they represent as vestiges of ancient incestuous practices. They argue that when incest was repressed among men, the incest wishes found a vent in the fanciful creations of myths and legends.[2] On the other hand, mythologists have suggested that the representations of the incest motive in myth and legend may be taken as a symbolic portrayal of certain important and impressive natural occurrences, such as the sequence of day and night, summer and winter, and so forth; and Silberer, himself a psycho-analyst, maintains that "it will not be possible for the psycho-analyst to force the nature mythologist out of his position and somehow to prove that any symbol means not the sun but the father". At the same time he is of opinion that the nature mythologist on his part "must not attack the specifically psychological question, why in the apperception of an object, this and not that symbolic image offers itself to consciousness".[3] But the choice of symbols for the natural phenomena may certainly have had some other foundation than incestuous desires.

Of considerable interest is the close relationship between the incestuous unions of celestial beings and those of royal persons, which is particularly striking where the latter also are regarded as divine. Osiris' and Set's marriages with their sisters Isis and Nephthys are exact parallels to the Egyptian Pharaos' marriages with their sisters; and according to an ancient Peruvian legend the sun sent two of her children, who were

[1] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vii. (Philadelphia, 1928), p. 506.

[2] Rank, *op. cit.* pp. 391, 416 *sqq.*

[3] H. Silberer, *Problems of Mysticism and its Symbolism* (New York, 1917), p. 331.

brother and sister and at the same time husband and wife, to become the ancestors of the royal family, in which there was a rule that the heir to the kingdom should marry his sister. Winckler believes that the brother and sister marriages in oriental royal families had their prototypes in myths of astral origin;[1] while Rank maintains that the repressed incest was projected to the gods before it came to be practised by divine kings, and that the latter afterwards pleaded the examples of gods in excuse of their incestuous marriages.[2] According to both writers, then, the incest myths, though explained in different ways by them, preceded the incest of kings; but it seems to me that the latter, or ideas similar to those from which it sprang, may have led to the myths. *Mésalliances* have to be avoided in heaven as well as on earth. It is possible that an ancient royal custom likewise has something to do with the Oedipus legend. Frazer observes that "the marriage of Oedipus with the widowed queen, his mother, fits in very well with the rule which has prevailed in some countries that a valid title to the throne is conferred by marriage with the late king's widow";[3] but that "the Oedipus legend would conform still more closely to custom if we could suppose that marriage with a mother was formerly allowed in cases where the king had neither a sister nor a stepmother, by marrying whom he could otherwise legalise his claim to the throne".[4]

According to Freud that legend originates in an extremely old dream material, which consists of the

[1] H. Winckler, 'Arabisch-Semitisch-Orientalisch', p. 14, in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, vi. (Berlin, 1901); *idem*, *Die babylonische Geisteskultur und ihre Beziehungen zur Kulturentwicklung der Menschheit* (Leipzig, 1907), quoted by Rank, *op. cit.* p. 390.

[2] Rank, *op. cit.* p. 391.

[3] Frazer, *The Dying God* (London, 1911), p. 193.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 193 n. 2.

painful disturbance of the relation towards one's parents by means of the first impulses of sexuality. In support of this conjecture he quotes a passage from Sophocles' tragedy where it is said that " it has already been the lot of many men in dreams to think themselves partners of their mother's bed ".[1] The legend tells us that Oedipus, the son of Laius, king of Thebes, and of Jocasta, is exposed immediately after his birth, because an oracle has informed the father that his son, who is still unborn, will be his murderer. He is rescued, and grows up as the king's son at a foreign court, until, being uncertain about his origin, he, also, consults the oracle, and is advised to avoid his native place, for he is destined to become the murderer of his father and the husband of his mother. On the road leading away from his supposed home he meets King Laius and strikes him dead in a sudden quarrel. Then he comes to the gates of Thebes, where he solves the riddle of the Sphinx who is barring the way, and he is elected king by the Thebans in gratitude, and is presented with the hand of Jocasta. He reigns in peace and honour for a long time, and begets two sons and two daughters upon his unknown mother, until at last a plague breaks out which causes the Thebans to consult the oracle anew. Here Sophocles' tragedy begins. The messengers bring the advice that the plague will stop as soon as the murderer of Laius is driven from the country. The action of the play now consists merely in a revelation, gradually completed and artfully delayed, of the fact that Oedipus himself is the murderer of Laius, and the son of the dead man and of Jocasta. Oedipus, profoundly shocked at the monstrosities that he has unknowingly committed, blinds himself and leaves his native place.

It is said that in this legend the nature of those tendencies which constitute the so-called Oedipus

[1] Freud, *Die Traumdeutung* (Leipzig & Wien, 1930), p. 182 (English translation [London, 1913], p. 224).

complex is most openly and powerfully revealed.[1] I fail to see how this allegation could be justified. It was not only unwittingly that Oedipus became the murderer of his father and the husband of his mother, but even in his unconscious there could have been neither love to the mother nor hatred to the father, since the former tendency, which is regarded as the cause of the latter, is not supposed to exist in a child before the age of two, and Oedipus was removed from his parents immediately —according to Sophocles, scarcely three days[2]—after his birth. Apparently he had not even experienced the first satisfaction of his " sex-impulse " by taking milk from his mother's breast. Even if the dream of which Jocasta speaks, and which Freud regards as the source of the legend, was the expression of an infantile incest wish, the Oedipus of the legend could not have been the Oedipus of the complex bearing his name. Nevertheless, Freud, in discussing the impression that Sophocles' tragedy makes upon the audience, says that the hearer " reacts as though by self-analysis he had detected the Oedipus complex in himself ",[3] that Oedipus' " fate moves us only for the reason that it might have been ours. . . . King Oedipus, who has struck his father Laius dead and has married his mother Jocasta, is nothing but the realised wish of our childhood. But more fortunate than he, we have since succeeded, unless we have become psycho-neurotics, in withdrawing our sexual impulses from our mothers and in forgetting our jealousy of our fathers ".[4] Oedipus could have had no such tendencies to suppress. If he had followed Freud, his love and hate would have been directed, not to Jocasta and Laius, but to his foster-parents.[5]

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 12. [2] Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex*, 718.
[3] Freud, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 343 (English translation, p. 278).
[4] *Idem*, *Die Traumdeutung*, p. 181 (English translation, p. 223).
[5] See *infra*, p. 84.

III

FREUD'S THEORY OF THE REPRESSION OF THE INCESTUOUS TENDENCIES: HOW THEY WERE REPRESSED

THE psycho-analysts admit, of course, the general prevalence of an aversion to incest, and explain it as the result of a repression of the original incestuous tendencies. They are then faced with the questions how this repression was produced, and why it was pursued.

The supposed repression of the wishes of infantile sexuality that, about the age of six, brings about the period of latency, is largely accomplished by education, which endeavours by severity and fear to paralyse the sensual element of the child's libido. But the external compulsion is soon internalised and leads to emotions of shame and disgust and to moral and aesthetic standards of ideas, which act as censors, definitely driving the infantile sexual wish out of the field of consciousness.

Among the fear-inspiring factors leading to repression the threat of castration plays the most prominent part. The Oedipus complex, the central phenomenon of the sexual period in early childhood, succumbs to the dread of castration with which the child is threatened because he handles his genital organ. But not immediately, for to begin with the boy does not believe in the threat, nor obeys it. What finally breaks down his unbelief is the sight of the female genitals, which convinces him of the absence of a penis in a creature so like himself. With this the loss of his own

penis becomes imaginable, and the threat of castration achieves its delayed effect.[1] The dread of castration is found in girls too. It is said that the father threatens the boy and the mother the girl.[2] But we are also told that in both sexes it is the mother who in the deepest strata of the unconscious is specially dreaded as castrator: she takes away the child's faeces, which is looked upon as an act of dismemberment, and therefore " in terms of psychic reality she *is* also already the castrator ".[3]

It is argued that if the adults do not remember the castration-threat, that does not prove its non-existence in their childhood.[4] And even if any number of parents testified that they never threatened their children with castration, that would be of no avail. As soon as a child feels that his parents are a check upon his sexual wishes he himself hits upon the castration complex, even though there was no threat at all; for it is a heritage from the time when " primitive men, long before there was any ' revealed ' religion, fell back on the threat of castration in order to secure the destruction of the Oedipus complex ".[5] But even this assumption is not requisite to explain the wide range of the castration complex. " The growing human being learns that every pleasure is closely followed by the loss of the

[1] Freud, *Der Untergang des Ödipuskomplexes* (in *Gesammelte Schriften* [Leipzig, Wien, Zürich), v. [1924]), p. 424 *sqq.* (English translation, in *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, v. [London, 1924], p. 419 *sqq.*).

[2] J. Sadger, *Die Lehre von den Geschlechtsverirrungen* (Leipzig & Wien, 1921), p. 57.

[3] Melanie Klein, ' The Psychological Principle of Infant Analysis ', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, viii. (1927), p. 27 n.; *idem*, ' Early Stages of the Oedipus Conflict ', *ibid.* ix. (1928), p. 171.

[4] G. Róheim, ' Psycho-Analysis of Primitive Cultural Types ', *ibid.* xiii. (1932), p. 91.

[5] Sadger, *op. cit.* p. 56; *idem*, ' Genital and Extragenital Libido ', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, x. (1929), p. 355.

pleasure-giving bodily organ (uterus, nipple, stool); so that on reaching the pleasure of onanism he is already prepared affectively to lose the corresponding pleasure-giving organ, the penis, and easily accepts the threat of castration as an obvious conclusion. The temporal sequence of the unconscious affective impressions is elaborated into a causal one (rationalised) and castration is to follow as a result of onanism. This affective basis also explains how the castration complex can play such an important part without any threat having been given—and that without drawing upon any phylogenetic explanation ".[1]

The assumption that the castration complex has, more or less, a hereditary basis in primitive custom is not substantiated by anything we know about uncivilised peoples. Professor Seligman observes that although we have very little exact information with regard to the " phallic phase " in children of the savage cultures, it is doubtful whether infantile or childish masturbation is ever corrected among savages.[2] Torday tells us that among the Baluba of the Congo masturbation is actually taught by the mother or some old woman to girls of tender age, as it is considered a preparation for marriage by enlarging (*i.e.* shaping) the sexual parts.[3] Investigation among a number of primitive peoples fails to discover any cessation of overt hetero-sexual interests during the years of the alleged latent period,[4] which indicates that the infantile sexuality has received no efficient check. The idea of castrating a child or of threatening to do so must be quite alien to the savage

[1] F. Alexander, ' The Castration Complex in the Formation of Character ', *ibid.* iv. (1923), p. 32 *sq.*

[2] C. G. Seligman, ' Anthropological Perspective and Psychological Theory ', in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lxii. (1932), p. 213.

[3] E. Torday, ' The Principles of Bantu Marriage ', in *Africa*, ii. (London, 1929), p. 257.

[4] Seligman, *loc. cit.* p. 213.

mind. As I have shown elsewhere, the children of many of the lower races are never, or hardly ever, subjected to corporal punishment of any description;[1] and other instances of the same kind might be quoted from more recent literature. To mention a case from the lowest strata of culture I may refer to Professor Radcliffe-Brown's statement that among the Andaman Islanders "the children are treated with extreme kindness, and are never punished, and hardly ever scolded".[2] In a recent book on the child in primitive society Dr. Miller makes the general remark that among the tribes of simpler culture physical punishment directed towards the end of leading the child into the correct path is very rare.[3]

At the age of puberty, or a little before or after, there are widespread initiation ceremonies, such as circumcision and the knocking out of teeth, that have been interpreted as "equivalents" to, or "symbols" of castration.[4] What this means is somewhat obscure. Sometimes circumcision has been represented as a survival of and substitute for an earlier act of castration.[5] This seems absurd, considering that castration could at most have taken place only in rare cases, while initiation rites, where they occur, are general. Circum-

[1] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. (London, 1912), p. 513 *sq.* See also S. R. Steinmetz, 'Das Verhältnis zwischen Eltern und Kindern bei den Naturvölkern', in *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, i. (Berlin, 1898), p. 610 *sqq.*

[2] A. R. Brown, *The Andaman Islanders* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 77.

[3] N. Miller, *The Child in Primitive Society* (London, 1928), p. 172 *sq.*

[4] Th. Reik, *Ritual* (London, 1931), p. 105; J. C. Flügel, *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family* (London, 1929), p. 85. Freud says (*Totem und Tabu* [in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x.; 1924], p. 184 n. 1) that "when our children learn about ritual circumcision they identify it with castration".

[5] O. Rank, *Das Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung und Sage* (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 308.

cision has been said to serve the purpose of punishing and preventing incest.[1] But its generality as an initiation rite also makes its impossible to look upon it as a punishment, unless the offence too was general; and as a means of preventing incest it would of course be useless. It cannot prevent it by inspiring fear, when it is performed anyhow; nor does it produce physical incapacity to perform the forbidden act. The most satisfactory explanation which has been suggested for this initiation rite is, in my opinion, that it at once makes the boy a man and gives him the appearance of sexual maturity, or that it by giving him such appearance is supposed to make him capable of procreation.[2] The idea that the ceremony of knocking out teeth is a symbol of castration is connected with the orthodox psycho-analytic belief that the dream of losing a tooth is a symbol of it. According to dream-books and popular interpretation of dreams it indicates the loss of a near relative.[3] Professor Seligman, who has an unusually wide experience of uncivilised peoples, and at the same time is in considerable sympathy with the application of psycho-analysis to anthropology, is of opinion that initiation customs have little influence on genital development and are of little consequence with regard to the Oedipus complex.[4]

The castration-threat is supposed to have left a good many other vestiges. It has led to fear of operations and hospitals;[5] to fear of sharp-edged razors;[6] to children's unwillingness to let their mothers pare their nails;[7]

[1] Reik, *op. cit.* pp. 105, 106, 116, 124; M. Zeller, *Die Knabenweihen* (Bern, 1923), p. 135; Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 85.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 563 *sq.*

[3] See, *e.g.*, E. Westermarck, *Ritual and Belief in Morocco*, ii. (London, 1926), p. 49.

[4] Seligman, *loc. cit.* p. 214 *sq.*

[5] Sadger, *Die Lehre von den Geschlechtsverirrungen*, p. 61.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 64.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 63.

to fear of examinations, in dreams and reality;[1] to contempt for women, as not possessing the penis;[2] to anti-Semitism, which is deeply rooted in the unconscious ever since the boy, already in the nursery, began to despise the Jew when hearing of the mutilation to which he is subjected in his infancy.[3] "The castration complex", says Hitschmann, "means, for the boy, pride in his penis or anxiety about it as a result of feelings of guilt or threats of punishment; for the girl feelings of bitterness or envy together with the idea of having suffered some infantile injury or humiliation".[4] According to Freud, the dread of castration, with which the higher being that later became the ego-ideal once threatened the ego, "is probably the kernel round which the subsequent fear of conscience has gathered; it is this dread that persists as the fear of conscience".[5]

One is amazed when reading of all those wonderful consequences of parental castration-threats. Such threats may be common enough, and they may have had the effect of stopping the child from handling his genitals; but I fail to see how they could have broken down his Oedipus complex. Let us remember that this complex implies a desire for sexual intimacy with the parent of the opposite sex, and that this desire (if it exists at all) is of so subtle a nature that it was detected only by the method of psycho-analysis, nay that even

[1] Sadger, 'Über Prüfungsangst und Prüfungsträume', in *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, vi. (1920), p. 150; Melanie Klein, 'The Role of the School in the Libidinal Development of the Child', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, v. (1924), p. 312; E. Blum, 'The Psychology of Study and Examinations', *ibid.* vii. (1926), p. 469.

[2] Flügel, 'Sexual and Social Sentiments', in *The British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vii. (Cambridge, 1927), p. 152.

[3] Sadger, *op. cit.* p. 67 *sq.*

[4] E. Hitschmann, 'Theory of Instinct and Sexuality', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, i. (1920), p. 277.

[5] Freud, *Das Ich und das Es* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi. [1925]), p. 403 *sq.* (English translation [London, 1927], p. 85).

psycho-analysts who do not belong to the Freudian school positively deny its existence. How, then, could we expect ordinary parents to discover it and, in consequence, try to stamp it out by horrible threats? What father would threaten to castrate his little son because he embraces and kisses his mother? We are here on the conscious plane, and the strong opposition to Freud's theory of infantile sexuality is just due principally to lack of observational experience.

Only at a later age could the sexual impulse lead to incestuous intercourse, and it is such intercourse alone that customs and laws try to prevent. According to Freud, as we have seen, the generality of these prohibitions proves that there is a widespread natural tendency to commit the forbidden act, and this implies that the repression of the childish impulse must have been more or less inadequate. The essence of repression lies simply in the function of rejecting and keeping something out of consciousness, but it does not hinder the instinct-presentation (that is, the idea or group of ideas which is charged with a definite amount of the mental energy pertaining to the instinct) from continuing to exist in the unconscious and from organising itself further. Indeed, the instinct-presentation develops in a more unchecked and luxuriant fashion if it is withdrawn by repression from conscious influence; it ramifies like a fungus, so to speak, in the dark. Hence the process of repression is not to be regarded as something which takes place once for all, the results of which are permanent, but it demands a constant expenditure of energy. " We may imagine that what is repressed exercises a continuous straining in the direction of consciousness, so that the balance has to be kept by means of a steady counter-pressure ".[1]

[1] Freud, *Die Verdrängung* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), pp. 468, 469, 471 (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, iv. [London, 1925], pp. 86, 87, 89 *sqq.*).

The Freudians maintain that the legal prohibitions have not only tended to suppress the incestuous act but also to repress the incestuous desire. They agree that there is an almost universal aversion to incest, and attribute this to the prohibition of it. The question, then, is how the repression of the incestuous desire has been accomplished. Freud gives no clear answer to this question, but has, in dealing with it, got entangled in contradictions.[1] He assumes, as we shall see later, that the sons of the primeval horde killed their father, who stood in the way of their incestuous demands and their desire for power, but afterwards experienced remorse and a sense of guilt coinciding with it and, in consequence, as an act of " subsequent obedience ", decided to renounce the fruits of their deed by denying themselves the liberated women; and this led to a repression of the wishes of the Oedipus complex. That sense of guilt was transmitted by inheritance to all their descendants for thousands of years and remained thus, as an innate feeling, effective in generations which could not have known anything of its cause.[2] Yet at diametrical variance with this statement Freud also denies emphatically that the aversion to incest has become innate.[3] The former supposition rests on the hypothesis of the inheritance of acquired characters. This hypothesis has been abandoned by most recent biologists; but even if future research should prove the possibility of such inheritance in certain cases, special evidence would have to be produced to show that an acquired psychic disposition of the kind in question can be transmitted from one generation to another. Freud certainly does nothing of the sort by arguing that " if psychic processes of one generation did not continue in the next, if each had to

[1] *Cf.* W. McDougall, Review of Freud's *Totem and Taboo*, in *Mind*, N.S. xxix. (London, 1920), p. 348 *sq.*

[2] Freud, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x.), p. 189 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 150 *sq.*

acquire its attitude towards life afresh, there would be no progress in this field and almost no development ".[1] But in any case—whether the repression of the incestuous desire and its transformation into aversion are supposed to have been repeated in each generation, or this process is supposed to have been accomplished in early times and its result to have been transmitted to succeeding generations in the form of psychic dispositions—we are now confronted with the question whether prohibitory rules are at all able to bring about such a result. It may be of some use to consider another variety of the sexual impulse the gratification of which has also been tabooed most stringently by law and public opinion, namely, masculine homosexuality.

Freud maintains that there is in every person an original bisexual tendency, but that the homosexual component of the sex instinct of the ordinary mind has been repressed, largely by social influences. In illustration of this he observes that in communities where inversion is not looked upon as a crime it is found to be in perfect agreement with the sexual inclinations of a considerable number of individuals.[2] In order to form an estimate of the accuracy and evidential validity of this statement it is necessary to enter a little deeper into the subject.

Homosexual practices are due sometimes to instinctive preference for an individual of one's own sex and sometimes merely to external conditions unfavourable to normal intercourse, especially absence of the other sex.[3] In the latter case we are not concerned with inversion at all, which presupposes that the person for the gratification of his sexual desire prefers his own

[1] Freud, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x.), p. 190 (English translation [London, *s.d.*], p. 262).

[2] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 105.

[3] E. Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. (London, 1917), p. 465 *sqq.*

sex to the opposite one, but simply with the accidental turning of the sexual instinct into an abnormal channel, the instinct being called out by an approximate substitute, or even by diffused emotional excitement, in the absence of the normal object.[1] At the same time it seems to me very probable that in such circumstances the homosexual attraction in the course of time easily develops into genuine inversion. When I wrote the chapter on homosexual love in my book *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, my observations in Morocco led me to oppose the view, then held by authorities on homosexuality, that acquired inversion is found only in occasional instances.[2] Among the mountaineers of Northern Morocco excessive indulgence in pederasty and definite inversion go hand in hand with great isolation of the women and a very high standard of female chastity, whereas the bedouins of the plains, where the unmarried girls enjoy considerable freedom, are very little or hardly at all addicted to pederasty. It is impossible to believe that this very unequal distribution of inverts among different neighbouring tribes of the same stock can be due to congenital differences; but it can be explained as the result of the lasting influence that homosexual practices in early youth may exercise on the sexual instinct, which, being then somewhat indefinite, is easily turned into a distinctly homosexual direction. In Morocco inversion is most prevalent among the scribes, who from childhood have lived in association with their fellow-students. Of course, influences of this kind presuppose an innate disposition that in certain circumstances develops into actual inversion. But between inversion and normal sexuality there seem to be all shades of variation. Long ago William James expressed the opinion that inversion

[1] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, ii. (Philadelphia, 1915), p. 6 *sq.*

[2] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 468.

is a "kind of sexual appetite, of which very likely most men possess the germinal possibility".[1] This is certainly the case in early puberty. On this point Freud agrees with earlier psychologists.[2]

If homosexual practices that rise from circumstances unfavourable to normal intercourse can lead to genuine inversion, it may very well be that—as Freud maintains—the lack of social restraint increases the number of inverts and not merely homosexual activity. But this by no means implies that social prohibitions can repress inversion—that is the sexual desire by preference directed towards one's own sex—where it exists, and least of all if it is congenital and consequently more deep-rooted than if it has been acquired. From the beginning of the Christian era European legislation has treated masculine homosexuality with the utmost severity. This was a heritage from the Hebrews. In the Old Testament unnatural vice was the sin of a people who were not the Lord's people, who thereby polluted the land, so that He visited their guilt and the land spued out its inhabitants. There were male prostitutes attached to Canaanite temples; and it is natural that the Yahveh worshippers should regard their practices with the utmost horror as forming part of an idolatrous cult. When this conception of homosexuality passed into Christianity the notion that it is a form of sacrilege was there strengthened by the habits of the Gentiles, among whom St. Paul found the abominations of Sodom rampant. During the Middle Ages heretics were accused of it as a matter of course; indeed, so closely was it associated with heresy that the same name was applied to both. The French *bougre* (from the Latin *Bulgarus*), to which there is an English equivalent, was originally a name given to a sect of

[1] W. James, *The Principles of Psychology*, ii. (London, 1891), p. 439.

[2] Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 104.

heretics who came from Bulgaria and was afterwards applied to other heretics, but at the same time it became the regular expression for a person guilty of unnatural intercourse. In mediaeval laws sodomy was repeatedly mentioned together with heresy, and the punishment was the same for both. Throughout the Middle Ages and later, Christian lawgivers thought that nothing but a painful death in the flames could atone for the sinful act. In France persons were actually burned for it in the middle and latter parts of the eighteenth century. In England it was punishable by death till 1861, although in practice the extreme punishment was not inflicted.[1]

As everybody knows, this draconic legislation has been utterly unable to stamp out homosexual intercourse in Europe. It has been even less able to repress inversion; I doubt whether any law has ever extinguished the peculiar desire of anybody born with strong homosexual tendencies. It is interesting to notice the difficulties that psycho-analysts have had in their treatment of inverts. Freud writes: " The removal of genital inversion or homosexuality is in my experience never an easy matter. On the contrary, I have found success possible only under specially favourable circumstances, and even then the success essentially consisted in being able to open to those who are restricted homosexually the way to the opposite sex, which had been till then barred, thus restoring to them full bisexual functions. . . . In general, to undertake to convert a fully developed homosexual into a heterosexual is not much more promising than to do the reverse, which for good reasons is never attempted ".[2] Ferenczi regards the passive form of inversion as

[1] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 480 *sqq.*

[2] Freud, *Uber die Psychogenese eines Falles von weiblicher Homosexualitat* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, v. [1924]), p. 317 (English translation, in *Collected Papers*, ii. [1924], p. 206 *sq.*).

incurable by analysis or by any kind of psycho-therapy at all, and it has not yet been possible, for him at least, to cure completely a severe case of the active form of it.[1] Sadger is hopeful in the case of an invert who is below the age of thirty or thirty-five;[2] but Boehm, who believes in the "theoretical" possibility of cure by psycho-analytic treatment, remarks that all the patients were treated by Sadger for only a few weeks or months, so that it is impossible to draw any conclusion as to the permanence of his results.[3]

Psycho-analysts have hardly raised the question why homosexuality has been prohibited, and when they have touched upon the subject they have shown insufficient knowledge of facts. Uncivilised peoples are generally said to take little notice of homosexual practices, though there are some statements to the contrary. Among the eastern nations of culture they are likewise, for the most part, treated with considerable indifference, though in the Zoroastrian books they are as much abhorred as in Hebrewism and Christianity and there, also, as sins of infidels, of Turanian Shamanists. In Greece pederasty in its baser forms was censured, though generally, it seems, with no great severity. In pagan Rome there was an old law of unknown date which imposed a mulct on him who committed pederasty with a free person; but this law, of which very little is known, had lain dormant for ages, and the subject of ordinary homosexual intercourse never afterwards attracted the attention of the pagan legislators.[4] It seems to me obvious that when such intercourse is censured on other than religious grounds, it is so in the first place on

[1] S. Ferenczi, *Contributions to Psycho-Analysis* (London, 1916), pp. 258, 263.

[2] Sadger, *Die Lehre von den Geschlechtsverirrungen*, p. 158 *sq.*

[3] F. Boehm, in a review of Sadger's book in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, v. (1924), p. 490.

[4] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 471 *sqq.*

account of that feeling of aversion which it tends to call forth in normally constituted adult individuals, whose sexual instincts have developed under normal conditions. I take the same to be the case with the condemnation of incest, the aversion to it being ultimately the cause of the prohibition of it. And I strongly doubt that any prohibition can extinguish a deep-rooted incestuous desire any more than it can do away with congenital inversion. According to Stekel it is perhaps the most difficult task that can be set a psycho-analyst to remove an incest fixation which goes back to early years, if it has been unconnected with sexual intercourse, and simply impossible to remove one which has been accompanied by such intercourse.[1]

If, then, incestuous desires are not more amenable to the prohibition of legislators than to the treatment of psycho-analysts, there must be some other cause of the almost universal aversion to incest than that postulated by the Freudians. I have already indicated in a few words my own opinion as to this cause, but want now to discuss the matter more fully, both on account of the criticism that psycho-analysts have passed on my theory, besides the objection dealt with above, and as a preliminary to my own criticism of Freud's explanation of the origin of the incest taboo.

Generally speaking, there is a remarkable lack of inclination for sexual intercourse between persons who have been living closely together from the childhood of one or both of them. This has been recognised by various writers as a psychological fact proved by common experience, and is attested by statements from different parts of the world.[2] When I asked my Berber teacher from the Great Atlas whether marriages between

[1] W. Stekel, 'Der Abbau des Inzestkomplexes', in *Fortschritte der Sexualwissenschaft und Psychanalyse*, ii. (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 216.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 193 *sqq.*

cousins were frequent in his tribe, his answer was, " How could you love a girl whom you have always seen? " A Moorish youth who was my attendant was grieved when his father wrote to him that he had to marry a certain girl living in his own village—not because he did not want to marry, but, as he told me, because he could not reconcile himself to the idea of getting for a wife a girl whom he knew so well. According to Dr. Havelock Ellis, " numberless women, when urged by a suitor they have known from childhood, have felt, and often said, ' I am very fond of you, but I don't want to marry you—I know you so well '"![1] In a review of my book on the history of marriage Dr. Jones writes: " One reads, breathlessly, that ' even between lads and girls who are educated together in the same school there is a conspicuous absence of erotic feelings ', according to an interesting communication of a lady who has for many years been the head-mistress of such a school in Finland. . . . It is a serious enough exposure of one's naïveté to expect someone who has been ' a head-mistress for many years ' to retain knowledge of the intimate feelings of children *in eroticis* ".[2] Dr. Jones evidently believes that nothing but psycho-analysis can teach us if a boy and a girl feel attraction for each other. He does not even consider it worth while to quote the following sentences in my book, which he presumably only regards as other exposures of the author's naïveté: " I heard of a lad who made a great distinction between girls of his own school and other, ' real ', girls, as he called them. According to other accounts boys may display erotic feelings towards younger girls in the school, but not towards girls of their own class "; my informants had themselves been educated in such

[1] Havelock Ellis, *Views and Reviews* (London, 1932), p. 168.

[2] E. Jones, in a review of the fifth edition of *The History of Human Marriage*, in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, iii. (1922), p. 251.

schools. Dr. Jones' ironical remark that " the situation must be desperate if one has to go to Finland for such information ", shows that he considers my statements not only unwarranted but absurd. I have sometimes wondered that psycho-analysts, who claim such intimate acquaintance with the unconscious part of the mind, display so little knowledge of the conscious part of it.

Among the lower animals, also, there are indications that the pairing instinct fails to be stimulated by companions and seeks strangers for its gratification. These are of considerable interest in the present connection; for even if psycho-analysts have found incestuous wishes in the unconscious of animals, I venture to think it unlikely that they could detect in them that super-ego in obedience to whose demands those wishes were repressed. The Marquis de Brisay, an authority on doves, says that " two birds from the same nest behave as though they regarded coupling as prohibited, or, rather, they know each other too well, and seem to be ignorant of their difference in sex, remaining unaffected in their relations by the changes which make them adults ".[1] Among domesticated animals it has often been noticed that companionship has a dulling effect upon the sexual instinct and that preference is given to strangers. Montaigne wrote: " I was fain to turn out into the paddock an old stallion, as he was not to be governed when he smelt a mare: the facility presently sated him as towards his own, but towards strange mares, and the first that passed by the pale of his pasture, he would again fall to his importunate neighing and his furious heats as before ".[2] I myself

[1] *L'Intermédiaire des biologistes*, 20th November 1897, quoted by Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, iv. *Sexual Selection in Man* (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 206 n. 3. For bees and ants see *infra*, p. 158.

[2] M. de Montaigne, *Essais*, book ii. ch. 15, vol. ii. (Bordeaux, 1909), p. 183 (English translation, ii. [London, 1905], p. 330).

have been told by a trustworthy person of a stallion that would not approach mares of the same stable. According to information given me by a correspondent, it seems to be well-known by dog breeders that if you bring up from puppyhood dogs and bitches together, the bitches very frequently refuse to take the dogs to which they have been accustomed from puppyhood, and his own experience corroborates this in a certain measure. Darwin quotes the statement of an informant to the effect that among dogs the male seems rather inclined towards strange females;[1] and Mr. Heape thinks that, in fact, all breeders will agree that animals brought into contact with strangers experience increased sexual stimulation.[2] Dr. Hamilton, basing his observations on eighteen macaques and two baboons at his laboratory in California, states that continuous confinement of one male with one female resulted in a marked diminution of sexual enthusiasm in both, particularly in the male, a condition which the animals sought to remedy by special stimulations; whereas vigour was immediately restored by supplying each with a new mate.[3]

Sexual indifference, however, is not by itself sufficient to account for prohibitory rules. But such indifference is very generally combined with sexual aversion when the act is thought of; indeed, I believe that this is normally the case whenever the idea of sexual intercourse occupies the mind with sufficient intensity and a desire fails to appear. An old and ugly woman, for instance, would in such circumstances become sexually repulsive to most men; and to many

[1] Ch. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, ii. (London, 1888), p. 294. See also H. Rohleder, *Die Zeugung unter Blutsverwandten* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 33 *sq.*

[2] W. Heape, *Sex Antagonism* (London, 1913), p. 63.

[3] G. V. Hamilton (in *Journal of Animal Behavior*, iv. [1914]), quoted by G. S. Miller, 'Some Elements of Sexual Behavior in Primates and Their Possible Influence on the Beginnings of Human Social Development', in *Journal of Mammalogy*, ix. (1928), p. 279.

male inverts any woman, as an object of sexual desire, is not merely indifferent but disgusting.[1] And aversions which are generally felt readily lead to moral disapproval and prohibitory customs or laws.[2] This I take to be the fundamental cause of the prohibition of incest. Persons who have been living closely together from childhood are as a rule near relatives. Hence their aversion to sexual relations with one another displays itself in custom and law as a prohibition of intercourse between persons who are near of kin.

As I have shown in detail elsewhere, many facts testify that the extent to which relatives are forbidden to intermarry is connected with their close living together.[3] Montesquieu observed long ago that marriage between cousins was prohibited by peoples among whom brothers and their children used to live in the same house. A comparison between the forbidden degrees of the Greeks and Romans is instructive. Among the former cousins and even half-brothers and sisters were allowed to intermarry, whereas among the latter marriage was prohibited also between more distantly related persons. This difference, as Rossbach remarks, was due to the fact that the family feeling of the Greeks was much weaker than that of the Romans, among whom in early times a son used to remain in his father's house even after marriage, so that cousins on the father's side were brought up as brothers and sisters. Later on, the several families separated from the common household, and the prohibited degrees were retrenched accordingly. But under the influence of Christian ascetic ideas they were again extended; in the Western Church they became gradually as many as seven, according to the " canonical computation ", but were subsequently limited to four, and since then

[1] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, ii. 278 *sq.*
[2] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. 116 *sq.*
[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 207 *sqq.*

there has been no change. Yet in spite of the religious sanction given them by the Church the exogamous rules have been much reduced by the laws of all Christian countries, which shows that they had been unable to repress people's feelings. But although marriage between cousins is allowed and, according to some modern law-books, marriage between uncle and niece and between aunt and nephew, there is no law that allows marriage between parent and child or between brother and sister; even the Russian 'Soviet Law of Marriage and the Family', which is the most liberal modern law of its kind, prohibits such unions. The explanation of this is simple enough. The prohibition of them is not felt as a restraint upon individual feelings, because in all normal cases there is no desire for the forbidden act.

Among various peoples marriage is prohibited even between all persons belonging to the same village or other local group, whether they are related by blood or not. At the same time the members of an exogamous clan very frequently do not live in the same locality. The exogamous rules, though in the first place associated with kinship because near relatives normally live together, have come to include relatives who do not do so—just as social rights and duties connected with kinship, although ultimately depending on local proximity, have a strong tendency to last after the local tie is broken. Clan exogamy has its counterpart, for instance, in the blood-feud as a duty incumbent on the whole clan, whether the members of it live together or not. In this process the influence of a common name has undoubtedly been of great importance. As kinship is traced by means of a system of names, the name comes to stand for blood-relationship. This system is naturally one-sided, keeping up the record of descent either on the father's or the mother's side, but not on both sides at once; hence the prohibited degrees, like

the social rights and duties generally connected with clanship, extend much farther on the one side than on the other. It should further be remembered that, according to primitive ideas, the name itself constitutes a mystic link between those who have it in common. The feeling against incest may also be opposed to intercourse between persons one of whom has or has had sexual relations with the other's relative; and, generally speaking, the feeling that two persons are intimately connected in some way or other may, through an association of ideas and feelings, give rise to the notion that marriage or sexual intercourse between them is improper or incestuous. Hence the prohibitions of marriage between relations by alliance and those of the Roman and Greek Churches on the ground of " spiritual relationship ". Every hypothesis which pretends to give a fairly full explanation of the exogamous rules must inevitably assume the operation of the law of association.

Various objections have been raised to my theory. It has been said that if close living together calls forth sexual aversion, such aversion ought to display itself between husband and wife as well as between near relatives. But these cases are certainly not identical. What I have spoken of is a lack of inclination for, and a feeling of aversion associated with the idea of, sexual intercourse between persons who have lived in a long-continued intimate relationship from a period of life when the action of sexual desire, in its acuter forms at least, is naturally out of the question. On the other hand, when a man marries a woman his feeling towards her is of a very different kind, and his love impulse may remain, nay increase, during the conjugal union. Yet even in this case long living together has undoubtedly a tendency to dull the sexual desire and sometimes to lead to positive aversion. The eternal uniformity of daily companionship may put love to sleep, damp its

ardour, and even give rise to a sense of latent or open hatred between a married pair. According to Bloch this hatred is observed most frequently in love-matches.[1]

It has been argued that "the noisome list" of peoples practising adelphic incest is hostile, or even fatal, to my theory of sexual aversion among young camp- or housemates, whether brothers and sisters or not. I have previously spoken of the cases on record of brother and sister marriage, and have pointed out that most of these statements are, if not obviously erroneous, of a more or less doubtful character, especially because it is uncertain whether they refer to full brothers and sisters or to such as have only one parent in common. The distinction between these two kinds of brothers and sisters is of importance in the present connection. Where marriage with a half-sister is allowed, as is not infrequently the case, it seems that the brother and half-sister have nearly always the same father. This is explained by the fact that the children of different mothers are not brought into the same contact with one another as the children of the same mother. In polygynous families each wife and her children form a small group, very often living in a separate hut, and hatred and rivalry are of no rare occurrence among the members of the various sub-families. With reference to the Athenian law which permitted a man to marry his half-sister by the father, Hume made the remark that "his step-mother and her children were as much shut up from him as the women of any other family".[2] After speaking of the marriage of half-brother and half-sister among the ancient Arabs, Robertson Smith

[1] I. Bloch, *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit* (Berlin, 1919), p. 217. *Cf.* E. von Hartmann, *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, i. (Leipzig, 1904), p. 205.

[2] D. Hume, 'An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals', sec. iv., in *Philosophical Works*, iv. (London, 1875), p. 199.

observes: " Whatever is the origin of bars to marriage, they certainly are early associated with the feeling that it is indecent for housemates to intermarry ".[1] As for the occasional cases of non-matrimonial incestuous intercourse occurring both among savage and civilised peoples we must not forget that a lack of desire, and even a positive feeling of aversion, may in certain cases be overcome. The sexual instinct is so powerful that when it cannot be gratified in the normal manner it may seek for abnormal gratification—masturbation, incest, homosexual intercourse, even bestiality. Incest springing from sexual preference undoubtedly occurs in some exceptional cases; but this is only what may be expected from the great variability of the sexual instinct. I have no doubt that in the world generally, and in some countries particularly, homosexual practices are infinitely more frequent than incest; and nevertheless nobody would consider their existence " fatal " or even " hostile " to the common view that there is normally a feeling of love between the sexes.

Sir James Frazer has raised another objection to my theory of the origin of the exogamous rules besides the one I have already discussed. In spite of his view that if exogamy had resulted from a natural instinct there would have been no need to reinforce that instinct by legal pains and penalties, he nevertheless admits that there seems to be some ground for believing in the existence of " a natural aversion to, or at least a want of inclination for, sexual intercourse between persons who have been brought up closely together from early youth "; but he finds it difficult to understand how this could have been changed into an aversion to sexual intercourse with persons near of kin, and maintains that, till I explain this satisfactorily, the chain of reasoning by which I support my theory breaks down

[1] W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (Cambridge, 1885), p. 170.

entirely at the crucial point.[1] In this objection, too, Frazer has the hearty support of Freud.[2]

My answer to this is that the transition which Frazer and Freud find so difficult to understand is not only possible and natural but well-nigh proved by an exactly analogous case of equally world-wide occurrence and of still greater social importance, namely, the process that has led to the association of all kinds of social rights and duties with kinship. The maternal and paternal sentiments, which are largely at the bottom of parental duties and rights, cannot in their simplest forms be based on a knowledge of blood-relationship, but respond to stimuli derived from other circumstances, notably the proximity of the helpless young, that is, the external relationship in which the offspring from the beginning stand to the parents. Nor is the so-called filial love in the first instance rooted in considerations of kinship; it is essentially retributive, the agreeable feeling produced by benefits received making the individual look with pleasure and kindliness upon the giver. Here again the affection is ultimately due to close living together. So also fraternal love and the duties and rights that have sprung from it depend in the first place on other circumstances than the idea of a common blood; and the same may be said of the tie which binds together relatives more remotely allied. Its social force is ultimately derived from near relatives' habit of living together. Men became gregarious chiefly by remaining in the circle where they were born; if, instead of keeping together with their kindred, they had preferred to isolate themselves or to unite with strangers, there would certainly be no blood-bond at all. The mutual attachment and the social rights and duties that resulted from this gregarious condition were associated with the relation in which members of the group stood to one

[1] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. (London, 1910), p. 96 *sq.*
[2] Freud, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x.), p. 149.

another—the relation of kinship as expressed by a common name—and these associations might last even after the local tie was broken, being kept up by the common name.[1] Here we have an immense group of facts which, though ultimately depending upon close living together, have been interpreted in terms of kinship. Why, then, may we not believe that the same has been the case with the aversion to incest and the prohibitory rules resulting from it?

Frazer asks: " If the root of the whole matter is a horror of marriage between persons who have always lived with each other, how comes it that at the present day that horror has been weakened into a mere general preference for marriage with persons whose attractions have not been blunted by long familiarity? . . . Why should the marriage of a brother with a sister, or of a mother with a son, excite the deepest detestation . . . while the origin of it all, the marriage between housemates, should excite at most a mild surprise too slight probably to suggest even a subject for a farce, and should be as legitimate in the eye of the law among all civilised nations as any other marriage? "[2] For my own part I believe that marriage between a man and his foster-daughter or between a foster-brother and his foster-sister, if the social relations between them have been exactly similar to those of blood-relatives of corresponding degrees, would cause more than a mild surprise, and appear unnatural and objectionable; in fact, as I have shown in my book, adoption or fosterage is very frequently, in custom and law, as stringent a bar to marriage as blood-relationship.[3] Much of course depends on the closeness of the social relationship and its nearness in time. Dr. Steinmetz's argument

[1] See *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, vol. ii. ch. xxxiv.

[2] Frazer, *op. cit.* iv. 96 *sq.*

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 154 *sqq.*

that " the very sensual Frenchmen often seem to marry the lady friends of their earliest youth ", is certainly not to the point.[1] Speaking of marriages between housemates among civilised peoples, Mr. Heape justly observes: " It must be recollected that, as civilisation progresses, the continuous living together from childhood upwards of blood strangers becomes more and more rare. It is also true that the male's temporary absences from home become more and more frequent after puberty, and that housemates before puberty thus become strangers afterwards if considered from a sexual point of view ".[2]

It can be no matter of surprise that the prohibitory rules so frequently refer to the marriage of kindred alone. Law, naturally, only takes into consideration general and well-defined cases, and hence relationships of some kind or other between persons who are nearly always kindred are defined in terms of blood-relationship. In the present case the social rule is often strengthened by superstitious beliefs. A transgression of it is often supposed to be attended with all sorts of injurious consequences for the offspring or the guilty parents, or to involve the whole community in danger and disaster by causing epidemics, earthquakes, sterility of women, plants, or animals, or other calamities. Other forms of illicit love, such as adultery or fornication, are also believed to produce similar disastrous effects.[3]

Freud cites " the excellent criticism " which Frazer has opposed to my theory, and adds the following remark: " It seems to me very remarkable that Westermarck looks upon this innate aversion to sexual

[1] S. R. Steinmetz, ' Die neueren Forschungen zur Geschichte der menschlichen Familie ', in *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, ii. (Berlin, 1899), p. 818.

[2] Heape, *op. cit.* p. 62 *sq.*

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 170-178, 182.

intercourse with persons with whom we have shared childhood as being at the same time a psychic representative of the biological fact that inbreeding means injury to the species. Such a biological instinct would hardly go so far astray in its psychological manifestation as to affect the companions of home and hearth which in this respect are quite harmless, instead of the blood-relatives which alone are injurious to procreation ".[1] I think Freud should be the very last person to find it astonishing if the people who made the exogamous rules expressed psychological facts in terms of blood-relationship, considering that he himself has done exactly the same thing. The incestuous wishes of early childhood that he speaks of are really wishes directed towards persons who stand in certain external relationships to the children which in normal cases coincide with the physiological relations between parents and offspring, but are intrinsically quite independent of any such relations. If the son has a desire for sexual intimacy with his mother and a daughter with her father, that is not because the former is borne by his mother and the latter begotten by her father, but simply on account of the parents' position in the family in relation to their children, which also may be occupied by persons who are not related to the latter by blood. In his discussion of the children's incestuous wishes Freud speaks repeatedly of their sexual love of their " fosterers " (*Pflegepersonen*),[2] or of the child's feelings towards his " nurse " (*Amme*), " as a rule the mother ".[3] Thus his argument against me recoils upon himself.

So also Professor Flügel, in speaking of the tendency

[1] Freud, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x.), p. 149 (English translation, p. 204).

[2] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, pp. 98, 99, 110; *idem*, *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi. [1925]), p. 342.

[3] *Idem*, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, p. 98.

to incest, remarks that " there is not unnaturally a temptation to regard it as an innate factor in man's mental constitution, *i.e.* to assert that there is in man a hereditary tendency to direct his love and inclination to those who are of his own blood *or at any rate to those with whom he has been brought up and has been familiar since his infancy* " (the italics are mine).[1] Yet Flügel, like Frazer and Freud, maintains that a difficulty in connection with my theory " is concerned with the question as to how an aversion to sexual intercourse between those who have lived from infancy together changed to a similar aversion between blood relatives. How is it, if the original aversion was of the former kind, that it has left but little trace of its existence, while the aversion to marriage between blood relatives, which is supposed to have been derived from it, is grown so strong? "[2] I shall ask another question in return. How is it, if there was an innate tendency in man to direct his sexual inclination to " those with whom he has been brought up and has been familiar since his infancy ", that the prohibitory laws which are supposed to have been made for the purpose of repressing this inclination were directed against sexual intercourse between blood-relatives? The psychoanalysts are encountered by exactly the same " difficulty " as the one they consider fatal to my theory. Professor Flügel has made a hesitating attempt to speculate on the possibility of an innate tendency to desire sexual intimacy with blood-relatives. He writes in a footnote: " It is not perhaps quite easy to see what can be the psychic mechanism in virtue of which men should be attracted to blood relations strictly as such, though to the present writer it would seem to be a possibility which should not be entirely lost sight of. Such a tendency may perhaps have arisen: (1) as the result of some vague and unconscious sense of affinity, similarity

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 198. [2] *Ibid.* p. 201 n. 4.

or harmony, based perhaps on an unconscious memory impression of pre-natal life (in the case of child and mother or of twins), or upon some other condition of a psychical, physiological or chemical order; (2) at a higher level through the action of perceived physical or psychical resemblance, these in turn playing on the Narcissistic components of the love impulse ".[1] That possibility then—itself modified by three " perhaps "—is the only alternative which we have to choose if we do not admit that feelings based upon close living together and familiarity since early childhood can lead to prohibitory rules against sexual intercourse between blood-relatives. Even then the Oedipus of the legend could not be a representative of the Oedipus of the complex, since neither an unconscious memory impression of pre-natal life nor the Narcissistic components of the love impulse could have led him to slay his father Laius instead of his foster-father Polybus, nor could he have been actuated by any other mysterious condition of " a psychical, physiological or chemical order " leading to incestuous tendencies.

Professor Flügel has raised a question which is not generally touched upon by psycho-analysts, namely, that referring to the origin of the innate tendency to incest. His answer is: " Possibly in the long ages in which man or his pre-human ancestors lived in relatively isolated families, this tendency was of advantage in the struggle for existence, in so much as it may have contributed both to more rapid multiplication and to the greater consolidation, and therefore greater safety and stability, of the family, as the most important social unit. This tendency to incest may thus be due ultimately to the action of natural selection; the long period during which incest was regularly practised may have established and ingrained it as a normal feature of the race and its persistence to-day may be due to the

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 198 n. 2.

continuance of the hereditary disposition thus formed and thus consolidated".[1] To this I would answer, first, that I have never heard that inbreeding contributes to more rapid multiplication, but that it may, on the contrary, result in a reduced fertility and a tendency to sterility.[2] East and Jones—whom Flügel has quoted to show that inbreeding is not in itself productive of ill effects, the results in any particular case depending entirely upon the hereditary qualities transmitted—state that "just as fertility is affected adversely by inbreeding more than any other character, so is it increased more in proportion by crossing".[3] As for the "persistence" of incest to-day I refer to what I have said before as regards the conditions under which it occurs. And the statement that it may have contributed to the greater consolidation of the family may be compared with a later one made by Professor Flügel, according to which "it would seem probable that the claims of social life have constantly exercised some influence in restricting the interests and affections which centre round the family" and have therefore probably constituted one of the forces which have helped to bring about the inhibition of the incest tendencies.[4] According to Freud, it was just these tendencies that broke up the primeval family by separating father and sons.

I, also, am of the opinion that any satisfactory explanation of the normal characteristics of the sexual instinct, which is of such immense importance for the existence of the species, must be sought for in their specific usefulness. But my suggestion is that the need

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 198.

[2] See, *e.g.*, F. H. A. Marshall, *The Physiology of Reproduction* (London, 1922), p. 215 *sqq.*; *infra*, p. 149 *sqq.*

[3] E. M. East and D. F. Jones, *Inbreeding and Outbreeding* (Philadelphia & London, [1919]), p. 191.

[4] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 211.

of the species has led, not to incestuous tendencies, but on the contrary to that lack of inclination for and positive aversion to sexual intercourse between persons who have been living together since childhood, to which I have traced the origin of the exogamic prohibitions, on account of the injurious effects generally resulting from close inbreeding. I shall deal with this matter more fully in a subsequent essay.[1]

[1] *Infra*, p. 147 *sqq.*

IV

FREUD'S THEORY OF THE REPRESSION OF THE INCESTUOUS TENDENCIES: WHY THEY WERE REPRESSED

WE have seen how the Freudians explain the almost universal aversion to incest as the result of a repression of the original incestuous tendencies assumed by them. Then the question arises, why these tendencies were repressed. Freud has made an attempt to solve the problem in his book *Totem and Taboo.*

He took up the conjecture, made by Darwin and further developed by Atkinson, to the effect that man lived originally in small family groups like the gorilla, consisting of an adult male, a number of wives, and immature individuals. When the younger males became old enough to evoke the father's jealousy they were driven off by him.[1] This is the starting point of Freud's theory of the origin of exogamy. It is in some measure supported by our present knowledge of the anthropoid apes. The family consisting of male, female or females, and young is found among every one of them. According to nearly all earlier accounts of the orang-utan only solitary old males, or females with young, or sometimes females and at other times males accompanied by half-grown young had been met with; but more recently Volz and Munnecke have definitely proved the existence of family associations with that ape,[2] whereas it apparently never, or scarcely ever,

[1] Freud, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften* [Leipzig, Wien, Zürich], x. [1924]), p. 152 *sq.* (English translation by A. A. Brill [London, *s.d.*], p. 208 *sq.*).

[2] *Infra*, p. 179 *sqq.*

congregates in larger groups.[1] The social unit of the chimpanzee and gorilla is the family, but several families may associate and then constitute a band or herd.[2] Summing up the available evidence, R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes write: "The male chimpanzee is dominant in family and band, and in the latter aggregation a mature male acts as leader. This is true also of the gorilla, for whether the social group be family or band, a mature, and often gray-backed, male is in command and leads as well as dominates the group".[3] In a passage quoted by Darwin, Savage says all his informants agree in the assertion that but one adult male is seen in a band; that when the young males grow up, a contest takes place for mastery, and the strongest, by killing and driving out the others, establishes himself as the head of the community. Darwin assumes that it is the younger males that are thus driven out,[4] but it would seem that this might occasionally happen to the old male. In many accounts of gorillas and chimpanzees solitary old males are spoken of, and different suggestions are made as to the reason for their solitude. According to Reichenow, they are animals whose young have become full-grown, who themselves have ceased to have any sexual desire, and who have lost touch with their companions in consequence of the break-up of their families.[5] Natives of the Cameroons informed Mr. Guthrie that the smaller companies of gorillas consist of one male with his one, two, or three wives and some small children, while a company of six or seven members would probably have two adult males; and that "as the younger members

[1] *Infra*, p. 205. [2] *Infra*, pp. 181, 185.

[3] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *The Great Apes* (New Haven & London, 1929), p. 541.

[4] Ch. Darwin, *The Descent of Man* (London, 1890), p. 591.

[5] E. Reichenow, 'Biologische Beobachtungen an Gorilla und Schimpanse', in *Sitzungsbericht der Gesellschaft naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin*, no. 1 (1920), p. 19 *sq.*

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. As to whether this isolation is from individual choice, or whether the females refuse to have more to do with the old male, or whether the young males band together and force his retirement, the natives do not agree".[1] Barns tells us that "a solitary male or 'old-man' gorilla may sometimes be found alone, having been beaten and thrown out by a younger and stronger rival".[2]

Darwin suggests that the younger males of the primeval family, being expelled, wander about and at last succeed in finding a partner, thus preventing too close breeding within the limits of the same family.[3] This seems a very natural suggestion. But it does not suit Freud in his dramatisation of the Oedipus complex: the banished sons remain somewhere in the neighbourhood, probably indulging in homosexual practices.[4] Here the first act comes to an end.

The second act opens more brilliantly. "One day the expelled brothers joined forces, slew and ate the father, and thus put an end to the father horde. Together they dared and accomplished what would have remained impossible for them singly. Perhaps some advance in culture, like the use of a new weapon, had given them the feeling of superiority".[5] It has been a matter of speculation what that weapon could have been. Róheim maintains that the *churinga* of the Central Australian natives go to show that the brothers

[1] A. E. Jenks, 'Bulu Knowledge of the Gorilla and Chimpanzee', in *The American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiii. (Lancaster, 1911), p. 56.

[2] T. A. Barns, *Across the Great Craterland to the Congo* (London, 1923), p. 130.

[3] Darwin, *op. cit.* p. 591.

[4] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 174.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 171 (English translation, p. 235).

probably stoned their father to death;[1] but Lorenz makes the objection that the stone used as a missile was not a new weapon, since it is used as such even by monkeys,[2] and suggests that the person who had discovered the art of striking fire had perhaps communicated to them his discovery, so that they might kill the father by throwing at him fire-brands, and then eat his half-burned body.[3] "Of course", says Freud, "these cannibalistic savages ate their victim." Why of course? The anthropoid apes are not known to feed on their own species;[4] and a large number of savage tribes, including some of the lowest, have never been known to be addicted to cannibalism, but are, on the contrary, said to feel the greatest dislike of it. Indeed, there seems to be a natural shrinking from eating human flesh, which, however may be overcome by other motives, such as hunger, revenge, the desire to acquire another person's courage or strength, the hope of making the enemy harmless, or of gaining supernatural benefits.[5] And, in fact, Freud mentions a motive for

[1] G. Róheim, *Australian Totemism* (London, 1925), p. 368.

[2] E. Lorenz, 'Chaos und Ritus', in *Imago*, xvii. (Wien, 1931), p. 459.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 471.

[4] I. Hermann ('Zum Triebleben der Primaten', in *Imago*, xix. [Wien, 1933], p. 121) says that Zuckerman refers to some reports according to which the apes eat their dead. But his evidence amounts to this: "The mother monkey appears to eat pieces of her dead baby, and Anderson states that 'he can vouch for the fact that a male *Hylobates leuciscus*, Schreber, robbed a female *Semnopithecus pileatus*, Blyth, of her babe, killed it and partially ate it. The incident occurred in the Calcutta Zoological Gardens'". This statement is followed by the comment: "It is conceivable, therefore, that the sub-human primates assist the scavengers of the animal world by eating their dead fellows. The remains of monkeys and apes are very rarely found in the wild" (which, of course, proves nothing) (S. Zuckermann, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes* [London, 1932], p. 303 *sq.* n.).

[5] Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. (London, 1917), p. 570 *sqq.*

the brothers' cannibalistic act: the violent primal father had been the envied and feared model for each of them, and they now accomplished their identification with him by devouring him, which imparted to each of them a part of his strength.[1]

But though the brothers hated the father who stood so powerfully in the way of their sexual demands and their desire for power, they also loved and admired him. Hence, after they had satisfied their hate by his removal and had carried out their wish for identification with him, the suppressed tender impulses had to assert themselves. This took place in the form of remorse; a sense of guilt was formed. What the father's presence had formerly prevented they themselves now prohibited "in the psychic situation of 'subsequent obedience' which we know so well from psycho-analysis": they renounced the fruits of their deed by denying themselves the liberated women. Yet their resolve to do so seems to have been far from effective. Freud says that the incest prohibition also had a strong practical foundation. "Though the brothers had joined forces in order to overcome the father, each was the other's rival among the women. Each one wanted to have them all to himself like the father, and in the fight of each against the other the new organisation would have perished. For there was no longer any one stronger than all the rest who could have successfully assumed the rôle of the father. Thus there was nothing left for the brothers, if they wanted to live together, but to erect the incest prohibition", which they did "perhaps after many difficult experiences". We are told that they thereby "saved the organisation which had made them strong and which could be based upon the homosexual feelings and activities which probably manifested themselves among them during the time of their

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 171 *sq.* (English translation, p. 235 *sq.*).

banishment".[1] The salvation, however, could only have been quite temporary; for the homosexual practices of the brothers were not calculated to perpetuate the horde, and we are not told that strange men were incorporated in it. In fact, they could not have been, if Freud's account of the events leading to the incest prohibition is applicable to the ancestry of the whole human race, as it is evidently meant to be. But then mankind could not have outlived the primal horde.

It may be added that Freud's explanation of the origin of the prohibition of incest takes no account of the relation between father and daughter, and any theory that omits to do this is necessarily a failure. In Freud's account the whole question could not arise, since the homosexual celibates had no daughters. But Atkinson and Lang also leave the problem unsolved. Hose and McDougall (who are not psycho-analysts) tried to make good the omission by suggesting how the patriarch may have come to renounce his sexual rights over his daughters. Although he drove away his grown-up sons out of jealousy, he allowed other young men to be incorporated in the band because they added to its security and strength, and gave them his daughters in marriage. The young male thus admitted to the group would be one who came with a price in his hand to offer in return for the bride he sought; but such a price could only be exacted by the patriarch on the condition that he himself refrained most rigorously from sexual intercourse with his daughter.[2] Now it may be asked: why did not the patriarch accept a price from his own sons or let them work for him, instead of mercilessly turning them out of their old home, although they

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 172 *sqq.* (English translation, p. 237 *sqq.*).

[2] Ch. Hose and W. McDougall, *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, ii. (London, 1912), p. 197 *sq.* n.

might have been just as good, if not better, protectors of it as the strangers? And how can the theory advanced by Hose and McDougall account for the prohibition of father and daughter incest among low savages who have never been known to expect a bride-price from a suitor?

Professor Flügel, who, I believe, may be described as a moderate Freudian, has also tackled the problem in question. He shares the orthodox belief in the existence of a strong impulse towards parent and child incest, as well as the assumption that the horror of incest corresponds in intensity to the intensity of the attraction towards it.[1] He suggests, as we have seen,[2] that the tendency to incest may be ultimately due to the action of natural selection. But at the same time he maintains that in " the most fundamental type of incest as revealed by psycho-analytic study—that of parent and child—there is involved a sort of biological absurdity, which may well have been to some extent instrumental, through the agency of natural selection, of bringing about that inhibition of the incestuous tendencies. . . . It can easily be understood that any races which tended to indulge to any large extent the impulses which prompt to incestuous unions between parents and children would be at a disadvantage as compared with those races in which these unions did not occur or occurred less frequently, the latter races tending therefore to supplant the former ".[3] We are thus asked to believe that natural selection did not originally prevent the rise of the fundamental incest desire, but on the contrary promoted its rise and continuance; and that it afterwards, as though it had discovered its absurd mistake, led to violent prohibi-

[1] J. C. Flügel, *The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family* (London, 1929), p. 292.

[2] *Supra*, p. 86 *sq.*

[3] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 207 *sq.*

tions of it. What was the cause of this extraordinary turn of its activity?

Professor Flügel mentions several disadvantages of parent-child incest.[1] "Parents and children necessarily differ considerably in age. . . . If men were to follow blindly the impulses manifested in the primitive and fundamental forms of incest tendency, sons would cohabit with their mothers, daughters with their fathers. In such unions one of the partners would be relatively aged, and the offspring would in consequence very probably be lacking in that degree of vitality or health normally possessed by the children of parents of more equal age". So far as I know, there is no evidence that unions between persons who differ in age as much as is normally the case with parents and children impair the vitality or health of the offspring; other persons better informed than myself, whom I have consulted on the subject, have told me the same. But even if they really are fraught with such consequences, it is impossible to believe that the discovery of this fact could have been made by savages on so large a scale as is presupposed by a theory which wants to explain rules of universal prevalence. And even if the discovery had been made, even if savages in all parts of the world had found that children born of a marriage between an old and a young person are not so sound and vigorous as other children, we could certainly not assume that they allowed this knowledge to check their passions. Considering how seldom a civilised man who has a disease, or the tendency to a disease, which is quite likely to be transmitted to his descendants, hesitates to marry, nay even to marry an equally unhealthy woman if he is in love with her, it would scarcely be reasonable to suppose that savages have greater forethought and self-command. There are peoples who believe that endogamous marriages lead to injurious results, and nevertheless allow or even

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 207 *sq.*

favour such marriages.[1] Nor can I think it in the least likely that unions in which one of the partners would be relatively aged are avoided in consequence of people's experience that the children of such unions would "fail, in the majority of cases, to enjoy that degree of provision and protection which could be afforded where *both* are still youthful". I presume that all this would be admitted by Professor Flügel himself; for he says that even if the savage were able to realise the ill effects of inbreeding it is pretty clear that his actions and feelings would be but little affected thereby, since it is one of the most general characteristics of the primitive mind that it takes but small account of distant consequences.[2] I must therefore take his arguments to mean that natural selection has, on the grounds mentioned by him, led to an instinctive aversion which generally prevents sexual unions between young and old persons.

This is professedly the meaning of his last argument. He says that "such unions would come into opposition with the almost universal tendency to find sexual attractiveness in youthful rather than in aged persons—a tendency which, like the appreciation of beauty in the opposite sex in general, we may suppose has been shaped largely, if not wholly, by the operation of natural selection, which has ensured that men and women should in the main be attracted to those who are most likely to produce strong and healthy children". I have myself, in my chapter on 'Sexual Selection in Man', pointed out both the existence of such tendencies and the rôle that natural selection may be assumed to have played in their formation.[3] But sexual unions between old and young come into opposition with them only on the part of the latter, young women being attractive to

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. (London, 1921), pp. 69, 173, 178 *sq.*

[2] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 204 n. 1.

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. ch. xvii.

old men. It is well known that among the Australian natives, whose old men are fond of appropriating a plurality of wives, it is as a rule the young girls that they secure for themselves, so that the young men mostly get old lubras as wives.[1]

Professor Flügel is of course well aware that the factors now mentioned could at most merely contribute to the repression of the tendencies towards parent-child incest, not explain it in full, since they have reference not only to the relations between parents and children but to all other unions in which the age difference is considerable. He has not repeated Huth's suggestion that marriage between parents and children is considered incestuous because marriage between old men and young women in general is considered so.[2] He tries then to find other factors that have been instrumental to the inhibition of the tendencies to that form of incest. He says that a potent set of influences calculated to inhibit tendencies to incest are those connected with sexual jealousy. A boy's love towards his mother almost necessarily brings him to some extent into conflict with his father, and a girl's affection to her father is similarly calculated to bring about the jealousy of her mother. This arousal of jealousy on the part of the parents may produce repression of the incest tendency in the child in a variety of ways, of which perhaps the most frequent and important are: fear of punishment at the hand of the jealous parent, and unwillingness to cause injury or sorrow to this parent because of genuine affection being felt towards him (or her) in spite of the jealousy and rivalry.[3]

All this is exceedingly disappointing. At the

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 253.

[2] A. H. Huth, in the first edition of his work *The Marriage of Near Kin* (London, 1875), p. 157. In the second edition (1887) he seems to have given up this unfortunate hypothesis (see p. 18).

[3] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 209.

crucial point of his discussion of parent-child incest Professor Flügel speaks of the repression of infantile incestuous tendencies, which is of no interest in the present connection. The repression of them must have been most unsuccessful if, as he and other psychoanalysts maintain, severe laws have been necessary to prevent a strong general desire for incestuous intercourse between persons old enough to be capable of it. What we should expect now is an explanation of the prohibition of such intercourse, but we find none. Nay, even if the childish incest wish were repressed, by fear of punishment or by affection, the parent might still have such a wish with reference to the child; Professor Flügel observes that the parents in virtue of their developed heterosexual inclinations tend very frequently to feel most attracted to those of their children who are of the opposite sex to their own.[1] And in no case is the parent, especially the father, a mere passive partner in the incestuous act. If sexual jealousy has anything to do with the prohibitory laws of parent-child incest, the only reason for it could be that the community sympathises with the injured and jealous parent, whether the husband or the wife; but its sympathy could not possibly lead to those severe penalties, even amounting to the punishment of death, that are exacted for infringement of the incest taboo. Parent-child incest might be punished as a kind of adultery, though only if the other parent is alive. But among savage and barbarous peoples it is obviously the rule that conjugal fidelity, while considered a stringent duty in the wife, is not generally considered so in the husband; and among the peoples of ancient civilisation the law requires faithfulness of the wife alone.[2]

While the theories concerning the prohibition of incest that have been proposed by other psycho-

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 15.

[2] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 451 *sqq.*

analysts—Freud and Flügel—are derived from facts belonging to the conscious part of the mind, Dr. Jones finds the explanation of the particular taboo with which we are now concerned—that relating to the father and daughter incest—in the obscure region of the unconscious. He writes confidently that this point is solved at once when one realises that the prohibition of the father incest must be not only weaker (and therefore more often broken through) than the prohibition of the son incest, but also inevitably secondary to it, simply because when the father-daughter relationship develops it becomes identified in the unconscious mind with the son-mother relationship, as he has shown in his study of the "alternation of generations" phantasy.[1] Speaking generally, Dr. Jones claims that psycho-analysis throws a flood of light on "the almost universal horror of incest, and the extraordinarily complicated and fierce laws that have been devised in the most varied parts of the world with the object of preventing it".[2] For my own part I cannot find that psycho-analysis has thrown even a ray of light on the all-important question *why* incest has been prohibited. Freud has tried to answer it by attributing the inhibition to some highly hypothetical primeval events—first the killing of the father and then the remorse and "subsequent obedience" of the sons. These events are, of course, by themselves no psycho-analytic "findings"; and even the ambivalent emotions of many sons towards their fathers, determined partly by hostility and partly by affection and regard, which suggested the belief in them, are no new discoveries of psycho-analysis, although the hypotheses of the acts in which they

[1] E. Jones, in a review of the fifth edition of *The History of Human Marriage*, in *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, iii. (London, 1922), p. 250.

[2] *Idem*, 'Psycho-Analysis and Anthropology', in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lix. (London, 1924), p. 54 *sq.*

expressed themselves and of the sexual motive of the sons' hostility are Freudian peculiarities. I have already discussed the supposed incest wish underlying the latter hypothesis, and shall now examine the foundation of the belief in a primeval parricide.

The hypothesis of such an event is not substantiated by anything we know about either apes or savages. As for the former it may be said that Winwood Reade, whom Irme Hermann quotes in an article dealing with the subject,[1] speaks of two male gorillas, one much larger than the other, who were fighting, but it was the smaller one that was killed.[2] The same might no doubt happen to the patriarch; but the many reports of solitary old male gorillas and chimpanzees[3] do not support the assumption of patricidal tendencies among those apes. In the ethnological literature, again, I have found extremely few instances of parricide, except in quite particular circumstances that have led to the killing of parents of either sex. It is a custom prevalent among various savages or barbarians that a parent who is worn out with age or disease is abandoned or killed. This custom is especially common among nomadic hunting tribes, owing to the hardships of life and the inability of decrepit persons to keep up in the march.[4] With reference to certain tribes of Western Victoria, Dawson remarks that the old people are a burden to the tribe, and, should any sudden attack be made by an enemy, the most liable to be captured, in which case they would probably be tortured and put to a lingering death.[5] Moreover, in times when the food-supply is insufficient to support all the members of a community,

[1] I. Hermann, 'Modelle zu den Ödipus- und Kastrationskomplexen bei Affen', in *Imago*, xii. (Wien, 1926), p. 64.

[2] Winwood Reade, *Savage Africa* (London, 1863), p. 214.

[3] *Supra*, p. 90 *sq.*; *infra*, p. 185 *sqq.*

[4] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. (London, 1912), p. 386 *sqq.*

[5] J. Dawson, *Australian Aborigines* (Melbourne, etc., 1881), p. 62.

it is more reasonable that the old and useless should have to perish than the young and vigorous. Hahn was told that among the Hottentots aged parents were sometimes abandoned by very poor people who had not food enough to support them.[1] And among peoples who have reached a certain degree of wealth and comfort the practice of killing the old folks, though no longer justified by necessity, may still go on, partly through survival of a custom inherited from harder times, partly from the humane intent of putting an end to lingering misery;[2] it is commonly approved of, or even insisted upon, by the old people themselves.[3] Needless to say that all those cases lend no support whatever to the Freudian theory.

The murder of the primeval father is alleged to have left vestiges in various customs and institutions, bearing testimony to its reality in the past. One of these is totemism. Freud maintains that the totem animal was a father substitute, and that the ritual killing of it symbolises the killing of the father. This theory rests on the assumption that "the totems were originally only animals";[4] but this is a mere conjecture. In totemism, as depicted by Frazer the totem is generally a species of either animals or plants, more rarely a class of inanimate objects, and very rarely a class of artificial objects; and there is nothing to show that all the other totems have developed out of totem animals. In support of his view that the totem animal is a father substitute Freud mentions animal phobias of neurotic children. He says that although these phobias have not

[1] Th. Hahn, *Tsuni-Goam. The Supreme Being of the Khoi-Khoi* (London 1881), p. 86.

[2] E. B. Tylor, 'Primitive Society', in *The Contemporary Review*, xxi. (London, 1873), p. 705; *idem*, *Anthropology* (London, 1895), p. 410 *sq.*

[3] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. (London, 1912), p. 388 *sqq.*

[4] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 130 (English translation, p. 177).

yet been made the object of careful analytical investigation, " several cases of such phobias directed against larger animals have proved accessible to analysis and have thus betrayed their secret to the investigator. In every case it was the same: the fear at bottom was of the father, if the children examined were boys, and was merely displaced upon the animal ".[1] If so, I take it to be the size of the animal, together with the fear it inspires, that is responsible for the displacement. But it is not a general characteristic of totem animals to be large-sized or naturally fear-inspiring.

In their endeavour to prove that the totem animal is really a substitute for the father, Freud and his disciples lay much stress on the correspondence of the ambivalent emotional attitude towards a father and that towards a totem animal. Both of them are said to be objects of hatred.[2] That the totem animal is hated is, in the first place, inferred from the general prohibition of killing it, on the presumption that the prohibition of an act is necessarily an indication of a strong desire to do it. I have already pointed out the fallacy of this presumption in my discussion of the incest taboo. The hostility to the totem animal is further inferred from the occasional ritual sacrifice of it;[3] but, as we shall soon see, the averred purpose of this sacrifice is something very different from the gratification of a feeling of hate. " On the whole ", says Frazer, " the relation in which a man stands to his totem appears to be one of friendship and kinship ".[4] There are cases in which totem animals are killed privately for utilitarian reasons. The South Australian Narrinyeri kill their totem animals if they

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 155 *sqq.* (English translation, p. 212 *sqq.*).

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 159, 170 *sq.*; Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 139 *sq.*; R. Money-Kyrle, *The Meaning of Sacrifice* (London, 1930), p. 195 *sq.*

[3] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 42; Money-Kyrle, *op. cit.* p. 195 *sq.*

[4] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, iv. (London, 1910), p. 4.

are good for food.[1] A Bechuana will kill his totem if it is a hurtful animal, for instance a lion; the slayer then only makes an apology to the beast and goes through a form of purification for the sacrilege.[2] Among the Menomini Indians a man belonging to the Bear clan may kill a bear, although he must first address himself to his victim and apologise for depriving it of life.[3] I imagine that not even psycho-analysts look upon cases like these as symbols of the primeval parricide.

Freud argues that when " we consider ourselves justified in substituting the father for the totem animal in the male's formula of totemism . . . we have taken no new or especially daring step. For primitive men say it themselves and, as far as the totemic system is still in effect to-day, the totem is called ancestor and primal father. We have only taken literally an expression of these races which ethnologists did not know what to do with and were therefore inclined to put it into the background ".[4] But it seems that the expression is not suited for being taken so literally. The relation in which a man stands to his totem appears, on the whole, to be essentially one of kinship in general, not particularly one between father and son. As Frazer says, " he regards the animals or plants or whatever the totems may be as his friends and relations, his fathers, his brothers, and so forth. He puts them as far as he can on a footing of equality with himself and with his fellows, the members of the same totemic clan. He considers them as essentially his peers, as beings of the same sort as himself and his human kinsmen ".[5] Even psycho-analysts themselves admit that at present " the

[1] G. Taplin, ' The Narrinyeri ', in J. D. Woods, *The Native Tribes of South Australia* (Adelaide, 1879), p. 63.

[2] E. Casalis, *The Basutos* (London, 1861), p. 211.

[3] W. J. Hoffman, ' The Menomini Indians ', in *Annual Reports of the Bureau of Ethnology*, xiv. (Washington, 1896), p. 44.

[4] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 159 *sq.* (English translation, p. 218 *sq.*).

[5] Frazer, *op. cit.* iv. 4.

relation of a savage to his totem is usually more that of a brother to a brother, whilst the father-complex is projected back into the abyss of time ".[1]

According to Flügel, " it has been shown that the totem spirit regularly, either to a complete or to a partial extent, plays the father's part in the creation of the child; the substitution of totem for father being rendered easier by the existence of a confused and ignorant state of mind on the subject of paternity; which makes it conceivable that the spirit of an animal or other object should enter into the mother's womb and thus produce conception ".[2] Flügel has given no references in support of his statement, nor could he have produced any evidence. What, according to him, has been shown to take place regularly is only what Frazer has tentatively postulated as an explanation of the origin of totemism. This explanation was suggested by the beliefs of some Central Australian aborigines. Ignorant of the true causes of child-birth, they imagine that a child only enters into a woman at the moment when she first feels it stirring in her womb, and that it has come from something which the woman may have seen or felt immediately before she knew herself to be with child. Their theory is that a spirit child has made its way into her from the nearest of those trees, rocks, water-pools or other natural features at which the spirits of the dead are waiting to be born again; and since only the spirits of people of one particular totem are believed to congregate at any one spot, and the natives well know what totemic spirits haunt each hallowed plot of ground, a woman has no difficulty in

[1] G. Róheim, *Australian Totemism* (London, 1925), p. 78. See also Money-Kyrle, *op. cit.* p. 59.

[2] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 138. Dr. E. Jones (*Essays in Applied Psycho-Analysis* [London & Vienna, 1923], p. 418 *sq.*) also speaks of " the primitive belief that children are begotten not of their Father but through impregnation of the Mother by the particular clan totem ", that is " an ancestral substitute for the Father ".

determining the totem of her unborn child. Frazer is careful to point out that this theory of conception does not by itself explain totemism, that is, the relation in which groups of people stand to species of things. "It stops short of doing so by a single step. What a woman imagines to enter her body at conception is not an animal, a plant, a stone or what not; it is only the spirit of a human child which has an animal, a plant, a stone or what not for its totem. Had the woman supposed that what passed into her at the critical moment was an animal, a plant, a stone or what not, and that when her child was born it would be that animal, plant, or stone, in human form, then we should have a complete explanation of totemism". But he thinks he has found elsewhere the missing link in the chain of evidence making for this theory of primitive totemism. In some of the Banks Islands many people believe that their mothers were impregnated by the entrance into their wombs of spirit animals or spirit fruits, and that they themselves are nothing but the particular animal or plant which effected a lodgment in their mother and in due time was born into the world with a superficial and deceptive resemblance to a human being. That is why they partake of the character of the animal or plant; that is why they refuse to eat animals or plants of that species. "This", says Frazer, "is not called totemism, but nevertheless it appears to be totemism in all its pristine simplicity".[1] I know nothing else that Flügel could bring forward in vindication of his statement that the totem spirit has been shown regularly, either completely or partially, to play the father's part in the creation of the child, but that complicated hypothesis of Frazer's, which has not even gained general acceptance. Among its opponents is also Freud, who raises the objection that the Central Australians' denial of fatherhood does not, apparently,

[1] Frazer, *op. cit.* iv. 57 *sqq.*

rest upon primitive ignorance, but that " they seem to have sacrificed fatherhood to a kind of a speculation which strives to honour the ancestral spirits ".[1]

Freud observes that his theory of the substitution of the totem animal for the father leads to a very remarkable result. " If the totem animal is the father, then the two main commandments of totemism, the two taboo rules which constitute its nucleus,—not to kill the totem animal and not to use a woman belonging to the same totem for sexual purposes,—agree in content with the two crimes of Oedipus, who slew his father and took his mother to wife, and also with the child's two primal wishes whose insufficient repression or whose reawakening forms the nucleus of perhaps all neuroses. If this similarity is more than a deceptive play of accident it would perforce make it possible for us to shed light upon the origin of totemism in prehistoric times. In other words, we should succeed in making it probable that the totemic system resulted from the conditions underlying the Oedipus complex ".[2] In his attempt to do so Freud suggests that the suppressed tender impulses of the sons, their love and admiration of their father, asserted themselves, after slaying him, not only in denying themselves the liberated women but also in undoing their deed by declaring that the killing of the father substitute, the totem, was not allowed. " Thus they created the two fundamental taboos of totemism out of the sense of guilt of the son, and for this very reason these had to correspond with the two repressed wishes of the Oedipus complex. Whoever disobeyed became guilty of the two only crimes which troubled primitive society ".[3]

This argument implies that exogamy is an essential part of the totemic system, being a consequence of

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 144 (English translation, p. 196).
[2] *Ibid.* p. 160 (English translation, p. 219 *sq.*).
[3] *Ibid.* p. 173 (English translation, p. 237 *sq.*).

the same rueful attitude of the sons that led to the prohibition of killing the father substitute, the totemic animal. But the supposed intrinsic connection between exogamy and totemism is not borne out by facts. Exogamous clans are by no means always totemic. The Masai of East Africa and a number of tribes in Sumatra and other parts of the Malay Archipelago are divided into exogamous clans which are not, so far as appears, totemic clans; and in India, especially, the institution of clan exogamy disjoined from the institution of totemism appears to be very widespread and is shared even by the pure Aryan peoples, including the Brahmans, Rajputs, and other high castes. Indeed, Frazer thinks that exogamy unaccompanied by totemism is so common that it might furnish a theme for a separate treatise.[1] And as clan exogamy may exist without totemism, so totemism may exist without exogamy. For example, among the Wahehe, Taveta, and Nandi in Africa, the Kachâris in Assam, the Samoans, the Kworafi tribe in British New Guinea, and the tribes in the heart of Australia, a man is free to marry a woman who has the same totem as himself.[2] Moreover, it should be noticed that totemic groups are as a rule at the same time kinship groups, or clans; and the usual combination of exogamy with totemism may therefore be due rather to the clanship than to the totem bond. Among the Arunta and other Central Australian tribes the division into totems is quite independent of the clan system,[3] and their totemic groups are not exogamous.

Freud's theory of the prohibition of the origin of incest presupposes the accuracy of his assumption that "totemism has regularly formed a phase of every

[1] Frazer, *op. cit.* iv. 10 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* iv. 8 *sq.*

[3] B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), ch. iv.

culture ".[1] We have no evidence of this. Frazer, our chief authority on the question, writes: "Totemism has not been found as a living institution in any part of Northern Africa, Europe, or Asia, with the single exception of India; in other words, it appears to be absent, either wholly or for the most part, from two of the three continents which together make up the land surface of the Old World, as well as from the adjacent portion of the third. Nor has it been demonstrated beyond the reach of reasonable doubt that the institution ever obtained among any of the three great families of mankind which have played the most conspicuous parts in history—the Aryan, the Semitic, and the Turanian. It is true that learned writers have sought to prove the former existence of totemism both among the Semites and among the Aryans, notably among the ancient Greeks and Celts; but so far as I have studied the evidence adduced to support these conclusions I have to confess that it leaves me doubtful or unconvinced ".[2]

Freud thinks he has found in the totemic ritual indications of the expelled sons' slaying of their father and their identifying themselves with him by devouring his body in order to acquire a part of his strength. He falls back upon Robertson Smith's theory of a totem sacrament, according to which the totem animal, whose killing at ordinary times was strictly forbidden, was on certain occasions solemnly killed by the clan to furnish a mystic meal by which the members of the clan strengthened their identification with the totem and with each other.[3] The author of this theory, however, could not adduce a single positive instance of such a sacrament in support of it.[4] Yet Freud maintains that in the *intichiuma* ceremonies of Central Australian tribes a trait has been afterwards observed which fits in excel-

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 131.
[2] Frazer, *op. cit.* iv. 12 *sq.*
[3] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 161 *sqq.*
[4] *Cf.* Frazer, *op. cit.* iv. 230 *sq.*

lently with the assumptions of Robertson Smith:[1] while those tribes generally abstain from eating their totemic animals or plants, they nevertheless at certain times partake of them as part of a solemn ritual. But, as a matter of fact, the object of this is totally different from that of the sacramental meal postulated by Robertson Smith. They eat a little of their totem as a magical ceremony intended to multiply the species in order to increase the food supply for other totemic groups, the fundamental idea being that the members of each totemic group are responsible for providing other individuals with a supply of their totem.[2] The totem feast, therefore, gives no support whatever to Freud's supposition that it is " the repetition and commemoration " of the sons' killing and devouring of their father—that " memorable, criminal act with which so many things began, social organisation, moral restrictions, and religion ".[3]

Like Robertson Smith, Freud regards totemism as the earliest form of religion and the killing and eating by the clan of its totem animal as the prototype of the sacrifice at the altar, which was an essential part of every ancient cult. As the totem religion had issued from the sense of guilt of the sons, being an attempt to palliate this feeling and to conciliate the injured father through subsequent obedience, so all later religions prove to be attempts to solve the same problem: they are all " reactions aiming at the same great event with which culture began and which ever since has not let mankind come to rest ".[4] Whatever may have been the origin of the idea of a personal god, " psycho-analytic investigation of the individual teaches with especial

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 169.

[2] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* ch. vi.; *iidem*, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), ch. ix. *sq.*

[3] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 172 (English translation, p. 236).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 175 (English translation, p. 240 *sq.*).

emphasis that god is in every case modelled after the father and that our personal relation to god is dependent upon our relation to our physical father, fluctuating and changing with him, and that god at bottom is nothing but an exalted father ".[1] But although the earlier father substitute has been abandoned in favour of the higher conception of god, the hostile impulses which belong to the father complex have not entirely subsided. " On the contrary, the first phases in the domination of the two new substitutive formations for the father, those of gods and kings, plainly show the most energetic expression of that ambivalence which is characteristic of religion ". In many instances a man-god or divine king is put to death by his worshippers; and this theanthropic god-sacrifice " acknowledges with unsurpassable candour that the object of the sacrificial action has always been the same, being identical with what is now revered as a god, namely with the father ".[2]

Frazer has suggested an entirely different explanation of this sacrifice. Primitive people sometimes believe that their own safety and even that of the world is bound up with the life of one of those god-men or human incarnations of the divinity. They therefore take the utmost care of his life, out of regard for their own. But no amount of care and precaution will prevent the divine king from growing old and feeble and at last dying. And in order to avert the catastrophes which may be expected from the enfeeblement of his powers and their final extinction in death, they kill him as soon as he shows symptoms of weakness, and his soul is transferred to a vigorous successor before it has been seriously impaired by the threatened decay.[3] But some peoples appear to have thought it unsafe to wait for even the slightest symptom of decay and have preferred to

[1] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 177 (English translation, p. 244).
[2] *Ibid.* p. 181 *sq.* (English translation, p. 250 *sq.*).
[3] Frazer, *The Dying God* (London, 1911), p. 9 *sqq.*

kill the divine king while he is still in the full vigour of life. Accordingly, they have fixed a term beyond which he may not reign, and at the close of which he must die, the term fixed upon being short enough to exclude the probability of his degenerating physically in the interval.[1]

Every reader of *The Golden Bough* must admire the ingenuity, skill, and learning with which its author has worked out his theory, even though he may fail to find the argument in every point convincing. It is obvious that the supernatural power of divine kings is frequently supposed to be influenced by the condition of their bodies. In some cases it is also obvious that they are killed on account of some illness, bodily defect, or symptom of old age, and that the ultimate reason for this lies in the supposed connection between physical deterioration and waning divinity. But, as Frazer himself observed in the two earlier editions of his work, a link is wanting in the chain of his evidence: he could produce no direct proof of the idea that the soul of the slain man-god is transmitted to his royal successor.[2] In the absence of such evidence I ventured to suggest a somewhat different explanation, which seems to me more in accordance with known facts—to wit, that the new king is supposed to inherit, not the predecessor's soul, but his divinity or holiness, which is looked upon in the light of a mysterious entity, temporarily seated in the ruling sovereign, but separable from him and transferable to another individual. Of this modification of Frazer's theory, which came into my mind as a result of certain beliefs I had found in Morocco, where holiness is ascribed to the sultanship,[3] he writes in the last edition of his work: " There is a good deal to be said in

[1] Frazer, *The Dying God*, p. 46 *sqq*.

[2] *Idem*, *The Golden Bough*, i. (London, 1890), p. 237 *sq*.; ii. (London, 1900), p. 56.

[3] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 607 *sqq*.

favour of Dr. Westermarck's theory, which is supported in particular by the sanctity attributed to the regalia. But on the whole I see no sufficient reason to abandon the view adopted in the text, and I am confirmed in it by the Shilluk evidence, which was unknown to Dr. Westermarck when he propounded his theory ".[1] In the facts on which this statement is based I have, however, found no convincing proof that the Shilluk really believed in the soul of their slain man-god being transmitted to his royal successor.[2] But my disagreement with Frazer on this point has of course nothing to do with his main theory that people killed their divine king for the purpose of saving him from decay.

Flügel thinks that such a motive, " belonging to the later and more conscious levels of the mind ", may very well coexist with the motives connected with the Oedipus complex, but that the primary and fundamental motive for the regicide was the feeling of hostility as a displaced form of the hate elements in that complex.[3] Such a feeling is said to be a still more important reason for regarding the sacrificed divine being as a father substitute than the presumed parricide itself. Money-Kyrle argues that it is not even essential to the Freudian theory of sacrifice to assert that the primeval parricide actually and habitually took place, and points out that this was admitted by Freud, who thinks " we may well assume in the case we are discussing, though without vouching for the absolute certainty of the decision, that ' in the beginning was the deed ' ".[4] We are told that " if the unconscious hatred of fathers that psycho-analysis detects to-day was present at all times, it must have been responsible for the killing of father-symbols. If the present conscious repudiation of this hatred was

[1] Frazer, *The Dying God*, p. 204 n. 1.
[2] *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, ii. 754.
[3] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 130 *sqq.*
[4] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 194 (English translation, p. 268).

also present, it must have concealed from the sacrificer the true motive of his act. No analyst would doubt that the hatred once found a still more direct expression in the act of parricide. But this inference is not an essential premise in the deduction that the sacrifice of gods was a result of the Oedipus complex ".[1] Now the hostility towards the father which forms part of this complex is caused by sexual jealousy, and how can psycho-analysts know that a similar feeling is the true, unconscious motive for the slaying of divine kings without analysing the minds of the slayers? Flügel refers to restraints laid on the sexual activities of some kings, and to the execution of others in consequence of failure of their sexual power, as motives for the hostility which has led to the regicide. But these suggestions are only fantastic interpretations of customs for which the conscious motives are not far to seek.

Psycho-analytic writers speak of other, not less fanciful, displacements of the father hate. We are told that " many who detest teachers and other persons set in authority over them, who loathe the State and its official chief, and whose hatred extends even to God himself, are in reality inspired only with hatred for the father, the misdirection being due to an unconscious change of address ".[2] Hunting served originally not only an economic but also another, equally important, purpose by displacing the father hate on to wild animals,[3] and the taming of animals led to the gratification of the same feeling.[4] Among some peoples youths are not admitted to the full privileges of maturity until they have killed a man—" in order, probably, to work

[1] Money-Kyrle, *op. cit.* p. 193 *sq.*

[2] O. Pfister, *Love in Children and its Aberrations* (London, 1924), p. 349.

[3] E. Lorenz, ' Chaos und Ritus ', in *Imago*, xvii. (Wien, 1931), p. 454.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 458.

off their hostile feelings on some third person who may serve as a substitute for the father who was the original object of these feelings ".[1]

According to Dr. Jones, the institution of mother-right was intended to deflect the hatred towards the father felt by the growing boy by transferring it to the maternal uncle. The savage was thus " provided with a figure who would incorporate the disliked and feared attributes of the father imago. In nearly all matrilineal societies, and in some that have partly passed over into the patrilineal form, the maternal uncle plays this part. It is he who wields over the children the direct potestas, he who is the main source of authority and discipline ".[2] This is far from being a correct general description of the maternal uncle's position in matrilineal societies. In all Australian tribes, whether patrilineal or matrilineal, the father is most distinctly the head of the family.[3] The same is the case in many parts of Melanesia, where descent is traced through the mother; as Codrington puts it, " the house of the family is the father's, the garden is his, the rule and government are his ".[4] 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 ".[5] And so forth;[6] Professor Malinowski observes that under mother-right there is always a double authority over the child.[7] But the theory in

[1] Flügel, *op. cit.* p. 83 *sq.*

[2] E. Jones, 'Mother-Right and the Sexual Ignorance of Savages', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, vi. (1925), pp. 120, 123 *sq.*

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 43; B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (London, 1913), pp. 67 *sqq.*, 254 *sqq.*

[4] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (Oxford, 1891), p. 34. See also *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 43 n. 2.

[5] J. Sibree, *The Great African Island* (London, 1880), p. 326.

[6] See *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 43 *sq.*

[7] B. Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (London, 1927), p. 271.

question suffers from another more serious defect than the exaggeration of the power wielded by the maternal uncle. The hostility towards the father which forms part of the Oedipus complex, as defined by Dr. Jones himself, is due to sexual jealousy; and how could the institution of mother-right interfere with the sexual relation between the father and the object of the son's incestuous desire, the mother? Dr. Jones refers to Professor Malinowski's statement that in the matrilineal family system any incestuous temptations are directed towards the sister rather than towards the mother;[1] hence " the repressed nuclear complex consists of brother and sister attraction, with nephew and uncle hatred ".[2] But no reason is given for the assumption that, under matrilineal conditions, the incestuous love of the mother is thus displaced on to the sister. So far as I can see, the Oedipus complex could exist in a matrilineal just as well as in a patrilineal society, and the matrilineal system with its avunculate could consequently not have arisen as " a mode of defence against the primordial Oedipus tendencies ".[3]

Dr. Jones maintains that, besides the institution of mother-right, there has been another method, closely connected with it, of deflecting the son's hatred towards his father, namely, a " tendentious denial of paternal procreation ", both phenomena being brought about by the same motive.[4] Now it is not to be doubted that existing savages are generally aware of the existence of some causal connection between sexual intercourse and childbirth. This may be inferred from many of their

[1] Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (London, 1927), p. 139.

[2] Jones, *loc. cit.* p. 127 *sq.* Malinowski's suggestion is also accepted by H. Becker and D. K. Bruner, ' Tabu und Totemismus ', in *Kölner Vierteljahrshefte für Soziologie*, xii. (München & Leipzig, 1933), p. 68.

[3] Jones, *loc. cit.* p. 128.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 120.

customs, and there are also 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 may be.[1] Various tribes—in South America,[2] British Central Africa,[3] and Australia[4]—maintain that the father is, properly speaking, the only parent, the child being merely formed from what the man introduces into the woman. But very different views are held by other Australian tribes, who believe that children enter women in the form of minute spirits and are then born in the shape of human beings[5] or are fashioned by spirits and then inserted in the mother.[6] Yet at least some of these natives are expressly said to be aware of a causal connection between copulation and procreation among animals;[7] and even in the case of human beings the ignorance of such a connection is not

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 287 *sq.* See also I. Schapera, *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa* (London, 1930), p. 103 (Bushmen); P. Schebesta, *Among The Forest Dwarfs of Malaya* (London, 1929), p. 101.

[2] K. von den Steinen, *Unter den Naturvölkern Zentral-Brasiliens* (Berlin, 1897), p. 291 *sq.*; C. Teschauer, 'Die Caingang oder Coroados-Indianer im brasilianischen Staate Rio Grande do Sul', in *Anthropos*, ix. (Wien, 1914), p. 22; R. Karsten, *The Civilization of the South American Indians* (London, 1926), p. 422 *sqq.*

[3] H. S. Stannus, 'Notes on some Tribes of British Central Africa', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (1910), p. 310.

[4] A. W. Howitt, 'Australian Group Relations', in *Smithsonian Institution, Annual Reports*, 1883 (Washington, 1885), p. 813; *idem*, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (London, 1904), pp. 195, 198, 255, 263, 284; A. L. P. Cameron, 'Notes on some Tribes of New South Wales', in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xiv. (1885), p. 352; B. H. Purcell, 'Rites and Customs of Australian Aborigines', in *Verhandlungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1893, p. 288.

[5] See *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 289.

[6] W. E. Roth, *North Queensland Ethnography: Bulletin No. 5. Superstition, Magic, and Medicine* (Brisbane, 1903), p. 23.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 22. C. Strehlow, *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien*, ii. (Frankfurt a. M., 1908), p. 52 n. 7.

complete. Spencer and Gillen assert that according to the beliefs of the Arunta, Loritja, and Ilpirra tribes, and probably also of other Central Australians, sexual intercourse at any rate prepares the mother for the reception and birth of an already formed spirit child who inhabits one of the local totem centres;[1] and Strehlow agrees with them in his account of the two first-mentioned tribes.[2] Basedow, who was acquainted with the Loritja and also the north-western tribes, throws doubt on the subject of their supposed ignorance;[3] and Róheim says he has seen native children enacting the whole process of coitus, conception, and childbirth.[4]

According to Malinowski, the natives of Kiriwina in Trobriand Islands (British New Guinea) believe that 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 spirit child by another *baloma*. A woman cannot conceive and give birth to a child unless she has been "opened" for the spirits in some way or other; but "once this has been done, in the normal way by sexual intercourse, there is no need for male and female to come together in order to produce a child".[5] I have suggested that this theory may be the outcome of superimposed animistic ideas;[6] but Malinowski has expressed a different opinion.[7] Yet, in a recent article, he writes

[1] Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes*, p. 265.

[2] Strehlow, *op. cit.* iii. (1911), pt. i. p. x. *sq.*

[3] H. Basedow, *The Australian Aboriginal* (London, 1925), p. 284 *sq.*

[4] G. Róheim, 'Psycho-Analysis of Primitive Cultural Types', in *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, xiii. (1932), p. 97.

[5] B. Malinowski, 'Baloma; the Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriand Islands', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* xlvi. (London, 1916), p. 403 *sqq.*; *idem*, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia* (London, 1929), p. 146 *sqq.*

[6] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 293.

[7] Malinowski, in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlvi. 416; *idem*, *Sexual Life of Savages*, p. 153 *sqq.*

of savage ideas about procreation that " in all cases, where the subject has been competently investigated, we find that the mechanism of procreation is conceived in a manner in which some biological knowledge is arbitrarily mixed up with animistic beliefs ".[1] In a recent book Professor Porteus observes, with regard to the alleged Central Australian belief in " immaculate conception ", that it is obviously bound up with the magico-religious ideas of the natives. " Once they are imbued with the belief that rocks and trees and other natural features are filled with the spirits of their ancestors and that these spirits are all awaiting a chance to reincarnate themselves, what is more reasonable than to ascribe to those spirits the main part in the generation of the individual? Yet what is affirmed as a matter of magico-religious belief is no proof of lack of common-sense observation of cause and effect. The native is so anxious to make clear and emphatic his affirmation of what is to him a most important belief, that his very insistence may appear to constitute an explicit denial of the ordinary and obvious facts of generation ".[2]

We must not, of course, 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 sexual connection is not sufficient to produce children, or that they may also be produced in other ways. Speaking

[1] Malinowski, ' Kinship ', in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiii. (London, 1929), p. 406.

[2] S. D. Porteus, *The Psychology of a Primitive People* (London, 1931), p. 218 *sq.*

of the Kariera tribe in Western Australia, Professor Radcliffe-Brown observes that even before the coming of the white man " there was a distinct association in the native mind between sexual desire and the birth of children, amongst people who, at the same time . . . associate pregnancy with the eating of food ".[1] Professor Landtman states that although the Kiwai Papuans of New Guinea are in a general way acquainted with the natural course of conception, we meet in their narratives with numerous cases in which women have conceived without having connection with a man, for instance through eating certain things which passed down the woman's throat without being chewed.[2] Professor Karsten considers it highly improbable that there is to-day any tribe of South American Indians so backward as not to be aware, in a general way, of the connection between sexual intercourse and pregnancy, but they do not understand that sexual intercourse is the only way in which a woman becomes pregnant: there are numerous instances showing that women are thought to become impregnated by some invisible spiritual beings directly entering into them.[3] Even among civilised peoples there are stories of " supernatural birth " side by side with the belief that in all normal cases children owe their origin to sexual relations between men and women.

In an article called ' No Paternity ', Carveth Read emphasises the power of social leaders to inculcate a dogma, however absurd, and observes that if there are strong interests in favour of the doctrine which attributes pregnancy and childbirth to the exclusive action of spirits, and if it is the practice of a tribe to adopt

[1] A. R. Brown, ' Beliefs concerning Childbirth in some Australian Tribes ', in *Man*, xii. (London, 1912), p. 182.

[2] G. Landtman, *The Kiwai Papuans of British New Guinea* (London, 1927), p. 228.

[3] Karsten, *op. cit.* p. 424.

animistic explanations, it is quite possible for such a fiction to repress the knowledge of natural paternity.[1] Indeed, with reference to some of the Central Australians Strehlow was assured that the old men knew cohabitation to be the cause of the conception of children, but said nothing about it to the young men and women.[2] Basedow states something to the same effect.[3] But even though there may have been a "tendentious denial of paternal procreation", I utterly fail to see how the motive of it could have been a desire to deflect the son's hatred towards his father. What has the cause of this hatred, the son's jealousy, to do with the idea of a physiological connection between himself and his rival, and how could it be prevented by the persuasion that no such connection exists?

The facts that have been adduced in support of the supposed prehistoric events to which Freud has attributed the inhibition of incest have thus in each case been found to be worthless as evidence. But he maintains that those events—the murder of the primeval father and the subsequent behaviour of the repentant sons—have been attended with much more far-reaching consequences than the mere prohibition of incest: he sees in them the beginnings of religion, morality, and social organisation.[4] He writes: "What is now the heritage of the individual was once, long ago, a newly acquired possession, handed down from one generation to another. . . . If we submit the prehistoric and ethnological material relating to this archaic heritage to psycho-analytical elaboration, we come to an unex-

[1] C. Read, 'No Paternity', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlviii. (1918), p. 150.

[2] Strehlow, *op. cit.* ii. 52 n. 7.

[3] Basedow, *op. cit.* p. 284 *sq.*

[4] Freud, *op. cit.* p. 188; *idem*, *Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, vi. [1925]), p. 324.

pectedly definite conclusion—namely, that the god the father at one time walked incarnate on the earth and exercised his sovereignty as leader of the hordes of primitive men until his sons combined together and slew him; and further, that the first social ties, the basic moral restrictions, and the oldest form of religion—totemism—originated as a result of, and a reaction against, this liberating misdeed. Later religions are filled with the same content and with the endeavour to obliterate the traces of that crime, or to expiate it by substituting other solutions for the conflict between father and sons.[1] . . . In the Christian doctrine mankind most unreservedly acknowledges the guilty deed of primordial times because it now has found the most complete expiation for this deed in the sacrificial death of the son ".[2] With regard to morality he writes that perhaps even now men " would still kill one another without inhibition, if there had not been among those acts of murder one—the slaughter of the primal father—which evoked an irresistible emotional reaction, momentous in its consequences. From it arose the commandment: thou shalt not kill, which in totemism was confined to the father substitute, and was later extended to others, but which even to-day is not universally observed ".[3]

It has seemed to me worth the while to put to a searching scrutiny a theory which has advanced such enormous claims. The rôle that the Oedipus complex plays in the psychology of the individual is in the first place to be decided by the neurologists; but the social facts underlying the supposition of its universality and

[1] Freud, 'Preface' to Th. Reik's book *Ritual* (London, 1931), p. 9 *sq.*

[2] *Idem*, *Totem und Tabu* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, x.), p. 185 (English translation, p. 256).

[3] *Idem*, *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* (Leipzig, Wien, Zürich, 1927), p. 68 *sq.* (English translation [London, 1928], p. 74).

the influence it is alleged to have exercised on the history of civilisation are matters that concern sociology. And objections raised by the latter cannot be ignored by those whose faith in Freud as a psycho-analyst has made them ready to swallow the unfounded sociological presumptions of his theory.

RECENT THEORIES OF EXOGAMY

RECENT THEORIES OF EXOGAMY

By exogamy I understand the rule which forbids the members of a particular group to marry any other member of it. The exogamous group is in most cases composed of persons who are, or consider themselves to be, related by blood or of the same kin; and the nearer the relationship the more frequently it is a bar to intermarriage, at least within the same line of descent. The term "exogamy" is generally used for a prohibition of marrying inside a larger group than one merely consisting of members of the same family, particularly the clan; but neither in the etymology of the word, nor in the nature of the prohibitions, can I find any ground for such a restriction. On the contrary, it has the disadvantage of dissociating rules that belong to the same class and, in my opinion, have the same foundation.

No problem relating to the history of marriage has led to a greater variety of attempted solutions than the origin of the exogamous rules. They have—to mention only some of the more important of those hypotheses—been ascribed to a pristine habit of female infanticide; to the vain desire of savage men to have trophies in their wives; to experience of the injurious influence of inbreeding (made at an earlier stage of human development than that represented by any living savages but afterwards forgotten); to marriage by capture originating in the hypothetical period of primitive promiscuity; to marriage by purchase; to a superstitious belief that incest blights the crops, prevents the multiplication of edible animals, and renders the women sterile; to

totemism; or to the furious jealousy of a gorilla-like ancestor. I have criticised these theories in the last edition of my book *The History of Human Marriage.* In the present essay I shall discuss some others which have appeared after its publication.

While Atkinson and Freud derive the rule of exogamy from the jealousy of the father in the primitive group, Dr. Briffault derives it, in particular, from the jealousy of the mother, though her jealousy was of a different type. According to him the constitution of primitive human groups was not patriarchal, but matriarchal, and the observance of the rule of exogamy was an essential condition of the preservation of that maternal character of the group. " If the women left their family to join their husbands, that family would cease to be a maternal group; if the men were the sexual mates as well as the brothers of the women, patriarchal succession would be established, and their authority and rivalry would bring about patriarchal dominance also ". Primitive peoples who have retained the matriarchal constitution are profoundly averse to allowing any of their girls or women to leave the group, whereas the men are not essential to the continuity and constitution of it, being but offshoots of the main female stem of which the group, as a stable social unit, consists. The rules that govern the constitution of the maternal group are in harmony with the spontaneous instincts and dispositions which are the source of that social constitution. While girls are in all primitive societies naturally tied, so to speak, to their mothers' apron-strings, the instincts of the young male impel him to wander in search of change, of food, of adventure. Those conditions made for the association of males from neighbouring groups with females who remained in their own group. And a habit, hardened into a traditionally established rule that males shall seek their sexual partners in another group, gave rise to a corre-

sponding rule that they shall not seek their sexual partners in the group to which they themselves belong.

But that prohibition was reinforced by another manifestation of the maternal instincts which determined the constitution of the primitive human group. The unparalleled development of those instincts to which the biological conditions of early human development were due implied as a correlate a corresponding tendency to jealousy in their exercise. The transference of the son's attachment and dependence to another woman would have been the most offensive blow to the jealous love of the mother and the authority she claimed over her sons. So " to the young male, terror-stricken by the anger of a despotic mother, no other course was open than to find surreptitiously the means of satisfying his most imperative impulses and to wander away from the family group in search of a female ".[1]

Dr. Briffault says that the impulses of the primitive mother were wholly unreasonable, unaffected by rational considerations or foresight. Yet one would think she had enough foresight to understand that if her son was not allowed to mate inside his own group he would seek a sexual partner in another group, and that she would thereby lose all influence over him instead of merely having to share her influence with her daughter. I also fail to see why matriarchal succession should come to an end if the men were both the sexual partners and the brothers of the women. Nor can I reconcile what Dr. Briffault says about " the mother of the group " with other statements made by him, to the effect that matrilocal marriage, which " was the original form of marriage union ",[2] was not in the beginning individual; that " the regulation of collective sexual relations between given groups has everywhere preceded any regulation of those relations between individual members of

[1] R. Briffault, *The Mothers*, i. (London, 1927), p. 250 *sqq.*
[2] *Ibid.* i. 307.

those groups";[1] that "in their origin marriage regulations had no reference to such individual relations, but to relations between groups".[2] Did the mother's prohibition of brother and sister incest refer to relations between groups? Dr. Briffault has even tried to prove that there was a primitive group-motherhood.[3]

The incest prohibition is thus supposed to apply primarily to relations between brothers and sisters. Dr. Briffault says that in the simplest forms of deliberate exogamic devices, such as they are found among some of the Australian tribes, "which are divided into two intermarrying classes, while that organisation prevents marriage between brothers and sisters, it does not oppose any artificial obstacle to incest between parents and children". He also refers to a couple of cases in which unions between father and daughter are regarded as quite legitimate, whereas the strictest prohibition exists in regard to unions between brother and sister. The same cases have been previously mentioned by myself;[4] but if he had taken sufficient notice of my list of peoples who are reported to practise, at least occasionally, incest between the nearest relatives, he would have found that the prohibition of it is not less, but more, general in regard to parents and children than in regard to brothers and sisters.[5] The former rule is accounted for in a few lines: "When the character of the mother in the primitive human group is apprehended, it is easy to understand that the awe and dread attaching to the maternal head of the family who imposed her veto against relations between brothers and sisters should render it even less likely that she should herself be a possible object of incestuous advances. Her instincts would equally oppose relations between father and

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 766.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 607.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 597 *sqq.*
[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. (London, 1921), p. 84 *sq.*
[5] *Ibid.* ii. 82 *sqq.*

daughters ".[1] Of course, the mother would not allow her son to rape her. But Dr. Briffault must be aware of the fact that elderly women are not unfrequently sexually attracted by young men; and we may imagine that this was also the case with the primitive mother in regard to her son, if, as Dr. Briffault says, the restraining effects of habitual association upon the sexual instincts which we notice among ourselves have no bearing upon the operation of those instincts in savage humanity.[2] His explanation of the taboo relating to father and daughter incest presupposes, of course, that the mother of the group was strong enough to impose it. Like his explanations of the other incest prohibitions it rests on his theory of a primitive stage of matriarchy, which, as will be seen in the following essay, I consider completely untenable.

While according to Dr. Briffault the incest prohibition applies primarily to relation between brothers and sisters, Mrs. Seligman maintains that " the parent-child type is the fundamental incest law ", though " the brother-sister type is an auxiliary to it ".[3] She argues as follows: " A sexual relationship between parent and child would be dangerous to the family group, quite apart from the directly sexual jealousies that such a situation would cause, for the child would then be raised to the social level of the parent, who could no longer exercise the authority due to the senior generation. From this point of view intercourse of father and daughter would upset the parent-child relationship and disturb the balance of [the] family group, just as much as intercourse on the part of the son with the mother or with his father's other wives. . . . The blow to parental

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 257 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* i. 247 *sq.*

[3] Brenda Z. Seligman, ' Incest and Descent: Their Influence on Social Organisation ', in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lix. (London, 1929), p. 368.

authority would be so great that the family group could hardly survive. If, on the other hand, a social law can be accepted which at the same time protects the mother from the son and the daughter from the father, the authority of both parents can be maintained over the children until they seek mates outside the family and themselves gain the social status of seniors without encroaching on that of their parents. The father keeps his authority over the family by accepting a rule which deprives him of intercourse with his daughter. In doing so the father gives up a real advantage, for there can be no doubt that very young girls are attractive to mature men ".[1]

This argument is based on the assumption that sexual relations are antagonistic to authority. What about the husband's authority over his wife? Among the lower races, as a rule, a woman is always more or less in a state of dependence: when she is emancipated from the power of the head of her family she generally passes into the power of her husband; and from the civilised world we likewise hear of the rule that the husband shall command and the wife obey. There are in the sexual impulse itself elements that lead to domination on the part of the man and to submission on the part of the woman: in the male it is connected with a desire to win the female, and in the female with a desire to be pursued and won by the male. The most judicious student of the psychology of sex, Dr. Havelock Ellis, observes: " While in men it is possible to trace a tendency to inflict pain, or the simulacrum of pain, on the women they love, it is still easier to trace in women a delight in experiencing physical pain when inflicted by

[1] Brenda Z. Seligman, ' Incest and Descent: Their Influence on Social Organisation ', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lix. 243 *sq.* The same argument is repeated in Mrs. Seligman's article ' The Incest Barrier: its Rôle in Social Organisation ', in *The British Journal of Psychology (General Section)*, xxii. (Cambridge, 1932), p. 259 *sq.*

a lover, and an eagerness to accept subjection to his will. Such a tendency is certainly normal. To abandon herself to her lover, to be able to rely on his physical strength and mental resourcefulness, to be swept out of herself and beyond the control of her own will, to drift idly in delicious submission to another and stronger will—this is one of the commonest aspirations in a young woman's intimate love-dreams ".[1] There is thus no reason at all to suppose that sexual relations between a father and his daughter should weaken his authority over her. At the same time they may cause jealousy on the part of the mother and the father's other wives, if he has more than one. That this, however, would not upset the family group is proved by the fact that polygyny is a recognised institution among an enormous number of peoples. In fact, it seems that domestic troubles are more easily averted if the wives are chosen from the same family, as they not unfrequently are. We often hear that a man who wishes to have several wives by preference marries sisters for the very purpose of securing more domestic peace;[2] and among some peoples—such as the Onas of Tierra del Fuego,[3] the Chiriguanos of Gran Chaco,[4] the Caribs,[5] the Negritos of Zambales,[6] and the Maori of New Zealand[7]—we find marriages with two women who are mother and daughter. Again, sexual relations

[1] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, iii. (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 89.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 94 *sq.*

[3] A. Cojazzi, *Los indios del Archipiélago Fueguino* (Santiago de Chile, 1914), p. 16.

[4] G. E. Church, *Aborigines of South America* (London, 1912), p. 238.

[5] J. B. Du Tertre, *Histoire générale des Antilles*, ii. (Paris, 1667), p. 378.

[6] W. A. Reed, *Negritos of Zambales* (Manila, 1904), p. 61.

[7] E. Best, 'Maori Marriage Customs', in *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, 1903, xxxvi. (Wellington, 1904), p. 29.

between a son and his mother would cause jealousy on the part of the father. In Tibet father and son sometimes share the same wife, but only on condition that she shall not be the son's mother;[1] and according to Caesar the ancient Britons practised "a form of community of wives, ten or twelve combining in a group, especially brothers with brothers and fathers with sons".[2] But such practices are possible only among a polyandrous people, and irregular sexual connections between a son and his mother would be no more tolerated by the father than similar connections between his wife and any other man. Whether a son's incest with his mother would weaken her authority over him is thus a question which need not be considered at all—the less so since among savages she has no such authority after the son has reached the age of puberty.

With regard to the taboo relating to brother and sister incest, Mrs. Seligman argues that "when the father accepted a barrier between himself and his daughter it is unlikely that he would permit his sons to take the very mates whom social pressure had caused him to renounce. The triumph of the sons over the father in mating with the sister would be unbearable, and considering the probable physical immaturity of the latter it would be unlikely that they could succeed without their father's consent. If the fathers renounce all sexual approach to their daughters the sons must do so too. Thus the brother-sister taboo imposed upon the younger generation by the father, not only prevents rivalry between brother and brother and between sister and sister, but it removes a second sphere of rivalry between father and son. The two incest taboos

[1] Sarat Chandra Das, *Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet* (London, 1904), p. 327; Ch. A. Sherring, *Western Tibet and the British Borderland* (London, 1906), p. 305.

[2] Caesar, *De bello Gallico*, v. 14.

are therefore complementary to one another, and together eliminate certain possible sources of disharmony within the family group ".[1] Mrs. Seligman's explanation of the brother and sister taboo is thus in the first place an inference from her explanation of the father and daughter taboo, and if the premiss is untenable the conclusion must be untenable too. But apart from this, if fathers had renounced all sexual approach to their daughters there could be no sexual rivalry between them and their sons, nor is it easy to imagine that it was a universal characteristic of primitive fathers to grudge the latter a privilege which they themselves had forsaken; and the authority over their daughters they lost anyhow when they gave them in marriage to other men. Again, the supposition that there would be disturbing rivalry between brother and brother and between sister and sister presupposes that no equally, if not more, acceptable mates could be found outside the family circle; and whatever psycho-analysts may say on the matter, I consider such an assumption completely unjustified. Mrs. Seligman also discusses exogamous rules relating to more distantly related persons. Like myself, she regards them as extensions of the two primary incest prohibitions, that between parent and child and that between brother and sister. I shall come back to them a little later.

With regard to her theory of the incest barrier Mrs. Seligman acknowledges her indebtedness to Professor Malinowski. According to him, the prohibition of incest is the result of two phenomena which spring up under culture. " In the first place, under the mechanisms which constitute the human family serious temptations to incest arise. In the second place, side by side with the sex temptations, specific

[1] Mrs. Seligman, in *British Journal of Psychology* (*General Section*), xxii. 261 *sq.* See also *idem*, in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lix. 246.

perils come into being for the human family, due to the existence of the incestuous tendencies". On the first point he agrees with Freud, but does not accept his theory that the infantile attachment to the mother is essentially sexual. The relation of the suckling to its mother is first of all induced by the desire for nutrition, while the bodily clinging of a child to its mother satisfies its bodily wants of warmth, protection, and guidance. But although the temptation of incest is not due to any sexual relation between the infant and its mother, there is a remarkable analogy between the preparatory actions of the sexual drive and the consummatory actions of the infantile impulse, consisting in the clinging to the mother's body in the fullest possible epidermic contact, above all in the contact of the child's lips with the mother's nipple; both kinds of actions are connected with sensuous pleasure derived from bodily contact. The caresses of lovers employ not only the same medium—epidermis; not only the same situation—embraces, cuddling, the maximum of personal approach; but they entail also the same type of sensuous feelings. When therefore this new type of drive enters, it must invariably awaken the memories of earlier similar experiences. These memories are associated with the mother. With regard to this person the erotic life introduces disturbing memories which stand in direct contradiction to the attitude of reverence, submission, and cultural dependence which in the growing boy has already completely repressed the early infantile sentimental attachment. This blending of the new type of erotic sensuality with the memories of early life threatens to break up the organised system of emotions built up around the mother, by giving rise to temptation to incest.[1]

In support of his theory Professor Malinowski argues

[1] B. Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (London, 1927), p. 244 *sqq*.

that " we can borrow from psycho-analysis the principle which has now become generally accepted in psychology that there are no experiences in later life which would not stir up analogous memories from infancy ". But Freud says that, in most people, a peculiar oblivion veils the first six or eight years of existence.[1] Not even savages, among whom the suckling period often lasts for two or three years, could have any real memory either of " the contact of the child's lips with the mother's nipple ", or of " the permanent clinging to the mother's body in the fullest possible epidermic contact ". How, then, could those infantile actions, unaccompanied with any sexual desire, be a source of temptation to incest in later life? According to Freud it is not a memory, but the repressed infantile incest desire, that becomes active at puberty, then strengthened by the bodily development. So far, then, there would be no reason to suppose that the temptation to incest with the mother is greater than the temptation to sexual intercourse with any other woman of her age; and this could not be very great. Professor Malinowski might have considered what his Trobriand Islanders told him when he asked them if they ever had erotic dreams relating to their mothers. The answer was a calm, unshocked negation: " The mother is forbidden—only an imbecile would dream such a thing. She is an old woman. No such thing would happen ".[2] Speaking of the same islanders he says that although they consider sexual intercourse with the father's own sister emphatically right and proper, it is not frequently practised, and that marriage with her, although permissible and even desirable, seems never to occur. This he explains by the remark that " she belongs to a previous generation, and, as a rule, what remains of her sexual endowment is

[1] S. Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Leipzig & Wien, 1926), p. 49.

[2] Malinowski, *op. cit.* p. 95.

not attractive ".[1] Does not exactly the same apply to the mother? Another natural check upon incestuous desires may be the son's respect for his mother, in so far as it tends to increase in this case that feeling of aversion to sexual intercourse between persons who have been living closely together from the childhood of one or both of them which, in my opinion, is the ultimate cause of all incest prohibitions. Professor Malinowski does not agree with me that there is any such feeling.[2] Yet I believe that it is that very feeling which has suggested the idea that son and mother incest is incompatible with filial reverence. That sexual feelings and behaviour are not by themselves inconsistent with the emotion of respect appears from its frequent occurrence in the relations between husband and wife. Finally, it should be noticed that the jealousy which that kind of incest would arouse in the father must be a powerful obstacle to it. Altogether, then, the temptations to it could not have been very great.

On the origin of the other incest taboos Professor Malinowski has little to say. He tells us, in a general way, that incest must be forbidden because it is " incompatible with the establishment of the first foundations of culture ", that without the prohibition of it " the family could not continue to exist " and there would be " complete social chaos and an impossibility of continuing cultural tradition ".[3] Even if the practice of incest were attended with so disastrous consequences—it seems to have been quite common in ancient Egypt without being destructive either to culture or to the family—I cannot believe it was prohibited for fear of them. I think it was forbidden simply because it was repulsive to the feelings of the

[1] Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia* (London, 1929), p. 450.

[2] *Idem*, *Sex and Repression*, pp. 244, 245, 252.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 251.

community—in other words, that the exogamous rules have fundamentally the same origin as other customs and laws which are expressions of public sentiments, and punish acts that shock them.[1]

A still later theory of the origin of exogamy comes from Lord Raglan. In an article published in 1931 he traced it to the belief that it is dangerous for a man to deflower a girl belonging to his own social group; but why it was considered dangerous he could not tell, though he thought it quite possible that the belief had originated in a fear of bloodshed.[2] Two years later he suggested that exogamy was connected with "a very ancient magical belief that it is dangerous to have intercourse with a woman who lives on the same side of the stream".[3] I must quote him verbatim: "I suppose that men became more and more frightened of menstruous women till they did not feel safe unless they had some obstacle between them and the women as a whole, and for this purpose utilised the stream on whose banks they lived; all the men lived on one side, and merely visited the women on the other, taking with them some of the spoils of the chase. This would not last for very long; old men would stay with the women, and old women with the men, and the idea might gradually arise that it was safe for people of both sexes to live on the same side so long as they did not have sexual intercourse. There was as yet no individual marriage—the divine king and queen were the first pair to be married—but the men would tend to visit the same women, those nearest to them on the opposite bank. . . . All this time, we may suppose, the belief in ancestral spirits had been slowly developing, and the danger from a breach of the menstrual taboo, which

[1] See *supra*, p. 54.

[2] Lord Raglan, 'Incest and Exogamy', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lxi. (London, 1931), p. 179.

[3] *Idem*, *Jocasta's Crime* (London, 1933), p. 191.

had formerly been supposed to come from the women themselves, or their blood, was in part transferred to the spirits, who thus became jealous guardians of the taboo. . . . A man from the other side was safe, because he could get safely back across the stream before the spirits, who are never very quick-witted, had realised what had happened, so all the ill-luck fell on the woman's own relatives ".[1]

Lord Raglan admits that there is perhaps not much evidence in favour of his theory, but says there is some. Thus, although a man who has had intercourse no longer crosses a stream, " he often takes care to avoid trouble from the evil spirits by performing a ritual ablution, and water, especially running or 'living' water, is generally regarded as a powerful magical disinfectant "; and, moreover, " there are still a few cases in which exogamous moieties are separated by water ".[2] Lord Raglan modestly says he does not claim that his theory is true, " for it is merely a guess ". But his next sentence is less modest, for he does claim " that it is an improvement on previous theories in two respects; in the first place it attempts to account for all the features of the three early sexual taboos and not merely a few selected features of one selected taboo ". These taboos are: " a man must not have intercourse with a woman of his own exogamous group; he must not see, or have anything to do with, a menstruous woman; he must not see, or have anything to do with, his mother-in-law ".[3]

Lord Raglan then ignores other sexual taboos which are generally considered to be most intimately connected with exogamy, as defined by him. Exogamy, he says, " means that a tribe is divided into two or more groups, usually totemic clans, and that members of the same group may not marry, even when there is no traceable

[1] Lord Raglan, *Jocasta's Crime*, p. 124 *sqq.*
[2] *Ibid.* p. 126 *sq.*
[3] *Ibid.* p. 122.

relationship between them "[1] (in another place he writes all the same that "exogamy must date from a time before marriage existed"[2]). This definition does not imply the prohibition of marriage between members of the same family who do not belong to the same clan; he blames me for confusing "with outbreeding the system of exogamy, which may permit . . . fathers to marry their own daughters, since under the matrilineal system the latter belong to their mother's clan"[3] (in my own clearly defined use of the term "exogamy" the prohibition of such unions is included). Lord Raglan simply says that "the laws of incest" are in all probability based on exogamy, though they "introduce two new principles—that a child is a blood-relative to his father, and therefore cannot marry, *e.g.* his father's sister, and that a man is a blood-relation to his wife".[4] Where do we find this idea? And what about the prohibition of son and mother incest when the son does not belong to his mother's clan?

Again, if other writers have not mentioned the taboos imposed on women at menstruation in connection with exogamy, their omission is explained by the fact that no such connection is known to exist. What has the rule that menstruous women must not cross streams, in order not to pollute the water or scare the fish,[5] to do with exogamy? Lord Raglan believes that the dread of menstruous women was so intense that it was considered dangerous for a man to have intercourse with any woman at any time; that it was particularly so if the man and the woman lived on the same side of the river; but that the danger was not so great if he visited a woman living on the other side of it, because he could then escape by outwitting the spirit guardians of the taboo, and get safely back across the

[1] Lord Raglan, *Jocasta's Crime*, p. 102.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 61. [3] *Ibid.* p. 16. [4] *Ibid.* p. 136.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 112, 126.

stream. Lord Raglan also says that " fear of a breach of the menstrual taboo gradually developed into a belief that the ancestral spirits did not like the women of the group to be touched by strangers ".[1] How these fancies can lead up to a theory of exogamy, which presupposes, not surreptitious meetings, but, in all normal cases, the living together of husband and wife, I am unable to conceive. Nor do I understand Lord Raglan's other claim that his theory is an improvement of all previous theories because " it does not demand a sudden breach with the past, a thing which never happens either in savage or in civilised communities except under foreign influence ".[2] It is just such a breach with the past under foreign influence, due to the diffusion of culture, that he assumes; he is compelled to do so since all exogamous communities do not live on river-banks. He writes: " We may conclude that the probability that any magical rite was devised in two different places is exceedingly remote, and that if the incest taboo was evolved from magical ideas, or practices, each of these originated in some one area, not necessarily the same one. There is no more justification for assuming that the natives of Central Africa invented the magical rites which they now practise than there is for assuming that they invented the bicycles which they now ride ".[3] Lord Raglan's ambitious claims can scarcely be taken seriously.

All those writers whose theories of exogamy I have now examined have raised objections to the theory proposed by myself. Dr. Briffault misrepresents it by saying that I derive " the horror of incest from the lower stimulating effect of a household companion of childhood on the male sexual impulses ".[4] What I have written is this: " Generally speaking, there is a

[1] Lord Raglan, *Jocasta's Crime*, p. 128.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 126.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 135.
[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 244.

remarkable absence of erotic feelings between persons living very closely together from childhood. Nay more, in this, as in many other cases, sexual indifference is combined with the positive feeling of aversion when the act is thought of".[1] I did not speak of the operation of the sexual instinct in the male only; Dr. Havelock Ellis may be right in saying that "this instinct is probably even more marked in the female".[2] With regard to Dr. Briffault's criticism of my view, I may quote what Dr. Ellis says in reply to his criticism of his own view of the horror of incest, which is in general agreement with my own:[3] "All this is, to an impartial observer, simple, natural, and universal. It represents the general rule, to which there are, of course, endless exceptions, early 'fixations', more or less pathological, which are never overcome. To bring them forward, as Dr. Briffault does, to invalidate the general rule, is idle and scarcely intelligent".[4]

The same may be said of Mrs. Seligman's criticism. She writes: "There seems little evidence for Westermarck's theory that house-mates are not mutually attractive, for brother-sister incest *does* take place in spite of the almost universal law against it".[5] It does not seem to have occurred to her that if exceptional cases of brother and sister incest can invalidate my theory of the prohibition of it, it can just as well invalidate her own; this, too, must refer to general cases only, since such incest *does* take place. She has also made another objection to my theory. She argues that if "the observance of the incest laws is a habit which has been formed within the family without any great difficulty,

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 192.

[2] H. Ellis, *Views and Reviews* (London, 1932), p. 168.

[3] *Idem*, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vii. (Philadelphia, 1928), p. 505.

[4] *Idem*, *Views and Reviews*, p. 167.

[5] Mrs. Seligman, in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lix. 245.

because the temptation was not severe (she adheres to the "superstition"—as Dr. Ellis calls it[1]—that the "formidable list of regulations testifies to the strength of the brother-sister temptation"[2]) . . . the sanction for exogamy and other marriage prohibitions becomes a greater mystery than ever. These laws divide the cousins in the most arbitrary manner into marriageable and non-marriageable persons, . . . and it is difficult to imagine how a supposed aversion to housemates could form either the guiding sentiment for obedience to such rules or the force which led to their institution".[3]

I have certainly not omitted to discuss the question how "the supposed aversion to housemates" may lead to prohibition of marriage between cousins of different kinds, as well as between other related, and even unrelated, persons who are not members of the family in our sense of the term. I have pointed out that marriage between cousins has been prohibited by peoples among whom brothers and their children used to live in the same dwelling or otherwise in very close proximity, *e.g.* the Romans, Hindus, Welsh, and Southern Slavs; and that among savages an exogamous clan is very frequently a territorial group as well as a group of kindred.[4] But the members of the same clan are prohibited from intermarrying even though they do not live in the same locality. This is a natural consequence of the fact that the aversion to sexual intercourse between persons living closely together from childhood has been expressed in prohibitions against unions between kindred. The exogamous rules, though in the first place associated with kinship because near relatives normally live together, have come to include

[1] Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vii. 506.

[2] Mrs. Seligman, in *British Journal of Psychology* (*General Section*), xxii. 270.

[3] *Idem*, in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lix. 233.

[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 207 *sqq.*

relatives who do not live together—a process in which the influence of a common name, signifying kinship, has undoubtedly been of great importance. This largely accounts for that division of cousins into marriageable and non-marriageable, which, on my theory, is said to remain a mystery. Very frequently the children of two brothers are not allowed to intermarry, nor the children of two sisters, although marriage between so-called cross-cousins—that is, the marriage of a man with his father's sister's daughter or with his mother's brother's daughter—is not prohibited. Where the clan system prevails cross-cousins belong to different clans, whether descent is patrilineal or matrilineal; whereas the children of two brothers belong to the same clan if descent is traced through the father, and the children of two sisters belong to the same clan if descent is traced through the mother. In the former case the children of two sisters also belong to the same clan if the sisters have married into that clan, and in the latter case the children of two brothers belong to the same clan if the brothers have married into that clan; but even when the children of brothers or the children of sisters belong to different clans they may stand to each other in a closer social relationship than the children of brother and sister, and marriages between them may on that account be regarded as incest. That the extent of the prohibited degrees is closely connected with social intimacy, whether combined with actual living together or not, is suggested, amongst other things, by the regular coexistence of comprehensive exogamous prohibitions with classificatory terms of relationship, which I consider to be fundamentally influenced by social relationships.[1] And it seems to me highly probable that the same feelings of intimacy and kinship as have, for instance, led to the classification of cousins with brothers and sisters have also led to the rule which treats sexual

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 250 *sqq.*; ii. 216 *sq.*

intercourse between them as incest, while the identity of terms must have operated in the same direction. It is significant that cross-cousins, who are allowed to intermarry, are not addressed by the terms which are used for brother and sister. I have thus, just like Mrs. Seligman, derived clan exogamy from the prohibition of incest within the family, and have done so very much on the same lines. The difference between our views lies mainly in our different explanations of the incest taboos within the family, and it is radical enough. My explanation of them may appear to her as a mystery; but the division of cousins into marriageable and non-marriageable cannot make it "a greater mystery than ever".

Lord Raglan's criticism is characteristic of the manner in which he discusses previous writers' theories of exogamy. He alleges that I postulate "an instinctive aversion to intercourse between those who have lived together", and is then able to make the "witty" remark (to quote the blurb on the jacket of his book) that I invite my readers "to regard the cohabitation of husband and wife as unnatural".[1] He omits to say that I speak of persons "living very closely together from childhood". His statement is based on the quotation (which, though put within inverted commas, is far from literal) of a passage in which I contrast living together as housemates with blood-relationship; and he has chosen to take it from one of the earlier editions of my book, although he is well aware of the last, completely rewritten edition of it. By doing so he has also been able to insert the word "instinctive" before "aversion", which he knows that I have dropped—chiefly in order to avoid useless controversy about the meaning of the term. But the essence of my theory has from the beginning been the influence which close living together from childhood has exercised on the

[1] Lord Raglan, *op. cit.* p. 16.

sexual instinct; and it seems incomprehensible how any one who has taken even the most superficial notice of it could have missed its fundamental point.

There is also another point in my theory that has been a target for attacks, namely, my attempt to account for that peculiarity of the sexual instinct which I take to be the cause of the prohibition of incest. It seems to me that the sexual instinct is of such immense importance for the existence of the species that any satisfactory explanation of its normal characteristics must be sought for in their specific usefulness; and I have made the suggestion that the lack of inclination for sexual intercourse—leading, when the act is thought of, to positive aversion—between household companions of childhood has a biological foundation in injurious consequences following unions of the nearest blood-relatives.[1] My opponents deny that there are such consequences. According to Dr. Briffault, the endeavours which have been made to substantiate, by a reference to facts, the old belief that inbreeding is injurious to the race have resulted in complete failure; "if the results of the breeding of domesticated animals prove anything, it is the absolute innocuousness, if not the actually beneficial effects, of inbreeding".[2] Professor Malinowski says that "biologists are in agreement on the point that there is no detrimental effect produced upon the species by incestuous unions".[3] Lord Raglan accuses me of having assumed that inbreeding is harmful "in the face of all the evidence".[4] The facts I have quoted in my book are in any case *some* evidence; and I venture to think they justified my supposition that inbreeding generally is, for some reason or other, more or less detrimental to the species.

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 218 *sqq.*
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 214.
[3] Malinowski, *Sex and Repression*, p. 243.
[4] Lord Raglan, *op. cit.* p. 16.

This supposition can certainly not be rejected by purely theoretical arguments. Dr. Briffault writes: " It is no more than the soberest conclusion that there is not in the records of breeding from domesticated animals a single fact, alleged or verified, which indicates, much less evidences, that inbreeding, even the closest, is in itself productive of evil effects ".[1] So also Captain Pitt-Rivers, to whose discussion of the biological nature of inbreeding Professor Malinowski refers his readers, says that " there is no sufficient evidence to show that inbreeding is harmful of itself ", and that " marriages between near relatives, wholly by reason of their consanguinity and regardless of the inheritance received, cannot be proved to affect the offspring adversely ".[2] This is no doubt at present the theory which is accepted by most biologists; but another opinion has also been expressed, not only by older scientists, like Darwin[3] and Hensen,[4] but by Professor Baur, who is recognised, I think, as the leading geneticist of Europe engaged in active work at the present time. He writes as follows: " The bad effects of inbreeding depend upon two very different things. In the first place, inbreeding and reproduction from individuals who are closely akin favours the mendelising-out of recessive developmental defects. . . . Many families carry such hereditary taints without the members being aware of it when the taints are recessive. In one family it will be one taint, and in another it will be another. Marriage outside the

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 215.

[2] G. H. Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, *The Clash of Culture and the Contact of Races* (London, 1927), pp. 90, 98.

[3] Ch. Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, ii. (London, 1868), p. 116; *idem*, *The Effects of Cross and Self Fertilisation in the Vegetable Kingdom* (London, 1876), p. 443 *sqq.*

[4] V. Hensen, ' Wachstum und Zeugen ', in *Schriften des Naturwissenschaftlichen Vereins für Schleswig-Holstein*, xv. (Kiel, 1913), p. 266.

family will not lead to the appearance of the taint, for the marriage will not produce homozygotic offspring;[1] but marriage within the family will favour its appearance. This is one cause, though not the only one, of the ill-effects of inbreeding. A second kind of ill-effect from inbreeding depends upon the fact that, *for unknown reasons* (the italics are mine), inbreeding—the more speedily, the closer it is—weakens the offspring and reduces the capacity for reproduction. This weakening always progresses until, sooner or later, a stable minimum is attained; that is to say when inbreeding is practised for many generations the vital efficiency of the offspring decreases at first rapidly generation after generation, but eventually the decrease slackens, and in the end a condition is reached wherein further inbreeding does no more harm. The minimal efficiency thus reached varies greatly from one organism to another. As to this particular type of ill-effects from long-continued and close inbreeding, we have no trustworthy information in the case of the human species. Very little is known about it, moreover, as regards the higher animals ".[2]

Dr. Mygind (whom Dr. Briffault calls " probably the highest expert authority on deaf-mutism "[3]) regards consanguinity as an important factor in the etiology of congenital deaf-mutism, but leaves it undecided whether consanguinity in itself is a remote cause of it, or whether it is through the intensified transmission of hereditary morbid conditions or tendencies prevalent in a family that it makes itself felt. " Theoretical considerations ", he says, " are strongly in favour of the latter supposition,

[1] A homozygotic organism is one that has originated out of the conjugation of two reproductive cells having like hereditary equipments.

[2] E. Baur, E. Fischer, and F. Lenz, *Human Heredity* (London, 1931), p. 109 *sq.*

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 230.

but it is but fair to say that up to the present there have not been many or convincing facts brought forward in its support ".[1] Dr. Mayet is of opinion that the great prevalence of idiocy, deaf-mutism, and *Retinitis pigmentosa* which he has found among the children of related parents in families where these abnormalities are not known to have existed before, must be due to consanguinity as such;[2] and the attempts to trace it to latent hereditary tendencies alone[3] do not seem quite convincing. Nor is it so easy to see how the hermaphroditism which appears in a certain moth, *Lymantria japonica* (a variety of *Lymantria dispar*), after some generations of inbreeding, could be accounted for as a result of heredity.[4]

But the question whether the bad effects of inbreeding depend exclusively upon the mendelising-out of recessive developmental defects or not, must not be confounded with the question about its actual consequences, as it apparently is to some extent by Dr. Briffault and Captain Pitt-Rivers. Theorists of both schools agree that it is attended with considerable danger. Professor Baur says that " when inbreeding is practised in the case of an organism wherein cross-fertilisation is the rule, the results are almost invariably disadvantageous ".[5] Dr. East and Dr. Jones also speak

[1] H. Mygind, *Deaf-Mutism* (London, 1894), p. 88 *sqq.*

[2] P. Mayet, ' Die Verwandtenehe und die Statistik ', in *Jahrbuch der internationalen Vereinigung für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft und Volkswirtschaftslehre zu Berlin*, vi.-vii. (Berlin, 1903–4), p. 207 *sqq.*

[3] F. Kraus and H. Döhrer, ' Blutsverwandtschaft in der Ehe und deren Folgen für die Nachkommenschaft ', in C. von Noorden and S. Kaminer, *Krankheiten und Ehe* (Leipzig, 1916), p. 81 ; Feer, *Der Einfluss der Blutsverwandtschaft der Eltern auf die Kinder*, reviewed by E. Rüdin, in *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie*, v. (München, 1908), p. 272 *sq.*

[4] R. Goldschmidt, ' Erblichkeitsstudien an Schmetterlingen ', in *Zeitschrift fur induktive Abstammungs- und Vererbungslehre*, vii. (Berlin, 1912), p. 1 *sqq.*, and xi. (1914), p. 280 *sqq.*

[5] Baur, Fischer, and Lenz, *op. cit.* p. 109.

of the injurious, nay "even disastrous", immediate results of inbreeding in naturally cross-fertilised organisms, its most noticeable effect in both animals and plants probably being a reduction in fertility in the earlier inbred generations; "the experiments of Ritzema-Bos with rats, of Weismann with mice, and of Wright with guinea-pigs are all thus characterised".[1] But at the same time they maintain that "whatever effect it may have is due wholly to the inheritance received", or, as they say more cautiously, that "the results of inbreeding depend more upon the genetic composition of the individuals subjected to inbreeding rather than upon any pernicious influence inherent in the process itself".[2] Professor Federley remarks that the injurious recessive genes are so prevalent that "the experienced breeder justly shrinks from inbreeding".[3] For a similar reason Professor Kraus[4] and Dr. Marcuse[5] consider a warning against the marriage of relatives to be justified.

So far as mankind is concerned, the study of the effects of close inbreeding is prevented by the general absence of marriages between the nearest relatives. The closest kind of intermarriage that we have an opportunity to examine is that between first cousins, and there is a considerable literature on the subject; but the opinions of the various writers vary greatly. It seems, however, now to be an established fact that certain physical or mental defects are more frequent among the offspring of consanguineous marriages than among the offspring of marriages between unrelated

[1] E. M. East and D. F. Jones, *Inbreeding and Outbreeding* (Philadelphia & London, [1919]), pp. 139, 188.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 244, 113.

[3] H. Federley, *Das Inzuchtproblem* (Berlin, 1927), p. 37.

[4] Kraus and Döhrer, *loc. cit.* p. 82.

[5] M. Marcuse, 'Verwandtenehe und Mischehe', in *Die Ehe*, edited by M. Marcuse (Berlin & Köln, 1927), p. 354.

individuals.[1] Dr. Briffault asserts that although marriages between first cousins have been the rule in many parts of the world from immemorial time, no indications of any resulting evil effects have been observed anywhere, and that the races which habitually practise those marriages include some of the finest physical types of mankind. As an outstanding example of these he mentions the Bedouins of Arabia, and he quotes in support of it Burton's statement that "here no evil results are anticipated from the union of first cousins, and the experience of ages and of a mighty nation may be trusted".[2] But in this case the experience of ages may have been quite the contrary. In the Mohammedan traditions it is said, "Marry among strangers, thus you will not have feeble posterity". "This view", says Professor Goldziher, "coincides with the opinion of the ancient Arabs that the children of endogamous marriages are weakly and lean. To this class also belongs the proverb of Al-Meydānī, '. . . Marry the distant, marry not the near' (in relationship)". A poet, praising a hero, says, "He is a hero, not borne by the cousin (of his father), he is not weakly; for the seed of relations brings forth feeble fruit".[3] There is also a belief in Morocco, expressed in one of its proverbs, that marriage with the daughter of a paternal uncle will make the children weak.[4] I have

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 227 *sqq*. See also G. Wulz, 'Ein Beitrag zur Verwandtenehen', in *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie*, xvii. (München, 1925), p. 82 *sq*.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit*. i. 218; R. F. Burton, *Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Al-Madinah and Meccah*, ii. (London, 1898), p. 84.

[3] I. Goldziher, 'Endogamy and Polygamy among the Arabs', in *The Academy*, xviii. (London, 1880), p. 26. *Cf*. G. A. Wilken, *Das Matriarchat (das Mutterrecht) bei den alten Arabern* (Leipzig, 1884), p. 61; W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (Cambridge, 1885), p. 60.

[4] E. Westermarck, *Wit and Wisdom in Morocco* (London, 1930), p. 72.

mentioned in my book many uncivilised peoples who ascribe evil results to close intermarriage, but pointed out that these facts do not seem to give much support to the opinion that savages have discovered by experience the injurious effects of it. Considering the detestation with which consanguineous marriages are looked upon, and considering further how readily all sorts of superstitions arise in connection with the sexual function, we may quite expect to find evil consequences attributed to incest, and the idea that these consequences will fall upon the incestuous brood is intelligible enough.[1] But the case is different when marriage between cousins is supposed to lead to injurious results in spite of being in accordance with native custom, as it was among the ancient Arabs, who even considered that a man had a right to marry his father's brother's daughter. As for the fine physique of the Arabs, it may be said that there was less inbreeding among them than Dr. Briffault will admit. According to Robertson Smith " it does not seem likely that strict endogamy was practised by any Arab tribe in historical time ".[2]

There are small and isolated communities—in Java, Peru, Great Britain, France, Scandinavia, and so forth —where long-continued inbreeding is said to have been accompanied with no discernible disadvantages;[3] but Dr. Briffault's allegation that such communities " are almost invariably distinguished by conspicuously fine bodily development and robust health " is certainly not proved by the statements he quotes[4] to counterbalance those quoted by me.[5] In any case we may say that this local endogamy is generally something different

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 170 *sqq.*
[2] Robertson Smith, *op. cit.* p. 60 *sq.*
[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 233 *sq.*
[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 219 *sqq.*
[5] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 227 *sqq.*

from marriage between near relatives. And it may also be well to remember Professor Baur's pronouncement, quoted above, that when inbreeding is practised for many generations the decrease of the vital efficiency of the offspring, which is rapid at first, eventually slackens, and that in the end a condition is reached in which further inbreeding does no more harm.

It has been argued that the recorded instances of brother and sister marriage, which constitutes the closest possible incest, lend no support to the doctrine of the evil results of inbreeding. We are told that there is no proof of the physical deterioration of peoples like the ancient Egyptians and Persians among whom such marriages did occur. But even if close intermarrying among them was more frequent than we have a right to assume, it was certainly very far from being the exclusive kind of marriage; and breeders of domestic animals inform us that the mixing-in even of a few drops of unrelated blood may be sufficient almost to neutralise the injurious effects of long-continued inbreeding. Particular emphasis has been laid on the customary brother and sister marriages in the families of kings and chiefs in various parts of the world.[1] But besides the fact that, in many of these instances, it is uncertain whether the parties were full- or half-brothers and sisters, it can hardly be denied that our knowledge of those marriages is too defective to throw any fresh light on the biological effects of the closest inbreeding in general. Dr. Briffault refers with approval to Huth's analysis of the family history of the Ptolemies, who habitually married their sisters, nieces, and cousins and nevertheless were found to be neither sterile nor particularly short-lived.[2] On the other hand, Galton saw in Ptolemaic experience a proof that close intermarriage is

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 222 *sq.*; Pitt-Rivers, *op. cit.* p. 87 *sq.*

[2] A. H. Huth, *The Marriage of Near Kin* (London, 1887), p. 36.

followed by diminished fertility;[1] and in an elaborate essay on the subject Ujfalvy has tried to show that the inbreeding of the Ptolemies led to physical and mental degeneration.[2] Dr. Firth says he could not find in Tikopia even a hint of Captain Pitt-Rivers' suggestion that Polynesian chiefs deliberately practise intermarriage with close kin in order to perpetuate a fine physical strain. "The Tikopian custom of chiefly families and commoners marrying each within their own class, which is quite different, is due to the desire to maintain exclusiveness of social and economic privilege, not to preserve any physical or mental qualities".[3]

In any case, the consanguineous marriages of kings and chiefs cannot be regarded as indicative of general effects of inbreeding; for there is evidence that the bad consequences of inbreeding may almost fail to appear under favourable conditions of life. Inbred plants, when allowed enough space and good soil, frequently show little or no deterioration; whereas, when placed in competition with another plant, they often perish or are much stunted.[4] Crampe's experiments with brown rats proved that the inbreeding was much less injurious if the offspring of the related parents were well fed and taken care of than it was otherwise.[5] And this is in striking accordance with Dr. Mitchell's observations as to consanguineous marriages in certain parts of Scotland, where he found the results to be least grave, and frequently almost *nil*, if the parents and children lived in

[1] F. Galton, *Hereditary Genius* (London, 1869), p. 152.

[2] K. E. von Ujfalvy, 'Die Ptolemäer', in *Archiv für Anthropologie*, N.S. ii. (Braunschweig, 1904), p. 73 *sqq.*, particularly p. 119 *sq.*

[3] R. Firth, 'Marriage and the Classificatory System of Relationship', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, lx. (1930), p. 249 n. 1.

[4] Darwin, *Effects of Cross and Self Fertilisation*, p. 439.

[5] Crampe, quoted by C. Düsing, *Die Regulierung des Geschlechtsverhältnisses bei der Vermehrung der Menschen, Tiere und Pflanzen* (Jena, 1884), p. 249.

tolerable comfort, earning enough to procure good food and clothing.[1]

Facts of this kind should also be taken into consideration in the case of inbred domestic animals which show no marked sign of deterioration. Moreover, if "choice" stocks have been produced by close inbreeding, there has, as Wallace remarks, been "rigid selection by which the weak or the infertile have been eliminated, and with such selection there is no doubt that the ill-effects of close interbreeding can be prevented for a long time; but this by no means proves that no ill-effects are produced".[2] Or "the issue is nothing but the development of a saleable defect which, from the animal's point of view, must be regarded as wholly unnatural and artificial, and not calculated to promote its well-being or natural usefulness".[3] According to Captain Pitt-Rivers no domestic breed illustrates the benefits accruing from intensive inbreeding better than the modern racehorse.[4] A very different opinion is expressed by Sir James Penn Boucaut, who has brought together an overwhelming mass of evidence as to the deterioration of the English thoroughbred, which has been produced exclusively with a view to winning races, and of the urgent need for the infusion of new blood.[5] He says his own views are amazingly corroborated by a statement in the *Field* to the effect that "if the thoroughbred inbreeding continues on the same lines for much longer there will probably be a collapse of the English thoroughbred".[6]

[1] A. Mitchell, 'Blood-Relationship in Marriage considered in its Influence upon the Offspring', in *Memoirs read before the Anthropological Society of London*, ii. (1866), p. 447.

[2] A. R. Wallace, *Darwinism* (London, 1889), p. 161.

[3] Mitchell, *loc. cit.* p. 451.

[4] Pitt-Rivers, *op. cit.* p. 97.

[5] J. P. Boucaut, *The Arab Horse, the Thoroughbred, and the Turf* (London, 1912), p. 142 *sqq.*

[6] *Ibid.* p. 139.

It was argued by Huth that incest is constantly practised by wild animals, and therefore, if it were injurious, would lead to the destruction of the species.[1] This argument is repeated by Dr. Briffault, who writes that "there exists no provision, either in the form of instincts or other devices, whereby any check is placed upon such inbreeding", and that "many animals appear to propagate exclusively by what we should term the closest incestuous unions".[2] In support of the latter assertion he quotes a few statements, one of which is made by Seton with reference to American buffaloes. But he omits mentioning what the same naturalist, whom he justly calls an "excellent authority",[3] has to say in other passages: "It is very necessary in the economy of Nature that families should break up. Inbreeding is ruinous, and many animals have developed instincts that guard against this. . . . The young would keep on indefinitely demanding sustenance and comfort from the mother, if allowed. Who has not seen a cow, a mare, a sheep, a cat, a dog, or a rabbit, driving away, with harsh menace or even violence, the overgrown young one that teases persistently for the sustenance of earlier years? The feeling that overpowers the maternal is, I think, in most cases the renewed mating instinct that springs from physical preparations for a new family".[4] There are other arrangements in the animal world producing similar effects.[5] Among hermaphrodites self-fertilisation is very often prevented by the circumstance that the ova and the sperms in the same animal become mature at different times.[6] It has been

[1] Huth, *op. cit.* p. 9.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 204.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 166.

[4] E. T. Seton, *Life-Histories of Northern Animals* (London, 1910), p. 166 *sq.*

[5] See V. Hensen, *Physiologie der Zeugung* (Leipzig, 1881), p. 181 *sqq.*; Kraus and Döhrer, *loc. cit.* p. 62; V. Häcker, *Der Gesang der Vögel* (Jena, 1900), p. 90.

[6] Hensen, *op. cit.* p. 182; Häcker, *op. cit.* p. 90.

pointed out that the excited state of the males in the rutting season urges them to move about in search and pursuance of females, and the great strength of their passions has been accounted for as a means of securing the necessary mixture of blood.[1] Among animals, also, there are indications that the pairing instinct fails to be stimulated by companions and seeks strangers for its gratification.[2] The honey-bee never propagates in the nest but flies out for this purpose.[3] Among winged ants it is common for both males and females to have a "marriage flight": they leave their nest about the same time, their swarms mix with other swarms, even their hereditary enemies, and there is nothing but joy and love-making.[4] I have suggested that certain secondary sexual characters may be 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 inbreeding by attracting individuals from a distance. Professor Häcker is of opinion that the singing of birds serves such a purpose,[5] and I venture to believe that the same may be equally true of sexual colours and odours.[6]

Taking, then, into consideration all the facts bearing on the subject which are known to me, I must confess that the attempts to prove the harmlessness of even the closest inbreeding have not shaken my opinion that there is convincing evidence to the contrary. And here I find, as before, a satisfactory explanation of the want of inclination for, and consequent positive aversion to, sexual intercourse between persons who from childhood

[1] Häcker, *op. cit.* p. 90 *sq.*; H. Rohleder, *Die Zeugung unter Blutsverwandten* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 33.

[2] *Supra*, p. 74 *sq.*

[3] Hensen, *op. cit.* p. 182.

[4] K. Escherich, *Die Ameise* (Braunschweig, 1917), p. 74 *sqq.*

[5] Häcker, *op. cit.* pp. 48, 90 *sq.*

[6] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 488. My view has been grotesquely misrepresented by Dr. Briffault (*op. cit.* i. 205 n. 7).

have lived together in that close intimacy which characterises the mutual relations of the nearest kindred. We may assume that in this, as in other cases, natural selection has operated, and by eliminating destructive tendencies and preserving useful variations has moulded the sexual instinct so as to meet the requirements of the species. It must not be argued that marriages between cousins have proved too slightly injurious to produce such a selection. For if, as I maintain, the family consisting of parents and children prevailed as a social unit among our early human or semi-human progenitors, that peculiarity of the sexual instinct of which I am speaking would have grown up among them as a consequence of the harmfulness of unions between the very nearest relatives, unless indeed it was an inheritance from a still earlier mammalian species. But once acquired, it would naturally show itself also in the case of more remote relatives or quite unrelated persons who lived in close intimacy from childhood, however harmless the unions between them might be. And through an association of ideas and feelings it might readily lead to the prohibition of sexual intercourse between individuals who did not live together at all. Needless to say, however, that the main part of my theory of exogamy does not stand or fall with the biological explanation I have given of that indifference, leading to aversion, to which I have traced the origin of the exogamous rules. The biological explanation is only an hypothesis; whereas the psychical peculiarities which it is intended to elucidate are, so far as I can see, facts proved by common experience.

"THE MOTHERS"

"THE MOTHERS"

A REJOINDER TO DR. BRIFFAULT

THE title of this essay is the name of a huge work in three volumes, each comprising about eight hundred pages, by Dr. Robert Briffault. It deals to a very large extent with the relations between the sexes in primitive humanity and the early forms of marriage, and covers thus much of the same ground as my own book *The History of Human Marriage*. On many points there is general agreement between our views, but such similarities are scarcely ever recognised. On the other hand, Dr. Briffault attacks me violently whenever he finds points of disagreement, and also in cases where he attributes to me opinions that are not mine. As Dr. Havelock Ellis remarks, Dr. Briffault "might seem to belong to that class of controversialists who hold that we should reply not to what our adversary actually said, but to what he ought to have said if we are to triumph over him".[1] He assails, however, not only my views, real or imaginary, but also in a very large measure the statements that I have quoted in support of them. And he does so not only when he finds them being contradicted by other statements—as everybody knows, the literature on the customs of savages abounds in such contradictions,—but also by accusing me of having distorted facts in order to make them fit in with theories that I hold, or am supposed by him to hold.

In the present essay I shall examine in detail both the most essential points on which Dr. Briffault's opinions differ from mine, together with the facts on

[1] H. Ellis, *Views and Reviews* (London, 1932), p. 168.

which they are based, as well as his criticism of the statements quoted by me; and since his objections are very numerous, my rejoinder must necessarily be a long one. I am glad to have an opportunity to discuss some of my old views in connection with Dr. Briffault's onset, and to give additional support to my theory of the origin of marriage and the family by means of fresh material which has appeared after I published the rewritten edition of my book a dozen of years ago. And it is a matter of honour with me to defend myself against false indictments that cast a stain on my character as a scientist and an honest seeker of truth.

I

THE BIOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF MARRIAGE

MARRIAGE, as a term for a social institution, 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 that 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. But the right to sexual intercourse is not necessarily exclusive. It can hardly be said to be so, from a legal point of view, unless adultery is considered an offence which entitles the other partner to dissolve the marriage union; and this 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 rule, he has some power over them, although his power over the children is in most cases of limited duration. Very often marriage determines the place that a newly born individual is to take in the

social structure of the community to which he or she belongs; but this can scarcely, as has been sometimes maintained, 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. 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 give some consideration 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 have expressed the opinion that it has most probably developed out of a primeval habit. I think we have reason to believe that, even in primitive times, it was the habit for a man and a woman, or several women, to live together, to have sexual relations with one another, and to rear their offspring in common, the man being the guardian 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.

Similar habits are found among many species of the animal kingdom, in which male and female remain together not only during the pairing season but till after the birth of the offspring. I have assumed that 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 indicated 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 affection, seem to be necessary for the existence of certain species, although there are many other means by which a species may be enabled to subsist. Among the Invertebrates, Fishes, Batrachia, and Reptiles, the relations between the sexes are generally of the most fugitive nature, and parental care is found only in exceptional cases; but while an immense proportion of the progeny succumb before reaching maturity, the number of eggs laid is proportionate to the number of those lost, and the species is preserved nevertheless. Among Birds, on the other hand, parental care is an absolute necessity, equal and continual warmth being the first requirement for the development of the embryo and the preservation of the young ones, and for this purpose the father very frequently provides the mother with neccssaries and sometimes relieves her of the brooding. Among the large majority of birds male and female keep together not only during the breeding season but also after it—in some species even till either one or the other dies,—and in very many of them the parental instinct has reached a high degree of intensity on the father's side as well as on the mother's. Nothing of the kind can be said of most of the Mammals. Among none of them can the young do without their mother, who is consequently ardently concerned for their welfare, nursing them with much affection, but in most of them the relations between the sexes are restricted to the pairing season. Yet there are also various species in which the union between male and female is of a more durable character and the male acts as a guardian of the family. I have given a fairly long list of such species; but for several items of it I have been severely rebuked by Dr. Briffault.

I wrote that among whales, seals, the hippopotamus,

the reindeer, a few cats and martens, the ichneumon, and possibly the wolf, the sexes are said to remain together even after the birth of the young, the male being the protector of the family.[1] Dr. Briffault remarks: "The latter statement is certainly untrue for every one of the animals mentioned, and there is not, except as regards the hippopotamus, a word to suggest it in the authority which he cites. Of whales, Brehm says that they live in large flocks and that very little is known concerning their breeding habits. At breeding time 'it would appear', he says, 'that the herds break up into single pairs, which remain longer together'. In the new edition that vaguely worded statement is withdrawn and a less ambiguous one substituted from the observations of Guldberg, to the effect that after sexual congress the sexes 'separate entirely'".[2] But in this Dr. Briffault himself is mistaken. The statement quoted from the earlier edition of Brehm is not withdrawn in the new edition,[3] and Guldberg's statement refers to a particular species, the common fin-whale or rorqual (*Balaenoptera musculus*).[4] Of another species, the sperm whale or *Physeter catodon*, we are told on the authority of whalers that every troop is invariably headed by a big old male, "who acts as leader and protects the females and young ones composing the rest of the flock against the attacks of hostile animals".[5]

Dr. Briffault writes: "Seals, whose reproductive habits are better known than those of most mammals, certainly do not 'remain together even after the birth of the young', nor does Brehm make any such statement.

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. (London, 1921), p. 31.

[2] R. Briffault, *The Mothers*, i. (London, 1927), p. 171 n. 2.

[3] A. E. Brehm, *Tierleben* xii. (Leipzig, 1920), p. 442. *Cf.* F. Doflein, *Das Tier als Glied des Naturganzen* (Leipzig & Berlin, 1914), p. 695.

[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* xii. 502.

[5] *Ibid.* xii. 483.

They are among the most typically polygamous of animals, and the females pass from one male to another as the first males become spent ".[1] But according to Brehm " every social group of seals is a family. The male associates himself with several females, and many of these sultans of the sea have a harem consisting of some dozens of slaves ". Blind jealousy drives the male to a struggle for life and death for the possession of the females. " About ten or twelve months after the pairing the female gives birth to one, rarely two, young. Old and young keep faithfully together, and the mother protects her tender offspring at the risk of her life against every danger "; but we also read that many males display much courage in defending females and young.[2] Of the sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*) it is said that males and females join in taking care of and guarding the little ones and in teaching them how to behave on the sea-margin and in the water.[3]

Dr. Briffault alleges that the reindeer of which Brehm speaks in the passage referred to by me is the semi-domesticated Norwegian animal, the life of which differs in almost every respect from that of the wild reindeer.[4] But the case is just the reverse: the animal to which the statement in question refers is expressly said to be the wild reindeer. A male and a female stray from the common herd and keep together even after the birth of the offspring; " only when the calves have become big, the families unite again into herds ".[5] Equally unfounded is Dr. Briffault's accusation that what I have said about a few cats and martens, the ichneumon, and the wolf is not suggested by a word in the authority cited by me. Here, also, my references are perfectly accurate, and the statements have been

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 171 n. 2.
[2] Brehm, *op. cit.* xi. (1921), p. 581.
[3] *Ibid.* xi. 586.
[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 171 n. 2.
[5] Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. (1920), p. 114.

repeated in the new edition of Brehm.[1] The sea otter or kalan (*Latax lutris*), who belongs to the martens, is, according to Steller—our chief authority—found lying in families: the male with his female, the half-grown young ones, and the little sucklings, the male caressing the female. "The parents' love of their young is so great that they expose themselves to the most obvious danger of losing their lives, and when these are taken from them, begin to cry aloud almost as a baby. They also grieve in such a degree that they, as we saw from fairly sure instances, within ten to fourteen days become as dry as skeletons, sick and feeble, and will not leave the land. They are throughout the year seen with young".[2] Of the ichneumon, which, contrary to Dr. Briffault's assertion, is neither a cat nor a marten, we are told that in spring or the early part of summer the female gives birth to two to four young, "which are suckled for a very long time and even for a much longer time are guided by *both* (the italics are Brehm's) parents". In summer it is always seen in the company of its family. The male takes the lead, the female follows very closely, and at the heels of their mother come the young. Now and then the male stops, raises his head, and, after making sure that there is nothing to be feared, walks on.[3]

As regards the wolf I am now able to adduce much more positive evidence of its mating habits and the father's participation in the rearing of the young. According to Mivart, the males of the common wolf "fight together in the month of January, and the successful combatant who has thus obtained a female, remains with her till the young are advanced in growth.... In November or December the cubs quit their parents,

[1] Brehm, *op. cit.* xii. 4; for cats and martens see also *ibid.* xii. 53, 149; for the wolf see *ibid.* xii. 214.

[2] *Ibid.* xii. 372 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* xii. 27.

but may keep together for another six or eight months or longer ".[1] Seton quotes the testimony of an observant fur-trader at Fort George, Hudson Bay, thoroughly conversant with the wolves of that region, who maintains that the male assists the female in caring for the young; and writes: " I have several times seen a male and female wolf together at a time when the sexual passion was dormant; and yet the male showed the female more attention than he would have done had she been simply a smaller male. This points to permanent partnership ". He adds that in certain wolves and several other carnivora there seems to be a deep-laid instinct to leave the mother quite alone during parturition and until the young are some days, or in some cases weeks, old, after which the father is allowed to join the family and brings fresh game to the den.[2] Concerning the northern coyote or prairie-wolf (*Canis latrans*) the same naturalist says it is the opinion of all persons familiar with its habits that it is strictly monogamous; every scrap of recorded evidence which he can find, as well as all his own observations, go to prove that winter and summer it is the rule for two coyotes to run, hunt, and live together, and from this he thinks we may safely infer that the species pairs for life. The male aids the female with the young, at least till they are able to leave the den, and when half-grown they begin to run with their parents and learn the arts of hunting.[3]

I have found that my list of mammalian species in which male and female are said to live together after the birth of the young, and not only the mother but also the father is said to take care of the latter, instead of being affected by Dr. Briffault's criticism, may be

[1] St. George Mivart, *Dogs, Jackals, Wolves, and Foxes* (London, 1890), p. 5.

[2] E. T. Seton, *Life-Histories of Northern Animals* (London, 1910), pp. 757, 759, 762.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 796, 798.

considerably enlarged. Lydekker states that " when a male lion has selected a female partner the union very generally lasts for the greater portion of the entire lives of the pair ".[1] The lion is often met with in family parties consisting of one old male, three or four adult females, and several cubs, some of which may stand almost as high at the shoulder as their mothers; but there are also authentic records of over twenty lions having been seen together in parts of Africa where game is, or was, very abundant. Selous writes: " I have come to the conclusion that such large assemblages of lions as this, in which there are several full-grown males, are, in all probability, only of a very temporary nature, the chance meeting and fraternisation of several families which, as a rule, live and hunt apart. . . . When a troop of lions is met with, in which, besides a full-grown male and some females and small cubs, there are also one or two good-sized young males with small manes, I believe that they are the offspring of the old male and one or other of the adult females, and that they have lived and hunted with the troop since cubhood. Such young males are probably not driven away to hunt by themselves until they commence to aspire to the affections of one of the females of the party ".[2]

It has often been noticed that the dog-fox supports young who have lost their mother, and the statements of trustworthy observers to the effect that he remains with his family also during the lifetime of the mother are becoming more and more numerous. Thus we are told by Löns that he has found a dog- and a bitch-fox with young ones a few weeks old in the same burrow. The male defended his offspring as vehemently as did the female, although it had been easy for him to escape.

[1] R. Lydekker, *The Royal Natural History*, i. (London, 1893-94), p. 366.

[2] F. C. Selous, *African Nature Notes and Reminiscences* (London, 1908), p. 76 *sq.*

" There is no doubt that the dog-fox takes an interest in his young, even though he does not take part in feeding them unless it becomes necessary ". But if the mother is killed he supplies them with plenty of food.[1] My friend Dr. L. Granit informs me that he once, when a boy, found a bitch-fox playing with her young; another fox, undoubtedly the father, was sitting close by behind a tree, and looked so threatening that the boy ran away. Concerning the royal fox (*Vulpes regalis*) Seton writes: " There can be little doubt that this fox truly pairs. I have never seen or heard of more than two full-grown foxes together in Manitoba, but this I have often seen, and have heard of times without number. Many observers, among them W. R. Hine, have found the home in cubbing time, and in each case both parents were about; it seems quite certain that the father takes an active interest in the young and helps to care for them. All of which tends to prove that our foxes pair. The argument of analogy is also in line, for I have observed that in Ontario both parents (*Vulpes fulvus*) take active care of the young. In Maine, E. Norton says, the male fox has as much to do with raising the family as the mother has. . . . In Wales, as T. W. Proger writes me, the male fox is a faithful partner, bringing food to the female while she is suckling the young, and has a great affection for his offspring, sharing with their mother the labour of feeding and caring for them . . . When the cubs are very young, he will frequently bring food right up to the earth, but as they get older he does not do this, but drops it at a distance from the earth, a hundred yards or more. This may be done to teach the cubs to hunt for themselves ".[2] Of the kit-fox (*Vulpes velox*) Seton says that " nothing is known of its mating,

[1] Brehm, *op. cit.* xii. 177; E. Löns, in *Wild und Hund*, vol. xvii. (1911), quoted *ibid.* xii. 177.

[2] Seton, *op. cit.* pp. 714, 715, 720.

beyond the fact that the creature pairs, and that the pair continue together all summer, probably for life, as the male is active in the care of the young ".[1] As regards the Azara fox (*Canis Azarae*) in Paraguay, Rengger states that male and female make for themselves a common lair in the bush. In spring the female brings forth three or five young, which she seldom leaves during the first weeks. The male carries to her prey, and when the young are able to eat both parents go out to hunt and provide jointly for the litter.[2]

Dr. Briffault has quoted certain statements made by Mivart and Seton with reference to wolves, but has, strangely indeed, omitted everything they have to say about their, as well as other animals', pairing habits, and positively affirms that among mammals " a union in pairs lasting beyond one season has been observed with certainty in the instance of the dwarf antelope only and a few allied species of the smaller antelopes ", which, he says, have no occasion to go in search of a mate.[3] The former statement is represented as the literal translation of a passage in Brehm's *Tierleben*, although it is something very different. What is spoken of in that passage is a " durable " (*dauerhaft*) monogamous union,[4] which cannot mean simply a union " beyond one season ", considering the numerous instances of such unions in mammalian species that are mentioned in the same work. From Seton, whom Dr. Briffault justly calls an " excellent authority ",[5] he might also have obtained the following information, which is at complete variance with his statement. " The hunters generally believe that the Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) is

[1] Seton, *op. cit.* p. 701.

[2] J. R. Rengger, *Naturgeschichte der Säugethiere von Paraguay* (Basel, 1830), p. 147 *sq.*

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 170 *sq.*

[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* x. (1920), p. 35.

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 166.

monogamous, and Miles Spencer gives it as the opinion of the Indians that the lynx assists the female in rearing the young. Linklater takes the same view and maintains that though the male does not actually accompany the young, when they follow the mother, he is always found at no great distance, both in summer and in winter. The same trapper believes that lynxes travel in families the year round, except in the spring".[1] "All the evidence there is goes to show that the raccoon is a monogamous animal and that the male stays with the female, helping to some extent in the rearing of the brood".[2] "My observations on [*Sciuropterus*] *volans* (the flying-squirrel) tend to show that that species pairs, and that the male takes an active interest in the young".[3] According to Kennicott, who knew the prairie deer-mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus bairdi*) well and studied it minutely, the species pairs; "in spring", he says, "I have always found the old male living with the female and young".[4] The male musk-rat (*Fiber zibethicus*) certainly divides all labour with the female, including the building and keeping up the home. Seton has again and again seen two adult musk-rats swimming and working together in spring and early summer; and according to Miles Spencer, who writes from personal experience backed by many inquiries among the Indians, the female is assisted by the male in rearing the young.[5]

According to Dr. Briffault, it is, among mammals, the invariable tendency of the female to segregate herself and to form an isolated group with her offspring. The animal family is the product of the maternal instincts alone; the mother is the sole centre and bond of it. The sexual instincts which bring the male and the female together have no part in the formation of it.

[1] Seton, *op. cit.* p. 683.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 1018.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 441.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 501.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 542, 544.

The male is not an essential member of it. He may join the maternal group, but commonly does not do so, and when he attaches himself to it his association with it is loose and precarious; in no animal species does it appear to survive the exercise of the sexual functions. These functions are the only ones that the male fulfils in the animal family when he is a member of it; the protective functions are exercised by the female alone. The parental relation is among mammals confined to that between the mother and her offspring; fatherhood does not exist. All this is true also of the nearest animal relatives of man, the anthropoid apes, the male being not more closely associated with the animal family than in other species.[1] We shall now see how far these statements are substantiated by the information we have about monkeys and apes.

Many species of them have, either regularly or occasionally, been found in families consisting of one male, one or several females, and one or several young ones. According to Rengger, the *Nyctipithecus trivirgatus*, a South American marmoset, seems to live in pairs throughout the whole year, for, whatever the season, a male and a female have always been found together.[2] Allen observed a family consisting of a male and a female with two young;[3] and he also states that he collected an adult pair of Mount Duida marmosets, the male carrying a younger one of the same sex, probably its own infant.[4] The Celebes "ape" (*Cynopithecus nigrescens*), according to Hickson, is "usually seen in pairs, but sometimes a family of seven or eight may be found together feeding in a tree. Such families invariably consist of a pair of adults and a

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 124, 187 *sqq.*, 520.

[2] Rengger, *op. cit.* p. 62.

[3] J A. Allen, quoted by S. Zuckerman, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes* (London, 1932), p. 190.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 190.

number of young ones". The natives told him that these monkeys, when once paired, remain faithful to one another until separated by death; but he adds, "I should not like to place too much confidence in the veracity of the story".[1] The Gibraltarian macaque (*Macacus inuus*) goes "generally in families—an old patriarch accompanied by several females and young ones of different sizes".[2] The crab-eating macaque (*Macacus cynomolgus*) is said to live in small family groups, presided over by a large male, into which no stranger is admitted without a fight. "The leading monkey having established his position, takes his food first, and has his selection of the females first. The other males he drives away should they presume to attempt to usurp his rights. In processions from one place to the other he always comes last, but if one of the younger monkeys gets into a dangerous position or is attacked he always runs to its rescue, and drives off the enemy, and the other big males often assist him if necessary".[3] Stevenson-Hamilton says of the Vervet monkey which is found in the dry, low country of Eastern Transvaal: "Solitary individuals and pairs, or small family parties, are most usually met with; but a little farther south, on the Maputa River of Portuguese East Africa, I have come across troops composed of at least forty individuals".[4]

In a 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

[1] S. J. Hickson, *A Naturalist in North Celebes* (London, 1889), p. 83.

[2] P. L. Sclater, 'On the Macacus inuus', quoting J. S. Inglefield, in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1900, p. 774.

[3] H. N. Ridley, 'The Menageries at the Botanic Gardens', in *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, no. 46 (Singapore, 1906), p. 140 *sqq.*

[4] J. Stevenson-Hamilton, *Animal Life in Africa*, i. (London, 1917), p. 144.

young; he says that he has often witnessed this himself, but, unfortunately, does not mention the name of any particular species.[1] The Ungka-puti, or agile gibbon, is said to live in pairs or in quite small troops.[2] Spaeth found that the gibbons of Siam live for the most part in family groups, though on one occasion he came upon a group of males alone in a tree, which he supposed to be some sort of a bachelors' club gathering. He says that "the gibbon has only one young a year and it takes three or four years for them to mature, so a family frequently consisted of two or more young ones in various stages of growth beside the father and mother".[3] Kloss writes: "I do not ever remember meeting Malayan gibbons in parties of more than five at a time, but the most usual numbers are four or less. A small district may often contain a large number of apes but the little groups seem to live quite independently of each other and do not combine. These parties consist of two parents and their offspring of different births, but as a rule it seems that about the time the third infant appears the eldest is sufficiently adult to take a partner with whom he starts life on its own account".[4] In the forests of southern Sumatra Volz constantly found the gibbons living in strictly monogamous families, consisting of a grown-up male, an adult female, and young ones, generally not more than three and rarely four in number; and his own experience was corroborated by that of native hunters. Sometimes he saw two and on

[1] M. Moszkowski, *Auf neuen Wegen durch Sumatra* (Berlin, 1909), p. 246.

[2] W. C. L. Martin, *A General Introduction to the Natural History of Mammiferous Animals* (London, 1841), p. 429; H. O. Forbes, *A Hand-book to the Primates*, ii. (London, 1894), p. 153.

[3] Spaeth, quoted by R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *The Great Apes* (New Haven & London, 1929), p. 59.

[4] C. B. Kloss, 'The White-Handed Gibbon', in *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, no. 50 (Singapore, 1908), p. 79 *sq.*

one occasion three families in proximity to each other yet strictly segregated. (Dr. Briffault refers to this statement by saying that " the gibbon may sometimes be found in quite small groups, which may be called families ".[1]) Occasionally Volz came across solitary gibbons, especially siamangs, which, judging by those he shot, he assumed always to be young males that had separated from their families and were strolling in the forest alone until they met a mature female with whom they then founded a family.[2] 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 and the females by the mother.[3]

Dr. Briffault says that with the orang-utan " there is no sexual association at all. All observers agree that the sexes, except when they come together for reproduction, live entirely separate ".[4] This is an astounding allegation. While he mentions that Volz on one occasion saw a male in the company of two females,[5] he takes no notice of what the same writer says in the very same sentence, namely, that the orang-utans live in the virgin forest in families, " one full-grown male, one female, and the young ".[6] In a later work Volz points out that one of the two females he saw in the company of a male was humpbacked, and observes that the young in a family hardly exceed two or three in number. He states that those apes stroll in the forest in a nomadic manner, but remain mostly in the same

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 174.

[2] W. Volz, *Nord-Sumatra*, ii. (Berlin, 1912), p. 368; *idem*, *Im Dämmer des Rimba* (Breslau, 1921), p. 59.

[3] Brehm, *Thierleben*, i. (Leipzig, 1877), p. 97. Curiously enough, Dr. Briffault refers in one place to this statement (*op. cit.* i. 255), in spite of his denial of paternal protection among monkeys and apes.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 174.

[5] *Ibid.* i. 174.

[6] Volz, *Nord Sumatra*, ii. 364.

region; that when the evening comes they construct a nest on the branches of a strong tree, twenty or thirty metres above the ground; and that they never use the same nest twice.[1] Dr. Briffault, who has quoted me so profusely in order to attack me, might also have given heed to my citation of C. de Crespigny's statement referring to the orang-utan of northern Borneo: " 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 ".[2]

I am not able to say whether Descamps' statement that the young orang-utans leave their parents at the age of three years and form small separate groups, is based upon first-hand observation or not. " As age advances ", he says, " there is an increasing tendency toward solitariness, and the old males spend most of their time alone, whereas the females live with their young ".[3] An important recent contribution to our knowledge of the life of the orang-utan comes from Munnecke, who accompanied Hagenbeck to Sumatra. Some natives found a family consisting of father, mother, and a young one in a tree in the forest. This was a very rare occurrence, because grown-up orang-utans avoid the neighbourhood of villages and take to flight as soon as they notice the approach of a human

[1] Volz, *Im Dämmer des Rimba*, p. 57.

[2] C. de Crespigny, ' On Northern Borneo ', in *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society*, xvi. (London, 1872), p. 177.

[3] P. Descamps, ' Les différences sociologiques entre les sauvages et les anthropoïdes ', in *L'Anthropologie*, xxx. (Paris, 1920), p. 142.

being. It is therefore the rule that hunters shoot the old ones and then catch the young, who mostly remain with the mother's body till it becomes cool. In this case, however, an attempt was made to catch all of them alive. They were driven to an open place in the forest. The old male gave a hoarse shriek and succeeded in climbing a solitary tree, the female and young one following him. The tree was cut down, and the two adult animals were captured alive, whereas the young one had been crushed by the falling tree. We are told that they were the largest pair of orang-utans ever captured; from this, as well as some other statements, it appears that pairs of that ape had been found also on earlier occasions. The two animals were taken to Jardin d'Acclimatation in Paris, where the female died of pneumonia eight weeks later, and the male outlived her only for two days.[1] The trustworthiness of writers who affirm the existence of family associations among these apes is of course by no means impaired by the fact that others have come across only solitary old males, or females with young, or, like Wallace, sometimes females and at other times males accompanied by half-grown young.[2]

With the chimpanzee the social unit is undoubtedly the family, although associated families may constitute more or less stable bands.[3] Dr. Briffault writes that chimpanzees " are usually found in considerable bands, which may contain some fifty individuals ".[4] In support of this statement he quotes Savage and Wyman. But what they say is this: " 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

[1] W. Munnecke, *Mit Hagenbeck im Dschungel* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 77-79, 86 *sq.*

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 32 *sq.*

[3] *Cf.* R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 541.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 174.

an unusual circumstance. They do not live in 'villages'. . . . They are more often seen in pairs than in gangs. . . . They cannot be called gregarious, seldom more than five or ten at most being found together. It has been said on good authority that they occasionally assemble in large numbers, in gambols. My informant asserts that he saw once not less than fifty so engaged; hooting, screaming, and drumming with sticks upon old logs". They also say 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".[1] Du Chaillu agrees with Savage and Wyman in denying gregariousness in the chimpanzee, and supplement their observations by indicating that one type, the "nshiego" (*Troglodytes calvus*), goes in pairs or alone instead of in companies; whereas another, *Troglodytes niger*, consorts in small companies when young, but in maturity goes by pairs or singly.[2] According to Schweinfurth, the chimpanzee in the Niam-Niam land is found either in pairs or even quite alone, and only the young are occasionally seen in groups;[3] and already Heuglin spoke of an ape in that country, large as a man, that lived in pairs and families.[4] Heck writes that it seems to be the growing immature chimpanzees of both sexes that form the larger bands which rush through the forest with much noise, while the adult animals keep in smaller family groups under the leadership of an old male who is accompanied by his females and young sucklings.[5]

[1] T. S. Savage and J. Wyman, 'Observations on the External Characters and Habits of the *Troglodytes Niger*', in *Boston Journal of Natural History*, iv. (Boston, 1844), p. 384 *sq.*

[2] P. B. Du Chaillu, *Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa* (London, 1861), pp. 231, 358.

[3] G. Schweinfurth, *The Heart of Africa*, i. (London, 1873), p. 522.

[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 653.

[5] *Ibid.* xiii. 661.

According to Pechuël-Loesche, Loango hunters distinguish between two varieties or species of the chimpanzee, one of which lives in small families, while the other one lives in bands.[1] The "tschego", a large kind of chimpanzee observed by the Duke Adolphus Frederick of Mecklenburg, lives in families of five to eight, each family having a particular range or pasture, which it is unwilling to leave.[2] Of the "sokos" in the Manuyema country, which would seem to be the common chimpanzee,[3] Livingstone says that "they live in communities of about ten, each having his own female; an intruder from another camp is beaten off with their fists and loud yells. If one tries to seize the female of another, he is caught on the ground, and all unite in boxing and biting the offender".[4]

Even larger bands have been encountered. In the Tanganyika Territory Reichard saw one containing about twenty animals, and, citing nests as evidence, he concludes that the chimpanzees go in herds of six to twenty.[5] We are told that in the Cameroons there may be as many as thirty in a band.[6] But Dr. Briffault has not substantiated his statement that chimpanzees "are usually found in considerable bands". He adds that "smaller troops are found, formed by one adult male with three or four females and a number of immature young".[7] This conveys the impression that the

[1] E. Pechuël-Loesche, *Die Loango-Expedition. Dritte Abtheilung*, i. (Leipzig, 1882), p. 248.

[2] The Duke Adolphus Frederick of Mecklenburg, *In the Heart of Africa* (London, 1910), p. 135 *sq.*

[3] Forbes, *op. cit.* ii. 197.

[4] D. Livingstone, *The Last Journals of, in Central Africa*, ii. (London, 1874), p. 55.

[5] P. Reichart (should be: Reichard), 'Schimpanse am Tanganika', in *Archiv für Naturgeschichte*, i. (Berlin, 1884), p. 121 *sq.*

[6] E. Reichenow, 'Biologische Beobachtungen an Gorilla und Schimpanse', in *Sitzungsbericht der Gesellschaft Naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin*, no. 1, 1920 (Berlin), p. 19.

[7] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 175.

" troop " is always polygynous, which is certainly not correct. That the " troop " *may* be polygynous is a different matter. Buck observed a family group consisting of an old male, two mature females, one with a baby, and several immature animals, that had arrived at its resting-place for the night.[1] According to Garner, " the family of the chimpanzee frequently consists of three or four wives and ten or twelve children, with one adult male ".[2] Dr. Zuckerman says that the Yerkes " after consideration of the literature of the subject, conclude that Garner was correct in his assumption that the chimpanzee is polygynous ";[3] but, as a matter of fact, they were not so positive as that. In one place they say they " suspect that Garner is correct in considering the type polygamous ".[4] In another place they write that the observations of Garner seem definitely to support polygamy, and that the reports of various observers indicate the presence of more than one apparently mature female with a mature male; but they add that the evidence is far from being decisive, especially since such authorities as Livingstone, Forbes, and Reichenow either definitely accept monogamy as established or consider it probable.[5] In a third place they say that " there are definite indications of monogamy in the chimpanzee ";[6] and in a fourth place, where they indicate points of contrast among the three types of great ape, they go so far as to speak of " relatively permanent monogamous and possibly also polygamous relations in the chimpanzee ".[7]

That the family associations of chimpanzees are in various cases monogamous clearly appears from state-

[1] Buck, quoted by R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 247.
[2] R. L. Garner, *Gorillas and Chimpanzees* (London, 1896), p. 54.
[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 177.
[4] R. M. and A. W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 247.
[5] *Ibid.* p. 260. [6] *Ibid.* p. 542. [7] *Ibid.* p. 543.

ments already quoted by me, and others to the same effect may be added. Dyce Sharp says that the chimpanzee is usually monogamous, and that only the older members of a party have even two female followers.[1] Forbes states, perhaps on the authority of Von Koppenfels,[2] that chimpanzees build resting-places, not far from the ground, " in which the female and her young take refuge for the night, the male placing himself on guard beneath ".[3] This is not the only case in which the male is said to protect or take care of the young. According to Von Oertzen, he, as well as the mother, defends them in case of danger.[4] The Duke of Mecklenburg tells us that one morning when he had shot down a young chimpanzee from a tree, an old male appeared with his mouth wide open, evidently inclined to attack him; he adds that old males " often accompany the families at a distance, but keep to themselves ".[5] Livingstone says of the " sokos " that " a male often carries a child, especially if they are passing from one patch of forest to another over a grassy space; he then gives it to the mother ".[6] According to Garner, " the male parent often plays with his children, and appears to be fond of them ".[7]

With the gorilla, as with the chimpanzee, the social unit is the family, though it is definitely indicated that in this ape also several families may associate and thus constitute a band or herd.[8] Dr. Briffault's statement

[1] N. A. Dyce Sharp, 'Notes on the Gorilla', in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1927, p. 1007.

[2] H. von Koppenfels, 'Meine Jagden auf Gorillas', in *Die Gartenlaube*, 1877 (Leipzig), p. 418.

[3] Forbes, *op. cit.* ii. 193. This statement should not have escaped Dr. Briffault's notice, since he, when speaking of another monkey (*op. cit.* i. 172), refers to Forbes as " the recognised authority on the subject ".

[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 661.

[5] The Duke Adolphus Frederick of Mecklenburg, *op. cit.* p. 139.

[6] Livingstone, *op. cit.* ii. 55.

[7] Garner, *op. cit.* p. 54.

[8] *Cf.* R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 541.

that " in bands of gorillas the sexes keep separate, the females and young forming one group, the males keeping to themselves ",[1] is merely based on Count Gyldenstolpe's description of a retreating flock of gorillas after four of their companions had been shot: " The remainder of the flock now slowly climbed up the mountain. They went in single file. First the females and the half-grown, then the little ones—of which I counted eight—and lastly the males. . . . It was strange to observe the calm order in which they retreated. There was no hurry, no running about in different directions ".[2]

According to Savage, the gorilla lives in bands, but all his informants agreed in the assertion that only 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 ".[3] Schweinfurth says that the gorillas are not found in herds, but either in pairs or quite alone, and that it is only the young that occasionally may be seen in groups.[4] On his first journey to Equatorial Africa Du Chaillu found " almost always one male with one female ", though sometimes the old male wandered companionless and young gorillas might be seen in companies of at most five;[5] but on his second expedition he saw two such bands numbering eight or ten and had accounts from the natives of other similar bands. He adds, however, that " when gorillas

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 123.

[2] Gyldenstolpe's account in Prince William of Sweden's book *Among Pygmies and Gorillas* (London, 1923), p. 194 *sq.*

[3] T. S. Savage, *A Description of the Characters and Habits of Troglodytes Gorilla* (Boston, 1847), p. 9 *sq.*

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

[5] Du Chaillu, *op. cit.* p. 349.

become aged, they seem to be more solitary, and to live in pairs, or, as in the case of old males, quite alone ".[1] Winwood Reade states that the gorilla goes " sometimes alone, sometimes accompanied by his female and young one "; but though he has never seen more than one track at a time, he has no doubt that it is also found in bands.[2] He was told that when a family ascends a tree and eats a certain fruit, the old father remains seated at the foot of the tree; and " when the female is pregnant the male builds a rude nest, usually about fifteen or twenty feet from the ground. . . . Here the female is delivered, and the nest is then abandoned ".[3] According to native accounts communicated by Pechuël-Loesche, the male gorilla has only one wife and few children, who all keep together; the family prepare a lair at the foot of a large tree, and the father defends the family.[4] Von Koppenfels says that the male gorilla 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.[5]

Dr. Briffault tries to discredit Von Koppenfels' article by pointing out that it was published in " a German popular magazine "; but subsequently he himself quotes with approval a statement regarding the gorilla from another article in the very same magazine.[6] Von Koppenfels' information is not only accepted by

[1] P. B. Du Chaillu, *A Journey to Ashango-land* (London, 1867), p. 57.

[2] W. Winwood Reade, *Savage Africa* (London, 1863), p. 214; *idem*, 'The Habits of the Gorilla', in *The American Naturalist*, i. (Salem, Mass., 1861), p. 179.

[3] *Idem*, *Savage Africa*, pp. 218, 214.

[4] Pechuël-Loesche, *op. cit.* i. 249.

[5] Von Koppenfels, *loc. cit.* p. 418 *sq.*

[6] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 175, 177.

Hartmann,[1] but appreciated by Brehm,[2] Pechuël-Loesche,[3] Reichenow,[4] and the Yerkes,[5] as being, contrary to many other accounts, based on personal observation. Dr. Briffault wants to "relegate to its proper sphere" Von Koppenfels' "oft-cited description of the male gorilla building a nest in a tree for the female and 'mounting guard' at the foot of the tree to 'protect his family from the attacks of leopards'", by citing two statements to the effect that the gorilla "lives chiefly on the ground, and may be classed as a rock-dweller", and that it never sleeps in trees.[6] As a matter of fact, however, its methods of nest-building vary considerably. The gorillas of the Cameroons, according to the findings of Reichenow, build either on or near the ground in low bushes or small trees, whereas those of the Gaboon, according to the observations not only of Von Koppenfels but also of Von Oertzen,[7] may place their nests at such considerable distance from the ground as twenty feet or may also rest directly on the ground. Concerning the gorillas of the Mamfe district of the Cameroons, Dyce Sharp writes: "The big male . . . is not arboreal, and invariably makes his bed on the ground while he sends his female belongings and young offspring up trees within sight of his bed. It is said that the old man directs his wives to their respective trees. I repeatedly tried the experiment of lying where the old male had lain, and in every case I was able to see from his couch the beds of his several

[1] R. Hartmann, *Die menschenähnlichen Affen* (Leipzig, 1883), pp. 214, 216.

[2] Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 654, 682.

[3] Pechuël-Loesche, *op. cit.* i. 248.

[4] E. Reichenow, *loc. cit.* p. 2.

[5] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 430.

[6] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 177 *sq.*

[7] Von Oertzen, quoted by Reichenow (*loc. cit.* p. 11), who has himself given an exhaustive account of gorilla and chimpanzee nests (*ibid.* pp. 4-14).

wives ".[1] Dr. Briffault says that " no instance has been reported of a male gorilla defending his 'family' ".[2] But Burbridge speaks of a great gorilla who met death in a headlong charge to rescue his young;[3] and, speaking of the gorilla of the Cameroons, Guthrie relates on native authority that in one instance, when a band was attacked by two men, " the old gorilla of the band first got his family out of danger, and then returned to the encounter ".[4]

Dr. Briffault also speaks disparagingly of Du Chaillu's " stories " about the gorilla,[5] following Winwood Reade, who considers his evidence as worthless.[6] But the Yerkes, who are our chief authorities on the great apes in general, say that the more they have used the publications of that bitterly and traditionally discredited writer, the more deeply have they been impressed by the value of his observations; indeed, they look upon them as by far the most important contribution to the natural history of the gorilla prior to the present century.[7] Reichenow calls Du Chaillu the best informant about the gorilla, and his account of its life and habits, in spite of minor mistakes, the most pertinent (*zutreffendste*) we possess.[8] And of Reichenow himself the Yerkes express the opinion that he presents the best available critical discussion of the herd and family life of the gorilla and the most considerable original contribution of fact.[9]

[1] Dyce Sharp, *loc. cit.* p. 1007. *Cf.* Zenker, quoted by Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 684.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 178.

[3] B. Burbridge, *Gorilla* (London, 1928), p. 238.

[4] A. E. Jenks, 'Bulu Knowledge of the Gorilla and Chimpanzee', in *The American Anthropologist*, N.S. xiii. (Lancaster, 1911), p. 58.

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 175 n. 3.

[6] Winwood Reade, *Savage Africa*, p. 212.

[7] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 432 *sq.*

[8] Reichenow, *loc. cit.* p. 2.

[9] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 432.

According to Reichenow, the gorilla family consists of male, female, and young; but he agrees with Von Oertzen that the size of the typical band probably exceeds that of the family, and believes that in the Cameroons the band usually contains ten to twenty animals, while in East Africa it may contain even thirty.[1] Families often associate to the number of as many as five, thus constituting bands which feed in the same general locality. During the day the herd scatters over a fairly wide tract of country, and only towards the evening the animals reunite to sleep near together in their resting-places. Reichenow thinks that this may account for the fact that "the social life of the gorilla could escape wholly or in part such good observers as Du Chaillu and Koppenfels", since the hunter usually runs across only one or two animals;[2] but Zell suggests that the gorillas of the Cameroons may be more sociable than those farther south because they stand in greater need of protection against hostile animals.[3] More than once Reichenow himself has found a family alone—on one occasion consisting of an adult male and female, a nearly grown male, which he shot, and possibly some younger animals—and two nests built by this little group. This, he admits, stands in contrast to what he has previously said concerning the social life of the gorilla; but "if we consider that the company of gorillas during the day wander far in their search of food, such an accidental find may be explained in that a family, separated from the others, did not join the main group for the night, but spent it alone, rejoining the others next day".[4]

[1] Speaking of gorillas in Congo, Prince William of Sweden says (*op. cit.* p. 101) that they generally congregate in flocks of ten to thirty.

[2] Reichenow, *loc. cit.* p. 15 *sq.*

[3] Th. Zell, 'Das Einfangen ausgewachsener Gorillas', in *Die Gartenlaube*, 1907 (Leipzig), p. 880.

[4] Reichenow, *loc. cit.* p. 17 *sq.*

A space of several yards may separate the sleeping-places of one family group from those of another, whereas the nests of a family are placed close together. With a single exception Reichenow has always found only two nests of grown animals near one another. Often is the whole family limited to these two nests, since the young seek the protection of their elders and therefore share their nests as long as they do not feel sufficiently strong themselves. If a third or, exceptionally, a fourth nest is present, these are distinctly smaller, and belong to half-grown youngsters. "Therefore", says Reichenow, "we can draw the important conclusion that the gorilla is not polygamous, but lives monogamously, and that the sexes do not unite only during the rutting time, but remain together for several years. The half-grown animals continue apparently for a long time in the company of their elders, perhaps even until they found families of their own. . . . If polygamy existed with the gorilla, then we should oftener find three nests of grown animals in a family group".[1] If Dr. Briffault had not ignored this conclusion drawn by Reichenow—which he must have known since it is mentioned by Akeley in connection with his suggestion of polygamy,[2] to which Dr. Briffault refers[3]—he could not have said that no other writer who has given attention to the subject but such as have followed Von Koppenfels makes the statement that the gorilla is monogamous.[4]

[1] Reichenow, *loc. cit.* pp. 15, 16, 18.

[2] C. E. Akeley, *In Brightest Africa* (London, 1924), p. 247.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 177.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 175 *sq.* This is not the only case in which Dr. Briffault's fanatical denial of monogamy among apes and monkeys has made him blind to the most glaring facts. He alleges (*ibid.* i. 173 n. 6) that "Darwin, whom one cannot suspect of tendentiousness in the presentation of evidence, certainly does not offer any indication of monogamous habits among monkeys". Yet Darwin writes (*The Descent of Man* [London, 1890], p. 590), "Several kinds, for example some of the Indian and American monkeys, are strictly monogamous, and associate all the year round with their wives".

The Yerkes say with reference to the gorilla, "Evidence and opinion alike favour Reichenow's contention that pairing is relatively permanent, but monogamy is not definitely established".[1] But they also say that "Akeley's evidence for polygamy seems meagre indeed";[2] nor can they accept[3] Garner's statement, quoted by Dr. Briffault, that "it is certain that the gorilla is polygamous".[4] The detailed description which this imaginative writer gives of the life of a gorilla family, consisting of one adult male and a number of females and their young, presents to us, as Reichenow remarks, "almost exactly the course of life of a rich negro";[5] and the Yerkes agree with him that "Garner almost certainly transcended the results of trustworthy observation and indulged freely and rather uncritically in the unchecked report of hearsay and in interpretation".[6] Winwood Reade's statement that "the gorilla is polygamous", to which Dr. Briffault attaches much importance,[7] has a very slender foundation. It amounts to this: "The males are said to fight with one another in the rutting season. . . . A reliable informant had seen two gorillas fighting. One of them was much larger than the other, and the smaller one was killed. From this we may, I think, infer that gorillas

[1] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 442. Dyce Sharp states (*loc. cit.* p. 1007) that a family troop of gorillas, consisting of one adult male, possibly one immature male, and four to six females with their young, "will remain together for years—until it is broken up by raids on its female members by some young and bold male".

[2] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 434.

[3] They say (*op. cit.* p. 434) that "although we might tentatively accept the inference that the lowland gorillas are monogamous and the highland gorillas polygamous, it probably would be even wiser to admit the inadequacy of the evidence and face the problem as unsolved".

[4] Garner, *op. cit.* p. 214.

[5] Reichenow, *loc. cit.* p. 15.

[6] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 431.

[7] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 176.

are polygamous, like stags, cocks, pheasants, and other animals which battle for wives".[1] Barns' belief in polygamy with the gorilla is not quite so definite as Dr. Briffault's quotation suggests.[2] He writes: "More often than not gorillas go about in small family parties of six or eight. Father and mother gorilla only will then make 'nests' for themselves, whilst the others—young ones of different ages—will huddle around them to keep warm. . . . I have never seen more than one fully adult male in a troop, but what appeared to be several fully grown females were usually present".[3] In some other cases, not referred to by Dr. Briffault, observers speak of companies containing one adult male, several females, and young.[4] In such instances we may have reason to believe that the male is polygynous, but it is not altogether impossible to suspect that some of the females may have been immature; or that young males may have been taken for adult females, from which they are scarcely distinguishable;[5] or that, to speak with Akeley,[6] "the extra females may have been spinster aunts of the family", or, as Mary Hastings Bradley says,[7] "marriageable daughters—maiden gorillas yet uncalled by roving gallants". I have myself, without a word of criticism, quoted the account given to Mr. Guthrie

[1] Winwood Reade, in *The American Naturalist*, i. 179; *idem*, *Savage Africa*, p. 214.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 177.

[3] T. A. Barns, *Across the Great Craterland to the Congo* (London, 1923), p. 130.

[4] Burbridge, *op. cit.* p. 199; C. W. Chorley, 'Note on Uganda Gorillas', in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1928, p. 268; Dyce Sharp, *loc. cit.* p. 1006 *sq.*; Zenker, quoted by P. Matschie, 'Bemerkungen über die Gattung Gorilla', in *Sitzungsbericht der Gesellschaft naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin von 8. März* 1904, p. 48.

[5] Burbridge, *op. cit.* p. 226.

[6] Akeley, *op. cit.* p. 247.

[7] M. Hastings Bradley, *On the Gorilla Trail* (London & New York, 1922), p. 133.

by natives, according to which the gorillas of the Cameroons "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.... The smaller companies consist of one male with his one, two, or three wives, and some small children".[1] This should have convinced Dr. Briffault that, contrary to what he makes his readers believe,[2] I have not based my "theory of human marriage" on the assumption that the gorilla is always monogamous.

Monogamy and polygyny may, of course, exist side by side in the same species, which then may be said to be both monogamous and polygynous, unless by a monogamous species is meant one which always lives in monogamy and by a polygynous species one which frequently lives in polygyny and would always do so if the males could procure several females. This is evidently the sense in which Dr. Zuckerman uses the word polygynous when he says that the balance of evidence at his disposal "suggests that most, if not all, wild primates are polygynous or tend to polygyny"; for he observes that when monogamy and polygyny exist side by side in the same species "they depend on the distribution of those qualities that go to make masculine dominance".[3] This implies a stronger tendency towards polygyny than can be shown to exist. It has been noticed that even in a generally polygynous species of monkeys, the Hamadryas baboon, the male may care for one female only once she has become a mother, and for their common offspring, taking no notice of other females.[4] Tinklepaugh describes a case of "monogamous attachment" on the part of a young Rhesus monkey, called "Cupid", living in the Psychological Laboratory of the

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 34.
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 175 *sq.*
[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* pp. 208, 209, 211 *sq.*
[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 571.

University of California, to a female common macaque much older than himself, called "Psyche", that had sexually initiated him. When, two and a half years after their first meeting, two young female Rhesus monkeys were introduced into the laboratory, Cupid proved very antagonistic to their intrusion. On five successive occasions when they were introduced into his cage, after Psyche had been previously removed, he attacked them, even though he had been sexually starved for two to three weeks before three of these incidents; and when Psyche was returned he continued to manifest a strong sexual interest in her. It required a fortnight's "conditioning", by feeding and muzzling, to induce him to enter into sexual relationship with one of the young females, and two to three weeks passed before he accepted the other one.[1] After relating this case, Dr. Zuckerman makes the remark that "at the very best, Cupid's 'monogamous feeling' towards Psyche was not of a durable kind".[2] But it should be noticed that on the occasion when the two young females were forced upon Cupid, he had no access to Psyche, and we do not know what his attitude would have been if she had been present. In any case his behaviour is evidently at variance with the supposition that every adult male monkey attempts to secure for himself as many females as possible.

The main question on which I have taken Dr. Briffault to task, however, is not that of polygamy or monogamy; it is the question whether there are mammalian species in which the relations between the sexes normally last till after the birth of the offspring, no matter whether they are polygamous or monogamous. On this point Dr. Zuckerman's opinion differs radically

[1] O. L. Tinklepaugh, 'The Self-Mutilation of a Male *Macacus rhesus* Monkey', in *Journal of Mammalogy*, ix. (Baltimore, 1928), p. 293 *sqq.*, quoted by Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 306 *sqq.*

[2] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 309.

from Dr. Briffault's, so far as the sub-human primates are concerned. "The primate family", he says, "consists of male, female or females, and young"; it is held together primarily by the interest of the male in the female portion of it and by their interest in their young; it is the nucleus of the society also when several families have united to form a larger group, never losing its identity within the herd, which never appears to be so stable a unit as the family; nay even the enormous hordes of a species like the baboon consist of numerous families banded together.[1] These facts must be very unpalatable truths to Dr. Briffault, who alleges that among monkeys and apes, as well as among all other animals, "the male has no share in forming the animal family" and "is not an essential member of it"; that an associated group of separate families is an "arrangement without precedent in biological history"; and that "association in large numbers inevitably means the breaking-up of the family grouping into the herd".[2] Speaking of the solitary males mentioned in many accounts of anthropoid apes,[3] he refutes the supposition that they are old ones past the reproductive age, and suggests another explanation of their solitude by saying: "It appears likely that male anthropoids are not in general permanently attached to a given group, but join a female, or group of females, as does the orang, according as their instincts prompt them".[4] He denies that the patriarchal family, which is founded upon the supremacy of the male as head of the family, is found among animals; it is the female, and not the male, that is its head.[5] According to Dr. Zuckerman, on the other hand, the primate family has its overlord,[6]

[1] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* pp. 147, 212, 213, 314 *sq.* See also Doflein, *op. cit.* pp. 692, 694.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 188, 192, 193, 200.

[3] See *supra*, pp. 90, 91, 185 *sqq.*

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 178.

[5] *Ibid.* i. 189.

[6] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 314.

" dominance determines the number of females that a male may possess, and except on occasions when there is a superfluity of food, it also determines the amount a monkey eats ".[1] The Yerkes remark: " The male chimpanzee is dominant in family and band, and in the latter aggregation a mature male acts as leader. This is true also of the gorilla, for whether the social group be family or band, a mature, and often gray-backed, male is in command and leads as well as dominates the group ".[2]

While Dr. Zuckerman's conclusions thus agree with my own as to the existence of the family consisting of male, female or females, and young, among the anthropoids, his explanation of its origin differs from that suggested by myself. I have attributed it to instincts, added to the sexual instinct, which have been acquired through natural selection because they have a tendency to preserve the next generation and therefore are of vital importance to the species. Dr. Zuckerman, on the other hand, maintains that the factor underlying the permanent association of the sexes among apes and monkeys is their uninterrupted reproductive life: " the male primate ", he says, " is always sexually potent, while the female is also to some extent receptive ".[3]

In my *History of Human Marriage* I considered the possibility of the family having such an origin as has now been suggested by Dr. Zuckerman;[4] but I found reason to believe that the anthropoid apes have a definite sexual season, and that the pairing of our earliest human or half-human ancestors also was restricted to a certain season of the year.[5] In support of the former opinion

[1] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 234.

[2] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 541.

[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* pp. 55, 313.

[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 77.

[5] As to the latter belief I have said, in my chapter on ' A Human Pairing Season in Primitive Times ' (*The History of Human Marriage*, i. 78-102), that it " derives additional probability from the fact that

I quoted some statements then known to me. I pointed out that Mohnike and other writers mention the occurrence of a sexual season with the orang-utan, although they do not inform us when it takes place. Mr. Wallace 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; and Burton says that the gorilla breeds about December, a cool and dry month, while according to his bushmen,

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 "; but I have fully admitted 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. . . . 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 Europe; in Chili, September) is, at least to a large extent, due to an increased tendency to procreation in May and June (in Chili, December). . . . 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 ". Dr. S. Zuckerman (' The Menstrual Cycle of the Primates—Part III.', in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1931, p. 339 n.) has raised the objection that there are " enough cultural and economic factors to which to ascribe seasonal variations in the human birth rate ", but he has not specified these factors more definitely, and this deprives his remark of all importance. Nor has he considered other facts mentioned by me in order to prove an annual increase of the sexual desire, but the periodical erotic feasts held by many peoples, to which I myself have, in a number of cases, ascribed little or no evidential value. So also I have pointed out that " another custom which calls for the greatest caution is that of contracting or cele-

the period of gestation is between five and six months.[1] Other statements of a similar character may be added. Reichenow speaks of a rutting season with the gorilla of the Cameroons;[2] and in the Mamfe district, according to Dyce Sharp, infant gorillas are most commonly seen at the time of the early rains, about February or March.[3] From information given by officers and travellers it appears that the chimpanzee in the Cameroons likewise gives birth to young at a certain time of the year, mostly in the beginning of the rainy season.[4] The gibbons of Siam, so far as Spaeth could ascertain, have their young in the early summer and spring.[5] According to Tickel, the Lar gibbon gives birth to young

brating marriages at some special time of the year"—a custom to which Dr. Briffault specially refers in his criticism of my hypothesis (*op. cit.* ii. 402 n. 2). Yet the latter admits that "there are among all peoples, savage or civilised, seasonal variations in reproductive activities", and mentions "one reference to such periodical intensification among the Australians which", as he alleges, "has escaped Dr. Westermarck's attention", namely Friedrich Müller's. This allegation is perfectly untrue. I have referred to Müller's statement as fully as he has done himself, and added that it is, partly at least, based on an account given by Oldfield, according to which the Watchandies in West Australia have but one time for copulation in the year, about the middle of spring. I wrote: "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; 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". It is astonishing that all this has escaped Dr. Briffault's attention.

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 81.
[2] Reichenow, *loc. cit.* p. 16.
[3] Dyce Sharp, *loc. cit.* p. 1008.
[4] Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 659.
[5] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 59.

generally in the early part of the cold weather;[1] and Blanford likewise states that its young are born in the early part of the cold season.[2]

Dr. Zuckerman, who mentions most of these statements, speaks of them disparagingly as being based mainly upon the narratives of travellers, "which in their turn usually depend upon the testimony of natives".[3] He maintains that, so far as it is possible to make generalisations, "all Old World monkeys about which accurate information is available breed at any time".[4] As regards the anthropoid apes this "accurate information" consists almost exclusively of records concerning animals kept in confinement. Now it is a common opinion that such animals do not afford a reliable source of information about the breeding activity of wild ones, because the generative system of the latter may be affected by the conditions attending captivity. In a paper published in 1930 Dr. Zuckerman seems to share this opinion. He writes: "It is doubtful . . . whether one may infer the reproductive habits of monkeys in a state of nature from observation of the same monkeys in captivity. The distinction between 'wild animals in a state of nature, wild animals in captivity, and domestic animals', pointed out by Heape in 1900 is an important one. Artificial conditions have the effect of increasing reproductive activity by prolonging the breeding season or by increasing the number of such seasons. . . . While it is true that most primates breed at any time of the year in captivity, if they breed at all, it is possible that captivity has already deranged their normal reproductive functions".[5] In another

[1] S. R. Tickel, 'Note on the Gibbon of Tenasserim, Hylobates lar', in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxxiii. (Calcutta, 1864), p. 197.

[2] Forbes, *op. cit.* ii. 161.

[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 45.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 50.

[5] *Idem*, 'The Menstrual Cycle of the Primates', in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1930, p. 693 *sq.*

paper published in the following year, however, Dr. Zuckerman has evidently changed his opinion concerning the effects of captivity upon reproduction. He writes there: "The records of monkey births in captivity probably give a very good indication of the breeding-habits of wild monkeys. Captive conditions may cause sterility in an animal; but there is practically no evidence that they increase reproductive power. . . . These records indicate clearly that monkeys can conceive at any time in captivity, and presumably, therefore, like the baboon, at any time in the wild".[1] The statements modified by a "probably" or "presumably" are merely Dr. Zuckerman's own conclusions and can certainly not be styled "accurate information". He says himself, "Definite knowledge about the breeding of wild Old World primates exists, so far as I am aware, only in the case of the Chacma baboon, an animal that is widely scattered over South Africa". By examining several adult females of this monkey, collected on a farm in the Eastern Province of South Africa, he found that they had become pregnant at different times of the year, which proved the absence of a demarcated breeding-season. He assumed that "the same is probably true of the Chacma baboon living in other parts of the country".[2]

The "accurate information" we possess about the breeding activities of Old World monkeys is thus infinitesimal, and hardly justifies any far-reaching conclusions. Apart from the extremely hypothetical character of the assumption that the times when a monkey breeds in captivity are also the times when it would breed in its natural habitat, it should be remembered that the very limited amount of information

[1] Zuckerman, 'The Menstrual Cycle of the Primates', in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1931, pp. 336, 339. *Cf. idem*, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, p. 36 *sqq.*

[2] *Idem*, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, p. 49 *sq.*; *idem*, in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1931, p. 341.

available about the breeding in captivity refers to certain species only; and Dr. Zuckerman himself has, in another connection, pointed out the danger of arguing from the behaviour of one animal to that of another. Curiously enough, he has illustrated this by the statement that the spotted deer of India breeds at all times of the year, whereas the red deer of Western Asia, which belongs to the same zoological family, has a short mating season, the only time when the sexes meet.[1] Another similar fact, recorded by Baker, is that the white-footed moose of North America breeds all the year round in the wild, although allied genera have a definite breeding-season.[2] But even the breeding records of captive monkeys are not unanimous. Hartman considers the seasonal variation in the birth-rate among his own colony of Rhesus macaques to be sufficiently marked to justify the description of a breeding season in monkeys;[3] and another monkey that is known to exhibit a seasonal birth-rate in captivity is the Hamadryas baboon, a frequency curve constructed on the basis of 69 births that have occurred in the London and Giza (Cairo) Zoological Gardens showing that the greatest number of births have taken place between November and December.[4] Moreover, Zuckerman states that his own observations both of captive animals in zoological gardens and of wild baboons in South Africa amply corroborate the view expressed by other writers that monkeys experience periods of increased sexual desire.[5] He also gives a

[1] Zuckerman, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, p. 25.

[2] J. R. Baker, *Sex in Man and Animals* (London, 1926), p. 144.

[3] C. G. Hartman, 'The Breeding Season in Monkeys', in *Journal of Mammalogy*, xii. (Baltimore, 1931), quoted by Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 55.

[4] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 56. In his paper of 1930 Dr. Zuckerman wrote himself (p. 694), "This is certainly suggestive of a breeding season".

[5] *Idem*, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, p. 142.

considerable list of reports of naturalists referring, not only to anthropoids as said above, but to many of the lower primates as well—including even the Chacma baboon—that indicate the existence of breeding seasons.[1] He dismisses most of them summarily by saying that one would require confirmatory evidence before accepting them; but at least one of the cases gives him trouble. There are two statements of different observers to the effect that the young of the Gibraltar macaque (*Macacus inuus*) are born in spring or early summer,[2] and "living as it does in a state of semi-domestication, this species has been closely observed. Nevertheless," says Dr. Zuckerman, "these reports cannot be accepted as final in the absence of details regarding the animal's ovarian and uterine cycles".[3]

It is difficult to understand this hypersceptical attitude towards all reports of breeding seasons among monkeys in a state of nature. They are in general conformity with what we know about the breeding of most mammals; and even if some of them are wrong, they seem to me to be too numerous to admit the suspicion that all of them are wrong. That many of them are based upon the testimony of natives does not imply that they lack evidential value. During the ten years I have spent in Morocco I have invariably found that the information given me by natives about their customs has been exceedingly accurate, and what native hunters have to tell about the habits of wild animals in their own country I should trust more readily than many casual observations made by foreign sportsmen or even naturalists. With reference to the anthropoids

[1] Zuckerman, *The Social Life of Monkeys and Apes*, p. 46 *sqq.*; *idem*, in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1930, p. 694 *sqq.*

[2] P. L. Sclater, in *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1900, p. 774; 'Sketches of Natural History at Gibraltar', in *The Field*, lvi. (London, 1880), p. 79.

[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 49.

the Yerkes, who are very cautious in their estimation of evidence and perfectly unbiassed by any particular theories, write: "The facts available suggest that there is a definite breeding season, or possibly seasons, for each of the five types" (the gibbon, siamang, orang-utan, chimpanzee, and gorilla).[1]

The occurrence of a definite breeding season does not *ipso facto* imply that sexual activity also takes place only at a certain time of the year: it may possibly depend merely upon the fact that the female's capacity for becoming pregnant is restricted to a certain period and not upon absence of coition. It has been proved that monkeys kept in confinement may be sexually active at any time,[2] but it has not been proved that the same is generally the case with monkeys in a state of nature. If this could be proved we might no doubt say that the more or less premanent sexual stimulus would help to hold male and female together. But I venture to suggest that such uninterrupted sexual capacity might itself be the result of natural selection owing to its tendency to preserve the offspring. It would thus have the same effect as the breeding season, which I have taken to be fundamentally governed by the law that the young shall be born at the time which is most favourable for their survival.[3] In no case, however, could uninterrupted sexual stimulus, which Dr. Zuckerman regards

[1] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 542.

[2] G. S. Miller, 'Some Elements of Sexual Behavior in Primates and their possible Influence on the Beginnings of Human Social Development', in *Journal of Mammalogy*, ix. (Baltimore, 1928), p. 278 *sqq.*

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 78 *sqq.* My theory has gained the support of Dr. F. H. A. Marshall (*The Physiology of Reproduction* [London, 1922], p. 29 *sq.*), who has answered objections raised by Mr. W. Heape ('The "Sexual Season" of Mammals and the Relation of the "Pro-œstrum" to Menstruation', in *The Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*, N.S. vol. xliv. pt. i. [London, 1900], p. 19 *sq.*).

as the sole source of the family with monkey and man, explain the male's relation to the offspring and the paternal instinct underlying it, which has been noticed both in the anthropoids and in other sub-human primates.[1] Speaking of the instinct that induces the male to remain with the female and to take care of her even after the sexual relations have ceased, I said " 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 together 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 ".[2]

In the case of the apes there are some obvious facts which may account for the need of marital and paternal protection. One is the small number of young: the female brings forth but one at a time.[3] Another is the long period of infancy: the gibbon seems to achieve sexual maturity at five to eight years of age, the orang-utan and chimpanzee at eight to twelve, the gorilla at ten to fourteen.[4] Finally, none of these apes is permanently gregarious. The orang-utan apparently never, or hardly ever, congregates in groups larger than the family[5] and is often found solitary; this may be due both

[1] See also Brehm, *op. cit.* xiii. 488, 571, 581.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 70.

[3] Spaeth, quoted by R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 59 (gibbon); W. T. Hornaday, *Two Years in the Jungle* (New York, 1885), p. 403 (orang-utan); Jenks, *loc. cit.* pp. 57, 61 (gorilla, chimpanzee).

[4] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 543.

[5] The only statement to this effect I know is one made by Ch. Brooke (*Ten Years in Saráwak*, i. [London, 1866], p. 100): " On one tree a large family was assembled. I counted eight of them in all, three old ones and the remainder of them young ".

to the scarcity of food[1] and to the fact that it has no enemy of equal strength except man, whom it avoids.[2] The social unit of the chimpanzee and gorilla is the family, although several families may associate and then constitute a band or herd; but even in the Cameroons, where the gorilla is particularly sociable, the herd scatters over a fairly wide district in search of food. The connection between the supply of food and gregariousness is well illustrated by Savage's statement that the chimpanzees are more numerous in the season when the greatest number of fruits come to maturity.[3]

These considerations are of importance for a discussion of the origin of the family in mankind. The family consisting of parents and children is found among the lowest savages as well as among the most civilised races of men; and we may suppose that the factors which led to marital and paternal relations among the apes also operated with a similar result among our earliest human or half-human ancestors. If, as most authorities maintain, on the basis of morphological resemblances, man and apes have evolved from a common type,[4] there

[1] Descamps, *loc. cit.* p. 142 *sq.*; Volz, *Im Dämmer des Rimba*, pp. 57, 60.

[2] O. Mohnike, 'Die Affen auf den indischen Inseln', in *Das Ausland*, xlv. (Augsburg, 1872), p. 894; Volz, *Im Dämmer des Rimba*, p. 57.

[3] Savage and Wyman, in *Boston Journal of Natural History*, iv. 384. *Cf.* Von Koppenfels, *loc. cit.* p. 419.

[4] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 24. Professor Elliot Smith (*The Search for Man's Ancestors* [London, 1931], p. 55) writes that wherever man was evolved, "he displays evidence of close kinship to the African anthropoids, and has certainly sprung from the same source as that which gave them birth". Sir Arthur Keith (*The Construction of Man's Family Tree* [London, 1934], pp. 40, 46) is of opinion that at the beginning of the Miocene period the great anthropoids and man were represented by a common ancestor, but that by the middle of that period the orang-utan ancestry had broken away from the stock which gave rise to man and the African anthropoids. He anticipates that "the fossil remains of an anthropoid ape will be found some day—probably in Africa—which will serve as a common ancestor for man, gorilla, and chimpanzee."

is no doubt that in mankind, too, the number of children has always been comparatively very small and that the period of infancy has always been comparatively very long; and it seems to me highly probable that with primitive man, as with the anthropoids, the large quantities of food which he required on account of his size were a hindrance to a permanently gregarious mode of life and therefore made family relations the more useful for the preservation of the offspring. There are even now many low savages 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, and may remain separated from the common group 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 much more favoured by nature.[1] I have expressly emphasised that it is on the factors now stated, 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 men.[2] I have therefore not been quite guilty of the mistake, imputed to me by Dr. Zuckerman, of attempting " to infer the mating habits of the first men from those of the gorilla ".[3] And when he says it is doubtful " whether the fact that the gorilla lives in family groups strengthens the view that the most primitive form of human society is—as Westermarck contends on the basis of existing records—the monogamous family unit of food-gathering peoples ",[4]

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 68. When I said that this is found to be the case also among the Australian aborigines, I expressly pointed out that I spoke not of their social organisation in general, but of their actual manner of living (*ibid.* i. 64 *sq.*). Hence I need not be told by Dr. Briffault (*op. cit.* i. 197 n. 3) that " nowhere is the clan organisation of society more definite than in Australia ".

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 69.

[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 25.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 24.

he ascribes to me a view which I do not hold. I said in my book that the gorilla has been found both in monogamous and polygamous family groups,[1] and I did not say that the most primitive form of human society is the monogamous family. As Dr. Zuckerman also has quoted Professor Elliot Smith in his criticism, I shall make a quotation from the same authority: "The family is the grouping invariably formed in the absence of an alien influence not only in human communities but also in the man-like apes. It is thus the social unit that gives expression to man's innate tendencies".[2] Yet, after all, Dr. Zuckerman himself comes to the conclusion that the family existed with primitive man because it exists among all other primates. "In the life of the monkey", he says, "one may see a crude picture of the social level from which our earliest human ancestors emerged. . . . The permanent sexual association of human beings is a characteristic common to all primates".[3] He adds, however, that the family unit in man differs from that of the sub-human primate in this respect, that "at the lowest level, according to most authorities, the family of human society was monogamous", whereas "there is the monkey or ape with its harem".[4] This difference is not so distinct as he suggests. As we have seen, monogamous family groups are very frequent with the chimpanzee and gorilla, while the orang-utan and some gibbons have been represented as strictly monogamous. On the other hand, polygyny is very prevalent among such a low race as the Australian aborigines. But this is a matter of minor importance in comparison with Dr. Zuckerman's agreement with my conclusion that the family consisting of parents and children existed with primitive man.

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 33 *sqq.*
[2] Elliot Smith, *Human History* (London, 1930), p. 254.
[3] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* pp. 26, 316. [4] *Ibid.* p. 315 *sq.*

Dr. Briffault is of a totally different opinion. According to him "the earliest human assemblages must . . . have been derived from animal groups belonging to the type of the animal family; they were not the manifestations of the sexual impulses of the male, but of the maternal instincts of the female". At the same time it is impossible to suppose that human society consisted, in the first stages of its development, of small isolated groups. "That the social human group should be much larger than the animal family is a condition of human progress. All that is involved in human evolution postulates a much larger group than the family". How, then, came those larger groups to be formed? It has commonly been taken for granted from ancient times until the present (Dr. Briffault quotes Cicero and myself) that they have originated through the aggregation of a number of families, and that these continue distinct within the larger group. There is nothing, he says, to justify such an assumption. "Whenever, among animals, such an assemblage of a large number of families takes place even temporarily, the family grouping tends to be broken up, and the constitution of [the] larger group lapses into that of the promiscuous herd". But this is certainly not true of the larger groups of the primates. As already said, they are formed by the aggregation of a number of families consisting of male, female or females, and young, and, according to Dr. Zuckerman, there are no sexually promiscuous bands of monkeys and apes. Even the baboons, which seem to be the most gregarious of the sub-human primates, "are not promiscuous. Very few observations have been made of females having relations with males other than their overlords".[1]

Dr. Briffault argues that there is only one way whereby the feminine constitution of the family could have been maintained, while it expanded at the same

[1] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* pp. 228, 315.

time into a larger assemblage, namely, by the sons leaving the group, and the daughters remaining and pairing with males from some other group. That arrangement he takes to be the one which was adopted by nascent humanity. The most general rule governing the organisation of primitive social groups is the rule that marriages shall not take place within the group, but always with a member of another group. "The manner in which that rule is carried out in a large number of primitive societies and was . . . in all probability observed originally by all, is by the males either leaving the parental group and being adopted into the group to which their wives belong, and living with them, or simply visiting them while they continue to live in their own group. In either case the daughters do not leave the family group in which they were born".[1] "All animals may be said to be, in so far as they form sexual associations, matrilocal in their habits. It is then natural to infer that the habits of primitive humanity were the same". The determination of the dwelling-place by the female is the rule among animals; it is the female, and not the male, who chooses a suitable lair or shelter for the rearing of her brood, and the male accommodates himself to those requirements, and when associating with the female seeks her in her abode".[2] Now, does Dr. Briffault really mean that this holds true also of the apes, who are of particular interest in the present connection? It is well known that they are nomadic, moving from place to place in search of food: the orang-utan, the chimpanzee, and the gorilla construct nests as sleeping-places, but these are not occupied for more than one night.[3] How, then,

[1] Briffault, *op cit.* i. 201 *sq.* [2] *Ibid.* i. 306.

[3] R. M. and Ada W. Yerkes, *op. cit.* p. 542; F. Alverdes, *Social Life in the Animal World* (London, 1927), p. 50 *sq.*; Zuckerman, *op. cit.* p. 176 *sq.*; Burbridge, *op. cit.* p. 199 (gorilla); Volz, *Im Dämmer des Rimba*, p. 57 (orang-utan).

could they be said to be matrilocal in their sexual associations? "Females attract males and males attract females", says Dr. Zuckerman; "the naturalistic literature provides enough illustrations to indicate that females do seek the males".[1]

The matrilocal marriage—which is of frequent occurrence, but certainly not, as Dr. Briffault alleges, "a custom of almost universal distribution",[2] in uncultured societies—is thus regarded by him as a continuation of the animal family consisting of mother and young. But the difference between them is great indeed: in the matrilocal marriage there is an interfering factor, unknown among animals, namely, the influence of the woman's family. With good reason Dr. Starcke remarks that it is due to the unwillingness of her family to part with one of its members.[3] It is remarkably rare among low hunters and food-gatherers. In Australia there is but the very slenderest evidence of matrilocal marriage, even where descent is reckoned through the mother;[4] Spencer and Gillen write, "In no Australian tribe, so far as we know, is it the custom for a man to take up his abode with the family of his wife and to work for them".[5] On the other hand, it is most frequent among agricultural tribes, presumably because among simple peoples agriculture devolves very largely on the women.[6] Dr. Briffault argues that the practice of matrilocal marriage has left clear traces of

[1] Zuckerman, *op. cit.* pp. 31, 65.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 268.

[3] C. N. Starcke, *The Primitive Family in its Origin and Development* (London, 1889), p. 79 *sq.*

[4] N. W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia* (Cambridge, 1906), p. 16 *sq.*

[5] B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), p. 470.

[6] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 297; my book, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. (London, 1912), p. 634.

its former prevalence among almost all those peoples whose marriages are nowadays patrilocal; thus a large number of them have the practice of reckoning descent, not from the father, but from the mother.[1] It is true that this practice prevails in nearly all cases where marriage is matrilocal,[2] but this does not prove that matrilocal marriage once prevailed among all peoples who now trace descent in the female line. Dr. Briffault says that an attenuated relic of matrilocal marriage survives among ourselves in " the custom of partaking of the wedding lunch at the bride's house ".[3] This, then, would also be a remnant of the animal family consisting of mother and young.

Dr. Briffault not only denies the prevalence of the family consisting of male, female or females, and young among apes, but asserts that it is only the uncritical disposition to regard existing institutions as rooted in the foundations of nature that has led " theorists in pre-scientific days " to regard it as the original unit of primitive society. This, he maintains, is quite contrary to the fact that the family is even nowadays, in many instances, scarcely found to exist as a solidary and recognised group. In support of this assertion[4] he chiefly quotes cases which imply little more than the tracing of descent from the mother; or such evidence as the statements that the Yakut have no word for the concept of " family ", except the word " uru ", which means marriage ", or that when the term " family " is applied in connection with East African natives in general, it is " used to convey an idea essentially different from the construction put upon it in modern society ". If, however, Dr. Briffault had quoted also the following sentence of his authority, the reader would have found that the one quoted by him means

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 307 *sq.*
[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 296 *sq.*
[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 303.
[4] *Ibid.* i. 505 *sqq.*

something essentially different from the construction he puts upon it in the present connection: "To us the matrimonial bond is generally supposed to be the uniting of two persons who have a deep affection the one for the other; in the African bush no such conception is harboured by anybody".[1]

It is significant that all the cases in Dr. Briffault's list of peoples among whom the family is "scarcely found to exist as a solidary and recognised group", refer to more or less advanced savages, except two, and these are quite misleading. "Among the Congo Pygmies", he says, "the social group consists of brothers and sisters, and in several camps no husbands and no wives may be found. The men visit their sexual partners in another camp". His authority is Le Roy, who was told by an old Congo Pygmy: "Nous vivons en famille de manière que, dans chaque campement, il n'y ait qu'un chef qui est le père de tout les autres, qui commande et qui est obéi. Là aussi il n'y a que des frères et des sœurs. Le jeune homme qui veut se marier va chercher sa femme au loin, et il se fait plus tard avec sa femme et ses enfants un nouveau campement".[2] According to Schebesta batches of families, joined by kinship, cling together in groups, and appoint the oldest of their members as a sort of overlord. "In the family the father is the head and his authority is recognised by the children, as long as they remain in the bosom of the family". The women-folk marry into a different family group.[3] This refers particularly to the Ituri Pygmies, of whom David also says that they live in patriarchal groups.[4] Hutereau states that among

[1] F. S. Joelson, *The Tanganyika Territory* (London, 1920), p. 113.

[2] Le Roy, 'Les Pygmées', in *Les Missions catholiques*, xxix. (Lyon, 1897), p. 102.

[3] P. Schebesta, *Among Congo Pigmies* (London, 1933), p. 121.

[4] J. David, 'Notizen uber die Pygmäen des Ituriwaldes', in *Globus*, lxxxvi. (Braunschweig, 1904), p. 196.

most bands of the Batua, or Pygmies, of Tanganyika, "les familles se composent du père, de la mère, des filles et des gendres. . . . Dans ces tribus les filles continuent, même étant mariées, à vivre chez leurs parents et les gendres, passant au groupement dont fait partie leur femme, viennent se mettre sous les ordres du père de celle-ci. . . . Les Batua étant un peuple nomade, la femme doit suivre son mari partout où il lui plaît. La mode est quelquefois renversée et dans certains groupes c'est le mari qui doit suivre sa femme". Children inherit their fathers.[1] Stuhlmann found "villages", consisting of a very variable number of huts.[2] 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.[3] According to Casati, the huts serving as family dwellings are usually scattered in the forests, or over the hills, but he also found a good many families living without any shelter at all.[4]

No less extraordinary is the other instance of savages at the lowest grade of culture that Dr. Briffault mentions in support of his thesis that the family composed of both parents and their children, which in "pre-scientific days" was looked upon as the original unit of human society, "is somewhat elusive in its more primitive stages". His instance consists of the brief statement that the Fuegians "are devoid of all family bonds". This is a quotation from Bove, who then uses the word "family" in the wider sense of a kinship group; for in the next sentence he writes, "Each family enjoys the greatest independence, and only the

[1] A. Hutereau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo belge* (Bruxelles, 1909), pp. 3, 5 *sqq.*

[2] F. Stuhlmann, *Mit Emin Pascha ins Herz von Afrika* (Berlin, 1894), p. 449.

[3] W. Schmidt, *Die Stellung der Pygmäenvölker in der Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen* (Stuttgart, 1910), pp. 61, 62, 187, 192.

[4] G. Casati, *Ten Years in Equatoria*, i. (London, 1891), p. 157 *sq.*

necessity of a common defence induces a few families to form a small tribe ".[1] All other authorities likewise speak of the family as the chief, if not the only, stable unit among the Fuegians.[2] Bishop Stirling says, " Get outside the family, and relationships are doubtful, if not hostile ".[3] With reference to the Yahgans, who live in the southern part of the archipelago, Hyades writes, " La famille est bien constituée, mais la tribu n'existe pas, à proprement parler ".[4] Mr. T. Bridges, who knew the Yahgans more intimately than any other white man, gave me in a letter 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. . . . 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 states that " family influence is the one great tie which binds these natives together, and the one great preventive of violence ".[5] 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, Gallardo writes that they lead a nomadic life in bands the size of which depends on the

[1] G. Bove, *Patagonia. Terra del Fuoco. Mari Australi* (Genova, 1883), p. 134.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 54 *sqq.* See also J. M. Cooper, *Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego and Adjacent Territory* (Washington, 1917), p. 178.

[3] W. H. Stirling, ' A Residence in Tierra del Fuego ', in *The South American Missionary Magazine*, iv. (London, 1870), p. 11.

[4] P. Hyades, ' Ethnographie des Fuégiens ', in *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, ser. iii. vol. x. (Paris, 1887), p. 333.

[5] T. Bridges, ' Manners and Customs of the Firelanders ', in *A Voice for South America*, xiii. (London, 1866), p. 204.

supply of food, but that every man is the chief of his family and is obeyed by its members.[1]

Dr. Briffault further alleges that the group which was at one time supposed to be the original unit of human society "not only does . . . not exist as a psychological, juridic, or social unit; it frequently does not exist as a physical association. It is common in primitive society for husband and wife not to live together". The evidence he produces for this[2] also refers almost exclusively to peoples who have advanced beyond the lowest level of culture; we even find statements like these: "In Africa, husband and wife do not live together in the same hut"; "There is no common life between husband and wife in China"; "In Korea 'family life as we have it is quite unknown'". The primitive hunters and food-gatherers are only represented by the Australian natives and the Andamanese. Of the former he says that "the women and the men have each their own camp and live quite separately". In support of this assertion he refers to Spencer and Gillen. They say nothing of the kind, but state on the contrary that in a camp of natives in the centre of Australia "each family, consisting of a man and one or more wives and children, accompanied always by dogs, occupies a *mia-mia*, which is merely a lean-to of shrubs".[3] There are similar statements relating to many other tribes.[4] Curr remarks that among the Bangerang in Victoria, and all other tribes he knows, each married couple had their own hut, although unmarried men and boys of eight or ten years and upwards lived together, and separate from their parents

[1] C. R. Gallardo, *Tierra del Fuego—Los Onas* (Buenos Aires, 1910), p. 207 *sq.*

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 508 *sqq.*

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* p. 18.

[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 66. See also B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (London, 1913), p. 119.

and sisters in the bachelors' camp.[1] Concerning the Gournditch-mara in Victoria, Howitt says that "each family camped by itself".[2] Of the Kabi and Wakka tribes in Queensland, Mathew writes 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".[3] Dr. Briffault asserts that among the Andamanese the men and the women keep to themselves in parties of their own sex. His authority is Portman, who writes: "The wives are practically slaves to their husbands, for whom they have to perform all the drudgery. They acquiesce in this, and keep together in parties of their own sex".[4] This, of course, does not mean that there is no "physical association" between husband and wife, nor that they do not live together. Professor Radcliffe-Brown says of the same people that in their "social organisation the family is of great importance. A family is constituted by a permanent union between one man and one woman. In one of its aspects this union is a sexual one".[5]

It is characteristic of the method with which Dr. Briffault handles ethnological evidence that he completely ignores my large collection of facts, covering many pages, which conclusively shows 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

[1] E. M. Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria* (Melbourne, &c., 1883), pp. 259, 277.

[2] L. Fison and A. W. Howitt, *Kamilaroi and Kurnai* (Melbourne & Sydney, 1880), p. 278.

[3] J. Mathew, *Two Representative Tribes of Queensland* (London, 1910), p. 153.

[4] M. V. Portman, *A History of Our Relations with the Andamanese* (Calcutta, 1899), p. 34.

[5] A. R. Brown, *The Andaman Islanders* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 70.

children is a very well marked social unit.[1] Its world-wide prevalence has more recently been affirmed by Professor Malinowski, who has a most intimate personal experience of matrilineal savages. He writes: "The typical family, a group consisting of mother, father and their progeny, is found in all communities, savage, barbarous and civilised; everywhere it plays an important rôle and influences the whole extent of social organisation and culture. . . . In no ethnographic area is the family absent as a domestic institution. . . . It is an undeniable fact that the family is universal and sociologically more important than the clan which, in the evolution of humanity, it preceded and outlasted".[2]

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 54 *sqq.*

[2] B. Malinowski, 'Kinship', in *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiii. (London, 1929), pp. 404, 405, 408.

II

PRE-NUPTIAL CHASTITY

How, then, does Dr. Briffault explain the origin of the human family consisting of both parents and their children, and of the more or less durable association between the sexes called marriage, which has led to it? Sentiments of tenderness and affection between the sexes, he says, are not originally connected with the sexual impulse, but with the mating instinct, which is not only distinct from, but antagonistic to, the sexual instinct; and the mating instinct, which leads to prolonged association, "appears to play in primitive humanity a scarcely more important part than among mammals generally".[1] "Individual marriage has its foundation in economic relations. In the vast majority of uncultured societies marriage is regarded almost exclusively in the light of economic considerations". But individual economic association between sexual partners has inevitably tended to establish individual sexual claims, and these claims have brought about new restrictions on sexual relations besides the old exogamic ones. (If there is antagonism between sexual relations and prolonged association, and marriage has its foundation in economic relations, I find it difficult to see why it is not concluded between persons of the same sex rather than between persons of different sex.) "The married woman tends in time to be prohibited or tabued to all but her individual associate. In comparatively advanced stages of social development the betrothal of females in infancy, more especially in the

[1] R. Briffault, *The Mothers*, i. (London, 1927), pp. 121, 125, 141.

case of chiefs and of aristocratic classes, has led to a retrospective operation of the restriction upon their sexual freedom, and to the demand that a bride shall be a virgin". But "in all uncultured societies, where advanced retrospective claims have not become developed, and the females are not regularly betrothed or actually married before they have reached the age of puberty, girls and women who are not married are under no restrictions as to their sexual relations, and are held to be entirely free to dispose of themselves as they please in that respect. To that rule there does not exist any known exception. Were any authenticated instance known of a primitive society, uninfluenced by the usages and sentiments of a more highly developed culture, where chastity is regarded as obligatory on unmarried or unbetrothed females, the fact would be of momentous importance. For we should be compelled to regard it as an example of the appearance in mankind, apart from social causes, of a sentiment entirely absent in animals; and we should therefore have no option than to account for it by some form of the theories which were current before scientific conceptions and methods had become applied to the development of the human race"—the theories that the origin of man was due to a special creation, and that the primitive state of mankind was one of primal virtue and moral perfection.[1]

The theory of a primitive moral and religious revelation was once supposed to be corroborated by observations made by Father Lafitau and other Jesuit missionaries concerning the manners and customs, including the sexual habits, of the American natives, who, owing to their isolation in the New World, might be regarded as apt representatives of uncivilised humanity. To the intelligent interest of these Jesuit Fathers, says Dr. Briffault, the science of comparative social anthropology owes to a large extent its origin.

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 1 *sqq.*

But subsequently, " the doctrine of organic evolution changed completely the theoretical premises of social anthropology, and, shortly after that doctrine was established by Darwin, a galaxy of brilliant and distinguished scholars placed the social history of the human race upon a scientific basis by showing that the organisation of primitive society and the conceptions upon which it was founded differed profoundly from those obtaining in modern European society, and that the institutions and corresponding conceptions and sentiments obtaining in the latter were the result of a gradual development from a state of society in which they did not originally exist ". Then, however, there was a revival of the doctrines of the old Jesuit theologians, " set forth by Dr. Westermarck with an industry in the collection of bibliographical references which outdid that of all previous writers, and with a dialectical adroitness not unworthy of the reputation of his noted predecessors; and the effect produced on a portion of the scientific public by those qualities, together with the appeal which any attempt to discredit the conclusions of evolutionary science was sure of making to the popular prejudices of the period, have caused those views to exercise for a long time an enormous influence ". After this pathetic introduction Dr. Briffault launches on an examination of the collection of statements brought together by me " in support of the conceptions of the moral theology of the last century " and " in support of Father Lafitau's thesis ". But he at once quiets the uneasiness of those readers who believe in the doctrine of evolution by the initial assurance that " such an examination shows that the number of relevant statements of the kind which we have no means of checking is, indeed, exceedingly small ". He has also adduced an evolutionary argument against me by saying that I have " not offered any examples of regard for chastity amongst monkeys ", and that " there would

therefore be no alternative but to account for those sentiments by the supposition of a special revelation ".[1] It is Dr. Briffault then and not myself who agrees with Father Lafitau's theory that regard for chastity among primitive people would presuppose a moral and religious revelation; the difference between them is only a matter of fact, not a matter of theory.

In my book on the history of marriage I dealt with the question of chastity in my criticism of the hypothesis of primitive promiscuity, which was in vogue among that school of scholars who, according to Dr. Briffault, " placed the history of the human race upon a scientific basis ", but was not shared by Darwin. I commenced my work as a faithful adherent of that hypothesis, 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. But I had not proceeded far 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. When writing my book I was thoroughly dominated by the doctrine of organic evolution; in my criticism of Darwin's theory of sexual selection I was even more Darwinian than the master himself, attributing a larger scope to natural selection than he had done. I am therefore perplexed by Dr. Briffault's attempt to represent me as an upholder of old theological doctrines (graciously admitting, however, that I have " not expressly repudiated the doctrine of organic evolution "[2]) and by the bitterness of his attack. He, also, is a believer in organic evolution; he has followed me in applying biological methods to

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 13 *sqq.*
[2] *Ibid.* i. 611 *sq.*; ii. 15.

human social origins, although he is violently opposed to my thesis of a patriarchal family grouping among apes, which has subsequently received such ample confirmation from the detailed investigations of the Yerkes and Zuckerman. Nay, he even rejects the idea of a primitive state of promiscuity.[1]

I discussed sexual relations between unmarried people because several supporters of the theory of primitive promiscuity thought they could detect in them survivals from a time when marriage did not exist. They argued that, side by side with marriage, promiscuity is even now found among savages in all parts of the world, very frequently not as a mere fact but as a practice permitted by custom, and that consequently sexual intercourse must originally have been unchecked.

I admitted, of course, that among very many uncivilised peoples both sexes enjoy perfect freedom previous to marriage. Instances of this had been stated by myself as well as by other writers, and "I could fill pages with fresh materials at my disposal". But I pointed out that, in looking at the facts a little more closely, we find that many of them could not in any circumstances be regarded as relics of primitive promiscuity. I quoted, first, various reports to show that this pre-nuptial freedom "is not always primitive", but in certain cases due to contact with civilised races;[2] and Dr. Briffault has not been able to disprove this very guarded statement. He accuses me of associating the absence of extra-connubial restrictions in primitive societies with prostitution.[3] Many of the reports quoted by me are most certainly free from any such confusion; but on the other hand it should be noticed that when travellers speak of unchastity in native women, their statements may easily be based on little else than

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 611 *sq.*; ii. 15.
[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. (London, 1921) p. 126 *sqq.*
[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 65.

the behaviour of women who have offered themselves to foreigners for mercenary purposes. In support of my remark that pre-nuptial freedom is in certain cases due to contact with civilised races, some fresh facts may be added. Sir Basil Thomson's statement—commented upon by Dr. Briffault[1]—to the effect that in the heathen times the majority of Fijian girls were virgins until they married or entered into concubinage, is corroborated by Mr. Hocart's account of the answer given by a Lauan to the accusation of morality being very lax among his people. "Formerly", he said, "young women used to stay in the father's house, and not go about, or if they went about it was in company. Now they go and sleep in the young men's dormitories and take no notice of their parents' admonitions".[2] The great freedom of intercourse which is nowadays tolerated among the Hottentots did not exist until the immigration of white people brought about a change of ancestral custom. Formerly pre-marital unchastity was severely condemned and even penalised among them. A girl who had gone wrong was thrashed by her parents, or with their consent, in the presence of her lover, who then received a similar punishment. These beatings were administered under the direction of the head of the camp, and thus received the stamp of publicity and recognised usage.[3] Professor and Mrs. Seligman tell us of the Azande in the Nilotic Sudan that their morality disapproves of any sexual intercourse outside marriage, but that "with the institution of European rule there has been a weakening of the sanctions enforcing chastity", and that "love affairs both with married and unmarried girls are therefore

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 55 *sq.*

[2] A. M. Hocart, *Lau Islands, Fiji* (Honolulu, 1929), p. 155 *sq.*

[3] L. Schultze, *Aus Namaland und Kalahari* (Jena, 1907), pp. 298, 319; I. Schapera, *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa* (London, 1930), p. 241 *sq.*

more frequent ".[1] I have myself witnessed in Morocco the deteriorating influence that European civilisation has in recent years exercised on the chastity of native women.

Secondly, I showed that pre-nuptial freedom 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. Instances of this kind are not promiscuity;[2] nor do they, if representing true customs, give support to Dr. Briffault's dictum that in uncultured societies unmarried women are held to be entirely free to dispose of themselves as they please with regard to their sexual relations. He alleges that there do not exist in primitive societies any " preliminaries to sexual relations ", nor " any pre-nuptial state corresponding to a period of courtship ". In support of this he refers to the absence of the habit of kissing, and quotes four reports, three of which directly contradict his statements, whilst according to the fourth " courtship as such does not exist " among the Ibos of Nigeria.[3] If he cares to consult what Dr. Havelock Ellis and myself have said on the subject, he will find how badly informed he is about love-making among savages.[4]

I pointed out that pre-nuptial relations among simple peoples do not always have the said character, but that

[1] C. G. and Brenda Z. Seligman, *Pagan Tribes of the Nilotic Sudan* (London, 1932), p. 516.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 131 *sqq.*

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 142. He also produces a curious *a priori* argument against the prevalence of love-making in primitive societies (*ibid.* i. 560 *sq.*).

[4] H. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, iii. (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 41 *sqq.*; *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 469 *sqq.*

we have too many and too positive statements to the contrary to allow any doubt as to the existence of extra-matrimonial promiscuity among them.[1] "Yet however commonly pre-nuptial chastity be disregarded in the savage world, we must not suppose that such 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".[2] Of the instances I adduced in support of this general statement Dr. Briffault says that in several of them "the fact that the reverse of what is suggested by Dr. Westermarck is the case is established beyond doubt", and that "in other instances the authorities referred to by him do not say what he ascribes to them, and sometimes they say the exact opposite".[3] I can certainly not guarantee the accuracy of all the statements I have quoted, nor can Dr. Briffault do the same with reference to those quoted by him in order to show that my authorities are wrong. I have not checked his numerous references, with the exception of those which are intended to prove that the authorities referred to by me do not say what I ascribe to them, or "say the exact opposite". And I must confess that the result of this examination is not quite reassuring as to the accuracy of the rest of his references.

Dr. Briffault says that I introduce the Eskimo in my list "with a reference to some of the natives of the long christianised districts of eastern Greenland", which is, on my own showing, emphatically contradicted.[4] But my authorities were in the first place Hans Egede, called

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 136 *sqq.*
[2] *Ibid.* i. 138 *sqq.*
[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 29. [4] *Ibid.* ii. 30.

" the apostle of the Greenlanders ", who lived among them as a missionary in the earlier half of the eighteenth century and speaks of them from fifteen years' experience, and Dalager, not a missionary, whose account also dates from that century. Then I wrote: " Modern accounts are less favourable. Holm says (in an article published in 1886) that on the east coast of Greenland (which had then been long christianised) it is no disgrace for an unmarried girl to get a child, but that it is a disgrace for a married woman to get none. Other Eskimo are equally indifferent to the chastity of their girls ".

Dr. Briffault writes: " Dr. Westermarck gives a list of references concerning various tribes of North America, and he asserts that in the passages indicated 'we read that the girls were chaste and carefully guarded' (even this short quotation from me is inaccurate: I said " chaste *or* carefully guarded ", which is a rather different thing). . . . Father Morice is accused by Dr. Westermarck of stating that untruth concerning 'various Déné tribes'. What Father Morice says on the subject is that the Déné have no word for a virgin ". This linguistic deficiency, however, is not meant to imply what Dr. Briffault suggests, by detaching the statement from its context.[1] Father Morice writes: " The Dénés have no more proper name for a virgin than the Hebrews of old. The latter . . . called such a person one hidden away . . . ; to the Carriers the same is . . . one that stays apart ". He adds that among the Déné the puberty of a girl gave rise to various observances, exactly the same as among the Jews, and, in the west at least, as strictly observed as among the latter. One was that " even at the expiration of her menstrual discharges, she remained in a state of mitigated seclusion until the time of her marriage "; another was that " she was under the guardianship of a close relative,

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 30 *sq.*

who was responsible for her conduct and whose duty it was to avenge any wrong done to her ".[1] Dr. Briffault quotes Father Morice's references to Father Demers, according to whom " promiscuity seems to enjoy an uncontroverted right " and " they outdo animals by the infamy of their conduct ";[2] and to M'Lean, who states that " the lewdness of the Carrier women cannot possibly be carried to a greater excess ", and that " they are addicted to the most abominable practices, abandoning themselves in early youth to the free indulgence of their passions ".[3] But he omits to say that these statements refer, not to the Dénés in general, but to those of Fort Alexandria, to whom, according to Father Morice, " the whites had given all their vices without communicating any of their virtues ".[4] As to the morals of the Dénés while still in their aboriginal state, Father Morice writes that " their standard varied considerably according to the tribes. Some, like the Sékauais and generally all the mountain or intermediate Dénés, remain as chaste in their private lives as the members of any civilised community, if not more so "; whereas others, " perhaps the majority, had but little regard for chastity, though they never quite stooped to the licentiousness of the allophylic North Pacific races ".[5] To the latter statement I also referred in my book. Who, then, has spoken the " untruth " about the Déné tribes, as represented by Father Morice—Dr. Briffault or myself?

In my list of North American Indians whose girls

[1] A. G. Morice, 'The Great Déné Race', in *Anthropos*, v. (Wien, 1910), pp. 971, 969.

[2] *Idem*, *The History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* (Toronto, 1904), p. 228.

[3] J. M'Lean, *Notes of a Twenty-five Years' Service in the Hudson's Bay Territory*, i. (London, 1849), p. 300.

[4] Morice, *op. cit.* p. 228.

[5] *Idem*, 'The Great Déné Race', in *Anthropos*, ii. (Salzburg, 1907), p. 32.

are said to be chaste or guarded I referred to Hearne, Schoolcraft, and Catlin. After quoting the latter part of a sentence from Hearne with reference to the Chipewayan girls, Dr. Briffault makes the comment that the "guarding" spoken of was doubtless against strangers.[1] The full sentence contradicts definitely this interpretation; it runs thus: "From the early age of eight or nine years they (that is, the girls) are prohibited by custom from joining in the amusements with children of the opposite sex; so that when sitting in their tents, or even when travelling, they are watched and guarded with such an unremitting attention as cannot be exceeded by the most rigid discipline of an English boarding-school".[2] Dr. Briffault alleges that Schoolcraft does "not say a word about Nez Percés girls being 'chaste or carefully guarded'. What Major Alvord says in the passage indicated by Dr. Westermarck is that 'their laws against prostitution are very severe upon the women'. The reference is apparently to married women, and by 'prostitution' is in all probability meant commerce with Europeans".[3] Yet Major Alvord expressly states that the women "are generally remarkable for their chastity"; but according to Dr. Briffault's interpretation of the term "women", it does not refer to the girls if the women are said to be chaste, whereas, if they are represented as unchaste, he seems gladly to include the girls too. Major Alvord also observes that "remarkable simplicity and purity of conduct and manners exist among some of the tribes most remote from the whites".[4] Concerning Catlin's report, to which I referred as testifying the observance

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 31 n. 4.

[2] S. Hearne, *A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort to the Northern Ocean* (Dublin, 1796), p. 311.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 35.

[4] H. R. Schoolcraft, *Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge*, v. (Philadelphia, 1860), p. 654.

of chastity by Mandan girls of respectable families, Dr. Briffault alleges that he makes no reference to such a thing, but that " all that is contained in his statement is the very moderate claim that the chastity of some of the ' women ', among the ' more respectable families ', was satisfactory ".[1] But what Catlin says is that " amongst the respectable families, virtue is as highly cherished and as inapproachable as in any society whatever ".[2] How in the world can this be twisted into an assertion that refers only to married women?

Dr. Briffault blames me for including in my list of peoples that require pre-nuptial chastity natives of Mexico who have long been Christians, such as the Tepehuane.[3] My authority, Dr. Lumholtz, says that these Indians " have not given up their own ancient religion ", and that " evidently the tribe always entertained extreme views regarding the relation of the sexes toward each other, or else the spirit of the new law would never have been imbibed so eagerly ".[4] This conclusion is the more justified since other Christian Indians in Mexico, like the Tarahumare, to whom Dr. Briffault himself refers,[5] do not require chastity of their girls. Professor Karsten, who has lived among different South American tribes for five years as a student of their customs, writes that the morals of the free Indians seemed to him very high, especially if compared with the morals of the half-civilised and nominally Christian Indians, and that manifest immorality among them is much rarer than in civilised societies; this also refers to the wild Jibaros of Ecuador, whose sexual relations both before and after marriage, according to Dr. Briffault,

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 35.

[2] G. Catlin, *Illustrations of the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indians*, i. (London, 1876), p. 121.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 16 n. 2.

[4] C. Lumholtz, *Unknown Mexico*, i. (London, 1903), pp. 462, 465.

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 4, 20.

"approach to complete promiscuity".[1] Professor Karsten expressly contrasts the morality of the tribes whom he learned to know in tropical South America with the great sexual liberty allowed to young people before marriage among the Chaco tribes.[2] The statements made by Whiffen and Hardenburg, which I quote in my book, may then, after all, not deserve that supercilious ridicule which Dr. Briffault casts upon them.[3]

With reference to my list of African peoples who are said to have regard for pre-nuptial chastity, Dr. Briffault remarks that "as regards the majority of those peoples the statement is entirely irrelevant, plainly incorrect, or definitely contradicted". He eliminates instances "so obviously irrelevant as regards primitive social conditions as the Muhammedan populations of North Africa and of the Sudan".[4] Nevertheless he includes the Algerian natives in his own list of peoples, which is intended to prove his assertion that in uncultured societies girls and unmarried women are under no restrictions as to their sexual relations;[5] and throws doubt upon the accuracy of my statements about the Berbers,[6] which are based partly on Hanoteau's and Letourneux's classical work on the Kabyles of Algeria and partly on my own researches in Morocco, extending over many years. He objects to my reference to the Yoruba and other peoples of the Gold Coast and Slave Coast of West Africa, and says I myself admit that the claim to chastity is confined to cases in which a girl has been betrothed in infancy, and to aristocratic families;[7] but my "admission" refers to the Yoruba

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 20.

[2] R. Karsten, *Bland Indianer i Ekvadors urskogar* (Helsingfors, 1921), p. 324; *idem*, *Indian Tribes of the Argentine and Bolivian Chaco* (*Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commutationes Humanarum Litterarum*, iv. 1; Helsingfors, 1932), p. 53.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 37.

[4] *Ibid.* ii. 38 *sq.*

[5] *Ibid.* ii. 7.

[6] *Ibid.* ii. 16 n. 1.

[7] *Ibid.* ii. 39.

only, and my statements as regards the other peoples, implying that the absence of the *primitiae* is *ipso facto* a reason for repudiating a bride, he has not tried to contest. The same is the case with many other statements, quoted by me, relating to African peoples, which show that girls are not "entirely free to dispose of themselves as they please" so far as sexual relations are concerned. Concerning the Herero Dr. Briffault objects that while I reproduce from Professor Kohler's article the statement of the Government official Bensen to the effect that it is considered a shame to the parents of a girl if she loses her virtue, I omit the statement contained in the same paragraph that no punishment attaches to pre-nuptial unchastity. It seems to me more objectionable that Dr. Briffault omits Meyer's statement, contained in the following paragraph, that the Herero attach much value to the chastity of their girls, and that a seducer who impregnates a girl is severely punished and may even lose his life. Kohler's curious "summing up of the evidence" of those two correspondents by saying that girls among the Herero are free, in principle, to dispose of themselves, is certainly not worth quoting.[1] The statements concerning the Bushmen are conflicting.[2] Miss Bleek was told by a woman that among the Naron "a girl may do as she pleases, but a married woman may not".[3] Kaufmann reports of the Auin that pre-nuptial intercourse hardly ever seems to occur.[4] Lebzelter writes of the Kung that chastity is insisted upon before marriage.[5]

[1] J. Kohler, 'Das Recht der Herero', in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv. (Stuttgart, 1900), p. 304.

[2] *Cf.* Schapera, *op. cit.* p. 102 *sq.*

[3] D. F. Bleek, *The Naron* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 32.

[4] H. Kaufmann, 'Die Auin', in *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, xxiii. (Berlin, 1910), p. 156.

[5] V. Lebzelter, 'Bei den !Kuñ-Buschleuten am oberen Omuramba und Ovambo (Südwestafrika)', in *Sitzungsberichte der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 1928-1929, p. [16].

To my earlier evidence relating to pre-nuptial chastity among various African peoples I may add the following quotation from Torday, a recognised authority on African ethnology: " Among the Eastern Bantu many tribes insist on tangible proofs of the bride's virginity. Betrothed Pedi girls must keep absolutely pure, and in some clans they must undergo, on the day of their marriage, physical examination at the hands of the husband's old female relatives to prove their virginity. Among the Wahehe an old woman is delegated to inspect the bed-cloth after the nuptials and sets up a triumphant shout if all is well. The definitive engagement of a Chagga girl may be preceded by an inspection, and if she is found wanting she is driven away through a hole in the back wall of the hut. Such a girl will have to content herself with becoming the junior wife of some polygynist. Even among the Western Bantu we find that a Yaka husband will repudiate a wife who is not a virgin when he marries her".[1] But although in the greatest part of Africa west of the Great Lakes no importance is attached to tangible virginity, " that does not mean that girls grow up to be anything but respectable matrons or that their mothers do not supervise them. In Loango ' a youth durst not speak to a girl except in her mother's presence ', and ' the crime of a maiden 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 to the king '. Among the Pangwe ' a girl who disgraces her family by wantonness, is banished from her clan, and, in case of seduction, the man is severely flogged '. In Mayombe there is a special disease with which immature girls are threatened should they fornicate, and matrons will put the juice of capsicum into the eyes of lads ' who have taken too great liberties with the

[1] E. Torday, ' The Principles of Bantu Marriage ', in *Africa*, ii. (London, 1929), p. 258.

girls '. Perhaps the ' too ' is the most significant part of this statement. There seems to be a rule of ' thus far and no farther '. Kaffir women are, on the good authority of Barrow, chaste and extremely modest, yet it is a common custom among the Amazulu that a betrothed couple indulge in frequent surreptitious, but unconsummated, intercourse".[1] For the authorities in the various cases the reader is referred to Torday's article. Speaking of some Bantu tribes of East Africa, Dundas states that " in Ugoni the seducer of a girl had formerly to pay ten to fifteen goats—that is to say, more than the penalty for adultery. Among the Wamakonde the offence was punished as adultery unless the parents had given their consent. The Wasangu punished the seducer by plundering him and all his family. Where a young couple consort sexually it is generally understood that they must subsequently marry. Such is the strict rule among the Wabunga. In practice such relations are in fact and invariably only a prelude to marriage. . . . In Ukarra a pregnant girl is banished from the island and can never be married. Elsewhere the value put on chastity appears from the price set on virginity, which is sometimes deducted from the dowry when the bride is not a virgin". The writer adds that although, so far as his information goes, free love is nowhere recognised as the normal and approved custom for unmarried adults, the tendency has been in the direction of increased immorality of this sort during recent years.[2]

Speaking of the views as to pre-nuptial chastity among certain Asiatic peoples,[3] Dr. Briffault tries to invalidate the statements of my authorities by references

[1] E. Torday, ' The Principles of Bantu Marriage ', in *Africa*, ii. (London, 1929), p. 257 *sq.*

[2] Ch. Dundas, ' Native Laws of some Bantu Tribes of East Africa ', in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, li. (London, 1921), p. 246.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 44 *sqq.*

to other writers. But if Hodgson says that among the Dhimáls chastity is prized in man or woman, married and unmarried, this may very well be the case even if, as Risley states, " intercourse preceding elopement or marriage is tacitly recognised ". The fraternal polyandry of the Santals and the Kammālans of the Cochin State does not imply pre-nuptial freedom. Nor is my statement that the Assam tribes differ greatly with regard to pre-nuptial chastity disproved by Dr. Briffault's categorical but unsubstantiated assertion that " among the tribes of Assam complete pre-nuptial freedom of intercourse is the time-honoured and general rule, and is regarded as in a manner obligatory ". He has not even attempted to dispute Playfair's report of the high moral standard of unmarried Garo women, nor the older accounts of the Kukis, according to which a man who seduced a girl had to marry her as soon as her parents heard of it. Of the Ulladans of the Cochin State my authority not merely states, as Dr. Briffault has it, that anyone rendering an unmarried girl pregnant must either marry her or pay a fine, but also that " sexual licence before marriage is neither recognised nor tolerated ".[1] Dr. Briffault says " it is clear from the account of Dr. Giles that unrestricted sexual freedom is permitted between members of the marrying classes " among the Zayeins or Sawng-tüng Karens. But what Giles writes is this: " When they reach the age of puberty all boys are made to live in a building called a *haw*, which stands just outside the village, and from the time of their entering this *haw* till their marriage they may not enter the houses of their parents, nor talk to any of the young women of the village ". If the girl signifies consent to the proposal made by the young man's parents, the parents of both families prepare a great feast. " Unmarried men and women meet only

[1] L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. (Madras, 1909), p. 60 *sq.*

on these occasions, but none but relations of the bride and bridegroom are admitted. The marriage feasts seem to be particularly disgraceful orgies and constitute the whole marriage ceremony".[1] This is certainly not "unrestricted sexual freedom". Promiscuous intercourse of wedding guests is a ritual practice found among many peoples, for example, at old Swedish country weddings, presumably as a means of assisting bride and bridegroom to achieve the aims of their union;[2] and when Dr. Briffault says that such orgies occur "when a meeting takes place between the two intermarrying villages, as on the occasion of a wedding between members of each", he flatly misquotes his authority, who expressly says that unmarried men and women meet *only* on those occasions. He alleges that we find in the Burmese code of laws, known as the Wonnana Dhammathat, "the conceptions which obtain in all primitive societies" laid down in the rule that "when sons, daughters, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and male slaves and females are not given in marriage before the completion of the sixteenth year, the sexual act shall not be called a fault". This is undoubtedly a misinterpretation of the law, the obvious meaning of it being that the fault is the person's who should arrange the marriage. For Jardine remarks in his note that much of this chapter is based on the ancient Hindu law, where it is said, for instance, that "reprehensible is the father who gives not his daughter in marriage at the proper time". And in another passage of the Burmese code in question we read, "If a young man has sexual connection with an adult woman, he should take her for his wife, and if, not being on good terms, he wishes not to remain, he shall pay the price of the sexual connec-

[1] Giles, quoted by J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardiman, *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, pt. i. vol. i. (Rangoon, 1900), p. 539 *sq.*

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, ii. 592.

tion ".[1] This cannot be called unrestricted freedom of sexual intercourse between unmarried people.

In his attempt to prove that " no importance is attached to virginity " among the Veddas of Ceylon, Dr. Briffault is particularly unfortunate. He writes: " Dr. Westermarck refers to them in the following terms: ' 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 " '. Since there is no pre-nuptial state amongst them, pre-nuptial promiscuity can scarcely take place, and the protection mentioned can only have reference to measures taken as a safeguard against the abduction of females ". Now if there is no pre-nuptial state, how can there be unmarried girls; and if the protection mentioned can only have reference to measures taken against abduction, why should widows, however young and pretty, be left unprotected, as the authority quoted by me, Mr. Nevill (who is considered to be remarkably trustworthy), attests, although Dr. Briffault has omitted this part of my sentence? He then tells us various things about the Veddas that have nothing whatever to do with pre-nuptial freedom, and arrives at this remarkable conclusion: " It is thus beyond doubt that, although from the nature of the case there is no pre-nuptial intercourse among the Veddahs, at least after puberty, the principle of trial-marriage is observed by them, and that no importance is attached to virginity. If there is no opportunity for the exercise of extra-nuptial sexual freedom before marriage, that such freedom is recognised is shown by the fact that it is fully indulged in after marriage. A widow, no matter how young she may be, enjoys complete sexual liberty, and is regarded as common to all the men ".[2] This

[1] J. Jardine, *Notes on Buddhist Law. III. Marriage* (Rangoon, 1883), p. 1.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 47 *sq.*

argument, queer as it stands, is directly contradicted by Dr. Briffault's own authority, who writes: " A widow who avoids exciting the jealousies of the wives, may have love affairs with half the men around, without exciting any wish for revenge among her relations, who would have given their lives at once to avenge any impropriety of conduct while she was single ".[1] This not only implies that there may be pre-nuptial intercourse, but shows that it is highly reprobated. Has Dr. Briffault never read Professor and Mrs. Seligman's book on the Veddas (which he mentions in his bibliography), the most authoritative account of this people which we possess? They write: " There was no doubt as to the attitude of public opinion towards connection between people who were not allotted to each other. This was, and still is, strongly disapproved, and there is no doubt that in the old days the guilty parties risked their lives ".[2]

As for the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula, Dr. Briffault dismisses Vaughan Stevens' statement about them with some disparaging words about the author,[3] but does not mention the other writers referred to by me. Martin quotes Stevens freely as an authority, also on the present subject, in his great work on those tribes.[4] Knocker writes with reference to the Orang

[1] H. Nevill, ' Vacddas of Ceylon ', in *The Taprobanian*, i. (Bombay, 1887), p. 178.

[2] C. G. and Brenda Z. Seligman, *The Veddas* (Cambridge, 1911), p. 96.

[3] According to Captain Berkeley, who remembers Vaughan Stevens well and has seen him in company with the Semang, coming out of the forest and talking with them at every opportunity, " he was certainly not a liar ", however large a talker he may have been (P. Schebesta, *Among the Forest Dwarfs of Malaya* [London, 1829], p. 53). W. W. Skeat and Ch. O. Blagden (*Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula*, ii. [London, 1906], p. 63) call him an observer " with not much critical sense ", but make abundant use of his facts.

[4] R. Martin, *Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel* (Jena, 1905), p. 874.

Bukit of Sungei Ujong: " As far as I could ascertain during my long experience and close acquaintanceship with these aborigines, they live a strictly moral life. . . . They have, apparently, no inclination towards crime or immorality in any form ".[1] Logan states that among the Orang Sabimba, a forest people of the extremity of the Peninsula, the seducer of a virgin is punished by being compelled to marry her and give the customary present to her parents.[2] Dr. Briffault quotes Wilkinson's words that the Sakai " leave everything to sexual passion ";[3] but we shall see below how misleading these words are when removed from their context.[4] He disposes of earlier accounts of pre-nuptial chastity among the Igorot of Luzon by a reference to Dr. Jenks' more recent study of a portion of them, the Bontoc Igorot. I have myself referred to this exhaustive study in connection with my discussion of sexual connections as a preliminary to marriage.[5] Dr. Jenks states that " marriage never takes place prior to sexual intimacy, and rarely prior to pregnancy "; and that, although it is customary for a young man to be sexually intimate with more than one of the girls in the *olags*, or girls' sleeping-places, at the same time, " a girl is almost invariably faithful to her temporary lover ".[6] He speaks of this faithfulness as a fact; but this evidently displeases Dr. Briffault, since he represents the statement as an allegation which Dr. Jenks mentions with scepticism.[7]

[1] F. W. Knocker, ' The Aborigines of Sungei Ujong ', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xxxvii. (1907), p. 293.

[2] J. R. Logan, ' The Orang Sabimba of the Extremity of the Malay Peninsula ', in *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, i. (Singapore, 1847), p. 297.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 48 *sq.*

[4] *Infra*, p. 273.

[5] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 132.

[6] A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorot (Philippine Islands.—Department of the Interior. Ethnological Survey Publications*, vol. i.; Manila, 1905), p. 66.

[7] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 50 *sq.*

Dr. Briffault accuses me of giving prominence to statements "calculated to convey the impression that the ritual virginity required of the brides of chiefs in Tonga and in Samoa and publicly demonstrated represented the general customs of those islands". What I wrote was this: "Among the nobles of the Line Islanders proof of virginity is required on marriage and 'it must be conclusive'. In Tonga the nuptial mat was paraded from house to house; 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". I might have added that in Samoa, according to both Turner and Krämer, the same practice was the rule among the non-noble classes with the only difference that it did not take place in the sight of the whole village. Turner writes: "The marriage ceremonies of common people passed off in a house; but the same obscene form was gone through to which we have referred. . . . But there were many marriages without such ceremonies at all. If there was a probability that the parents would not consent, from disparity of rank or other causes, an elopement took place".[1] Dr. Briffault has conveyed the impression that the obscene practice was an exception by adding a "sometimes" to Turner's statement, and by omitting to mention the circumstances in which it was absent.[2] According to Krämer it was observed even in the case of elopement; and he adds that in ancient pagan times the estimation in which virginity was held reminds one of the vestal virgins.[3] Dr. Briffault writes: "We have quantitative information concerning Samoan virginity: there was exactly one virgin per village, that village virgin being specially chosen and guarded for the purpose of a

[1] G. Turner, *Samoa a Hundred Years Ago* (London, 1884), pp. 95, 97.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 56 *sq.*

[3] A. Krämer, *Die Samoa-Inseln*, i. (Stuttgart, 1902), p. 39.

ceremonial marriage with a chief". This is a purely imaginary statement not supported by any of the authorities to whom he refers. Kurze states that in every locality of any considerable size there was a so-called *taupou*, or virgin of honour (*Ehrenjungfrau*),[1] and Brown says that the people of some town or village would select some young girl, generally the daughter of a ruling chief, as the *taupou* of the town and of the respective family relations connected with it;[2] but neither of them indicates that she was the only virgin in the place. Von Hesse-Wartegg, Dr. Briffault's third authority, again, tells us that there are few uncultured peoples who have, comparatively speaking, attached so high value to virtue as do the Samoans, and that when the girls become fourteen or fifteen years old they no longer sleep in the house of their parents but in the company of the *taupou* in a special house, which no man is allowed to approach after dark.[3]

In order to prove the universal prevalence of pre-nuptial freedom among the Australian aborigines Dr. Briffault quotes numerous statements to the effect that " there is not much to be said about their morals, for they have none "; that the virtue of chastity is " not even comprehensible as an object or motive of conduct "; that " one of the darkest features in the aboriginal character is its gross sensuality "; that the females are from infancy " sexually at the mercy of all who may get hold of them "; and so forth. But he also mentions various cases in which pre-nuptial unchastity is positively affirmed; and I have no reason to deny their accuracy. On the other hand I cannot admit that he

[1] G. Kurze, 'Die Samoaner in der heidnischen Zeit', in *Mitteilungen der Geografischen Gesellschaft (für Thüringen) zu Jena*, xix. (Jena, 1900/1901), p. 7 *sq.*

[2] G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians* (London, 1910), p. 119 *sq.*

[3] E. von Hesse-Wartegg, *Samoa Bismarkarchipel und Neuguinea* (Leipzig, 1902), p. 236 *sq.*

has been at all successful in his attempt to discredit the statements of a contrary character made by Strehlow, Holden, and Moore Davis, which were quoted by me. He says that my only remaining witnesses to the chastity of the Australian aborigines are Mrs. Parker and " the indispensable " Mr. Curr, but that even these authorities " do not say one word from which the observance of pre-nuptial chastity among the Australian aborigines might be inferred ".[1] Mrs. Parker states that " unchaste women were punished terribly "; and Curr asserts expressly 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 ". This statement cannot be disproved by a contemptuous epithet, for Curr had much personal experience of that tribe. Dr. Briffault also tries to discredit it by alleging that Curr " merely cites a Mr. Stephens as asserting that Australian 'immorality' was due to 'the white man's drink' "—an extraordinary allegation in the face of the fact that his book was published six years before Stephens' account.[2] Generally speaking, I think there is much truth in Professor Malinowski's saying that the question whether pre-nuptial chastity is or is not observed among the Australian aborigines " seems relatively unimportant, as we know that girls are handed over to their promised husbands on arriving at puberty, or even before ".[3]

Strangely enough Dr. Briffault has not mentioned the statistical investigation into the problem of pre-nuptial chastity among the uncivilised peoples which has been made with much industry and care by Messrs.

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 57 *sqq.*

[2] E. M. Curr, *Recollections of Squatting in Victoria* (Melbourne, etc., 1883), p. 249; E. Stephens, ' The Aborigines of Australia ', in *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, xxiii. (Sydney & London, 1889), p. 480.

[3] B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (London, 1913), p. 104.

Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg. They have 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 ".[1] I think it would be wise of Dr. Briffault to examine the facts on which these alarming numbers are based before he makes up his mind about a moral and religious revelation, which, according to him, would be proved by any authenticated primitive instance of chastity being obligatory on unmarried or unbetrothed females.

Dr. Briffault remarks that a considerable number of my examples consist of statements to the effect that a girl is blamed or even severely punished for having a pre-nuptial child, although sexual relations may be unrestricted before marriage.[2] I think I was justified in mentioning those cases together with, but not confounding them with, obligatory pre-nuptial chastity in my criticism of the hypothesis of a primitive state of promiscuity, because they, in any case, implied a recognition of the principle that children should not be produced outside the marriage relation.[3] At the same time it may very well be that the birth of a child out of wedlock is considered disgraceful as a conspicuous testimony of an act which is recognised as immoral but connived at; there is evidence of this in our own societies. I find it very difficult to believe that at the birth of an illegitimate child the condemnation merely refers to the fact that there has been neither contraception (which,

[1] L. T. Hobhouse, G. C. Wheeler, and M. Ginsberg, *The Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples* (London, 1915), p. 167.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 25.

[3] *Cf.* B. Malinowski, 'Marriage', in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiv. (London, 1929), p. 941.

according to Professor Malinowski, has been reported from very few savage tribes by trustworthy informants[1]) nor abortion. But there may also be another explanation of it. " It is scarcely credible ", says Torday, " that Bantu parents and elders should be devoid of common sense to such an extent as to permit their children to have promiscuous intercourse and yet visit them with dire penalties when the natural consequence, pregnancy, follows. When this question has been fully investigated (an extremely delicate task) it will be found, no doubt, that what is generally described as free sexual intercourse between unmarried youngsters is nothing more than one form or another of mutual masturbation ".[2] Dundas writes: " Europeans are, of course, often misled as to the actual nature of native practices. Thus I have found that it is popularly believed that the Wakikuyu permit free sexual intercourse between unmarried girls and youths. Actual sexual connection is, however, not permitted nor indulged in excepting in rare cases, but the girls and warriors may and do indulge in any other extreme of intimacy. This is called *ngwiko* ".[3] Torday states that " Mr. Leakey, who spent all his life among the Akikuyu, is of the same opinion, but says that in his part of the country the word used is *umba*. This ", he adds, " is very interesting, as *umba* is a root-word which implies shaping, as the potter shapes his vessel of clay. Now, among the Baluba masturbation is taught by the mother or some old woman to girls of tender age, as it is considered a preparation for marriage by enlarging (*i.e.* shaping) the sexual parts. The girls themselves try to break their hymen when they attain the age of puberty. We may then more safely assume that, whatever freedom boys and girls take with each other, as a rule actual sexual intercourse does not take place,

[1] *Cf.* B. Malinowski, ' Marriage ', in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiv. (London, 1929), p. 941.

[2] Torday, *loc. cit.* p. 256.

[3] Dundas, *loc. cit.* p. 247.

and reports to that effect have to be accepted with caution, as they are based on hearsay and the very nature of the subject renders investigation very difficult and invites misinterpretation".[1] Dr. Driberg states that among the Lango, a Nilotic tribe of Uganda, clandestine friendships with unmarried women " are platonic in so far as, though the couple may even spend the night together, they do not have sexual relations with each other. . . . Should they go beyond this stage . . . the lover will have committed the offence of *luk* (illegitimate intercourse), which is very often the precursor of matrimony".[2]

Dr. Briffault has again and again imputed to me the affirmation of an " innate " regard for chastity among uncivilised peoples. Yet I have not even once used this term. In my list of peoples who are reported to show regard for pre-nuptial chastity I have simply been concerned with the fact without touching upon the question whether the regard is " innate " or acquired. I have then added a few words about its probable origin. I said that " it seems to spring partly from a feeling akin to jealousy towards women who have had previous connections with other men ". This cannot be called an innate moral regard for chastity; but it is nevertheless rejected by Dr. Briffault. " Such a feeling ", he says, " which in its fully developed form embodies the appreciation of more than merely physical union, is a very advanced product of psychological development, which has been built upon the scaffolding of much grosser and quite different conceptions. The demand for virginity in the bride is in the first instance a claim established by the contract of child-marriage; the lack of virginity is not an offence against sexual sentiments of possession, but a breach of faith and an act of commercial dishonesty, the ' seducer ' being legally liable

[1] Torday, *loc. cit.* p. 257.

[2] J. H. Driberg, *The Lango* (London, 1923), p. 155 n. 2.

for the bride-price which has been disbursed by the intending husband". "Throughout the more primitive stages of social culture no such claims are put forward", although "the bespeaking of a female infant after birth, or even before, prevails among all uncivilised peoples". "The claim to the virginity of the bride and the importance attached to it is, among uncultured races, found more especially developed in those regions where the theory of marriage by purchase has attained its crudest mercenary form". In such countries, "as among the slave-holding populations of Africa and Asia, infant betrothal is the general rule. The claim thus becomes an established rule, and the 'honour' of the man who does not obtain the same standard of exclusive possession as others is thereby injured".[1]

To this explanation of the origin of the regard for pre-nuptial chastity serious objections may be raised. In the first place, we have statements to the effect that it prevails among various savages of the lowest type;[2] and some of these statements are as reliable as any ethnological evidence can be, while there is no reason to distrust the accuracy of others. I may add that among the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego, according to information given me by Mr. Bridges, the chief authority on them, lewdness is condemned as evil and never indulged in with the consent of parents,[3] but yet very frequent; and among the Onas, another Fuegian tribe, virginity is said by Gallardo to be preserved by both boys and girls as a rule until marriage, both being carefully guarded by their parents.[4] Moreover, a high standard of pre-

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* iii. 334 *sqq.*

[2] See also B. Hagen, *Die Orang Kubu auf Sumatra* (*Veroffentlichungen aus dem städtischen Völker-Museum Frankfurt am Main*, ii.; 1908), p. 130 *sq.*

[3] See also W. Koppers, *Unter Feuerland-Indianern* (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 98 *sq.*

[4] C. R. Gallardo, *Tierra del Fuego—Los Onas* (Buenos Aires, 1910), p. 217.

nuptial chastity is reported by competent observers to exist among a large number of savage peoples who are not known to practise infant-betrothal as a rule, and whose marriages are no business transactions. All these cases cannot be accounted for by Dr. Briffault's hypothesis. Nor can he explain satisfactorily the extension of the demand for virginity in a betrothed girl to a similar demand in the case of an unbetrothed girl; why should a privilege that has been bought by some men, however many they are, also be conceded to all other men? But then the question arises: why is chastity required even of a betrothed girl, as Dr. Briffault admits to be the case among many of the more advanced savages? His answer is, as already said, that the lack of virginity in such a girl is a breach of contract, like infidelity in a wife. But if, as he maintains, individual marriage has its foundation, not in sexual relations, but in economic relations, how has this economic association between the partners come to establish individual sexual claims? Dr. Briffault says that it has "inevitably tended to do so", but he has slurred the all-important question why it has done it, and this is fatal to his whole theory of the origin of individual marriage.

For my own part I have traced the individual sexual claims of men to the feeling of masculine jealousy. Following Darwin's remark that from what we know of the jealousy of all male quadrupeds, promiscuous intercourse is utterly unlikely to prevail in a state of nature, I drew the conclusion that, in the absence of any reason to believe in a stage of promiscuity, it is exceedingly improbable that there ever was such a stage, because the prevalence of male jealousy both among the anthropoid apes and the existing races of men constitutes a strong *prima-facie* evidence of its prevalence in earlier ages as well.[1] At the same time, in marriage as a social institution the husband's right to sexual intercourse is

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 299 *sq.*

not necessarily exclusive: there is both polyandry and group-marriage. And I have also expressly pointed out that the institution of marriage is not merely a sexual relation but also an economic institution. The reason for this seems obvious enough. If, as I have suggested, individuals of different sex among our earliest human ancestors, as among apes, were drawn to each other by their sexual impulses and remained with each other, this living together naturally led to economic partnership. If Dr. Briffault had not ignored my definition of marriage in the beginning of the first chapter of my book, he would have had to admit its resemblance to his own view with regard both to the economic aspect of marriage and to its social and juridical character. But, being unwilling to recognise any resemblance in our views, he simply asserts that I, in my attempt to lay down a definition of marriage, have proposed to regard 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".[1] I have said that as the word "family" is not only used to denote a certain institution, so I think we may be allowed to apply the word "marriage" also in a broader and vaguer sense as a term for a relation which, like the family, is found among some animals as well as in mankind. But I have pointed out that "I shall throughout deal with unions which are, or may be supposed to be, sanctioned by custom or law".[2]

While saying that the preference given to virgin brides seems to spring partly from a feeling akin to jealousy towards women who have had previous connections with other men, I have also suggested that it is partly due to an instinctive appreciation of female coyness. Each sex is attracted by the distinctive characteristics of the opposite sex, and coyness is a

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 75.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 71 *sq.*

female quality both in animals and mankind. Hence conspicuous eagerness in a woman appears to a man unwomanly, repulsive, contemptible; his ideal is the virgin, the lustful woman he despises. It is true that preference is by no means always given to a virgin bride. Desire for offspring may induce a man to marry a young woman who has borne a child, or a virgin bride may be avoided because "she who has not been known to others can have nothing pleasing about her", or because a wife "is nothing worth unless she has been used to consort with men".[1] But my point is that where pre-nuptial chastity is held in general regard in the savage world the principal reason for it is the men's preference for virginity, whatever its cause may be, and although this preference has influenced the moral judgment of unchastity it is itself no moral feeling. Although Dr. Briffault has, on his own showing, read my opinion on this subject, he has nevertheless thought it fit to attribute to me the views that there is an innate moral regard for chastity in unmarried women, and that the sentiments and instincts manifested by primitive peoples constitute a strong argument in support of "the moral doctrines of seventeenth-century theology".[2]

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 160 *sqq.*
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 137.

III

MONOGAMY AND POLYGYNY

I SHALL now pass to the subject of monogamy among savage races. Speaking of the " alleged instances of primitive monogamous institutions ", Dr. Briffault says that " the zeal which the subject has aroused has tended to falsify reports in this respect to an even greater extent than in regard to pre-nuptial sexual freedom or any other form of unchastity. As a matter of fact, not only is no uncivilised people certainly known to have monogamous institutions, but very few statements concerning any of those peoples among whom monogyny is said to be usual or general and to represent their original customs, will bear investigation. In view of the prevalent misconceptions on the subject, we shall examine a few of those statements; and again we cannot do better than to take as our guide Dr. Westermarck, whose instances and conclusions have been very frequently appealed to and reproduced without enquiry ".[1]

Dr. Briffault says that I mention by name eleven South American tribes altogether " as being, without qualification ' monogamous ' ".[2] He should have cited me correctly, as writing " tribes which are said to be monogamous ".[3] I have not guaranteed the accuracy of the statements. He asserts that " eight out of ten of those instances are contradicted on good authority ". As regards the Ackawoi of Guiana I have referred to

[1] R. Briffault, *The Mothers*, ii. (London, 1927), p. 276 *sq.*
[2] *Ibid.* ii. 283 *sqq.*
[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. (London, 1921), p. 1.

Brett, but also quoted Im Thurn, who states that they are not polygynous except perhaps in the case of individuals who choose to break through the customs of their tribe. Dr. Briffault has made use of the same statement to contradict me, though in the garbled form that they are admitted not to be monogamous invariably; but I would say that a tribe in which polygyny is a breach of custom and occurs only in exceptional cases may be properly called monogamous. Im Thurn makes a similar statement with regard to the Macusi. Dr. Briffault represents Schomburgk as saying, "While polygamy is the native usage among all other tribes of Guiana, it is only rarely met with among the Macusi". This quotation is inaccurate: Schomburgk says (in two places) that polygamy is "only extremely rare" (*nur äusserst selten*) among them.[1] Father Gumilla's account of the Otomacos of the Orinoco is scarcely contradicted by von Humboldt's much later description of them as savages with "unbridled passions", or even by his general statement that "at Esmeralda, as everywhere else throughout the missions, the Indians who will not be baptised, and who are merely aggregated in the community, live in a state of polygamy".[2] Father Gilij speaks of three tribes of the Orinoco in which the men who have more than one wife each are "rarissimi".[3]

For the Mundrucûs I have referred to Wallace, Tocantins, and Von Martius; I find, however, that the last-mentioned authority writes in another place that "each man takes several wives according to his power and influence".[4] Dr. Briffault says that we are "justified in regarding with some reserve Wallace's

[1] R. Schomburgk, *Reisen in Britisch-Guiana*, i. (Leipzig, 1847), p. 358; ii. (1848), p. 312.

[2] A. von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of America*, ii. (London, 1852), pp. 504, 455.

[3] F. S. Gilij, *Saggio di storia americana* (Roma, 1781), p. 253.

[4] C. F. Ph. von Martius, *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas zumal Brasiliens*, i. (Leipzig, 1867), p. 392.

repetition of the same statement with reference to the Curetus and the Purupurus, of whom he says that he never saw any". But as regards the former, Wallace says on the contrary that he obtained his information from some Indians of that tribe whom he met, as well as from an Isánna Indian who had visited them.[1] It is the more likely to be essentially correct since we have very trustworthy evidence of strong monogamous tendencies among other tribes of the Amazon region farther west. Concerning the Huitoto of the Putamayo, Hardenburg writes: "Among these aborigines polygamy does not exist, and only in very rare cases does the *capitán* or *tuchaua* have more than one wife"; marriages "are considered binding among the Huitotos".[2] Of the wild Indians of Ecuador Professor Karsten, who lived among them for a long time, states that polygamy is generally very rare, that the large majority of tribes are monogamous, and that even among the polygamous Jibaros ("whose sexual relations both before and after marriage", according to Dr. Briffault, "approach to complete promiscuity"[3]), a man usually contents himself with the wife he has taken in his youth until he is middle-aged.[4] Of the Karayá, on the Araguay, Ehrenreich states that monogamy is the usual form of marriage, but that not infrequently a married man is compelled to take a second wife when the first one becomes too old;[5] according to Krause, only the chief may have more than one wife[6] (Dr. Briffault attributes

[1] A. R. Wallace, *Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negro* (London, 1853), p. 509.

[2] W. E. Hardenburg, 'The Indians of the Putamayo, Upper Amazon', in *Man*, x. (London, 1910), p. 135.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 20.

[4] R. Karsten, *Bland Indianer i Ekvadors urskogar* (Helsingfors, 1921), p. 324.

[5] P. Ehrenreich, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde Brasiliens* (Berlin, 1891), p. 27.

[6] F. Krause, *In den Wildnissen Brasiliens* (Leipzig, 1911), p. 325.

to him, inaccurately, the statement that "only chiefs are able to support many wives simultaneously"). I have mentioned in my book various South American tribes among whom polygamy is a privilege of chiefs, and may add that this, according to Koch-Grünberg, is the case with all the Indians of the Caiarý.[1] Dr. Briffault's indirect criticism of my statements concerning the Canelas and Chavantes is quite futile, and Von den Steinen's assertion about the Paressí he has not even tried to contradict. Of the monogamy of the Guaycurûs he says that it was scarcely distinguishable from complete sexual communism. My authorities for it are Von Martius and Lozano. The latter, who is also quoted by Dr. Briffault,[2] states that although the men have not more than one wife, there are no proper marriages (that is, from the Roman Catholic point of view) among them, because the husband may part with his wife and the wife with her husband without difficulty and without disgrace; but on the other hand it is also reported that separations between husbands and wives are rare among them.[3] I may add the following information given by Professor Karsten: "The Choroti are a strictly monogamous people. During my stay among the different Choroti tribes I never found a single case of polygamy, and I was moreover able to confirm that polygamy is strongly disapproved of by custom and the social morality of the people".[4]

My examination of Dr. Briffault's criticism thus by no means shows that eight out of ten of the instances referred to by me "are contradicted on good authority". More than one half of the number has not been contradicted on any authority at all, and some of the others are

[1] Th. Koch-Grünberg, *Zwei Jahre unter den Indianern* (Stuttgart, 1909), p. 273.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 82.

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 117 *sq.*

[4] R. Karsten, *Indian Tribes of the Argentine and Bolivian Chaco* (*Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commutationes Humanarum Litterarum*, IV. 1; Helsingfors, 1932), p. 53.

in essential agreement with the very statements quoted by him to disapprove them. There is little difference between a tribe reported to be monogamous and one of which it is said that polygamy is rarely met with or practised only by chiefs. The fresh evidence now added by me contributes to show that monogamous tendencies are undoubtedly widespread among the South American Indians. From my own collection of statements, as well as from the tables given by Messrs. Hobhouse, Wheeler, and Ginsberg,[1] I gather that the number of their tribes in which polygamy is represented as fairly common does not amount to a third of the number of tribes in which it is said to be practised only occasionally or not at all.

It seems rather uncalled-for that Dr. Briffault, in his attempt to prove the non-existence of uncivilised peoples known to have monogamous institutions, also speaks of the Berbers of North Africa.[2] I have mentioned them simply because my object was to examine the distribution of polygyny and monogamy in Africa, not because I had any thesis to prove. The statements relating to the Tuareg are no doubt conflicting. Being Mohammedans, all of them recognise of course polygamy as legal, but its prevalence seems to vary considerably in different tribes, and there is no reason to doubt that some of them are practically monogamous. The report, quoted by Dr. Briffault, that the Tuareg of Aïr "scarcely ever have less than four wives" is ridiculous; how could there be such an enormous disproportion of the sexes? The latest authority on this people states that in practice monogamy is more frequent than polygamy; but this is to put it very mildly, for he also writes: "How often has it not been said

[1] L. T. Hobhouse, G. C. Wheeler, and M. Ginsberg, *The Material Culture and Social Institutions among the Simpler Peoples* (London, 1915), pp. 180, 186, 188, 190, 194, 206.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 287 *sqq.*

to me that 'the Imajeghan respect their women, and *therefore* have only one wife, not like the negroes and heathen'? . . . After considering the question carefully, I have come to the conclusion that monogamy is probably an old tradition dependent upon and consistent with the status of Tuareg women, and not a consequence of economic conditions which have, however, served to perpetuate the custom".[1] After referring to my quotation of Chavanne's statement that among the Moorish tribes in the Western Sahara Vincent did not meet a single man who had a plurality of wives, Dr. Briffault remarks, apparently as an argument against it, that Dr. Rohlfs "met one at Tafilet, in the heart of the same region, who had three hundred", and that Mr. W. B. Harris "speaks of the harîms and of the large polygamous households and slave-girls of the Sharifian families". As a matter of fact, the three hundred wives mentioned by Rohlfs constituted the harem of a brother of the Sultan,[2] and Harris does not speak of "large polygamous households", but only says that the first wife is nearly always a shereefa, that the sons of shereefs by purchased slave-girls are shereefs, and that the harems no doubt contain better specimens of women than he saw.[3] I have myself stated that among some Berber tribes in Morocco polygamy is much practised, owing to the prevalence of the blood-feud, which makes it highly desirable for a man to have many sons.[4] But it is an unquestionable fact that in Morocco and Algeria the great bulk of the people are monogamous; in the former country there are villages where no man has more than

[1] F. Rennell Rodd, *People of the Veil* (London, 1926), p. 170 *sq.* Lieutenant Gösta Moberg, who has just returned from an expedition to the Tuareg of the Ahaggar, tells me that they are strictly monogamous.

[2] G. Rohlfs, *Reise durch Marokko* (Bremen, 1868), p. 65.

[3] W. B. Harris, *Tafilet* (Edinburgh & London, 1895), pp. 286, 289.

[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 77.

one wife, unless it be perhaps some well-to-do person who has a second wife in another village where he owns property.[1] Dr. Briffault's statement that " when, in Morocco, pólygamy is limited by poverty, sexual customs are correspondingly licentious ", is based on no other authority than his own imagination.

Passing to India, Dr. Briffault asserts that I have " not succeeded in culling " a dozen instances of tribes concerning which monogamy has been predicated.[2] I have mentioned a very much larger number of tribes of which, if they have polygyny at all, it is expressly said that it is exceptional or infrequent, and among several of them it is reported to be practised or permitted only when the first wife is barren or does not give birth to male offspring.[3] In my long list of such tribes there is only one, the Nagas, as to whom Dr. Briffault has been able to produce a contradictory report; but my authority, Mr. Hodson, is as good as any, and it is quite likely that their marriage customs vary in different localities. Concerning the Kacháris, Dr. Briffault states that the Rev. S. Endle, whom I have quoted in my enumeration of tribes where polygyny is exceptional if not unknown, " merely makes the usual statement that polygyny is not common except among the well-to-do ". What Endle says is this: " As a rule the Kacháris are a strictly monogamous race, though cases of men having two wives have occasionally come under the writer's notice. These cases are, however, almost invariably limited to men of a somewhat high social position or great wealth. . . . Where, too, a first wife proves childless, Kachári custom sanctions the taking of a second, mainly with a view to handing down the father's name to posterity ".[4] This exception was

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 25.
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 289 *sqq.*
[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 8 *sqq.*
[4] S. Endle, *The Kachâris* (London, 1911), p. 30.

specially pointed out by me. Dr. Briffault writes that "the Mikirs, who are cited by Dr. Westermarck as monogamous, are expressly stated by Mr. Stack in his monograph of them, to be polygamous". On the page of his book quoted by Dr. Briffault he says exactly the reverse: he records that "monogamy is the rule, and no one is allowed to marry two wives", thereby modifying an earlier statement made by him.[1] I wrote that among some of the Old Kukis "polygyny and concubinage are said to be forbidden"; but even this short passage is not allowed by Dr. Briffault to remain as it stands: he quotes me as saying, "Polygamy and concubinage are strictly forbidden". Then he adds, "That residue consists, in fact, according to Colonel Shakespear, of the Kohlen (*sic*) clan, whose sexual laxity strongly savours of promiscuity". Colonel Shakespear writes, "Polygamy is but little practised on account of the expense; among the Kolhen it is prohibited";[2] but I find nothing said by him about sexual laxity savouring of promiscuity. The strict monogamy of the Nayādis is attested by our best authority on the Cochin tribes, Mr. Anantha Krishna Iyer; and Dr. Briffault's quotation from Mr. Stuart merely contains that they are "monandrous with great freedom of divorce". After this inspection of Dr. Briffault's arguments I think I am justified in saying that his attack on my evidence relating to numerous Indian tribes, which he initiated with such an air of superiority, turned out a complete failure.

With reference to the Italons, Malayan head-hunters of Luzon, I have quoted Father Arzaga's statement that they are monogamous; but Dr. Briffault rejects it as incredible, and says that Father Diaz, on the contrary, complained that they were polygamous.[3] He refrains,

[1] E. Stack, *The Mikirs* (London, 1908), p. 19.
[2] J. Shakespear, *The Lushei Kuki Clans* (London, 1912), p. 155.
[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 292.

however, from mentioning Diaz' assertion that the polygamy had been taught them by Chinese immigrants.[1] In a modern description of the Italons Mr. Bennett, governor of Nueva Vizcaya, writes: "The chiefs of all these settlements stated to me positively that adultery was unknown among these people, and that their family relations were very closely drawn. They further stated that they never knew of a case of a young woman giving birth before she had been married".[2] Dr. Briffault also objects to my authority for the monogamy of the Tinguianes, a sub-Malayan people of Luzon, Mr. Foreman, whose information he declares to be unreliable and worthless,[3] and writes that Mr. Cole, the only authority concerning the tribe who need be taken into account, tells us, on the contrary, that there is amongst them no objection to a man having two wives. This is really amusing. As a matter of fact Mr. Cole asserts that in the tales of this tribe no objection seems to be raised to a man having two wives "so long as one of these is an inhabitant of the upper world"—that is, the sky—whereas we find Kanag telling his former sweetheart that he cannot marry her since he is now married to another; and when two women lay claim to Aponĭtolau as their husband, they undergo a test and the looser returns to her former house. The rule that prohibits a man from having two wives, however, does not prevent him from having several concubines.[4] I have written that among the Negritos of Zambales, in the same island, well-to-do people have

[1] C. Diaz, in E. H. Blair and J. A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands 1493-1898*, xlii. (Cleveland, 1906), p. 255.

[2] L. E. Bennett, in *Census of the Philippine Islands*, i. (Washington, 1905), p. 545.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 292 n. 6.

[4] F. C. Cole, *Traditions of the Tinguian* (*Field Museum of Natural History, Publication 180*; *Anthropological Series*, vol. xiv. no. 1; Chicago, 1915), pp. 12, 111, 138, 94, 121. *Cf. idem*, *The Tinguian* (*ibid. Publication 209*, vol. xiv. no. 2; Chicago, 1922), p. 283: "The

more than one wife—and might have added that the practice is usually confined to the captain or head man of the tribe—but that generally the Negritos of the Philippines are strictly monogamous. The former statement of mine, which is based on the authority of Mr. Reed, is not mentioned by Dr. Briffault, and the latter, for which I refer to six different informants, is dismissed by him with the following quotation from Mr. Reed:[1] " Among the Negritos ' a man may marry as many wives as he can buy (a statement which his authority makes with reference to those of Zambales only). . . . Polygamy is allowed throughout the Negrito territory, and it is not uncommon for a man to marry several sisters' ".[2] For this summary statement Mr. Reed gives no evidence, and it is contradicted by too many other accounts to be accepted. To my quotation from Dean Worcester that the Tagbanuas of Palawan do not allow polygyny, Dr. Briffault makes the objection that the authority for it is " very doubtful ";[3] yet Dean Worcester was Secretary of the Interior. In support of his criticism Dr. Briffault alleges[4] that " we are informed by the official authority on the region that both polygyny and polyandry are permitted by their customs, although not much practised at the present day ". This is again a distorted statement: the official authority tells us that they " seem not to be practised at present ".[5]

Dr. Briffault attempts to invalidate my information

Tinguian recognise only one wife, but a man may have as many concubines (*pota*), as he can secure. The *pota* lives in a house of her own, but she is held somewhat in contempt by the other woman, and is seldom seen in the social gatherings or in other homes ".

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 292.

[2] W. A. Reed, *Negritos of Zambales* (*Philippine Islands.—Department of the Interior, Ethnological Survey Publications*, vol. ii. pt. i.; Manila, 1904), p. 60 *sq.*

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 293 n. 1. [4] *Ibid.* ii. 293.

[5] E. Y. Miller, ' The Bataks of Palawan ', in *Ethnological Survey Publications*, ii. (Manila, 1905), p. 184.

about the monogamy of the Igorot of Luzon,[1] first, by a citation from Mr. Foreman (of whom he spoke most disparagingly on the previous page) to the effect that " polygyny seems to be permitted, but little practised ". He then refers to Mr. Reyes Lala, also quoted by me, who says that polygyny sometimes occurs among the Igorot. He, moreover, imputes to Dr. Jenks the statement that " a man may have two wives ", and that he knew one who had five. What Dr. Jenks writes is this: " Bontoc families are monogamous, and monogamy is the rule throughout the area, though now and then a man has two wives. The presidente of Titipan has five ".[2] Dr. Briffault is of opinion that Dr. Jenks' exhaustive study " has entirely superseded our previous quite defective and unreliable information " concerning the Igorot,[3] and it seems therefore rather useless that he quotes ancient missionary evidence to prove polygynous habits among the Igorot. He also writes: " ' In case of adultery ', says Dr. Westermarck, ' the guilty party can be compelled to leave the hut and the family for ever '. Dr. Jenks says that there is no tribal law against adultery, and that married men commonly frequent the ' olags ' (sleeping-places) of the unmarried girls who solicit them ". The reader should compare this with what Dr. Jenks actually says on the matter, which is exactly the reverse: " It is not usual for a married man to go to the o-lag, though a young man may go if one of his late mates is still alone. . . . The married woman is said always to be true to her husband. . . . Adultery is not a common crime. I was unable to learn that the punishment for adultery was ever the subject for a council of the old men. It seems rather

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 293.

[2] A. E. Jenks, *The Bontoc Igorot* (*Philippine Islands.—Department of the Interior, Ethnological Survey Publications*, vol. i.; Manila, 1905), p. 59.

[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 50.

that the punishment—death of the offenders—is always administered naturally, being prompted by shocked and turbulent emotions rather than by a council of wise men. In Igorot society the spouse of either criminal may take the lives of both the guilty if they are apprehended in the crime. To-day the group consciousness of the penalty for adultery is so firmly fixed that adulterers are slain, not necessarily on the spur of the moment of a suspected crime but sometimes after carefully laid plans for detection".[1] Mr. Reyes Lala says that adultery is almost unknown among the Igorot.[2]

Concerning the wild tribes of the Malay Peninsula I have said that polygyny is either rare or unknown, and given much detailed evidence for it. In his criticism Dr. Briffault has not produced a single contradictory statement, but some that rather contradict his own allegation that "monogamy does not seem to be observed as a general rule by any of them".[3] He does not prove it by his insidious remark that Messrs. Skeat and Blagden, who have written a classical work on the pagan races of the Malay Peninsula, "are disposed to present the facts concerning their marriage customs in the light of the supposition that primitive races 'who live simpler lives are commonly, from the exigencies of the case, monogamists'". I have quoted Dr. Martin's statement that, so far as his own experience goes, the pure Senoi and Semang tribes "are thoroughly monogamous", and that "most of the earlier observers also agree with this opinion".[4] On the other hand, I have also cited Swettenham's information that the Semang of Ijoh "have, as a rule, one wife, but if all parties consent may have two, never three".[5] Re-

[1] Jenks, *op. cit.* pp. 67, 170.
[2] R. Reyes Lala, *The Philippine Islands* (New York, 1899), p. 98.
[3] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 294 *sq.*
[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 121 *sq.*
[5] *Ibid.* iii. 10 *sq.*

ferring to this information, Dr. Briffault makes the misleading general statement, "Among the Semang there is no such rule; some have two wives". On the authority of two French writers he says that "a Sakai marries two wives", and that "their polygamy is only limited by their means"; and in connection with the latter statement he also refers to Cerruti, who, as a matter of fact, says that bigamy, although not absolutely unknown, is extremely rare.[1] Why does Dr. Briffault refrain from quoting Mr. R. J. Wilkinson—"probably the highest authority" on the Sakai, as he calls him[2]—who writes that "polygamy is tolerated though very rare"?[3]

In connection with the Andaman Islanders Dr. Briffault has once for a way paid me a compliment: he says that I have very wisely omitted from the new edition of my book Mr. Man's account of their sexual regulations and that I have now very little to say about them.[4] But the compliment is quite undeserved. I have referred both to Mr. Man's statement that polygyny is unknown among them, and to other similar statements made by Portman and Kloss, and said that, according to Lowis, polygyny is "almost unknown" at Port Blair. Portman writes: "The Andamanese are monogamic, and though there is a freedom of intercourse between the sexes before marriage, after it the husband keeps faithful to his wife, as a rule, and she to him. Her murder would be the result of any unfaithfulness on the wife's part, and possibly the murder of her lover also. Divorce is rare, and unknown after a child has been born to the married couple. . . . The Andamanese never have two

[1] G. B. Cerruti, *Nel paese dei Veleni. Fra i Sakai* (Verona, 1906), p. 149.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 48.

[3] R. J. Wilkinson, *Papers on Malay Subjects. Supplement: The Aboriginal Tribes* (Kuala Lumpur, 1910), p. 57.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 295.

wives at the same time. . . . Monogamy prevails not only among the Great Andaman tribes but also among the Ongés" (who inhabit the Little Andaman).[1] Subsequently he says that divorce is "very rare" after the birth of a child, and that the women are "fairly good wives", but not "models of constancy" (as Man alleged).[2] Dr. Briffault maintains that "the earlier much-discredited accounts turn out after all not to be so far removed from the truth as subsequent contradictions of them". What are these "accounts"? He only refers to one, that of Lieutenant St. John, which runs thus: "Very little has been ascertained as to their marriage laws; but, as far as we have been able to make out, the man only remains with a woman until a child is born, and weaned, and then seeks another wife". This is an extract from 'Notes from a day's march (*sic*) into the interior'.[3] Dr. Briffault says that "there appears no reason to doubt" the accuracy of this report.[4] On the other hand he has evidently not thought it worth while to quote Professor Radcliffe-Brown, whose book on the Andaman Islanders he mentions in his 'Bibliography'. There we read: "In the Andamanese social organisation the family is of great importance. A family is constituted by a permanent union between one man and one woman. In one of its aspects this union is a sexual one. By marriage a man acquires the sole right to sexual congress with the woman who becomes his wife". Concerning the natives of the Great Andaman he adds that "at the present time conjugal infidelity is very common and is lightly regarded", but that "it is almost certain that

[1] M. V. Portman, *A History of Our Relations with the Andamanese* (Calcutta, 1899), pp. 39, 285, 826.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 627.

[3] E. Belcher, 'Notes on the Andaman Islands', in *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, N.S., v. (1867), p. 45.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 296 n. 2.

the establishment of the Penal Settlement amongst them has affected their morals in this particular".[1] The monogamy of the Andamanese (which is recognised even in Lieutenant St. John's curious report) must be an annoying case for Dr. Briffault, because they are savages of the lowest type, who depend for their subsistence entirely on the natural products of the sea and the forest.

The Veddas of Ceylon present similar difficulties to Dr. Briffault, and his attempt to wriggle out of them is equally unsuccessful. He says that "their actual sex relations are very imperfectly known, and accounts are full of contradictions".[2] But, as a matter of fact, there are few cases of primitive monogamy on which opinions have been so unanimous. That the Veddas never have more than one wife has been attested by Bailey, Hartshorne, Nevill, Le Mesurier, P. and F. Sarasin, Deschamps, and Professor and Mrs. Seligman, and even adultery is said to be unknown or extremely rare among them.[3] Dr. Briffault mentions every one of those writers in his 'Bibliography', but in this connection he refers to none of them, except the Sarasins and Bailey, and in the reference to the latter nothing is said about monogamy. The latest and best authorities, the Seligmans, write: "The Veddas are strictly monogamous, and we are able to confirm Bailey's observations as regards their marital fidelity. . . . The only case of suicide of which we heard took place in connection with a breach of the common rule of conjugal fidelity".[4] The only writer who states that they have polygamy is

[1] A. R. Brown, *The Andaman Islanders* (Cambridge, 1922), p. 70 *sq.*

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 297 *sq.*

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 12 *sq.*; C. J. R. Le Mesurier, 'The Veddás of Ceylon', in *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, ix. (Colombo, 1888), p. 340.

[4] C. G. and Brenda Z. Seligman, *The Veddas* (Cambridge, 1911), p. 87 *sq.*

Gillings, but his report is restricted to the Veddas of Bintenne,[1] that is, village Veddas, who are no fair representatives of old Vedda customs.[2] According to Dr. Briffault, " Professor Virchow thinks that polygyny is found among the Veddahs occasionally ". This is again one of those distortions of facts which makes Dr. Briffault's statements so extremely unreliable. Virchow writes: " Adultery and polygamy are mentioned only where attempts have been made to civilise them. . . . Conjugal fidelity and monogamy, as well as love for their children, were matters of course among the Veddás."[3] Dr. Briffault also says " the Singhalese affirm that in pre-European days, when the Veddahs were not so cowed as they are at present, they used to make raids for the purpose of capturing girls ". This statement has, of course, nothing to do either with polygamy or monogamy; the authority for it is Bailey, who states that polygamy does not exist and that divorce is unknown among the Veddas.[4]

Dr. Briffault's allegation that I have " not been able to discover any suggestion of monogamy in Polynesia or in Melanesia ",[5] is not correct. I have referred to reports that suggest strict monogamy, to others that suggest that polygyny was restricted to chiefs, and to a great number according to which most men were monogamists. These cases, as also the records of a striking excess of males over females in many Pacific islands,[6] certainly justify the conclusion that the bulk

[1] J. Gillings, ' On the Veddahs of Bintenne ', in *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, ii. (Colombo, 1853), p. 86.

[2] C. G. and Brenda Z. Seligman, *op. cit.* pp. 49, 52.

[3] R. Virchow, ' The Veddás of Ceylon ', in *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, ix. (Colombo, 1888), p. 369.

[4] J. Bailey, ' An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon ', in *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, N.S., vol. ii. (London, 1863), p. 292 *sq.*

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 299.

[6] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 56 *sqq.*

of the people in those islands lived in monogamy. As for the Australian aborigines Dr. Briffault imputes to me the statement that Mr. Curr " has discovered some truly monogamous tribes " among them.[1] This I have never said. I have simply recorded three statements to that effect, and expressly said that I regard them as " doubtful cases ".[2]

My statement that the Central African Pygmies " seem to be mostly monogamous ", which is in agreement with Father Schmidt's monograph on the Pygmies, is also supported by later authorities. Hutereau writes: " La plupart des bandes Batua du Tanganika ne pratiquent pas la polygamie ".[3] According to David, the Wambutti of Ituri emphatically deny that any man has more than one wife in his hut; on this report, quoted by me, Dr. Briffault makes the trenchant remark that " the West African gentleman whose wives ' stretch over three hundred miles of country ' has also ' no more than one wife in his hut ' ".[4] He admits that a later traveller also describes them as monogamous, but remarks that this statement is immediately followed by another to the effect that " as soon as the men acquire a sufficiency of barter goods, the women ' discard their native objection to competitors in the affection of their spouses ' ". This, however, is a gross distortion of the statement made by his authority, who writes: " At present there is a slight tendency for them to consort with the Wanyari (neighbours belonging to the Bantu family). . . . But even here there are very few cases of close alliances ". The polygamy of those Pygmy women is thus due to the influence of a foreign custom, and the reason suggested for it is their desire to

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 301.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 20, 26.

[3] A. Hutereau, *Notes sur la vie familiale et juridique de quelques populations du Congo belge* (Bruxelles, 1909), p. 3.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 298 n. 4.

get away from the forest.[1] Our latest authority on the Pygmies of Congo, P. Schebesta, writes: " Speaking of them in general, the pigmies are a monogamous race. From my knowledge of them I should say that only one per cent of the Bambutti is polygamous. That this should be so considering that they live in the midst of the polygamous negroes, seems very extraordinary ".[2] Among the Babira-Bambutti " monogamy is imperative ".[3]

Dr. Briffault says that Theal formerly stated in so many words that the Bushman " was a strict monogamist ", but later recognised that he had been misled. He omits, however, to mention Theal's statement in his later book to the effect that in modern days " the instances of a man living with more than one woman at a time have been exceedingly rare. Miss Lloyd, after long inquiry, could learn of but one such case, and other investigators could hear of none whatever ".[4] Dr. Briffault quotes Stow's passage, " It is certain that among the greater part of them a plurality of wives was allowed ", but suppresses the beginning of the sentence, " It is said that owing to the extreme jealousy and passionate disposition of the women, some of the tribes never take more than one wife ". Stow also remarks that " from the evidence we can gather upon this subject, it would appear that there was no uniform custom with regard to either marriage or polygamy which governed the Bushman race ".[5] I have myself quoted the statement made by Kicherer, who visited the Bushmen in 1799, to the effect that the men had several

[1] L. J. Vanden Bergh, *On the Trail of the Pigmies* (London, 1922), p. 244 *sq.*

[2] P. Schebesta, *Among the Congo Pigmies* (London, 1933), p. 128.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 273.

[4] G. M. McCall Theal, *The Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa south of the Zambesi* (London, 1910), p. 47.

[5] G. W. Stow, *The Native Races of South Africa* (London, 1905), p. 95.

wives. So also I cited Kaufmann's report according to which the Auin of Gam are said to have on an average two and not infrequently five wives each, whereas those of Rietfontein are strict monogamists. The latter fact is not mentioned by Dr. Briffault, although he refers to Kaufmann's article. Nor has he taken any notice of my statement that the Namib Bushmen are likewise strictly monogamous; the only recognised grounds for divorce are reported to be adultery and barrenness in the wife.[1] He says that "among the Tati Bushmen 'a man will have as many as four wives or even more'", but omits the preceding sentence of his authority, "They are mostly monogamists, though those of the Sansokwe are partly polygamists".[2] I may now add some other statements bearing upon the subject. According to Miss Bleek, the southern Bushmen "are monogamous, and man and wife generally remain faithful to each other till death".[3] The northern tribes permit polygyny, although the frequency of such marriages varies.[4] Among the Naron at Sandfountein monogamy is the rule, but to take a second wife is not considered wrong.[5] Among the Kung a second wife may be taken, if the first one consents; but owing to the difficulty of providing for more than one wife, our authority adds, polygynous marriages are very rare.[6] According to Dr. Schapera, all the Hottentot tribes formerly per-

[1] Trenk, 'Die Buschleute der Namib', in *Mittheilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten*, xxiii. (Berlin, 1910), p. 168.

[2] S. S. Dornan, 'The Tati Bushmen (Masarwas) and their Language', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xlvii. (London, 1917), p. 47.

[3] D. F. Bleek, *The Mantis and his Friends* (Cape Town, [1923]), Introduction.

[4] I. Schapera, *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa* (London, 1930), p. 103.

[5] D. F. Bleek, *The Naron* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 34.

[6] V. Lebzelter, 'Bei den !Kuñ-Buschleuten am oberen Omuramba und Ovambo (Sudwestafrika)', in *Sitzungsberichte der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 1928-1929, p. [13 *sq.*].

mitted polygyny, but it seems to have been practised to a slight extent only and as a rule solely by the more powerful and wealthy men.[1]

If the reader has been patient enough to give attention to this lengthy discussion of the criticism which Dr. Briffault has passed upon the reported instances of monogamy among uncultured peoples which I have quoted in my book, he may be able to judge how far it justifies the conclusion that "no monogamous primitive society is known".[2] He may also form his own opinion about the tendency "to falsify reports" which is spoken of in the preamble to that criticism. Dr. Briffault suspects again religious zeal as the motive for the "falsifications". He writes that "it would be difficult for any hypothesis to be so uniformly and directly in contradiction with the facts upon which it may be supposed to depend for evidence than (*sic*) the theological doctrine of primitive monogamy".[3] For my own part I have not even touched upon the question whether our earliest human ancestors were monogamous or polygamous, and it may very well be that they lived sometimes in monogamy and sometimes in polygyny, as seems to be the case with gorillas and chimpanzees. I have said that "to judge by my collection of facts, polygyny has not been practised on a larger scale by any of the lower hunters and food-collectors, except some Australian and Bushman tribes, nor by any incipient agriculturists, at least among those of the lower type", whereas "a considerable number of these low hunting and slightly agricultural tribes are strictly monogamous";[4] and I fail to see that Dr. Briffault has been able to invalidate the evidence on which these conclusions are based. Nor are the causes

[1] Schapera, *op. cit.* p. 251.
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 303.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 303.
[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 26.

to which I have attributed these monogamous tendencies of such a nature as to give any support to "the theological doctrine of primitive monogamy". I have pointed out that an examination of the causes of monogamy and polygyny makes it possible to explain why progress in civilisation up to a certain point has proved favourable to polygyny, although in its highest forms it has led to monogamy. The first tendency is largely due to economic and social circumstances which are absent in more primitive stages—the accumulation and unequal distribution of wealth and increasing social differentiation; but it should also be noticed that the considerable surplus of females which among many of the higher savages may be caused by their wars is not found at the lowest grades of civilisation, where war does not seriously disturb the proportion of the sexes.[1]

Among the factors that act as a check upon polygynous practices I have mentioned the jealousy or rivalry that frequently disturbs the peace in polygynous families. This does not please Dr. Briffault. He says that "the testimony, often reluctant, as to the harmony which obtains between the several wives of the same man is too definite and general to be ignored".[2] Why "reluctant"? I for one think it is wholly admirable if they agree, and I believe I have given almost as many instances as Dr. Briffault himself to show that there are savage women who do not object to polygyny, who rejoice at the arrival of a new wife, who themselves bring their husband a fresh one when they become old or prove barren, who approve of polygyny because it implies a division of labour, or because it increases the reputation of the family or the authority of the first wife, or because it gives greater liberty to the married women.[3] This notwithstanding I find from my collec-

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 104.
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 257.
[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 86 *sqq.*

tion of facts that polygyny is more frequently a cause of quarrel and domestic misery.[1] Dr. Briffault is of a very different opinion, even though he, on his own showing, is acquainted with my evidence. He makes the extraordinary statement that we, in the accounts of travellers, "occasionally" come upon references to discords and quarrels among the women in a polygynous family, but that "a large proportion of those remarks appears to represent assumptions as to what, in the opinion of the reporter, ought to take place, rather than observations".[2] So far as my experience goes, there is in Morocco nothing that a married woman dreads more than the introduction of a fresh wife, nor any more frequent object for her witchcraft than to prevent such a fatality or to make her husband incapable of having sexual intercourse with a fellow-wife. The last-mentioned fact is not in agreement with Dr. Briffault's assumption that quarrels among the women in a polygynous family have no more to do with sexual jealousy than bickerings among fellow-servants, clerks, or shop-assistants.[3] But what may we not expect to hear from a writer whose mind is perverted by preconceived ideas about polygyny in such a degree as to enable him to write that polygyny "is everywhere in uncultured societies regarded by men and women as a merit and a sign of worth, as a laudable ideal and even as a moral virtue"?[4]

He says, "When we are informed that a given people in a low state of culture are 'monogamous', the presumption is generally found to be justified that the relations between the sexes approach, with that people, to a condition of unrestricted promiscuity".[5] Thus, "among the Alfurs of Pelang, off the coast of northern Celebes, the sex relations are such that no real marriage

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 89 *sqq.*
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 260.
[3] *Ibid.* ii. 260. [4] *Ibid.* ii. 265. [5] *Ibid.* ii. 271.

bond is said to be known amongst them". In support of this statement he refers to de Hollander, Bosscher and Matthijsen, and de Clerq.[1] If the reader looks up these references he will find that the last-mentioned writer directly opposes the others, saying that the denial of marriage among those islanders is perfectly untrue and that they usually have one wife, whom they acquire by purchase.[2] As for de Hollander, it is significant that in a later edition of the very work quoted by Dr. Briffault the sentence in which marriage is said to be unknown among them has been withdrawn; this I have expressly pointed out in my book,[3] and Dr. Briffault must have been aware of it. He states that the Alfurs of Tounsawah, in Minahassa, "live in a state of gross sexual communism";[4] although his authority speaks only of "immorality", and has nothing to say about "sexual communism".[5] He quotes a description of such communism among the Sakai given by Miklucho-Maclay, who says that he only received his information about it from Malays in Pahang and members of the Catholic Mission at Malacca;[6] but this appears to Dr. Briffault "to be a very good source of information". On the other hand he rejects "the aberrant testimony of Mr. Maxwell"—according to which the stringency attaching to the marriage law of the Sakai is astounding—as being contrary to "our most reliable and latest information. Mr. Wilkinson, who resides on the spot and is probably the highest

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 305.

[2] F. S. A. de Clercq, *Bijdragen tot de kennis der residentie Ternate* (Leiden, 1890), p. 131.

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 120.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 305 *sq.*

[5] J. G. F. Riedel, 'De Minahasa in 1825', in *Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde*, xviii. (Batavia, 1872), p. 486.

[6] N. von Miklucho-Maclay, 'Ethnological Excursions in the Malay Peninsula', in *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, no. 2 (Singapore, 1878), pp. 211, 215.

living authority on those tribes, says that the Sakai 'leave everything to sensual passion and exchange wives from time to time' ".[1] But this is again one of those misleading statements of which Dr. Briffault's book abounds. What Mr. Wilkinson writes is something very different: " Betrothals are arranged by the parents—often at a very early age—though the inclination of the parties is not forced if they object to carrying out the contract. This is true, at least of the Mai Darat (the Central Sakai who live in the lower valleys): the Mai Miloi (the Central Sakai who occupy certain portions of the higher slopes) are said to be laxer, to leave everything to sexual passion, to have no marriage ceremonies, and even to exchange wives from time to time. Polygamy is tolerated though very rare. Among the Mai Miloi divorce is said to be as informal as marriage, and even among the Mai Darat of Tapah it is simply a matter for the parties to decide for themselves; among the Mai Darat of Kampar marriage is taken more seriously and is only dissolved if the elders of the community permit its dissolution, in which case a twig is broken solemnly to typify what is being done ".[2] The statements concerning the Mai Darat are evidently based upon personal observation, and those concerning the Mai Miloi upon hearsay only, but even the latter affirm the existence of individual marriage among the Sakai. Dr. Briffault also states that according to Signor Cerruti a man and wife may part, on the best of terms, and that the wife is usually (should be: not infrequently) settled with another man on the same day; but he omits mentioning that this happens only on rare occasions.[3] It is somewhat amusing to be told by

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 79 *sq.*

[2] R. J. Wilkinson, *Papers on Malay Subjects. Supplement: The Aboriginal Tribes* (Kuala Lumpur, 1910), p. 56 *sq.*

[3] G. B. Cerruti, *Nel paese dei Veleni. Fra i Sakai* (Verona, 1906), p. 143.

Dr. Briffault that "the best available evidence, therefore, entirely justifies M. Pleyte's 'violent attack' on Dr. Westermarck's statements",[1] although my statements in fact only implied a refutation of Wilken's allegation that marriage is unknown among several tribes in the Indian Archipelago and Malacca, among others the Sakai.[2]

I have written that "where polygyny occurs it may be modified in a monogamous direction both from the social and the sexual point of view. . . . The general rule is undoubtedly that one of the wives holds a higher social position than the rest or is regarded as the principal wife; and in the large majority of these cases it is the first wife to whom such a distinction is assigned, presumably because monogamy is, or formerly was, the rule among the people and polygyny either a novelty or an exception".[3] Criticising this view, Dr. Briffault remarks that, "as can be clearly shown, development has commonly taken place in the opposite direction".[4] But he has not shown it. I shall make the following quotation from Torday's more recent discussion of the principles of Bantu marriage. "A sharp line is always drawn between the wife a man first married and those who were added afterwards. In many ways her position is to such an extent specialised that one cannot resist the impression that in the eyes of Bantu law she is still the one and only real wife, and that the name of wife, when given to the women married subsequently, is nothing more than a concession made under economic stress, after the relaxation of tribal influences, to the time-honoured institution of concubinage. This concession has grown till such illegitimate liaisons have become so fully accepted by public opinion, that even

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 79.
[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 119 *sqq.*
[3] *Ibid.* iii. 28 *sqq.*
[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* ii. 307.

the virtuous free daughters of the country have consented to occupy the position of second or third wife originally intended for slaves purchased or captives taken in war. Still, in many cases, instead of rivals, the subsequent wives are practically the handmaids of the first. . . . Some Bantu in West Africa to this day treat polygyny in a manner which appears to indicate that the taking of a second wife is considered in the light of adultery. A Mukongo doing so has to perform the same purificatory rites, *maguga*, as an adulterer. . . . From the above evidence it appears clear that even in polygynous Bantu marriages the first-married woman is still considered the only legitimate wife".[1]

[1] Torday, 'The Principles of Bantu Marriage', in *Africa*, ii. (London, 1929), pp. 263, 267, 269.

IV

GROUP-MARRIAGE AND POLYANDRY

WE have now been dealing with individual marriage. But according to Dr. Briffault the matrilocal marriage, which " was the original form of marriage union ",[1] was not in the beginning individual. He maintains that " the regulation of collective sexual relations between given groups has everywhere preceded any regulation of those relations between individual members of those groups ",[2] and that " in their origin marriage regulations had no reference to such individual relations, but to relations between groups ".[3]

I have written that group-marriage has been found among many peoples who practise polyandry, but, so far as I am aware, among no others. On the other hand, " there are peoples who have a kind of sex communism, in which several men have the right of access to several women, although none of the women is properly married to more than one of the men. The fact that some of our authorities apply the term 'group-marriage' to relations of this sort should not deceive us as regards their true nature ".[4] According to my definition of " marriage ", it is not merely a regulated sexual relation, but also an economic institution. Now I find, with some surprise, that Dr. Briffault, who defines marriage, when contracted between individuals, as essentially an economic association, with

[1] Briffault, *The Mothers*, i. (London, 1927), p. 307.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 766.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 607.
[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. (London, 1921), p. 228.

or without exclusive sexual rights, uses the same term for relations which are purely sexual, without any economic aspect at all. Yet, however inconsistent this terminology appears to me, it is after all only a matter of definition. There are other points connected with the relations which Dr. Briffault calls "group-marriages" on which our disagreement is much more essential.

He says that "in those societies which have preserved their primitive organisation in clans or intermarrying groups, recognised freedom of access between any male of the one group and any female of the other is, in fact, the rule rather than the exception".[1] For my own part I doubt whether such unlimited freedom has been proved to exist even among a single people. Let us look at Dr. Briffault's evidence, apart from all hypothetical interpretations.

He begins his survey of the subject by summarising Sternberg's account of sex communism among the Gilyak, who inhabit the region of the lower Amur river and the northern parts of the island of Sakhalin.[2] They are organised into exogamic intermarrying classes, and every member, male and female, of one class marries into the corresponding marriage class to which he or she is allotted from birth. Those classes correspond to the degrees of relationship, and the terms used to denote these indicate at the same time the norms of their marriage regulations. Thus a man shall marry his mother's brother's daughter and a girl her father's sister's son (own, or in default of such, collateral);[3] whereas all other cousins are strictly barred even in the remotest degree. But the husband does not possess exclusive sexual rights over his wife. Among the western Gilyak all his brothers, own and collateral, have marital rights over her; among the eastern Gilyak,

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 608 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* i. 629 *sq.*

[3] L. Y. Sternberg, 'Gilyaki', in *Etnografičeskoe obozrenie*, xl. (Moskwa, 1904), p. 32 *sq.*

again, the younger brothers have such a claim to the wives of the elder brothers, whereas the elder brothers have no right to the wives of the younger ones.[1] In neither case, however, does this sex communism represent " recognised freedom of access between any male of the one [intermarrying] group and any female of the other ". The freedom is restricted to occasions when the husband is absent. Sternberg writes: " A wife who lives in a so to speak legal individual marriage makes at the same time use of her right to have privately (*neglasno*), that is, in her husband's absence, intercourse with members of the group of men whom she calls her *pu* " (men whom she may marry); and in mentioning a case where a man cohabited with his sister-in-law, he adds that, as a matter of course, it happened when the husband was not in the dwelling.[2] He also tells us that the carrying out of those rights often leads to violent protests from the person affected by the act.[3] Maksimoff remarks that we cannot speak here of any " rights " at all, and that Sternberg's enthusiasm for a theory has made him forget the actual facts.[4] I suspect that Sternberg, in his description of the sex communism of the Gilyak, has, like some other writers in similar cases, been unduly influenced by the classificatory terms of relationship. He lays it down as a general principle that " the classificatory system is but the register of the rules of marriage ",[5] and says that " all serious students of primitive institutions now acknowledge the root principle of Morgan's theory, namely, that the classifi-

[1] L. Y. Sternberg, ' The Turano-Ganowanian System and the Nations of North-East Asia ', in *International Congress of Americanists, Proceedings of the XVIII. Session, London, 1912* (London, 1913), p. 323 *sqq.*

[2] *Idem*, in *Etnografičeskoe obozrenie*, xl. 23.

[3] *Idem*, ' Sachalinskie Gilyaki ', *ibid.* xvii. (1893), p. 7.

[4] A. N. Maksimoff, ' Gruppowoi brak ', *ibid.* lxxviii. (1908), p. 41.

[5] Sternberg, in *International Congress of Americanists*, p. 319.

catory system, especially the Turano-Ganowanian system, is simply the outcome of certain peculiar rules of marriage, the real forms of which Morgan believed to have found in the so-called *punalua* family".[1] Polyandry exists among the Gilyak; Sternberg has more than once found brothers living together with a common wife,[2] and we hear of polyandry from other writers also.[3] It has been accounted for by a disproportion between the sexes: according to the statistics of Patkanow, from 1912, there were among the Gilyak 2556 men and only 2093 women.[4] It may be that in this, as in many other cases, polyandrous relations have led to group relations.

Sternberg states that among the Tungus marriage is regulated by a classificatory system of relationship with somewhat wider age-grades: a man has sexual rights over the wives of his elder brothers, own and collateral, and over the wives of the younger brothers of his father.[5] This, however, is not, as Dr. Briffault alleges, "complete group-marriage relations",[6] in the sense of sexual relations between two intermarrying groups; for the reciprocal marrying classes consist obviously of all those who stand in the said relations to each other irrespectively of their age. Jochelson has informed Sternberg that among the Aleut in former times the younger brothers lived in group-marriage with the wives of the elder brothers, and that at the present time

[1] Sternberg, in *International Congress of Americanists*, p. 319.

[2] *Idem*, in *Etnografičeskoe obozrenie*, xl. 24.

[3] E. G. Ravenstein, *The Russians on the Amur* (London, 1861), p. 391; P. Labbé, *Un Bagne russe, L'île de Sakhaline* (Paris, 1905), p. 170, quoted by P. Descamps, 'La promiscuité est-elle primitive?' in *Revue de l'Institut de Sociologie*, 1924–5, i. (Bruxelles), p. 16. See also Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 629.

[4] Miss M. A. Czaplicka, *Aboriginal Siberia* (Oxford, 1914), p. 100 n. 1.

[5] Sternberg, in *International Congress of Americanists*, p. 327.

[6] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 632.

the institution is preserved among cousins, not as a facultative institution but as an obligatory one, to participate in group-marriage being the duty of all cousins.[1] This information is lacking in definiteness. According to earlier writers there was polyandry among the Aleut.[2]

Sex communism is found among the Chukchi, inhabiting the extreme north-east of the Asiatic continent. Dr. Bogoras states that " marriage among the Chukchi does not deal with one couple only, but extends over an entire group ". The men belonging to such a " marriage-union " are called " companions in wives ". " Each ' companion ' has a right to all the wives of his ' companion ', but takes advantage of his right comparatively seldom, namely, only when he visits for some reason the camp of one of the ' companions '. Then the host cedes him his place in the sleeping-room ". The companions do not form together a group, all the members of which have *ipso facto* access to each other's wives: a man may have several companions who do not stand in a similar relation to each other. Nor does any man become automatically another man's companion: the union is formed by a pact into which the members deliberately enter by an individual contract. The companions are mostly persons who are well acquainted, especially neighbours and relatives, but seldom inmates of one and the same camp; and although second and third cousins are almost invariably united by ties of this kind, brothers do not enter into such unions. On the other hand, there are unions with inhabitants of other districts, with chance acquaintances during temporary trading-relations, and even with individuals belonging to a different people—Tungus, Russians, or American

[1] Sternberg, in *International Congress of Americanists*, p. 332.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 109; Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 633 *sq.*

Eskimo.[1] Dr. Bogoras believes that this sex communism of the Chukchi was a union between the members of a related group, and that only in the course of time other friendly persons began to be included in the union.[2] But if this so-called group-marriage was in the first place a union between relatives, how is it that brothers, who among so many peoples have their wife or wives in common, are expressly excluded from it (an important fact which Dr. Briffault omits to mention), whereas perfect strangers are not? That the access granted to strangers is not a modern innovation is obvious from some of the tales referring to ancient times in which unions with American Eskimo are spoken of. From facts like these, as well as from the important statements that "the inmates of one and the same camp are seldom willing to enter into a group-marriage",[3] and that a man takes advantage of his right of access only when he visits the camp of one of his companions,[4] I draw the conclusion that one object at least of the sex communism of the Chukchi is to provide men with bedfellows during their absence from home.[5] Another object may be mutual protection. "Not to be connected with such a union", says Bogoras, "means to have no friends and good-wishers, and no protectors in case of need"; hence at the present time the unions through "group-marriage" embrace practically all Chukchi families.[6] On the other hand I can find no justification for Dr. Briffault's assumption that the "group-marriage" of the Chukchi "corresponds to,

[1] W. Bogoras, *The Chukchi* (*Publications of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition*, vol. vii. [Leiden & New York, 1904–9]), p. 602 *sqq.*

[2] *Ibid.* p. 603. [3] *Ibid.* p. 603. [4] *Ibid.* p. 602.

[5] According to G. A. Erman (*Travels in Siberia*, ii. [London, 1848], p. 530 n.*), the Chukchi offer their wives and daughters to travellers who chance to visit them, and "observe the same custom with men of their own race, and expect as much in return".

[6] Bogoras, *op. cit.* p. 604.

and is a direct derivative of, established marriage rights between two marrying classes or groups".[1] There is no sexual communism between established marrying classes or groups, and, as already said, the unions depend in each case upon a special contract between individuals; and I find nothing to indicate that they once arose from a collective contract between two groups.

On the whole it seems that the so-called group-marriages of the Chukchi do not differ essentially from practices found among their neighbours on the other side of the sea and among Eskimo farther east. As regards those about Bering Strait, Nelson writes that " it is a common custom for two men living in different villages to agree to become bond fellows, or brothers by adoption. Having made this agreement, whenever one of them goes to the other's village he is received as the bond brother's guest and is given the use of his host's bed with his wife during his stay. When the visit is returned the same favour is extended to the other".[2] Temporary exchange of wives is probably practised all over the area inhabited by Eskimo;[3] but nobody, I suppose, would call it " group-marriage ", although it has been represented as a relic of earlier group-marriage. It is only by looking upon this and other customs—polyandry, sexual hospitality, the sororate, the levirate—as survivals of such an institution, that Dr. Briffault is able to say that, apparently, with the large majority of tribes from Manchuria on the Asiatic side to British Columbia on the American side " reciprocal sexual rights between all the males and all the females of two intermarrying groups are recognised and used at the present day,

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 633.

[2] E. W. Nelson, ' The Eskimo about Bering Strait ', in *Annual Reports of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, xviii. (Washington, 1899), p. 292. See also *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 109.

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 230 *sqq.*

or were so until quite recent times".[1] Existing conditions most decidedly do not justify this statement; of the interpretation of those customs as vestiges of ancient "group-marriage" I shall speak later.

Concerning the Santals of Bengal, Dr. Briffault writes: "A man has right of access to all the younger sisters of his wife, and his younger brothers also have the same right. In other words, the institution of complete group-marriage between families . . . is 'part of the social system of the Santals'".[2] This is not correct. According to the authorities quoted by him—who are the same as have been previously quoted by myself[3]—a husband's younger brothers are allowed to share his wife's favours, but not *vice versa*; the husband has access to his wife's younger sisters; but it is nowhere said that the younger brothers of the husband have access to the younger sisters of his wife. Hence we cannot speak here of conjugal relations between a group of brothers and a group of sisters, or, as Dr. Briffault puts it, of "complete group-marriage between families". Moreover, I have not found that a man is bound to marry into a certain family. The same may be said of sex communism in Madagascar. The ancestral law of the Malagasy authorised sexual relations between a man and the unmarried sisters and female cousins of his wife (Dr. Briffault has left out the word "unmarried"[4]), and with the wives of his younger brothers and of his cousins; and a woman, though having only one husband, was during his absence compelled to receive in the conjugal bed his younger brothers and cousins and the husbands of his sisters and cousins. If any of them was caught in flagrant adultery, he was allowed to atone for his fault by proposing to the

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 643 *sq.*
[2] *Ibid.* i. 674.
[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 265.
[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 722.

husband to share with him the family expenses, as well as the woman and her children, a proposal which, it is said, the injured husband was at liberty to accept or refuse.[1]

Among the Banyoro, or Bakitara, in the Uganda Protectorate, according to Roscoe, who is quoted by Dr. Briffault,[2] "it was perfectly legitimate for a man to have relations with the wives of the men he called his brothers, that is, his clan-fellows, and such action was not looked upon as adultery. A man might use his influence with his wife to make her refrain from such action, and might be annoyed if she admitted to her bed a member of the clan with whom he was not on good terms, but he could not accuse her of unfaithfulness for so doing. Adultery lay in admitting to her bed a man of some other clan than her husband's".[3] This is certainly not an instance of recognised freedom of access between any male of one clan and any female of another clan. We are not told that a man had access to all the women of his wife's clan, nor even that the men of one clan always married into any particular one of the many exogamous clans, numbering over one hundred, into which the Bakitara are divided;[4] and the statement in question refers only to men's relations to married women. Dr. Briffault says that similar usages obtain among the Banyankole or Bahima, though the restriction to clan-brothers of the husband is not insisted on, so that the wife is free to admit any man she pleases, and the husband enjoys a like liberty as regards any other woman. According to his authority, however, this refers only to the serfs

[1] A. and G. Grandidier, *Histoire physique, naturelle et politique de Madagascar*, vol. iv.: *Ethnographie*, pt. ii. (Paris, 1914), pp. 155, 156, 189 n. *a*.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 716 *sq.*

[3] J. Roscoe, *The Bakitara or Banyoro* (Cambridge, 1923), p. 265. See also *ibid.* p. 239.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 13.

in Ankole, not to the pastoral people, among whom monogamy was customary and polygyny, though permissible, was practised in most cases only if the first wife turned out to be sterile.[1] Roscoe's statement concerning the husband's liberty to have connection with "any other woman" is modified by another, according to which, among the serfs in Ankole, "the chastity of a girl before marriage was the object of the greatest care, and if a girl went wrong she was driven from home and utterly disowned by her parents".[2] On the same authority Dr. Briffault says that among the Bakunta on the shores of Lake Edward "a woman after marriage was expected to admit (should be: "might permit") any of her husband's friends to her favours". Here also "the bride was treated as in Ankole, being fattened and secluded before marriage and carefully guarded".[3] Dr. Briffault refers briefly to cases of sexual communism among some tribes in West Africa and in the Upper Congo;[4] but whatever else may be said of them, they certainly do not imply anything like freedom of access between the men and women of two intermarrying groups.

Among the Akamba, in British East Africa, according to Lindblom, also quoted by Dr. Briffault,[5] "a married woman can quite lawfully have relations with other men, her husband often placing her at the disposal of a man of the same clan, or of a friend, who comes on a visit and stays over night"; but although such relations are considered lawful, the man who indulges in them must be purified before he can enter his own hut again. Among the same people, "if a man has several wives

[1] J. Roscoe, *The Bayankole* (Cambridge, 1923), pp. 129, 122.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 129.
[3] *Idem*, *The Bagesu and other Tribes of the Uganda Protectorate* (Cambridge, 1924), p. 160.
[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 718 *sq.*
[5] *Ibid.* i. 717.

(A, B, and C), and they have sons who are married, every man has a right to have sexual intercourse with the wife of the half-brother corresponding to him in age; that is to say, A's eldest son can sleep with the wife of the eldest son of B or C; A's second son with the wife of the second son of B or C; and so on".[1] Dr. Briffault also speaks of these customs in the present connection. In the former case the right of access is evidently dependent on the husband's permission, and in neither case is there a collective contract between two intermarrying groups.

Dr. Briffault writes: "Farther south, among the Masai and other kindred tribes, the right of access to one another's wives among members of the same marriage class is recognised and observed. Those classes are, however, not constituted by the clans, but by 'age-groups' consisting of the men who have passed through the puberty ceremonies at the same time".[2] But if there are intermarrying groups there must also be a group of women into which the men have to marry, and we are not told that a Masai has to take his wife from a group of women of his own age. On the contrary, Hollis states that when a man wishes to marry, "he commences his courtship by making love to a girl while she is still young, and by presenting some tobacco to her father", and then waits until the girl grows up;[3] whilst, according to Merker, he generally engages himself at the age of twenty to twenty-two to a girl of eight to ten.[4] Although it is no offence if a man commits adultery or fornication with a woman or girl of his own age, and a woman may cohabit with any man of her husband's age-grade, provided that they are not

[1] G. Lindblom, *The Akamba in British East Africa* (Uppsala, 1916), p. 78 *sq.*

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 717.

[3] A. C. Hollis, *The Masai* (Oxford, 1905), p. 302.

[4] M. Merker, *Die Masai* (Berlin, 1904), p. 44.

of the same sub-clan or too nearly related,[1] it seems that a man has access to another man's wife chiefly when he comes as a guest. For it is said that when a Masai goes to another kraal to pay a visit, he enters the hut of a man of his own age and is left there alone with the wife, or one of the wives, of the owner, who himself goes to search for a place to sleep in elsewhere; and that a man " cannot refuse hospitality to a stranger (of his own age), for he is afraid that the other members of his age will curse him, and he will die ".[2] Weiss speaks of the sexual communism of the Masai only as a form of hospitality, frequently practised on account of their travelling habits; when a man comes to a friendly village, he thrusts his spear into the ground (which looks to me as a conditional curse), with the result that its owner has to spend the night in another hut.[3] Dr. Driberg calls it a feature of Nilo-Hamitic culture that any member of the group to which a married man belongs has the right of access to his wife " for the time they happen to be in the position of guest and host. Full hospitality, that is, includes the wife's body. . . . The theory underlying the privilege allowed to members of the husband's age-set is that people occupying the same status share their lives so fully that one can be substituted for another in nearly every circumstance. This holds good for blood revenge, and is equally good in domestic arrangements, though the substitute ' husband ' of a night has no marital rights over the woman other than those of sexual access. She is not considered to be married to a

[1] Hollis, *op. cit.* p. 312 ; *idem*, ' A Note on the Masai System of Relationship and other Matters connected therewith ', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, xl. (London, 1910), p. 480; Merker, *op. cit.* p. 118.

[2] Hollis, *The Masai*, p. 287 *sq.*

[3] M. Weiss, *Die Völkerstamme im Norden Deutsch-Ostafrikas* (Berlin, 1910), p. 386. See also *ibid.* p. 407.

group of men as has sometimes been erroneously alleged".[1]

The custom which permits men of the same age-grade to have sexual intercourse with each other's wives is also found in some places of British New Guinea. In the Bartle Bay communities all the individuals of the same sex who are of approximately the same age are respectively considered as members of a class called a *kimta*. The members of a *kimta* form a sort of association having certain rights to each other's fellowship and help; and the relations are particularly intimate between a man and his *kimta* mates in his own settlement, who are called *eriam*. Messrs. Seligman and Giblin state that at Wedau and some other communities, at least, each member of the *eriam* fellowship has marital rights over the wives of his fellow *eriam*, the only bar to these rights being those laws of clan-group and totem or individual consanguinity which would have prevented the man himself from marrying these women. According to Mr. Newton, a man cannot have as an *eriam* a man of his own clan (a fact not mentioned by Dr. Briffault); a man may be *eriam* to a man of a younger *kimta*, although he would more often be *eriam* to men of his own *kimta*; the *eriam* relationship is hereditary; and if a man with one wife is *eriam* to a man with several wives, his rights only extend to the first or one wife, whereas he has no rights over the others.[2] Here, also, the sexual communism has no reference to relations between members of two intermarrying groups. For the *kimtas* are not such groups: the men belonging to one *kimta* are not said to marry into a certain other *kimta* consisting of women. There are certain statements that perhaps justify the suspicion that the main

[1] J. H. Driberg, ' The Status of Women among the Nilotics and Nilo-Hamitics ', in *Africa*, v. (London, 1932), p. 417.

[2] C. G. Seligman and Brenda Z. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea* (Cambridge, 1910), p. 470 *sqq.*

object of the sexual rights implied in the *eriam* relationship was to give men an opportunity to gratify their desires by intercourse with the wives of their friends at times when they had to abstain from intercourse with their own, particularly from the time when pregnancy was diagnosed until the child was weaned.[1]

Dr. Briffault discusses the institution of sexual communism among the Herero in South-West Africa, for which the native name is *oupánga*, and tries to show how it may have developed out of an earlier group-marriage between clans.[2] At present it is nothing of the kind. According to Brincker, *oupánga* was originally the right word for "friendship", but came to be used by the heathen Herero for a custom consisting in a community of women and, to a certain extent, of property.[3] "Two men", he says, "who are each *epánga* to the other, bind themselves by mutual presents of cattle and other things to an intimate friendship, which makes accessible to every *epánga* the wives of his *epánga*, and on the other hand confers the right to take anything from his herd at pleasure".[4] Other authorities also speak of the *oupánga* as a custom through which a few men agree to have property, or cattle, and wives in common.[5] Dr. Briffault misquotes Hahn grossly when he represents him as saying that every man and every woman stand towards certain other men and women

[1] *Cf.* C. G. Seligman and Brenda Z. Seligman, *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, p. 474.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 719 *sqq.*

[3] P. H. Brincker, *Wörterbuch und kurzgefasste Grammatik des Otji-Hérero* (Leipzig, 1886), p. 227.

[4] *Idem*, 'Charakter, Sitten und Gebräuche speciell der Bantu Deutsch-Südwestafrikas', in *Mittheilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen an der Königl. Friedrich Wilhelms Universität zu Berlin*, vol. iii. pt. iii. (Berlin & Stuttgart, 1900), p. 86.

[5] J. Hahn, 'Die Ovahereró', in *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin*, iv. (Berlin, 1869), p. 490; Bensen, in J. Kohler, 'Das Recht der Herero', in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, xiv. (Stuttgart, 1900), p. 298.

in a particular relation called *upanga*; Hahn says on the contrary that this relation occurs "fairly seldom" (*ziemlich selten*). According to Von François, the *oupánga* gives those who conclude it a right to each other's assistance in critical cases, during a famine and in war, and secures each of them a hospitable reception at the other's farm and even access to one or several of his wives.[1] Dannert expressly denies that the community of wives among the Herero carries with it a community of goods, though a man is considered to be by honour bound to give to his *epánga* the best piece of meat at a feast and the best ram of his flock if the *epánga* in travelling passes one of his stock-stations. The same writer also informs us that a man who lives in polygyny may conclude an *oupánga*-union with reference to one of his wives only, although he may give other men a share in his other wives.[2] The *oupánga* is concluded by a verbal agreement without any religious or other formalities, and it may be dissolved at any time, which commonly happens through a quarrel caused by one of the women concerned.[3] As regards the persons who form an *oupánga* our authorities disagree. Schinz[4] and Von François[5] state that they are often brothers; on the other hand, Dannert, who is probably our best authority, tells us that it is strictly forbidden for brothers to become *omapanga*, nay, that the male partners must not be related to each other by blood at all.[6] But an *oupánga* may also be formed by two unmarried women, who thereby not only promise to stand by each other in all circumstances,

[1] H. von François, *Nama und Damara Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika* (Magdeburg, [1896]), p. 198 *sq.*

[2] E. Dannert, *Zum Rechte der Herero* (Berlin, 1906), p. 41 *sq.*

[3] *Ibid.* p. 39 *sq.*

[4] H. Schinz, *Deutsch-Süd-West-Afrika* (Oldenburg & Leipzig, [1891]), p. 173.

[5] Von François, *op. cit.* p. 199.

[6] Dannert, *op. cit.* p. 40.

but also to enter into sexual relations with one another.[1]

As to the origin of the *oupánga* formed by men different opinions have been expressed. Kohler looks upon it as a relic of an earlier group-marriage in which the husbands were brothers;[2] and Dr. Briffault suggests that it was originally entered into, not by a special pact with non-relatives, but automatically between clan-relatives. Interpretations of this kind, however, are simply made to suit a certain evolutionary scheme which is purely speculative. Fritsch attributes this institution to poverty.[3] But I should imagine that poverty would lead to polyandry rather than to group-unions, and so far as I can gather from the information available, the men who conclude an *oupánga* are married men who mutually agree to give each other a share in their wives. It may, however, be a substitute for polygyny, resorted to either from economic motives or from lack of women, especially as the female offspring among the Herero are said to be less numerous than the male.[4] Dannert suggests that the *oupánga* may be due to the fact that a young man is not at liberty to choose his wife himself but has to marry the girl selected for him by his parents, and therefore is anxious to form new connections after his own taste. Or it may be that a man enters into such a union with one or several other men in order not to lack female companionship when he visits their houses, or when he goes to his stock-station and is unable to take his wife with him.[5] The *oupánga* of the Herero may thus serve the same purpose as the group-unions of the Chukchi. But whatever may be

[1] Brincker, in *Mittheil. d. Seminars f. orientalische Sprachen*, vol. iii. pt. iii. p. 86; *idem*, *Wörterbuch*, p. 16; G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrikas* (Breslau, 1872), p. 227.

[2] Kohler, *loc. cit.* p. 299.

[3] Fritsch, *op. cit.* p. 227.

[4] Von François, *op. cit.* p. 195.

[5] Dannert, *op. cit.* p. 41.

its origin it is certainly not a relation between two intermarrying groups; its sexual communism is simply based upon the mutual agreement of one man with another man.

A famous case of group-unions is the *punalua* system of the Hawaiians. Judge Lorin Andrews wrote in 1860 to Morgan: " The relationship of *punalŭa* is rather amphibious. It arose from the fact that two or more brothers with their wives, or two or more sisters with their husbands, were inclined to possess each other in common; but the modern use of the word is that of *dear friend* and *intimate companion*".[1] The Rev. A. Bishop, who sent Morgan a schedule of the Hawaiian system of relationship terms, observed that the " confusion of relationships " was " the result of the ancient custom among relatives of the living together of husbands and wives in common ". Dr. Bartlett wrote, " Husbands had many wives and wives many husbands, and exchanged with each other at pleasure ".[2] Dr. Rivers remarks that side by side with the presence of individual marriage as a social institution there existed in Hawaii much laxity, and also " a definite system of cicisbeism in which the paramours had a recognised status. Of these paramours those who would seem to have had the most definite status were certain relatives, viz. the brothers of the husband and the sisters of the wife. These formed a group within which all the males had marital rights over all the females "; and Dr. Rivers was told that even now, nearly a century after the general acceptance of Christianity, the rights of *punalua* " are still sometimes recognised, and give rise to cases which come before the law courts, where they are treated as cases of adultery. In addition to these *punalua* who had a recognised status owing to their relationship to the married couple, there were often other paramours

[1] L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* (London, 1877), p. 427.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 427 *sq.*

apparently chosen freely at the will of the husband and wife ".[1]

That the Hawaiians have had individual marriage as long as they have been known to us is certain. Ellis, who wrote his account more than a hundred years ago, speaks of nothing else, and says that polygyny was practised only by the chiefs.[2] That the *punalua* system was not group-marriage, but at most, as Dr. Rivers puts it, " a definite system of cicisbeism ", is also more than probable. Whether the right of a *punalua* belonged to him as a matter of course on account of his relationship to the married couple, or was specially granted to him in each case, is not clear; Judge Andrews' statement, that brothers with their wives and sisters with their husbands " were inclined to possess each other in common ", rather speaks in favour of the latter alternative. The Hawaiian *punalua* custom is certainly full of obscurity. While Rivers regards it as sex communism between a group of brothers and a group of sisters, Sternberg interprets it as a group-marriage of either several brothers (own and collateral) with their wives, not necessarily related to one another, or of several sisters (own and collaterial) with their husbands, likewise not necessarily related to one another.[3] The accounts of it are so meagre and indefinite and so much mixed up with reference to the terms of relationship that one cannot help asking oneself whether there may not have been some confusion between the habits of life and the terms of relationship, similar to that which has led to the statement that in Australian tribes all the males in one division of a tribe were married to all the females

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. (Cambridge, 1914), p. 386 *sq.*

[2] W. Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii* (London, 1826), p. 414. *Cf.* U. Lisiansky, *A Voyage round the World* (London, 1814), p. 128.

[3] Sternberg, *International Congress of Americanists, Proceedings of the XVIII. Session, London, 1912*, p. 325.

of the same generation in another division. As to the origin of the *punalua* system no other conjecture has, to my knowledge, been made than Morgan's that it developed out of the purely hypothetical " consanguine family ", consisting of a body of kinsfolk within which there prevailed communal marriage between all men and women of the same generation.[1] The males are said to have outnumbered the females in Hawaii,[2] and this disproportion of the sexes may, of course, have influenced the sexual relations of the people.

Dr. Rivers states that in some parts of Melanesia there are, side by side with definite individual marriage, sexual relations between a group of men formed by the husband's brothers and a group of women formed by the wife's sisters—brothers and sisters understood in the classificatory sense. He observes that now, at any rate, such group-relations are merely sexual, and that it therefore seems better in these cases not to speak of group-marriage but of sexual communism associated with individual marriage.[3] His statement, however, seems to be based not on direct evidence but on inference. Dr. Rivers denies that the correspondences which are found between certain terms of relationship and actual communistic relations in Melanesia at the present time or in the recent past lend any support to the hypothesis that they are survivals of sexual communism, since they are more naturally explained as the result of the status of certain men and women as potential husbands and wives.[4] But the case is

[1] Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (*Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge*, vol. xvii.; Washington, 1871), p. 488; *idem*, *Ancient Society*, p. 502.

[2] Ellis, *op. cit.* p. 414; A. Marcuse, *Die Hawaiischen Inseln* (Berlin, 1894), p. 109.

[3] Rivers, ' Marriage (Introductory and Primitive) ', in J. Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, viii. (Edinburgh, 1915), p. 428.

[4] *Idem*, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 128 *sq.*

different " when we turn to the duties and restrictions associated with Melanesian terms of relationship ": it is only then that " we meet with definite evidence for the existence of sexual communism, not merely in the past, but even at the present time ". We are told that the most conclusive evidence of this kind comes from the Torres Islands.[1] I have examined it in detail in my book, and arrived at the following conclusion: " An account in which there are so many obscurities and ambiguities, where possibilities, occurrences, and recognised rights are mixed up in a way which makes it hardly possible to find out what the author really means, and where statements of great importance for the argument are modified by a 'perhaps', or an 'almost certainly'—such an account cannot, in my opinion, provide us with 'definite evidence for the existence of sexual communism' in Melanesia ".[2] Dr. Codrington, also, is inclined to believe that sexual communism once existed in that part of the world. He admits that the people have no memory of a time when all the women of one division were in fact common wives to the men of another division, but on the other side, he argues, " is to be set the testimony, the strong testimony, of words ".[3] I have examined this evidence, too, and found it to be of extremely doubtful value.[4] It is surprising that Dr. Briffault has not referred to Dr. Rivers' evidence for group-marriage in Melanesia; perhaps he, also, has found it unconvincing.

Dr. Briffault mentions, quite cursorily, Dr. Tautain's account of sexual communism in the Marquesas.[5] Dr. Tautain states that all the brothers of a man became from the moment of his marriage *vahana pekio*,

[1] Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 132 *sqq.*
[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 244 *sqq.*
[3] R. H. Codrington, *The Melanesians* (Oxford, 1891), p. 27 *sqq.*
[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 246 *sq.*
[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 723 *sq.*

or secondary husbands to his wife, and all her sisters became *vehine pekio*, or secondary wives to him, which, however, did not prevent them from marrying other men if they were not married already. But the husbands of one woman were not always brothers. If a man carried off another man's wife he became her principal husband, while the original husband, if he followed her, now only became her *vahana pekio* and the principal husband's servant; and the principal wife of a man could also on her own account take a secondary husband, and often did so.[1] Dr. Briffault, who does not mention these details, assumes that " the fraternal sororal polygamy of the Marquesans was derived from an originally wider form of tribal sexual communism "; but this is a sheer conjecture. On the other hand we have three earlier accounts of polyandry unconnected with polygyny in the Marquesas. De Roquefeuil, who visited those islands in the earlier part of the nineteenth century, says that nearly every woman there had at least two husbands, the supplementary husband being generally a brother or friend of the principal one; whereas polygyny was so rare that men who had more than one wife were specially spoken of.[2] Lisiansky, whose description is of a slightly earlier date, writes of the natives of Nukahiva, one of the Marquesas: " In rich families, every woman has two husbands; of whom one may be called the assistant husband. This last, when the other is at home, is nothing more than the head servant of the house; but, in case of absence, exercises all the rights of matrimony, and is also obliged to attend his lady wherever she goes. It happens sometimes, that the subordinate partner is chosen after

[1] L. Tautain, ' Étude sur le mariage chez les Polynésiens (Mao'i) des îles Marquises ', in *L'Anthropologie*, vi. (Paris, 1895), pp. 644, 646, 648.

[2] C. de Roquefeuil, *Journal d'un voyage autour du monde*, i. (Paris, 1823), p. 308 *sq.*

marriage; but in general two men present themselves to the same woman, who, if she approves their addresses, appoints one for the real husband, and the other as his auxiliary: the auxiliary is generally poor, but handsome and well-made".[1] Melville states that among the Nukahivans living in the valley of Typee no man has more than one wife, and no wife of mature years has less than two husbands: "a second suitor presents himself, of graver years, and carries both boy and girl away to his own habitation".[2] These statements suggest that among the Marquesas Islanders, as among various other polyandrous peoples, group-marriage arose as a combination of polygyny with polyandry.

Group-marriage has particularly been the subject of much discussion in connection with Australian ethnology. It is said actually to exist among some Australian tribes, while its former prevalence among others has been deduced from certain practices that have been represented as social survivals. The best known of the tribes that are still said to practise group-marriage are the Dieri and Urabunna in Central Australia. The former, whose marriage customs have been most fully described by Dr. Howitt, are divided into two exogamous moieties, whose members may intermarry freely, subject only to restrictions dependent on kinship. We are told that they have two kinds of marriages: the *tippa-malku* or individual marriage, and the *pirrauru* or group-marriage. As regards the individual marriage Dr. Howitt informs us in his latest book that it is usually brought about by betrothal in infancy or childhood, and that the arrangement is made by the mothers with the concurrence of the girl's maternal uncles.[3] The *pirrauru* relation, on the other hand,

[1] Lisiansky, *op. cit.* p. 83.

[2] H. Melville, *Typee* (London, [1892]), p. 282.

[3] A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (London, 1904), p. 177.

"arises through the exchange by brothers of their wives. When two brothers are married to two sisters, they commonly live together in a group-marriage of four. When a man becomes a widower he has his brother's wife as *Pirrauru*, making presents to his brother. A man being a visitor, and being of the proper class, is offered his host's *Tippa-malku* wife as a temporary *Pirrauru*". Moreover, if a man is in great favour with the women, "a woman might even ask her husband to give her such or such a man as a *Pirrauru*. Should he refuse to do this, she must put up with it; but if he agrees to do so, the matter is arranged".[1] In another account Dr. Howitt also mentions allocation by the elders as one source of the *pirrauru* relation.[2] In order to make the *pirrauru* relation legal a ceremony is performed by the head of the totem, or heads when there are more than one totem concerned, a ceremony that is performed for batches of people at the same time.[3] A man may have several *pirrauru* wives and a woman several *pirrauru* husbands, but no woman can have more than one *tippa-malku* husband simultaneously,[4] although a man can have more than one *tippa-malku* wife. This description shows quite clearly that no person becomes a *pirrauru* husband or wife as a matter of course on account of his, or her, status. Nor is the *pirrauru* relation by far equal to the *tippa-malku* relation. The *tippa-malku* wife takes precedence over the *pirrauru* wife,[5] and the rights granted to a *pirrauru* husband are much inferior to those possessed by the *tippa-malku* husband. He has marital rights over the

[1] Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia* (London, 1904), p. 181.

[2] *Idem*, 'Australian Group-Relationships', in *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, xxxvii. (1907), p. 279.

[3] *Idem*, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 181 *sq.*

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 179, 181.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 184.

wife only if the *tippa-malku* husband is absent; " but he cannot take her away from him, unless by his consent, excepting at certain ceremonial times, as for instance at the initiation ceremonies, or at one of the marriages arranged between a man and a woman of two different tribes ". While the *tippa-malku* husband and his wife form a real household, it is only in his absence that she lives with any of her *pirraurus*, enjoying his protection.[1] And from a statement made by Mr. Gason it appears that the *tippa-malku* husband recognises all the children of his wife as his own and treats them with the same kindness and affection.[2] Thus there is no group-fatherhood.

In the Urabunna tribe, whose territory adjoins that of the Dieri on the north, Messrs. Spencer and Gillen found an institution very similar to the *pirrauru* relation. A man can only marry women who stand to him in the relationship of *nupa*, that is, are the children of his mother's elder brothers (own or tribal), or, what is the same thing, of his father's elder sisters. But while he has one or perhaps two of these *nupa* women who are specially attached to him and live with him in his own camp, he has in addition to them certain other *nupa* women to whom he stands in the relationship of *piraungaru*. To the latter he has access, " if the first man be present, with his consent, or, in his absence, without any restrictions whatever ".[3] A woman's elder brothers will give one man a preferential right to her and other men of the same group a secondary right, but in the case of the *piraungaru* the arrangement must receive the sanction of the old men of the group before it can take effect. A woman may also be *piraungaru* to

[1] Howitt, *Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 184.

[2] S. Gason, ' Of the Tribes, Dieyerie, Auminie, etc.', in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xxiv. (1895), p. 169.

[3] These conditions are mentioned by B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1899), p. 110.

a number of men.[1] It is obvious, then, that—as in the case of a *pirrauru*—no person becomes a *piraungaru* as a matter of course on account of his or her status, in other words, that there is no "recognised freedom of access between any male of the one marrying group and any female of the other"; and it is also obvious that the freedom of access within the *piraungaru* relation is not unrestricted.

There are some much less detailed reports of sexual communism in other Australian tribes. Dr. Briffault quotes Roth's statement that among certain natives of northern Queensland a husband has marital rights over his wife's blood-sisters, and that she, whenever he is absent, can without fear of any consequences regularly sleep with any of his blood-brothers.[2] But he omits to mention the important qualifications with which this statement is hedged. It is only in certain circumstances that the husband's rights over his wife's blood-sisters can be claimed: "On the Pennefather River, for instance, the husband has to ask his step-parents for them as each arrives at marriageable age, whereas on the Tully River he may satisfy his desires by force if necessary, irrespective of any age, unless the girl is already married, when he can do so by getting her husband's permission. For, according to his mood, a husband here may or may not object to his wife having intercourse with any of his group- or blood-brothers".[3] Dr. Briffault refers to Krichauff's vague statement in his brief report on the class system of the Aldolinga on the upper Finke River that "a Beltare man can cohabit with any Kumare woman, or a Burule with all the

[1] Spencer and Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 61 *sqq.*

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 740.

[3] W. E. Roth, 'North Queensland Ethnography, Bulletin No. 10', in *Records of the Australian Museum*, vii. (Sydney, 1908-1910), p. 12.

Bunanke women", but leaves out the next sentence, which is more definite: "He may sleep with his brother's wife, or his brother with his wife; and this occurs very frequently".[1] Dr. Briffault alleges that Krichauff's report "dates from several years before the publication of Mr. Fison's views, and are therefore wholly unaffected by any preconceived theory".[2] But as a matter of fact it dates from several years *after* the publication of Fison's and Howitt's book on the Kamilaroi and Kurnai, and was expressly intended to explain certain matters at the request of Howitt. Dr. Briffault quotes J. Fraser's statement referring to the Kamilaroi, that "every man in any one class is supposed to have marital rights over every woman in the class with which he can marry",[3] but refrains from adding the next sentences, which help to explain the nature of those rights: "Thus every Ipai regards every Kubbitha woman as his wife *in posse*. Hence a young man of the Ipai class, as soon as by tribal ceremonies he has acquired the right to marry, may go to the abode of a family of Kubbitha girls and say to one of them, in the presence of her parents—'I wife will take by and by'. His demand thus made cannot be refused, and the parents must keep the girl until he comes to take her as his wife".[4] There is no suggestion of sexual communism in this.

Dr. Briffault says that the existence of group-marriage relations in Australia is not, so far as he is aware, disputed by anyone at the present day,[5] and this

[1] F. E. H. W. Krichauff, 'Further Notes on the "Aldolinga", or "Mbenderinga" Tribe of Aborigines', in *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia: South Australian Branch. Sessions* 1886-7 and 1887-8, ii. (Adelaide, 1890), p. 77.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 737 n. 3.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 737.

[4] J. Fraser, 'The Aborigines of New South Wales', in *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, 1882, xvi. (Sydney, 1883), p. 222.

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 741.

is quite correct if "group-marriage" implies almost exclusively sexual licence. But there are many who deny the existence of group-marriage if it implies something more than this, and Dr. Briffault himself would be one of them if he were consistent in his use of the term "marriage". The *pirrauru* and *piraungaru* relations are essentially different from the *tippa-malku* relation or the ordinary Australian marriage, which, as Professor Malinowski observes, cannot be detached from family life, but is defined by "the problems of the economic unity of the family, of the bonds created by common life in one wurley, through the common rearing of, and affection towards, the offspring".[1] But, as we have seen, even from the purely sexual point of view there are important differences between the rights of the individual husband and wife and a *pirrauru*.

The *pirrauru* and *piraungaru* relations are of particular interest on account of the support they are considered to give to the hypothesis of ancient group-marriage in Australia, according to which all the men of one division or class had as wives all the women of another division or class. "Marriages" of this sort do not exist anywhere in Australia at the present time, and I therefore spoke of them, in the earlier editions of my book, as "pretended group-marriages"; but this expression was criticised by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen, who observed that in the case of the Urabunna "there is no pretence of any kind", and that exactly the same is true of the Dieri.[2] This implies a curious confusion of terms, as has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Thomas.[3] In the case of the so-called group-marriage of the Urabunna and Dieri the term "group"

[1] B. Malinowski, *The Family among the Australian Aborigines* (London, 1913), p. 119.

[2] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* p. 109.

[3] N. W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia* (Cambridge, 1906), p. 128.

only means a number of persons who stand in a certain artificial relationship to another number of persons, whereas in the theory of group-marriage the same term is applied to a portion of a tribe distinguished by a class name and term of relationship. And, as already shown, this is not the only difference between the two kinds of "group-marriages". Considering especially that the *tippa-malku* spouse in every respect takes precedence over the *pirrauru*, I have found no reason to accept Dr. Howitt's view that the *tippa-malku* marriage is an innovation and "an encroachment upon the *pirrauru* group-right";[1] whereas it seems to me much more probable that the *pirrauru* relation is an engraftment on individual marriage.

Dr. Briffault scornfully opposes this view, held by "those to whom the application of the doctrine of evolution to human institutions, and more especially to the institution of individual marriage, appears objectionable. . . . Little has been done to elucidate it".[2] He has then partly ignored and partly actually reversed my suggested explanation, even going so far as to quote as arguments against me some of my own facts, conveying the impression that they had been discovered by himself. In order to expose his amazing method of criticism I must cite him in full, and beg the reader to compare his references (parenthesised by me) with my own. He writes:

"The transformation of Australian marriage institutions from exclusive individual marriage to sexual communism has usually been assigned to the difficulty of obtaining wives owing to the scarcity of women, and *to the benevolent consideration shown by the older married men in endeavouring to remedy the distress of the younger members of the community by allowing them access to their own wives* (the italics are mine; E. Westermarck, *The History of*

[1] Howitt, 'The Native Tribes of South and East Australia', in *Folk-Lore*, xvii. (London, 1906), p. 187.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* pp. 740, 744.

Human Marriage, iii. 253 *sqq.*; N. W. Thomas, *Kinship Organisations and Group Marriage in Australia*, p. 138). But, unfortunately for those suggestions, they are directly contradicted by all known relevant facts. Almost every account tells us that it is precisely the greed and selfishness of the older men who seek to monopolise the women which is the chief cause of the scarcity of the latter and of the difficulty which the younger men find in obtaining wives. Far from endeavouring to remedy the situation, the older men, on the contrary, expressly prevent the younger ones, sometimes it appears under pain of death, from marrying at all. They even look unfavourably on young men entering into 'pirrauru' relations (A. W. Howitt, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 182). . . . And, in fact, we are expressly told that it is the old men and not the younger ones who invariably have the largest number of 'pirraurus' (Howitt, in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx. 57; *idem*, *The Native Tribes of South-East Australia*, p. 184); and the Dieri and other tribes state that the older men are the chief beneficiaries in 'pirrauru' relations, and constantly claim access to the wives of the younger married men and to their 'pirraurus' (E. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien*, p. 136 *sq.*)".[1]

What I have said about the *pirrauru* relation in the present connection is briefly this:

"It seems to me much more probable . . . that, partly at least, it owes its origin to circumstances not unlike those which have led to more or less similar customs in other parts of the world. From various parts of Australia we hear of the difficulty the young native has in getting a wife on attaining manhood. . . . One cause of the large number of bachelors is the comparative scarcity of women[2] . . . and another cause is the polygyny of the old men, who have no scruple of appropriating to themselves a plurality of women, though many of the younger men have no wife at all. . . . It is, as a rule, the young girls that the old men secure for themselves, whereas the boys or young men, whenever they are allowed to marry, get old lubras as wives. We have statements to this effect with regard to tribes scattered all over the continent. . . . Whilst many men are thus compelled

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 174 *sq.*
[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 164.

to remain unmarried for a considerable length of time or are married to women who must be more or less distasteful to them, tribal custom may provide them with certain means of gratifying their sexual desires outside the ordinary marriage relation". In some tribes, if a young man on reaching a marriageable age can find no wife, he is presented with a boy-wife. " In the Dieri tribe, again, the *pirrauru* custom may serve as a substitute for regular marriage in the case of unmarried young men. Howitt expressly says that they may have *pirraurus*, nay that there is no bachelor without one. . . . It is, moreover, obvious that the *pirrauru* relation must give comfort to many a young man who is married to an old woman. But it is equally evident that the old and influential men largely make use of it to their own advantage. Among the Urabunna 'the number of a man's *Piraungaru* depends entirely upon the measure of his power and popularity'. . . . Among the Dieri the leading men in the tribe have likewise more *pirraurus* than other men; Howitt knew one who had over a dozen allotted to him, in addition to whom 'honorary' *pirraurus* were assigned to him in neighbouring tribes.[1] We are told that the elders do not look favourably upon a youth having either a *tippa-malku* wife or a *pirrauru* early, and that when a man has a number of *pirraurus* the old men recommend him to confine himself to one.[2] . . . Dr. Eylmann was told by members of the Dieri and other tribes that the *pirrauru* custom chiefly benefited the old men, because it gave them an excellent opportunity to have sexual intercourse with young women without transgressing the rules of tribal morality, though it was only with the greatest reluctance that the younger men let them have access to their wives.[3] Nor is the sexual gratification the only benefit a man derives from having many *pirraurus*. Howitt observes that 'it is an advantage to a man to have as many *Pirraurus* as possible. He has then less work to do in hunting, as when they are with him they supply him with a share of the food they procure, their own *Tippa-malku* husbands being absent. He also obtains great influence in the tribe by lending his *Pirraurus* occasionally, and receiving presents from the younger men who

[1] Howitt, in *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xx. 57; *idem*, *Native Tribes*, p. 184.

[2] *Idem*, *Native Tribes*, p. 182 *sq.*

[3] E. Eylmann, *Die Eingeborenen der Kolonie Südaustralien* (Berlin, 1908), p. 136 *sq.*

have no *Pirraurus* with them, or to whom none has yet been allotted'.... I am therefore inclined to believe that the *pirrauru* custom is a consequence of the comparative scarcity of women and of the selfish tyranny (not "benevolent consideration", as Dr. Briffault alleges) of the old men. But we must also remember another fact, which we have often before met with in connection with polyandry and group-relations, namely, the necessity of a married woman to have a protector and guardian during the temporary absence of her husband. It is significant that a man has sexual rights over a woman who is *pirrauru* or *piraungaru* to him chiefly, if not exclusively, while her husband is away, and on such occasions only does she live with him, enjoying his protection. That the need of protection and guardianship has something to do with the *pirrauru* custom is also suggested by a statement for which I am indebted to Mr. Frank P. ('Bulman') Brown. He tells me that among the Kacoodja, on the South Alligator River in the Northern Territory, if a man goes away for some time he hands over his wife to some other man of his own class, who during his absence is entitled to have sexual intercourse with her. In case she were left alone she would probably be seized by somebody else, or she might herself invite somebody to have connection with her".[1]

The last-mentioned fact ought to have appealed to Dr. Briffault quite strongly. For he repeatedly states that any Australian female, old or young, found unprotected is invariably or almost invariably ravished, and in many or most instances killed afterwards.[2]

I have now mentioned the main facts on which I have based my suggestion that the *pirrauru* custom is an engraftment on individual marriage. What facts, then, has Dr. Briffault advanced to prove that "the individual relations are a later development grafted upon an organisation in which all members of one group had recognised access to all members of the opposite sex in the corresponding group"?[3] He argues that "indi-

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 252 *sqq.*
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 313; ii. 21. See also *ibid.* i. 248.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 711 *sq.*

vidual marriage, that is, the habitual cohabitation of individuals of different sexes and their association for economic purposes . . . owes its existence to economic necessity. . . . The necessity for such economic association could have been dispensed with only if a pure matriarchal clan-organisation had been maintained and its continuous development had been possible. But the establishment of male ascendancy at a stage of culture so low that the economic advantages of women in early phases of society had no opportunity of making their weight felt, has not permitted of such a development; Australian society afforded no scope for the development of the maternal clan. Failing such a development there is no alternative but individual economic association of men and women, that is to say, individual marriage".[1] This argument is, of course, purely speculative; so much so that I fail to understand it. Elsewhere in his book Dr. Briffault makes the assumption that "the maternal stage of society" subsisted in Australia within fairly recent times.[2]

But there are yet other customs besides the *pirrauru* relation that have been supposed to give support to the group-marriage theory. Particular stress has been laid on the use of terms, especially on the fact that the term applied to the individual wife is also applied to all the other women of her group "whom it is lawful for a man to marry and outside of whom he may not marry".[3] But I can find no reason for looking upon the common term as a relic of group-marriage, as it is easily explained by the fact that the women who may be a man's wives and those who cannot possibly be so stand in a widely different relation to him. The same view is held by Dr. Codrington and Dr. Rivers, who in spite of their

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 731 *sq.*

[2] *Ibid.* i. 337 *sqq.*

[3] Spencer and Gillen, *op. cit.* pp. 95, 96, 106; *iidem*, *The Northern Tribes of Central Australia* (London, 1904), p. 140; Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 757.

belief in ancient group-marriage or sexual communism in Melanesia, maintain that terms of the kind in question lend no support to the hypothesis that they are survivals of such a practice, since they are more naturally explained as the result of the status of certain men and women as potential husbands and wives.[1]

There are other classificatory terms that have been looked upon as survivals of ancient group-marriage, both in Australia and elsewhere. That the classificatory system of relationship terms has originated in group-marriage or sexual communism is a view which is held by many anthropologists beside Dr. Briffault. I have devoted a whole chapter of my book to a criticism of this view[2] and shall not repeat my arguments except on one point where I have been assailed by him. The assumption has been made that the same term is applied to the father and to the father's brothers and cousins, or (in the Hawaiian 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 facts that the same term is also applied to the mother and to the mother's sisters and cousins or (in the Hawaiian system) to the father's sisters and cousins as well, and that a woman applies the same terms to her sisters' and cousins' children as to her own sons and daughters. It is conceivable that uncertainty as regards fatherhood might have led people to call several men a person's fathers, but uncertainty as regards motherhood could

[1] Codrington, *op. cit.* p. 22 *sq.*; Rivers, *The History of Melanesian Society*, ii. 128 *sq.*

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 236 *sqq.*

never have led them to call several women his mothers, or led a woman to call other women's children her sons and daughters.

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 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] Dr. Briffault is of a similar opinion, and fills several pages with statements to prove the existence of a primitive group-motherhood. They tell us of children that are suckled by other women beside the mother and even of children that are not suckled by the mother, of adoption and fosterage,[2] but no case suggests in the least a general ignorance of individual motherhood. Such ignorance cannot possibly be attributed to people who have invented relationship terms; even among sheep I have noticed the eagerness with which in the evening, when the flock of ewes and the flock of

[1] W. H. R. Rivers, 'On the Origin of the Classificatory System of Relationships', in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor* (Oxford, 1907), p. 317.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 597 *sqq.*

lambs are reunited, each mother seeks for her own lamb and many a lamb, at least, for her mother.[1]

As Dr. Briffault's facts have no bearing on the point at issue I have not considered it worth while to examine their accuracy in full, but in testing a few of them I have made amazing discoveries. The statements ascribed to Waitz-Gerland have not the slightest resemblance to

[1] In support of this I may quote the following passage from Mr. J. Corin's book *Mating, Marriage, and the Status of Woman* (London & Felling-on-Tyne, 1910), p. 17: "Mix the ewes and the lambs as one will, and they sort themselves. The lamb does not always know its mother, but the ewe knows her lamb—by smell. If the wrong lamb comes to her, she savagely butts it away. The unwillingness of a ewe to suckle a strange lamb is the great trouble of shepherds. When a mother has lost her lamb, and the shepherd wishes to make her adopt another, to save her from trouble with milk-congestion, and to relieve another ewe burdened with twins, he has very great difficulty. Often he has to resort to the practice of skinning the dead lamb and wrapping its skin round the one to be adopted. Even then he may be unable to deceive the mother—perhaps he would not do so in any case, did not milk-pains compel her. At this not unusual country practice I have assisted shepherds in my young days. The practice is described by Thomas Hardy in *Far from the Madding Crowd*, p. 139, chap. xviii". Dr. Briffault (*op. cit.* i. 593) writes: "Scarcely any fact of zoology is more definite, clear and conspicuous than the entire absence among animals of any relation between the operation of the maternal instinct and actual physiological consanguinity or kinship. From the lowest invertebrates in which the most rudimentary physiological forms of the reaction of maternal instinct are exhibited to its highest development among the nearest animal allies of the human species, the maternal instinct acts irrespectively of any actual relationship". But among monkeys the discrimination denied by Dr. Briffault has been found even in cases of conscious adoption. On the authority of Brehm, Darwin tells us of a female baboon which had so capacious a heart that she not only adopted young monkeys of other species, but stole young dogs and cats which she continually carried about; yet her kindness did not go so far as to share food with her adopted offspring, although she divided everything quite fairly with her own young ones (*The Descent of Man* [London, 1890], p. 70; see also F. Alverdes, *Social Life in the Animal World* [London, 1927], p. 135). To account for maternal love we must assume the existence of some other stimulus besides the perception of smallness and helplessness,

those in the sources mentioned in the footnotes.[1] The same may be said of the assertion that "in northern Celebes, among the primitive Alfurs of Minahassa, the practice [of adoption] is so general that it is almost impossible to discover who are a person's actual parents".[2] In support of this statement, which might perhaps be supposed to carry more weight than the others, Dr. Briffault refers to five authorities: Hickson, Graafland, G. A. Wilken, De Clerg, and P. N. Wilken. Hickson writes: "If a married couple are not blessed with children, or even if they are, they sometimes adopt the children of other people. . . . A child so adopted becomes a member of the family of the foster-parents in every respect but one, *i.e.* he or she is allowed to marry with his or her foster-parents' own children".[3] According to P. N. Wilken and Graafland, a young person may express his wish to be adopted by an old man or woman, or old persons may *vice versa* wish to adopt a young one. The adoption takes place by mutual consent and, according to Graafland, nearly always before witnesses. It carries with it the same rights and duties as those belonging to a son or daughter; but, according to Wilken, the adopted child does not often live with the new parents. It is said that the motive of the adoption is seldom affection, but generally mutual interest.[4] G. A. Wilken also states that the

which produces, or at least strengthens, the instinctive response in the mother. This stimulus can only be rooted in the external relationship in which the offspring stand to the mother from the very beginning. She is in close proximity to her helpless young from their tenderest age; and she loves them because they are to her a cause of pleasure.

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 602 n. 1, 605 n. 4. [2] *Ibid.* i. 600.

[3] S. J. Hickson, *A Naturalist in North Celebes* (London, 1889), p. 282.

[4] P. N. Wilken, 'Bijdragen tot de kennis van de zeden en gewoonten der Alfoeren in de Minahassa', in *Mededeelingen van wege het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, vii. (Rotterdam, 1863), p. 289; N. Graafland, *De Minahassa*, i. (Rotterdam, 1867), p. 322 *sq.*

adoption is brought about simply through a declaration to the purpose, and refers for details to P. N. Wilken and Graafland. He observes that there can be no doubt as to the physical connection between mother and child, and quotes the Roman maxim, "*Mater semper certa est*".[1] De Clerg's article is not found in the place indicated by Dr. Briffault, nor is it mentioned in his Bibliography.

Dr. Briffault triumphantly exclaims that the custom of taking away infants from their mothers when they are weaned "is found among some of the people of Morocco, a country about which he (Dr. Westermarck) has written books and concerning which he claims special knowledge. Among the Kuntahs, a nomadic tribe of the Saharah, 'brothers exchange their children, for they say it would be shameful to bring up one's own children. . . . We have found a similar custom among the Fulbeh (that is to say, the Filane), but here the sentiment is more intense and more general. Accordingly, children are never brought up in their own family unless it is impossible to do otherwise'".[2] Unfortunately for Dr. Briffault, the people he mentions live far away from Morocco, the Kountah between 16 and 18 degrees of latitude and between 4 and 6 degrees of longitude and the Fulbeh in the western and central Sudan from Senegambia to the Chad region; and it is not at all said of them that infants are taken away from their mothers when they are weaned. Moreover, Dr. Briffault has left out the words which give us the clue to the custom referred to. The Kountah say "it would be shameful to bring up one's children and especially to give them away in marriage oneself", and of the Fulbeh we are told that if it is necessary for a person to bring up his own children, for example if he

[1] G. A. Wilken, *De verspreide geschriften* (Semarang, etc., 1912), ii. 375 *sq.*; i. 307.

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 604.

has no brother, he must do so "and give them away in marriage himself".[1] From this it appears to me quite obvious that the custom in question is closely connected with that sexual bashfulness between parents and children which is so conspicuous in Morocco.[2] Dr. Briffault's succeeding references to the Albanians and the Ossetes are equally inadequate. The essence of Von Hahn's statement concerning the former is that "it is the rule for fathers to exchange their sons for their earliest years in order to habituate them to strict discipline";[3] and as regards the Ossetes Dr. Briffault's authority tells us, not, as he alleges, that "every boy is sent away to a foster-parent as soon as he is weaned", but that, after he has received his name, he is sent to the house of a stranger "in order to be educated", and "as soon as he has completed his sixth year, is taken by his educator back to his parental home".[4]

As Sir James Frazer rightly observes, while 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".[5] But if the term for "mother" does not express any definite kind of blood-relationship, why should the term for "father" do so? 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 has possibly begotten it? I have no doubt that the classificatory terms are fundamentally influenced by social relations. It is probable that they

[1] L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Soudan* (Paris, 1912), p. 638.

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 434 *sq.* See also my *Marriage Ceremonies in Morocco* (London, 1914), Index, *s.v.* Bashfulness.

[3] J. G. von Hahn, *Albanesische Studien* (Jena, 1854), p. 150.

[4] P. Fuchs, 'Ethnologische Beschreibung der Osseten', in *Das Ausland*, xlix. (Stuttgart, 1876), p. 166.

[5] J. G. Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy*, i. (London, 1910), p. 304.

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.

Other supposed survivals of ancient group-marriage or sexual communism are the practice of exchanging wives temporarily and the custom which requires that a man should offer his wife or one of his wives to a guest. I have discussed these customs in my criticism of the hypothesis of promiscuity, and the explanations of them which I offered give no more support to the hypothesis of group-marriage than to that of general communism.[1] I cannot see that Dr. Briffault has advanced any arguments which upset them. The practice of exchanging wives may be traced to many different causes. Most frequently it is a perfectly voluntary arrangement between the husbands or between all the parties concerned, and it never has the character of a claim that one man has to another man's wife. Sexual hospitality, again, is an incident of the general rule of hospitality, which in some form or other seems to prevail universally at the lower stages of civilisation. It is not always the wife that is offered: it may be a daughter, a sister, or a servant. And there can be no doubt that both this and other kinds of hospitality are in the main based upon egoistic considerations.[2] 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. But the custom of hospitality is also associated with superstitious beliefs: the unknown stranger, like everything unknown and everything strange, arouses a feeling

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, i. 225 *sqq*.

[2] See my book, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, i. (London, 1912), p. 581 *sqq*.

of mysterious awe in simple minds. On the one hand, he is regarded as a potential source of evil, on the other hand, as a potential benefactor; and sexual hospitality becomes thus more intelligible when we consider the supposed danger of the stranger's evil eye or his curses or sorcery, as also the benefits which may be supposed to result from his love. Dr. Briffault has given no heed to such considerations. He writes: "Community of wives being originally part of the relation of tribal brotherhood, it was naturally regarded as an essential token of that relation. . . . A man who has been admitted to the relation of guest is necessarily to be regarded and treated as a tribal brother. . . . Sexual hospitality . . . is very general in all primitive societies. From the manner in which it is regarded we may be as certain as we can be of any inference in social anthropology that wherever it is observed clan-brotherhood is, or was formerly, considered to imply sexual communism, for it is by assimilation to a clan-brother that the guest is treated as he is".[1] If the last sentence were true all inferences in social anthropology would be worthless. The guest is not assimilated to a clan-brother, hospitality does not imply that he is "necessarily to be regarded and treated as a tribal brother". It is probably always limited by time—often to three days, sometimes even to a day and a night. And while the custom of offering one's wife to a guest is widespread, it is open to considerable doubt whether there is any tribe in which all one's clan-brothers enjoy a similar privilege. Dr. Briffault has not told us how it is that sexual communism has survived in the case of a guest although it has died out in the case of clan-brothers.

Like some previous writers, Dr. Briffault regards the sororate, or marrying a living or deceased wife's sister,[2] and the levirate, or marrying a dead brother's widow,[3]

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 635 *sqq.*
[2] *Ibid.* i. 614 *sqq.* [3] *Ibid.* i. 766 *sqq.*

as relics of ancient group-marriage. I have discussed both customs at some length and given quite different explanations of them;[1] and I have nothing to add, since Dr. Briffault has set forth no new arguments to support his view, except his usual appeal to my reluctance against "the application of the theory of evolution to the human race".[2] His discussion of polyandry, which he likewise looks upon as a relic of group-marriage, calls for more attention.

Group-marriage has been found among many peoples who practise polyandry. Of this I have given instances, particularly from Tibet, India, and Ceylon, as numerous, I believe, as those gathered by Dr. Briffault;[3] but he has a strong tendency to exaggerate the prevalence of group-marriage in comparison with that of polyandry. He states that among the Záparo Indians of Ecuador "polyandry is usual, and two men may have five wives between them".[4] But this is not what is said by his authority, who only writes that polyandry exists among them, and that two men whom he selected to be his travelling companions "had five wives—two each, and one in common"—which does not constitute a group-marriage at all.[5] Of Tibetan marriage Dr. Briffault alleges that it is "not simple polyandry, but is, in fact, a complete group-marriage in principle and in practice, all the males of one group becoming united, by virtue of the marriage contract, to all the females of another, and reciprocally".[6] He bases this statement upon some very general information given by a writer whose

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 94-97, 263-*sqq.*; iii. 207-220, 261 *sqq.*

[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 625.

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 223 *sqq.* See also *ibid.* iii. 147.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 646.

[5] A. Simson, *Travels in the Wilds of Ecuador* (London, 1886), pp. 173, 178.

[6] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 649.

book on Tibet is looked upon with considerable suspicion;[1] but Dr. Briffault maintains that there can "be no question as to the accuracy" of his account. In the majority of reports where polyandry is spoken of no mention is made of its being combined with polygyny, and from others it appears that such a combination is more or less unusual. Ahmad Shah says that although all the forms of marriage coexist in Tibet, "the right thing there is polyandry".[2] In his description of polyandry in Sikhim, Tibet, and Bhutan, Claude White states that "three brothers can marry three sisters, and all the wives be in common, but this is not very often met with".[3] Dr. Briffault quotes Crosby's statement that "equal numbers of husbands and wives in one family are frequently seen" in Tibet,[4] but omits a previous passage which indicates that polyandry is more usual: "Should some rare good fortune befall, then the eldest brother may choose another wife, even a third. And so it may be, if the first wife have no children, though the property be not increased".[5] Speaking of polyandry among the Kanets of the higher hills, the Punjab Superintendent makes the statement that "the brothers may, if necessary, marry a second or a third joint wife or one of the brothers who may have gone out may marry a separate wife there. When he returns home, it depends on the choice of the wife whether she will remain the exclusive wife of the husband who married her or become the joint property of the family".[6] Of the Kammālans of Malabar we

[1] A. H. Savage Landor, *In the Forbidden Land*, ii. (London, 1898), p. 60.

[2] Ahmad Shah, *Four Years in Tibet* (Benares, 1906), p. 52.

[3] J. C. White, *Sikhim and Bhutan* (London, 1909), p. 320.

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 650.

[5] O. T. Crosby, *Tibet and Turkestan* (New York & London, 1905), p. 152.

[6] Pandit Harikishan Kaul, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. xiv. (Punjab) Report (Lahore, 1912), p. 287.

read that if one of the brothers who have a wife in common, on the ground of incompatibility of temper, brings a new wife, she is privileged to cohabit with the other brothers.[1] Among the Izhuvans or Tiyyans in the northern part of the Cochin State, if the union of several brothers with one woman proves to be unpleasant or inconvenient, one of them takes a new wife and either keeps her for himself or allows her to be the wife of others also.[2] Concerning the Todas of the Nilgiri Hills, in South India, Shortt wrote in 1869 that, owing to the great scarcity of women among them, it most frequently happens that a single woman is wife to several husbands, sometimes as many as six.[3] In a more recent account, Dr. Rivers speaks of the "tendency for the polyandry of the Todas to become combined with polygyny. Two brothers, who in former times would have had one wife between them, may now take two wives, but as a general rule the two men have the two wives in common". And he thinks that polygyny is thus becoming associated with polyandry because there are now a greater number of women owing to the diminished female infanticide.[4]

In these cases it is either implied or directly said that group-marriage has arisen as a combination of polygyny with polyandry. In other cases the same may be inferred from the facts that both in Tibet and India polyandry is much more prevalent than group-marriage; that the latter occurs there nowhere except side by side with polyandry; and that the occasional combination of polygyny with polyandry, when the

[1] E. Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India* (Madras, 1906), p. 114.

[2] L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, i. (Madras, 1909), p. 295.

[3] J. Shortt, 'An Account of the Hill Tribes of the Neilgherries', in *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, N.S. vii. (London, 1869), p. 240.

[4] W. H. R. Rivers, *The Todas* (London, 1906), pp. 521, 518 *sq.*

circumstances permit it and make it convenient, is easy to explain, whereas the opinion that polyandry has developed out of an earlier stage of group-marriage is based upon the assumption that there was such a stage. Dr. Briffault has attributed this development in Tibet to the following facts: "The paramount object of family unity is considered to be best attained by limiting fraternal sexual cummunism to one wife. The number of sisters or cousins that is received into a household is also related to economic conditions. . . . The paramount position of the woman as head of the household and symbol of its unity makes likewise for monogyny".[1] But he does not explain why the plurality of husbands remained, when the plurality of wives was given up.

I have devoted nearly a whole chapter, or sixty pages of my book, to a discussion of the causes to which polyandry may be traced.[2] One of these causes is the numerical proportion between the sexes. Among various polyandrous peoples there are said to be more men than women, and their polyandry has in several cases been directly attributed to this fact.[3] Dr. Briffault wants to convey the impression that I assume such a cause for polyandry in Tibet, by quoting a statement from an early edition of my book to the effect that, generally speaking, the chief immediate cause of polyandry is, no doubt, a numerical disproportion between the sexes;[4] this is by no means the only case in which he, when it suits his purpose, adopts such an unfair method in his criticism of my book, though

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 660 *sq.*

[2] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 158 *sqq.*

[3] As an addition to this collection of facts I may quote Father Morice's statement that he has heard of a few cases of polyandry among the Sékauais, but only in the tribes that systematically practised infanticide at the birth of female children (A. G. Morice, 'The Great Déné Race', in *Anthropos*, v. [Wien, 1910], p. 990).

[4] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 667.

being well acquainted with the later completely re-written edition of it.[1] He conceals the fact that all the statements referred to by him in support of the view that there is no excess of males in Tibet have been previously mentioned by me, and at the same time he omits mentioning the statements to the contrary to which I have referred, simply saying that "there is in Tibet no trace of evidence to give colour to the supposition". Summing up the pros and cons I have cautiously said that "the old statement that there are more men than women in Tibet may perhaps after all be true". I have further pointed out that among various peoples polyandry has been traced to economic motives. Thus it has been said that in Tibet it obtains as a necessary institution because every spot of ground within the hills which can be cultivated has been under the plough for ages; and several authorities mention as a motive for it the circumstance that it keeps the family property together where the husbands are brothers, as they usually are in Tibet. It has also been noticed that polyandry is associated with pastoral habits of life, both in the North-Western Provinces of India and in Tibet, where men are frequently away from their homes for weeks or months, but one must remain in charge of the house-wife. And beside a pastoral mode of life there are also other reasons that account for the frequent absence of husbands. According to Rockhill, who much emphasises the prevalence of polyandry among the agricultural population of Tibet, it is not too much to say that more than half of the time of nearly every man in the country is spent away from his home.[2]

All such facts and suggestions are completely ignored by Dr. Briffault, who writes: "It appears superfluous to point out that no importance can be attached to the various theories and suppositions that

[1] See Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 666, 667, 675 *sq.*; ii. 97.

[2] W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas* (London, 1891), p. 211.

have been put forward to 'explain the origin' of so-called polyandry in Tibet".[1] My attempt to explain it is, of course, only another sign of "the fundamental objection to the doctrine of evolution as applied to human society", which, according to Dr. Briffault, "forms the guiding principle" of my theories, being "a survival of doctrines of special creation and innate ideas".[2] Yet even Dr. Briffault cannot altogether escape the burden of "explaining" how it is that group-marriage has survived in Tibet while it has disappeared in most other countries. He writes that "the survival of collective marriage in Tibetan-speaking countries does not appear to call for any other explanation than the persistence in a profoundly conservative and proverbially segregated society of its traditional organisation and institutions"; and he adds that "in the same manner, the naturally and artificially segregated communities of Sparta retained in ancient Greece the social organisation and spirit of another age", thus alluding to the polyandry which, according to Polybius, existed in Sparta.[3] Are we then really to assume that these peoples, who cannot be called uncivilised, have remained more isolated than all those primitive savages who have no sexual communism at all?

Dr. Briffault maintains that in Tibet marriage is theoretically a union between all the brothers of one family with all the sisters of another family. We know for a certainty that in Tibetan polyandry all the husbands are as a rule brothers, although in many parts of the country they are not necessarily so;[4] but the allegation that all the sisters of a wife are in theory "deemed to be married to the same set of husbands"[5] is founded on

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 666.
[2] *Ibid.* i. 584, 587.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 668.
[4] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 112 *sqq.*
[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 659.

a statement made by Savage Landor which is not confirmed by a single one of the many other authorities on marriage customs in Tibet. Claude White, whom I have quoted above, merely states that three brothers can marry three sisters, but that this is not very often met with. Dr. Briffault says it has been noted in the province of Ladak " that a group of brothers cohabit with a group of sisters ";[1] but his authority only writes that " the wife of several brothers can bring in her sister as a co-wife ".[2] Among Indian group-marriages I have only found one case, that of the Todas, in which the common wives are said to be sisters;[3] but this is evidently not the general rule even among them. For Rivers mentions only two instances in his Toda genealogies of two brothers, or two groups of brothers, marrying sisters, whereas there are several cases in which a man or a group of men have had two wives who have been relatives.[4] Dr. Briffault alleges that " other tribes of the Nilgiri Hills, such as the Kurumbas, observe the same usages as the Todas ".[5] Yet his authority does not speak of group-marriage at all, but only writes: " I am informed that, among the Kurumbas of the Nilgiris, it is the custom for several brothers to take one wife in common and that they do not object to their women being open to others also ".[6] Dr. Briffault, however, does not rest satisfied merely with a fraternal-sororal group-marriage: he thinks " there is every reason to believe that group-marriage between families—that is, patriarchal families—is in every instance derived from an organisation in which the marrying groups were

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 649 *sq.*

[2] E. A. Gait, *Census of India*, 1911, vol. i. (India) Report (Calcutta, 1913), p. 240.

[3] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 224; Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 698.

[4] Rivers, *The Todas*, p. 522.

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 699.

[6] E. Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, iv. (Madras, 1909), p. 169.

originally clans, or in later stages marrying classes ".[1] For this opinion I can find no evidence whatever.

While among nearly all the polyandrous peoples of India the husbands or at least most of them are brothers, either invariably or as a general rule, there is one people, the Nayars of Cochin, Malabar, and Travancore, who have polyandrous unions of a different, non-fraternal, type. The prevalence of such unions has been testified by a large number of travellers from the beginning of the fifteenth century onwards; but in the course of the nineteenth century polyandry was dwindling away among the Nayars, and may now be said to be extinct, except in some remote localities, where even cases of non-fraternal polyandry may still be found, or at least occurred a few years ago.

According to ancient Nayar usage, every girl, before she attained puberty, goes through a marriage ceremony, the essential incident of which consists in the nominal husband tying a *tāli*, or tiny plate of gold, round her neck. It is possible that in earlier times the man who performed this rite deflowered the girl whom he thus technically married; but even then he had no further rights over her. Subsequently the woman was allowed to cohabit with any Brahman or Nayar she chose, but if she did so with a man belonging to a lower caste she was punished with death or at least became an outcaste. She was " under no obligation to admit above a single attachment ", but usually she had several lovers, and was not less respected on that account. The numbers of lovers are given differently by different writers, from two to ten or even more; but some writers speak as if there were a limit to the number of men who were allowed to visit a Nayar lady. Many of our authorities testify that all the lovers contributed jointly to the maintenance of the woman, but she lived apart from them. This is expressly said in the earliest account;

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 656.

and even to this day it frequently happens that a married man only visits his wife in her home at night. The lovers cohabited with their mistress by agreement between themselves. The unions were dissolved as easily as they were entered into. As to the legitimacy of polygynous unions among the Nayars the statements vary. One writer says that they might have but one wife, at the same time, another that they might have as many as five, a third that they were not confined to a set number of wives.[1]

In the numerous accounts of the polyandrous unions of the Nayars every sociologist who, prior to Dr. Briffault, has discussed the subject has found abundant evidence that the male partners were not brothers; but Dr. Briffault will have it that they were. "Nayar marriage", he declares, "was, in fact, identical with all other institutions of fraternal sororal polygamy which we have come upon, and differed only from the Tibetan form as it exists to-day, in being of a more primitive type, the marrying groups being unmodified matriarchal clans and not, as in Tibet, semi-patriarchal families".[2] Let us consider his arguments.

On the authority of the Rev. S. Mateer, he says that "in the lower castes and wherever polyandry still survives among Nayar castes at the present day, it is confined to the fraternal form". What the writer quoted by him says is this: "The females of a wealthy Náyar family, where there is but one sister, are visited at their homes by Brahman paramours, or persons of their own caste; and their children are reared up in the same house, and inherit from their mothers' brothers.... Females of poorer and less fashionable families go to reside with partners of their own caste, so long as they agree together, or permanently: the average duration of such unions happily is increasing through the spread of

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 133 *sqq.*
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 706 *sq.*

civilisation and enlightenment. . . . It is not now usual for a woman to enter into such concubinage with several men at one time, except she resides with several who are brothers".[1] From this it is perfectly obvious that the male partners in the polyandrous unions connected with the matrilocal system of the Nayars were not brothers; even Dr. Briffault could not admit that the woman went to live with the brothers in their home.

He writes further: "The Italian traveller Gemelli Careri expressly states that the husbands in Nayar marriage were brothers; 'when one brother marries a woman', he states, 'she is common to all the others'". As a matter of fact the Italian traveller writes of the Nayars: "Their women are in common. Anyone who is going to stay in a woman's house leaves, when he enters it, his sword and buckler at the door, that everybody may know that the place is taken up. . . . When a brother marries, his wife is common to the others".[2] Of the former custom he gives a more explicit description in another place, where he says: "In Malabar the women (even those that are of quality and the king's sisters) have the liberty to choose a lover to lie with them. When a Nair or gentile is in a lady's chamber, he leaves his staff or his sword at the door, that others who would go in may see that the place is taken up; and no man has the boldness to disturb him. Thus there being no possibility of knowing who is the father of the child that is born into the world, the succession is regulated in another manner; that is, when a man dies his sister's children inherit him".[3] This description, which, as is indicated in the margin, is

[1] S. Mateer, *Native Life in Travancore* (London, 1883), p. 172 *sq.*

[2] F. Gemelli Careri, *Giro del mondo*, iii. (Venezia, 1728), p. 171.

[3] *Ibid.* iii. 150.

borrowed from Thévenot,[1] refers of course just to those polyandrous unions with which we are concerned at present, and is by no means contradicted by the statement that "when a brother marries, his wife is common to the others". The two statements have nothing to do with each other: in the former case the women are said to have liberty to choose lovers (Thévenot says more explicitly: "to choose such Nairs or gentlemen as they please") to lie with them; the latter case deals with marriages contracted by the men. That fraternal polyandry existed among the Nayars side by side with their non-fraternal polyandrous unions has not been asserted either by Thévenot or any other writer on ancient Nayar usages. Gemelli Careri's statement to that effect occurs in his work on a voyage round the world, and he had evidently little, if any, first-hand knowledge of the Nayars. The following extract from his book, referring to "all the gentiles in India", may serve as a warning against taking him too seriously: "It is their custom when an infant will not suck, to carry it into the field; and there they leave it from morning till night, in a cloth tied up on high by the four corners, that the crows may peck its eyes out; and this is the reason why there are so many blind in Bengala".[2]

Dr. Briffault's other arguments rest upon sheer groundless assumptions. "Other travellers", he says, "misled by the part played by Brahmans in such unions, and also by the fact that in the Nayar social system there were no 'actual', but only 'tribal' brothers, that is, members of the same 'târwad', have described Nayar polyandry as non-fraternal. Since there was no 'family', there were no brothers in the family sense, but only in the clan sense. That Nayar polyandry was fraternal follows from the obligation to marry in certain

[1] J. de Thévenot, *Voyages . . . contenant la relation de l'Indostan*, etc. (Paris, 1684), p. 258.

[2] Gemelli Careri, *op. cit.* iii. 173.

'târwads' only". But none of the accounts even hints that the word "brother" is used in a tribal sense; we are told by several writers that brothers almost always lived under the same roof.[1] Nor is it said anywhere that the male partners belonged to the same *tarwad* or could cohabit with a woman belonging to a certain *tarwad* only;[2] it is said on the contrary that a Nayar woman was allowed to cohabit with any Brahman or Nayar she chose. Nor is there any indication of sororal polygamy among the Nayars. Mr. Anantha Krishna Iyer, who is our greatest authority on the Cochin tribes and castes, wrote to me: "Regarding the polyandry among the Nayars as stated by Mr. Briffault in his book *The Mothers*, I have to state it was never *fraternal*. But fraternal polyandry existed until very recently among the Kammalans and other similar castes whose inheritance is patrilineal".

I have discussed in my book at some length the reasons which may account for the fact that polyandry is generally fraternal, as also for the fact that it was not so among the Nayars. It is easy to see that where it is a result of a disproportion between the sexes or of poverty or of the frequent absence of the men from their homes, it naturally tends to assume a fraternal character; and if it is intended to keep property together, it is necessary that the husbands should be brothers or at all events near relatives. When it is impossible for every man to get a wife for himself owing to the paucity of women, fraternal feelings may induce a man to give his younger brothers a share in his wife. When a man is too poor to take or to maintain a wife for himself alone, he would by preference choose his brother as his partner, owing to the economic interests they have in

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 141.

[2] A *tarwad* is defined as a "family consisting of all the descendants in the female line of one common female ancestor" (Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, v. [Madras, 1909], p. 302).

common; and when a plurality of husbands is desirable in order that the family and homestead shall not be left without a male supporter and protector for any length of time, a brother would generally be the most suitable substitute for the absent husband. Brothers generally live at the same spot, there is a feeling of solidarity and fellowship between them, and no stranger is brought into the world through intercourse with the same woman. But such circumstances would have little force if the men do not live together with the women with whom they consort and, at the same time, inheritance runs through the mother, as was the case among the Nayars. That they did not live with their wives or mistresses and the children borne by them, was presumably due to their military organisation, which prevented them from leading the ordinary life of a husband and father of a family; this explanation has been given by several authorities, and is supported by parallel customs elsewhere.[1] Dr. Briffault speaks with scorn of my attempts to explain customs and institutions by known facts instead of regarding them as survivals of unknown and entirely hypothetical conditions in the past;[2] this method, at any rate, prevents me from distorting known facts so as to make them fit in with a preconceived evolutional scheme.

As for the interpretation of polyandry as a survival of primitive group-marriage, it is still to be noticed that it has been mainly found, not among savages of the lowest type, but among peoples who have flocks and herds or who practise agriculture. When Bailey asked a Vedda what the consequence would be if one of their women were to live with two husbands, the unaffected vehemence with which he raised his axe, saying "A blow would settle it", showed "the natural repugnance with which they regard the national custom of their

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 197, 198, 200 *sq.*
[2] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 584 *sqq.*

Kandyan neighbours ".[1] These neighbours were certainly no savages; and the same may be said of the Tibetans and various polyandrous tribes and castes in India. Mr. Anantha Krishna Iyer contrasts the loose polyandrous unions of a people so cultivated as the Nayars with the " regular system of marriage " among the jungle tribes and very low castes.[2] Speaking of the polyandry and some other customs of the people of Sirmur, Fraser says it is remarkable that they in other respects " evince a much higher advancement in civilisation than we discover among other nations, whose manners are more engaging ".[3] On the arrival of the Spaniards, the polyandrous inhabitants of Lanccrote were distinguished from the other Canarians, who had no polyandry, by marks of greater civilisation.[4]

Beside the interpretation of all sorts of customs as survivals of earlier group-marriage, Dr. Briffault advances a more general argument for his thesis that in their origin marriage regulations had no reference to relations between individuals but were collective contracts between groups. He writes: " The imperative necessity which imposed such contracts in the earliest phases of human society did not call in the same manner for the regulation of individual relations between the members of the associated groups. In the self-contained and economically self-sufficient group of brothers and sisters, sexual partners need never separate from their own group, and the economic motive for their association is absent ".[5] From this it might seem

[1] J. Bailey,' An Account of the Wild Tribes of the Veddahs of Ceylon ', in *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, N.S. ii. (London, 1863), p. 292.

[2] Anantha Krishna Iyer, *op. cit.* ii. (Madras, 1912), p. 41.

[3] J. B. Fraser, *Journal of a Tour through Part of the Snowy Range of the Himālā Mountains* (London, 1820), p. 209.

[4] *Cf.* A. von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent*, i. (London, 1814), p. 83.

[5] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 611.

he maintained that as individual marriage was not necessary, group-marriage was so, since there must have been some manner of procreation anyhow. But Dr. Briffault gives another reason for the necessity of group-marriage. He writes: "It is precisely by that remarkable solidarity of the larger primitive human group, or clan, a solidarity which, as we find it among primitive peoples, is to us almost unintelligible, and which has been destroyed by the later development of individualism—it is by that close communion between tribal brothers, which the Australian aborigines cement by drinking one another's blood, and of which the obligation of sexual communism is regarded as the most essential token, that human society has in the first instance been rendered possible". Dr. Briffault then cites with approval Messrs. Spencer's and Gillen's remark that "this system of what has been called group-marriage, serving as it does to bind more or less closely together groups of individuals who are mutually interested in one another's welfare, has been one of the most powerful agents in the early stages of the upward development of the human race".[1] But how is it then that savages, from the lowest to the highest types, who have no sexual communism, and even monkeys that live in bands, get on so well without it, whereas irregular interference with individual sex relations among them is a cause of disturbance? And for the rest, has "group-marriage" been able to raise the Australian aborigines to any high level of culture?

[1] Briffault, *op. cit.* i. 742 *sq.*

V

AN AMERICAN ECHO

A WRITER who accuses another of a tendentiously inaccurate handling of his material takes upon himself a grave responsibility, seeing that his readers are naturally apt to believe him. I was myself perplexed when I first read Dr. Briffault's criticism of my references, until I, by verifying them, found that they were invariably right and his allegations wrong. It very seldom happens that a reader does what Dr. Havelock Ellis did, when he tried to verify one of Dr. Briffault's criticisms in which he reprovingly states that I gave "an incorrect reference to H. H. Ellis". "But", he says, "on looking the point up, the reference is found to be perfectly correct; the incorrection is Briffault's".[1]

Mr. Calverton has not been equally cautious. In a long article in *The American Journal of Sociology* he swallows *in toto* what Dr. Briffault tells his readers, and disfigures page after page of that highly respected journal by reproducing verbatim his inaccuracies. Mr. Calverton also imitates his master in ascribing to me motives utterly inconsistent with the scientist's impartial search for truth. He pays me the compliment—certainly most undeserved and certainly not meant as a compliment—of representing me to have been for several decades "the leading authority on morality and marriage. . . . Since the 1890's", he says, "no other person in this field has exerted anything

[1] H. Ellis, *Views and Reviews* (London, 1932), p. 166.

like the enormous influence of Westermarck. . . . *The History of Human Marriage* indeed became the new Bible of the social sciences. And it remained so until the twenties of this century, when its conclusions were assailed and annihilated by Robert Briffault in his work *The Mothers*". Mr. Calverton then asks, "Why should a man's doctrine become so widely accepted when his evidences were so flimsy and fallacious?" His answer is: "In attempting to prove that in all likelihood 'monogamy prevailed almost exclusively among our earliest human ancestors', that the family existed anterior to man, and that 'human marriage, in all probability, is an inheritance from some apelike progenitor', he was able to provide nineteenth-century civilisation with an absolute that justified in perpetuity one of its main institutions. The family thus became an institution that radicals could no longer assail. No evolution in society could eradicate it. Neither could monogamy be attacked since it was rooted in man's primeval past, and was part of what Westermarck calls the 'monogamous instinct'. . . . His doctrines supplied a need of the time, a protection against . . . doctrines that threatened middle-class supremacy in the field of ethics and economics, . . . they became at once part of the cultural defence of the era".[1] And the same circumstances as made those false doctrines so acceptable to the public had also led their author to propound them. "Why should he originally have argued for the monogamous habits of the gorilla—and for the anthropoid apes in general—when the evidence leaned in the opposite direction, or at best was highly uncertain.[2] . . . Influenced by the middle-class culture

[1] V. F. Calverton, 'The Compulsive Basis of Social Thought', in *The American Journal of Sociology*, xxxvi. (Chicago, 1931), pp. 696, 697, 702.

[2] Mr. Calverton remarks in a foot-note that "the observations of H. von Koppenfels were ridiculed with finality by Burton (*Two*

of his day, and the necessity of defending its institutions by every device of logic, his mind reverted to that evidence which tended to justify those institutions and endow them with a natural origin and continuity. . . . It is not surprising, therefore, that Westermarck, in his zeal, distorted evidence out of all proportion and threw his whole emphasis, to the exclusion of all contradictions, upon those materials which tended to prove his case".[1] "In order to root the tendency to monogamy deep in nature itself, in other words to give it something of an instinctive cast, he tried to trace its origins to the higher animals. . . . And again, in order to fortify his case [when representing the family as the basic unit of primitive society] Westermarck has abused both evidence and observation".[2]

I have to inform Mr. Calverton that there was no need for Dr. Briffault to "annihilate" my old statements about almost exclusive monogamy among the anthropoid apes and our earliest human ancestors, because I did it myself, in consequence of fresh evidence, in the rewritten edition of my book five years before his criticism; and moreover, that Dr. Briffault has been incapable of annihilating my statement that the family exists among the apes, because, as I have shown above, it has been amply confirmed by all the best later authorities. Again, Dr. Briffault's and Mr. Calverton's allegations that I have attempted to support certain moral doctrines where I should have aimed at scientific truth alone, cannot be substantiated by a single line in my book. I drew my conclusions from the material which I had collected without any preconceived opinion, and when I had formed a provisional theory

Trips to Gorilla Land and the Cataracts of the Congo)"—indeed a wonderful achievement considering that Burton's book was published before Von Koppenfels' article appeared.

[1] Calverton, *loc. cit.* p. 700.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 698, 702.

I endeavoured to take heed of every fact that seemed to contradict it. This method I learned from Darwin's *Life and Letters*, which made a deep impression on my mind in those days when I first set about writing my book. Thus I was led to give up my belief in the theory of primitive promiscuity, then in vogue among anthropologists, to which I adhered firmly in the beginning, and came to the conclusion that the family was the earliest social unit. If I thought that monogamy predominated in primitive marriage, I did so because it seemed to me that the available facts pointed in that direction, but surely not from any religious or moral motive. My opponents cannot bring forward a single passage in my book where I have even said that monogamy is the ideal form of marriage; if I were asked to give my opinion on this subject, I should say that in some circumstances one form of marriage is the best and in other circumstances another form, and that the ideal form can be found only in ideal circumstances, which are a sheer abstraction. I have raised the question—with special reference to western civilisation—whether monogamy will be the only recognised form of marriage in the future. My tentative answer was based, not on any such "wish-fulfilment thought" as Mr. Calverton thinks he has discovered beneath my "superstructure of moral ideas",[1] but on historical facts. I wrote: "I think we may without hesitation assert that if mankind will advance in the same direction as hitherto, if consequently the causes to which monogamy in the most progressive societies owes its origin will continue to operate with constantly growing force, if especially the regard for the feelings of women, and the women's influence on legalisation, will increase, the laws of monogamy are not likely to be changed. It is certainly difficult to imagine a time when western civilisation would legalise the marriage of one man with

[1] Calverton, *loc. cit.* p. 714.

several women simultaneously".[1] I believe that the large majority of women would oppose the introduction of legal polygyny, and that if anybody brought in a bill for legalising polyandry the men would throw it out. I doubt whether group-marriage would have a much better chance. So monogamy would be the only alternative, unless mankind reverted to the hypothetical stage of primitive promiscuity.

When speaking of monogamy I have strictly stuck to my definition of it as the marriage of one man to one woman, which says nothing either of its cause or its duration—a circumstance which my opponents have not always taken notice of. What I have conjectured as regards its future has therefore no bearing upon the durability of the marriage relation. I think that the dissolution of it will become considerably easier than it is at present in most Christian countries; and I do not only think but hope that it will. This is the only point in my book on which I have expressed a moral opinion: I argued strongly in favour of the dissolubility of marriage by the mutual consent of the partners. But I did not do so as a mouthpiece either for moral theology or for middle-class ethics. I am amused by reading, in Mr. Calverton's description of the break-down of my moral doctrines and of eighteenth-century ethics in general, that "the absolutistic concept of evolution had to be abandoned", and that "the relativistic concept has steadily gained in power".[2] Both in my book *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, of which Mr. Calverton says that it only strengthened my influence, and in my recent book *Ethical Relativity* I have emphatically refuted the objectivity of all moral values.

[1] *The History of Human Marriage*, iii. 106.
[2] Calverton, *loc. cit.* p. 714.

AUTHORITIES QUOTED

Abraham, K., 34, 46
Adler, A., 24
Adolphus Frederick of Mecklenburg, the *Duke*, 183, 185
Ahmad Shah, *Rev.*, 317
Akeley, C. E., 191-193
Alexander, F., 61
Allen, J. A., 176
Alverdes, F., 210, 310
Alvord, *Major*, 229
Anantha Krishna Iyer, L. K., 235, 257, 318, 327, 329
Andrews, Lorin, 292
Arnobius, 50
Arzaga, *Father*, 257
Atkinson, J. J., 89, 94, 128
Augustin, *Saint*, 50

Bailey, J., 264, 265, 329
Baker, J. R., 202
Barns, T. A., 91, 193
Barrow, J., 234
Bartlett, *Dr.*, 292
Basedow, H., 118, 121
Baur, E., 149, 150, 154
Becker, H., 116
Belcher, E., 263
Bennett, L. E., 258
Bensen, 289
Best, E., 133
Bishop, A., 292
Blagden, Ch. O., 238, 261
Blair, E. H., 258
Bleek, D. F., 232, 268
Bloch, I., 35, 39, 79
Blum, E., 65
Boehm, F., 71
Bogoras, W., 281
Borst, Marie, 9
Bos, Ritzema, 151
Boucaut, *Sir* J. P., 156
Bove, G., 215
Bradley, M. Hastings, 193
Brehm, A. E., 168-170, 173, 174, 179, 182, 185, 188, 189, 194, 199, 205, 310
Brett, W. H., 251
Bridges, T., 215
Briffault, R., 129-131, 142, 147-150, 152-154, 157, 158, 163-335 *passim*
Brill, A. A., 30, 34
Brincker, P. H., 289, 291
Brisay, *Marquis* de, 74
Brooke Ch., 205
Brown, A. R., 62, 120, 217, 264
Brown, G., 241
Bruner, D. K., 116
Buck, 184
Burbridge, B., 189, 193, 210
Burckhardt, J. L., 40
Burnell, A. C., 50
Burton, *Sir* R. F., 152, 198, 332, 333

Caesar, 134
Calverton, V. F., 331-335
Cameron, A. L. P., 117
Casalis, E., 104
Casati, G., 214

Catlin, G., 230
Cerruti, G. B., 262, 273
Chavanne, J., 255
Chorley, C. W., 193
Church, G. E., 133
Cicero, M. Tullius, 53
Cimbal, W., 28
Clercq, F. S. A. de, 272
Codrington, R. H., 115, 295, 308
Cojazzi, A., 133
Cole, F. C., 258
Cooper, J. M., 215
Corin, J., 310
Crampe, *Dr.*, 155
Crespigny, C. de, 180
Crosby, O. T., 317
Curr, E. M., 199, 217, 242, 266
Czaplicka, M. A., 279

Dalager, L., 227
Dannert, E., 42, 290, 291
Darwin, Ch., 75, 89-91, 148, 155, 191, 221, 222, 247, 310, 334
David, J., 213, 266
Dawson, J., 101
Demers, *Father*, 228
Descamps, P., 180, 206, 279
Deschamps, E., 264
Diaz, C., 258
Diogenes Laertius, 53
Döhrer, H., 150, 151, 157
Doflein, F., 168, 196
Dornan, S. S., 268
Driberg, J. H., 245, 288
Du Chaillu, P. B., 182, 186, 187, 189, 190
Düsing, C., 155
Dundas, Ch., 234, 244
Du Tertre, J. B., 133

East, E. M., 87, 151
Egede, Hans, 226
Ehrenreich, P., 252
Ellis, Havelock, 23, 26, 32, 55, 68, 73, 74, 76, 133, 143, 144, 163, 225, 331
Ellis, W., 293, 294
Endle, S., 256
Erman, G. A., 281
Escherich, K., 158
Eylmann, E., 304, 305

Federley, H., 151
Feer, *Dr.*, 150
Ferenczi, S., 71
Firth, R., 155
Fischer, E., 149, 150
Fison, L., 217
Flügel, J. C., 5, 28, 32, 34, 43, 44, 46, 62, 64, 85-88, 95-99, 105, 113, 115
Forbes, H. O., 178, 183, 185, 200
Foreman, J., 258, 260
François, H. von, 290, 291
Fraser, J., 301
Fraser, J. B., 329
Frazer, *Sir* J. G., 37, 51, 53, 56, 81, 82, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 111-113
Freud, S., 4, 7, 8, 10-17, 21, 23-26, 29-34, 37, 44-46, 49-52, 57, 58, 60, 62, 64-67, 69, 70, 81, 84, 89-91, 93, 94, 102-104, 107, 109-111, 113, 121, 122, 137
Fritsch, G., 291
Fuchs, P., 313

Gadelius, B., 22, 28
Gait, E. A., 41, 42
Gallardo, C. R., 216, 246
Galton, F., 155
Garner, R. L., 184, 185, 192
Gason, S., 299
Geiger, W., 39
Gemelli Careri, F., 325, 326
Giblin, 288
Giles, *Dr.*, 236
Gilij, F. S., 251
Gillen, F. J., 108, 110, 118, 211, 216, 299, 300, 302, 307
Gillings, J., 265

Ginsberg, M., 243, 254
Goldschmidt, R., 150
Goldziher, I., 40, 152
Graafland, N., 311
Grandidier, A. and G., 284
Granit, L., 173
Grant, Ch., 42
Guldberg, 168
Gumilla, J., 251
Guthrie, 189
Gyldenstolpe, *Count*, 186

Häcker, V., 157, 158
Hagen, B., 246
Hahn, J., 289
Hahn, J. G. von, 313
Hahn, Th., 102
Hamilton, G. V., 75
Hanoteau, A., 231
Hardenburg, W. E., 231, 252
Hardiman, J. P., 236
Hardy, Thomas, 310
Harris, W. B., 255
Hart, B., 9, 10
Hartman, C. G., 202
Hartmann, E. von, 79
Hartmann, R., 188
Hartshorne, B. F., 264
Hayavadana Rao, C., 42, 43
Heape, W., 75, 83, 199, 200, 204
Hearne, S., 229
Heck, 182
Hensen, V., 148, 157, 158
Hentig, 35
Hermann, I., 92, 101
Herport, A., 47
Hertz, W., 47, 50
Hesse-Wartegg, E. von, 241
Heuglin, 182
Hickson, S. J., 177, 311
Hine, W. R., 173
Hitschmann, E., 64
Hobhouse, L. T., 243, 254
Hocart, A. M., 224
Hodgson, B. H., 235
Hodson, T. C., 256
Hoffman, W. J., 104
Hollander, J. J. de, 272
Hollis, A. C., 286, 287
Holm, G., 227
Hornaday, W. T., 205
Horney, Karen, 33
Hose, Ch., 94
Howitt, A. W., 117, 217, 297-299, 303-305
Hug-Hellmuth, Hermine, 17, 18
Humboldt, A. von, 251, 329
Hume, D., 79
Hutereau, A., 214, 266
Huth, A. H., 98, 154, 157
Hyades, P., 215

Im Thurn, *Sir* E. F., 251
Inglefield, J. S., 177

James, W., 69
Jardine, J., 237
Jenks, A. E., 91, 189, 205, 239, 260, 261
Joelson, F. S., 213
Jones, D. F., 87, 151
Jones, E., 6, 13, 24, 34, 52, 73, 74, 100, 105, 115, 116
Jung, C. G., 9, 24, 50

Kaminer, S., 150, 151, 157
Karsten, R., 51, 117, 120, 231, 252, 253
Kaufmann, H., 232, 268
Keith, *Sir* A., 206
Ketjen, E., 47
Kicherer, 267
Kjerschow, P., 9
Klein, Melanie, 17, 60, 64
Kloss, C. B., 178, 262
Knocker, F. W., 239
Koch-Grünberg, Th., 253
Kohler, J., 42, 232, 289, 291
Koppenfels, H. von, 185, 187, 188, 190, 206, 332
Koppers, W., 246

Krämer, A., 240
Kraus, F., 150, 151, 157
Krause, F., 252
Krichauff, F. E. H. W., 301
Kurze, G., 241

Labbé, P., 279
Lactantius, L. C. F., 50
Lafitau, J. F., 220-222
Landor, A. H. Savage, 317
Landtman, G., 120
Lang, Andrew, 94
Lebzelter, V., 232, 268
Le Mesurier, C. J. R., 264
Lenz, F., 149, 150
Le Roy, 213
Letourneux, A., 231
Lindblom, G., 286
Linklater, 175
Linschoten, J. H. van, 50
Lisiansky, U., 293, 297
Livingstone, D., 183, 185
Löns, E., 173
Logan, J. R., 239
Lorenz, E., 92, 114
Lovisato, D., 215
Lowis, R. F., 262
Lozano, P., 253
Lumholtz, C., 230
Lydekker, R., 172

McDougall, W., 26, 27, 31, 32, 66, 94
M'Lean, J., 228
McLennan, J. F., 37
Maksimoff, A. N., 278
Malinowski, B., 115, 116, 118, 119, 135-138, 147, 148, 216, 218, 242-244, 302
Man, E. H., 262
Mandlik, V. N., 43
Marcuse, A., 294
Marcuse, M., 151
Marshall, F. H. A., 87, 204
Martin, R., 238, 261
Martin, W. C. L., 178
Martius, C. F. Ph. von, 251, 253
Mateer, S., 325
Mathew, J., 217
Matschie, P., 193
Maxwell, 272
Mayet, P., 150
Melville, H., 297
Merker, M., 286
Miklucho-Maclay, N. von, 47, 272
Miller, E. Y., 259
Miller, G. S., 75, 204
Miller, N., 62
Mitchell, A., 156
Mivart, St. George, 171
Moberg, G., 255
Mohnike, O., 198, 206
Moll, A., 27, 30, 31
Moloni, J. Ch., 42
Money-Kyrle, R., 103, 105, 114
Montaigne, M. de, 74
Morgan, L. H., 45, 278, 279, 292, 294
Morice, A. G., 228, 319
Mortimer, G., 36
Moszkowski, M., 178
Müller, F., 199
Mundt, Th., 35
Munnecke, W., 89, 181
Mygind, H., 150

Nachmansohn, M., 15
Nelson, E. W., 282
Nevill, H., 237, 238
Nietzold, J., 37
Noorden, C. von, 150, 151, 157
Norton, E., 173

Oertzen, von, 188
Oldenberg, H., 51
Oldfield, A., 199

Pandit Harikishan Kaul, 317
Parker, K. Langloh, 242
Patkanow, 279
Paul, *Saint*, 15

Pechuël-Loesche, E., 183, 187, 188
Pfister, O., 14, 15, 114
Pitt-Rivers, G. H. Lane-Fox, 148, 154-156
Plato, 54
Playfair, A., 235
Pleyte, C. M., 274
Ploss, H.–Bartels, M., 47
Polack, J. S., 41
Porteus, S. D., 119
Portman, M. V., 217, 263
Proger, T. W., 173
Purcell, B. H., 117

Radcliffe-Brown, A. *See* Brown, A. R.
Raglan, *Lord*, 139-142, 146, 147
Rank, O., 33, 35, 43, 52, 55, 56, 62
Rapp, A., 39
Ravenstein, E. G., 279
Read, Carveth, 121
Reade, W. Winwood, 101, 187, 189, 193, 198
Reed, W. A., 133, 259
Reichard, P., 183
Reichenow, E., 90, 183, 188-192, 199
Reik, Th., 62, 63
Reitzenstein, F. von, 51
Rengger, J. R., 174, 176
Reyes Lala, R., 261
Richards, F. J., 42
Ridley, H. N., 177
Riedel, J. G. F., 272
Risley, *Sir* H., 235
Rivers, W. H. R., 42, 293-295, 308, 309, 318
Robertson, J. A., 258
Rockhill, W. W., 320
Rodd, F. Rennell, 255
Róheim, G., 19, 20, 60, 92, 105, 118
Rohleder, H., 75, 158
Rohlfs, G., 255
Roquefeuil, C. de, 296
Roscoe, J., 37, 284, 285
Ross, T. A., 15, 22, 32
Rossbach, A., 50
Roth, W. E., 117, 300
Rüdin, E., 150

Sadger, J., 33, 60, 63, 64, 71
St. John, *Lieutenant*, 263
Sarasin, F. and P., 264
Sarat Chandra Das, 134
Savage, T. S., 90, 182, 186, 206
Schapera, I., 117, 224, 232, 268, 269
Schebesta, P., 117, 213, 238, 267
Schinz, H., 290
Schmidt, W., 214, 266
Schomburgk, R., 251
Schoolcraft, H. R., 229
Schotter, A., 42
Schouten, W., 50
Schultze, L., 224
Schweinfurth, G., 182, 186
Sclater, P. L., 177, 203
Scott, J. G., 236
Seligman, Brenda Z., 131, 132, 135, 143, 144, 225, 238, 264, 265, 288, 289
Seligman, C. G., 61, 63, 225, 238, 264, 265, 288, 289
Selous, F. C., 172
Seton, E. T., 157, 171, 173-175
Shakespear, J., 257
Sherring, Ch. A., 134
Shortland, E., 38
Shortt, J., 318
Sibree, J., 41, 115
Silberer, H., 55
Simson, A., 316
Skeat, W. W., 238, 261
Smith, G. Elliot, 206, 208
Smith, W. Robertson, 80, 109, 110, 152, 153
Sophocles, 58
Spaeth, 178, 199, 205
Spencer, Miles, 175

Spencer, *Sir* W. B., 108, 110, 118, 199, 211, 216, 299, 300, 302, 307
Stack, E., 257
Stannus, H. S., 117
Starcke, C. N., 211
Steinen, K. von den, 117
Steinmetz, S. R., 62, 83
Stekel, W., 22, 26, 30, 34, 39, 72
Stephens, E., 242
Stern, Clara, 18
Stern, W., 9, 18, 26, 27
Sternberg, L. Y., 277-280, 293
Stevens, H. Vaughan, 238
Stevenson-Hamilton, J., 177
Stirling, W. H., 215
Storfer, A. J., 44, 46, 50
Stow, G. W., 267
Strehlow, C., 117, 118, 121, 242
Stuart, H. A., 257
Stuhlmann, F., 214
Swettenham, F. A., 261

Tansley, A. G., 22, 26
Taplin, G., 104
Tautain, L., 296
Tauxier, L., 313
Teschauer, C., 117
Thévenot, J. de, 326
Theal, G. M. McCall, 267
Thomas, N. W., 211, 302, 304
Thomson, *Sir* B., 224
Thomson, J., 39
Thurston, E., 42, 318, 327
Thyagaraja Aiyar, V. R., 43
Tickel, S. R., 200
Tinklepaugh, O. L., 195
Tocantins, A. M. G., 251
Torday, E., 61, 233, 234, 244, 245, 275
Tout, C. Hill, 42
Tregear, E., 38
Trenk, *Oberleutnant*, 268
Turner, G., 240
Tylor, *Sir* E. B., 102

Ujfalvy, K. E. von, 155

Vanden Bergh, L. J., 267
Virchow, R., 265
Volz, W., 89, 179, 180, 206, 210

Waitz, Th.–Gerland, G., 310
Wallace, A. R., 156, 181, 198, 252
Weiss, M., 287
Wellhausen, J., 40
West, E. W., 39
Wheeler, G. C., 243, 254
Whiffen, Th., 231
White, J. C., 317
Weismann, A., 151
Wilcken, U., 37
Wilken, G. A., 47, 152, 312
Wilken, P. N., 311
Wilkinson, R. J., 239, 262, 273
William of Sweden, *Prince*, 186, 190
Williams, T., 31
Winckler, H., 56
Woods, J. D., 104
Worcester, Dean C., 259
Wulz, G., 152
Wyman, J., 182, 206

Yerkes, Ada W. and R. M., 90, 178, 181, 184, 185, 188, 189, 192, 197, 199, 204, 205, 210

Zell, Th., 190
Zeller, M., 63
Zenker, 189, 193
Zuckerman, S., 92, 176, 184, 194-198, 200-203, 206-211

INDEX

Abortion, among savages, 244
Ackawoi (Guiana), monogamy among the, 250, 251
Adoption, a bar to intermarriage, 82; among savages, 309-312; among monkeys, 310
Adultery, 99, 134, 234, 258, 260-265, 268, 275, 283, 284, 286
Africa, British Central, views on procreation among tribes in, 117
African natives, pre-nuptial chastity among, 231-234, 285; monogamy and polygyny, 254-256, 274, 275; sexual communism, 283-292
Akamba (British East Africa), sexual communism among the, 285, 286
Akikuyu, pre-nuptial sexual intercourse among the, 244
Albania, alleged "group-motherhood" in, 313
Aldolinga (Central Australia), sexual communism among the, 300, 301
Aleut, group-marriage among the, 279, 280; polyandry, 280
Algeria, pre-nuptial chastity among the Berbers of, 231; monogamy and polygyny in, 254, 255
Andaman Islanders, children never punished among the, 62; the family, 217; monogamy, 262-264
"Animal family, the", according to Dr. Briffault, 175, 176, 196, 209-211
Animal phobias, 102, 103
Animals, the pairing instinct dulled by companionship among, 74, 75; as father substitutes, 102, 103, 114, *see* Totemism; effects of inbreeding among, 147-151, 154-158; the family consisting of parents and offspring, 167-206 *passim*
Antelopes, pairing habits of, 174
Anti-Semitism, attributed to the castration threat, 64
Ants, "marriage flight" among winged, 158
Apes, the anthropoid, relations between the sexes and between parents and offspring, and other social relations among, 177-194, 197, 205, 206; sexual season, 197-200, 204; small number of young, 205; long period of infancy, 205; man's kinship to, 206
Arabs, cousin marriage among the, 40, 152
—, ancient, marriage with a father's brother's daughter among the, 40, 152, 153; with a half-sister, 79
Aranda or Arunta (Central Australia), psycho-analytic study of children among the, 19, 20; totemism, 108; views on procreation, 118
Asiatic peoples, pre-nuptial chastity among, 234-239; monogamy and polygyny, 256-265, 272, 273; group-marriage and polyandry, 316-329
Assam tribes, pre-nuptial chastity among, 235; monogamy, 256, 257
Athenians, marriage with a half-sister among the, 79
Aunt, the original love of the mother displaced on to an, 34; marriage between nephew and, 77, 137, 138
Australian aborigines, psycho-analytic study of children among the, 19, 20; marriage between old men and young women, 97, 98; killing of old people, 101; totemism, 103, 104, 108-110; views on procreation, 105-107, 117-121; exogamy, 108, 130; the father the head of the family even in the matrilineal tribes, 115; sexual periodicity, 199; the family, 207, 216, 217; social conditions, 207; polygyny, 208,

269, 304, 306; matrilocal marriage, 211; pre-nuptial chastity, 241, 242; doubtful reports of truly monogamous tribes, 266; "group-marriage", 297-308, 330; difficulty in procuring wives, 304, 305; comparative scarcity of women, 304, 306; classificatory terms for wives and potential wives, 307; classificatory system of relationship terms, 308
Auto-erotic impulses, 10, 25-27
Azande (Nilotic Sudan), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 224, 225

Bakunta (Uganda Protectorate), sexual communism among the, 285; pre-nuptial chastity, 285
Baluba (Congo), masturbation among the, 61, 244
Banks Islands, views on procreation in the, 106
Bantu tribes, pre-nuptial chastity among, 233, 234, 244, 245; pre-nuptial pregnancy, 244; polygyny modified in a monogamous direction, 274, 275
Banyoro (Uganda Protectorate), princes marrying their sisters among the, 37; sexual communism, 284
Batrachia, relations between the sexes and parental care among, 167
Bayankole (Uganda Protectorate), sexual communism among the, 284, 285; monogamy and polygyny, 285; pre-nuptial chastity, 285
Bechuanas, totemism among the, 104
Bees, "marriage flight" among, 158
Berbers, pre-nuptial chastity among the, 231; monogamy and polygyny, 254
Bestiality, 15, 54, 80
Bhutan, polyandry and group-marriage in, 317
Birds, singing of, 158; relations between the sexes and parental care among, 167
Birth, interest taken by children in the mysteries of birth, 28
Births, periodical fluctuations in the number of, 198; pre-nuptial, 243, 244
Blood-feud, the, 77, 287
Brahmans, clan exogamy unconnected with totemism among the, 108
Brazilian Indians, incest among some, 39
Bride, the, not deflowered by the bridegroom, 46-50; held to be in a state of danger, 51
Bridegroom, the bride not deflowered by the, 46-50; held to be in a state of danger, 48, 51
Britons, ancient, community of women among the, 134
Brother, a daughter's erotic love of her father transferred to her, 34; sexual intercourse between sister and, 35, 36, 39, 143; marriage between sister and, 36-40, 43-45, 55, 56, 79, 80, 129-131, 134, 135, 138, 143, 154, 155; between half-sister and, 36, 37, 76, 79, 154. *See* Fraternal love
Buffaloes, American, inbreeding among, 157
Burmese law, relating to pre-nuptial intercourse, 236, 237
Bushmen, incest among the, 39; pre-nuptial chastity, 232; monogamy and polygyny, 267-269

Caiarý, Indians of the, monogamy among the, 253
Canelas (Matto Grosso), monogamy among the, 253
Canelos Indians (Ecuador), continence of bride and bridegroom among the, 51
Cannibalism, 91-93; among monkeys, 92
Caressing, 11, 13, 26, 29, 136
Caribs, marriage with women who are mother and daughter among the, 133
Castration and the castration complex, 46, 59-65
Catholic Church, the Roman, prohibitions of marriage between relatives in, 76, 77; prohibitions on the ground of "spiritual relationship", 78
Cats, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 168-170
Chaco tribes, pre-nuptial liberty among the, 231
Chastity, pre-nuptial, 219-249
Chavantes (Goyaz), monogamy among the, 253
Chiefs, marrying their sisters, 36, 37, 43, 44, 154, 155; deflowering brides, 48, 49

Childhood, the so-called memories of, frequently mere fancies, 17
Children, sexuality of, 11-13, 16, 25-28; analysis of, 16-20; dreams of, 18; interest taken in the mysteries of birth by, 28; rarely punished among savages, 62. *See* Infancy, Infants
Chili, periodical fluctuations in the birth-rate in, 198
Chimpanzees, relations between the sexes and between parents and young, and other social relations among, 90, 181-185, 197, 206; solitary old males, 90, 101, 185; sexual season, 199; small number of young, 205; long period of infancy, 205
Chipewayan (Dénés), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 229
Chiriguanos (Gran Chaco), marriage with women who are mother and daughter among the, 133
Choroti (Gran Chaco), monogamy among the, 253
Chukchi, incest among the, 39; sexual communism, 280-282
Circumcision, 62, 63
Classificatory terms for wives and potential wives, supposed to have originated in group-marriage, 294, 307, 308
— terms of relationship, coexistence of comprehensive exogamous rules with, 145, 146; fundamentally influenced by social relations, 145, 313, 314; supposed to have originated in group-marriage, 277-279, 292, 293, 308, 309
Concubinage, 224, 257, 258, 274
" Consanguine family, the ", L. H. Morgan's hypothesis of, 45, 294; alleged to persist among modern savages, 45
Conscience, the dread of castration supposed to persist as the fear of, 64. *See* Remorse
Continence of bride and bridegroom, 50-52
Contraception, among savages, 243, 244
Courtship, pre-nuptial sexual intercourse a method of, 225; the existence of, in primitive societies denied by Dr. Briffault, 225
Cousin, the original love of a parent displaced on to a, 34; marriage with a, 40-43, 144-146, 151-153; with a cross-, 41, 42, 145, 146, 277, 299
Coyness, female, appreciation of, 248, 249
Cross-cousin marriage, 41, 42, 145, 146, 277, 299
Curetus (Rio Negro), monogamy among the, 252
Customs and laws, alleged corroboration of the psycho-analytic findings relating to the Oedipus complex derived from, 35-55; expressing the general feelings of the community and punishing acts that shock them, 54, 138, 139

Daughter, sexually attached to her father, 3, 11-14, 23, 24, 30, 31, 98; jealous of her mother and even wishing her death, 3, 13, 14, 23, 24, 30, 98; the mother more fond of her son than of her, 31, 32, 99; the father less fond of his son than of his, 31, 32, 99; sexual intercourse or marriage between a father and his, 35, 38, 39, 46, 47, 49, 50, 94-100, 130-135; deflowered by her father, 46, 47, 49-51. *See* Filial love
Deafmutism, among children of related parents, 149, 150
Deermice, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 175
Defloration of brides, 46-50, 139
Déné or Tinne (North American Indians), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 227-229; polyandry, 319
Dhimáls (Assam), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 235
Dieri (South - East Australia), " group-marriage " among the, 297-299
" Displacement ", by which a repressed tendency is modified in such a manner that its original object is abandoned in favour of a new one that meets with less resistance, 12, 33-36. *See* Father substitutes, Mother substitutes
Divorce, 253, 257, 260, 262, 263, 265, 268, 273
Domestication of animals, represented as a means of gratifying the father hate, 114

Dream-books, 22, 63
Dreams, the analysis of, 18, 21-23; incestuous, 21, 56-58, 137; symbolic, 21, 22, 63

Ecuador, the wild Indians of, monogamy among the, 252. *See* Canelos Indians, Jibaros, Záparo Indians
Education, infantile sexuality repressed by, 11, 59
Egypt, ancient, brother and sister marriage in, 37, 44, 55, 138, 154, 155; myths of brother and sister marriage among celestial beings, 55
Electra complex, the, 3, 13, 14, 30
England, punishment of sodomy in, 70
" Envy of the penis ", 45, 49
" Erogenous zones ", 26
Eskimo, pre-nuptial chastity among the, 226, 227; sexual communism, 282; temporary exchange of wives, 282
Europe, cases of incest in, 35, 39; punishment of sodomy, 69, 70; periodical fluctuations in the birth-rate, 198
Examinations, fear of, attributed to the castration threat, 64
Exchange of wives, temporary, 282, 314
Exogamy, the author's theory of the origin of, 52-55, 72-88, 138, 139, 142-159; Freud's, 89-121 *passim*; relation between totemism and, 107, 108; definition of, 127; Dr. Briffault's theory of the origin of, 128-131, 210; Mrs. Seligman's, 131-135; Professor Malinowski's, 135-139, Lord Raglan's, 139-142. *See* Brother, Father, Son

Family, the, consisting of parents and offspring among animals, 167-206 *passim*; presumably prevalent with primitive man and universal among existing savages, 206-218
"—, the animal ", according to Dr. Briffault, 175, 176, 196, 209-211
Father, the sex-impulse of the girl fixated on her, 3, 11-14, 23, 24, 30, 31, 98; the son hostile to and even wishing the death of his, 3, 13, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29, 32, 33, 58, 98, 100-122; more fond of his daughter than of his son, 31, 32, 99; sexual intercourse or marriage between a daughter and her, 35, 38, 39, 46, 47, 49, 50, 94-100, 130-135; deflowering his daughter, 46, 47, 49-51; killing of the primeval, by his sons, 66, 91, 92, 100-114, 121, 122; eating of the primeval, 91-93, 109, 110; loved and admired, 93, 100, 103, 107; killed or abandoned when worn out with age or disease, 100, 102; distinctly the head of the family even in many matrilineal societies, 115. *See* Filial love, Paternal care, Paternal instinct
— substitutes, 12, 19, 20, 33, 34, 46, 47, 49-51, 55, 102-122
Feasts with sexual licence, 198, 236
Fijians, pre-nuptial chastity among the, 224
Filial love, 81
Fire-brands, thrown at the primeval father for the purpose of killing him, 92
Fishes, relations between the sexes and parental care among, 167
Foreigners, brides deflowered by, 47, 48
Fosterage, 309-313; a bar to intermarriage, 82
Fosterers, psycho-analysts' confusion of parents with, in their discussion of incestuous tendencies, 84-86
Foxes, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 172-174
France, incest in, 35; punishment of sodomy, 70; endogamous communities, 153
Fraternal love, 81
Fuegians, the family among the, 214-216. *See* Onas, Yahgans
Fulbeh (Sudan), alleged " group-motherhood " among the, 312, 313

Garos (Assam), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 235
Gibbons, relations between the sexes and between parents and young among, 178, 179; sexual season, 199, 200; small number of young, 205; long period of infancy, 205
Gilyak, sexual communism among the, 277-279; polyandry, 279
God-men, killing of, 111-114
Gods, regarded as father substitutes, 110, 111, 122

Gold Coast (West Africa), pre-nuptial chastity on the, 231
Gorillas, relations between the sexes and between parents and young, and other social relations among, 89-91, 185-194, 197, 206; solitary old males, 90, 91, 101, 186, 187; supposed patricidal tendencies, 101; sexual season, 198, 199; small number of young, 205; long period of infancy, 205
Great Britain, endogamous communities in, 153
Greece, pederasty in, 71; marriage with a half-sister, 76
Greek Church, the Orthodox, prohibitions of marriage on the ground of "spiritual relationship" in, 78
Greenlanders, pre-nuptial chastity among the eastern, 226, 227
Group-marriage, 44, 45, 129, 130, 276-323, 328-330
"Group-motherhood", supposed existence of a primitive, 130, 309-313
Guaycurûs (Gran Chaco), monogamy among the, 253
Guests, supplied with temporary wives, 281, 282, 287, 291, 298, 314, 315
Guilt, the sense of. *See* Remorse

Hawaiians, sexual communism among the, 292-294; proportion of the sexes, 294
Hebrews, horror of sodomy among the, 69
Heredity, of acquired characters assumed by Freud, 66, 67
Herero (South-West Africa), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 232; sexual communism, 289-292; proportion of the sexes, 291
Heresy, associated with sodomy, 69, 70
Hermaphroditism, 150, 157
Hindus, prohibition of marriage between cousins among the, 144
Hippopotami, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 167, 168
Holiness, of kings, 112, 113
Holy men, deflowering brides, 46, 48; sexual intercourse with, 48
Homicide, the prohibition of, 122. *See* Parricide
Homosexual intercourse, 39, 67-72, 80, 91, 93, 94
Homosexual tendencies. *See* Inversion
Homosexuals, dreams of, 21
Horses, English race-, effects of in-breeding upon, 156
Hospitality, sexual, 281, 282, 287, 290, 291, 298, 314, 315
Hospitals, fear of, attributed to the castration threat, 63
Hottentots, aged parents abandoned among the, 102; pre-nuptial chastity, 224; monogamy and polygyny, 268, 269
Huitoto (Putamayo region), monogamy among the, 252
Hunting, represented as a means of displacing the father hate on to wild animals, 114
— peoples and incipient agriculturists, monogamy and polygyny among, 208, 269, 270
Husband, the, a father substitute, 33; authority of, 33, 115, 132. *See* Marital care, Marital instinct
Hymeneal blood, fear of, 48

Ichneumons, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 168-170
Idiocy, among children of related parents, 150
Igorot (Luzon), accounts of pre-nuptial chastity among the, 239; sexual intimacy a preliminary to marriage, 239; monogamy, 260; adultery, 261
Illegitimate children, 166, 243, 244
Inbreeding, effects (real or imagined) of, 83, 86-88, 127, 147-159
Incest, the prohibition of, by custom or law supposed to prove that there is a natural instinct in favour of it, 52-55, 65, 99, 144; practised by celestial beings, 55, 56; superstitious beliefs connected with, 83, 127. *See* Brother, Exogamy, Father, Inbreeding, Son
Incestuous dreams, 21, 56-58
— tendencies, in infancy, 11, 23, 28-31; repression of, 11, 12; regression of, at puberty, 12, 137; the Freudian theory of the repression of the, 59-88 *passim* (how they were repressed), 89-123 *passim* (why they were repressed); difficult or impossible to remove by means of psycho-analysis, 72; origin of in-

Incestuous tendencies—*continued*
nate, 86, 87. *See* Daughter, Displacement, Son
India, cousin marriage among the Mohammedans of, 41; defloration of virgins or brides in temples in, 49, 50; clan exogamy unconnected with totemism, 108; pre-nuptial chastity, 235 - 239; monogamy among tribes, 256, 257, 261-265; polyandry and group-marriage, 316-318, 320, 322-329
—, ancient, continence of bride and bridegroom in, 50, 51
Indian Archipelago, exogamy unconnected with totemism among tribes in the, 108
Infancy, the splitting of the mind into conscious and unconscious regions in, 5, 6; sexuality, 10, 11, 25-27, 65; incestuous tendencies, 11, 23, 28-31, 59; jealousy towards the parent of the opposite sex, 23, 28-31; masturbation, 26, 27, 61
Infanticide, female, 127, 318, 319
Infants, analysis of, 16-18; alleged corroboration of the psycho-analytic findings as regards infantile sexuality and the Oedipus complex derived from direct observation of, 25-31; betrothal of, 219, 220, 231, 245-247, 297
Infidels, homosexual practices sins of heretics and, 69-71
Inheritance, of inhibiting forces, 11, 60, 61, 66, 67
Initiation ceremonies, 62, 63
Instincts, the relation of the unconscious to primary, 5, 6
Inversion, 67-72
Invertebrates, relations between the sexes and parental care among, 167
Italons (Luzon), monogamy and polygyny among the, 257, 258
Izhuvans (Cochin State), polyandry and group-marriage among the, 318

Java, endogamous communities in, 153
Jealousy, 3, 13, 14, 16, 58, 89, 94, 98, 99, 116, 121, 128, 129, 131, 133-135, 138, 247, 267, 270, 271
Jibaros (Equador), sexual morality among the, 230, 231; monogamy and polygyny, 252
Jus primae noctis, the so-called, regarded as a survival of ancient incest, 44, 46, 47, 49-51; Freud's explanation of, 45, 46, 49; the author's, 46-49

Kacháris (Assam), totemism unconnected with exogamy among the, 108; monogamy, 256
Kafirs, pre-nuptial chastity among the, 234
Kamilaroi (New South Wales), alleged sexual communism among the, 301
Kammālans (Cochin State), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 235; polyandry and group-marriage, 235, 317, 318, 327
Karayá (Araguay), monogamy among the, 252
Karens, Sawng-tüng (Burma), not unrestricted pre-nuptial freedom among the, 235
Kings, marrying their sisters, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44, 55, 56, 154, 155; deflowering brides, 48, 49; killing of divine, 111-114
Kinship, origin of the social force of, 81
Kissing, 11, 26, 30, 65, 225
Kountah (Sudan), alleged " group-motherhood " among the, 312
Kukis (Assam), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 235
—, Old (Assam), monogamy among the, 257
Kurumbas (Nilgiri Hills), polyandry among the, 322
Kworafi tribe (British New Guinea), totemism unconnected with exogamy among the, 108

Ladak, polyandry and group-marriage in, 322
Laius, 86
Lancerote (Canary Islands), 329
Lango (Uganda), pre-nuptial relations among the, 245
" Latency ", the period of, 11, 12, 27, 59, 61
Levirate, the, 44, 282, 315, 316
" Libido ", what Freud means by, 14-15
Lions, relations between the sexes and between parents and young among, 172

Lynxes, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 174, 175

Macusi (Rio Branco), monogamy among the, 251
Madagascar, cousin marriage in, 41; the father the head of the family among matrilineal tribes, 115; sexual communism, 283, 284
Malay Peninsula, wild tribes of the, pre-nuptial chastity among the, 238, 239; monogamy, 261, 262
Mammals, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 167-206 *passim*
Mandan (Dakotan tribe), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 230
Man-gods, killing of, 111-114
Maori (New Zealand), brother and sister marriages among the, 37, 38; marriage with women who are mother and daughter, 133
Marital care, 166-208 *passim*
— instinct, the, 166, 167, 197, 205
Marquesas Islands, group-marriage in the, 295-297; polyandry, 296, 297
Marriage, between parent and child, 35, 38, 130-135; brother and sister, 36-40, 43-45, 55, 56, 79, 80, 129-131, 134, 135, 138, 143, 154, 155; brother and half-sister, 36, 37, 76, 79, 154; cousins, 40-43, 144-146, 151-153; uncle and niece, 42, 43, 77; nephew and aunt, 77, 137, 138; by purchase, 94, 95, 127, 246, 247, 272; between an old and a young person, 96-98; by capture, 127; with women who are sisters, 133; who are mother and daughter, 133; the biological foundation of, 165-218; definitions of the word, 165, 166, 248; not only a sex-relation but also an economic institution, 165, 248, 276; the institution of, probably developed out of a primeval habit, 166; celebrated at some special time of the year, 198, 199; Dr. Briffault's theory of individual, 219, 220; sexual connection a preliminary to, 225, 234, 239, 245; upon trial, 234. *See* Exogamy, Group-marriage, Levirate, Matrilocal marriage, Monogamy and polygyny, Polyandry, Sororate, Weddings
Martens, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 168-170
Masai (East Africa), exogamy unconnected with totemism among the, 108; sexual communism, 286, 287
Masturbation, 26, 27, 61, 80, 244
Maternal instinct, the, 81, 167, 175, 176, 310, 311
— uncle, the hatred towards the father supposed to be transferred to the, in matrilineal societies, 115, 116; position of the, 115
Matriarchal family groups, 128, 129, 131, 307
Matrilocal marriage, 129, 210-212, 276
Melanesia, the father the head of the family also among matrilineal tribes in, 115; monogamy, 265, 266; sexual communism, 288, 289, 294, 295
Memory, an unreliable instrument, 8, 9; relating to childhood, 16, 17, 137
Menomini Indians, totemism among the, 104
Menstruous women, fear of, 139-142
Mikirs (Assam), monogamy among the, 257
Minahassa, alleged " group-motherhood " among the Alfurs of, 311, 312
Mohammedans, cousin marriage among, 40, 41, 43, 152
Monkeys, the sexual instinct dulled by companionship in, 75; cannibalism among, 92; relations between the sexes and between parents and young, and other social relations, 176-197, 205, 206; sexual season, 197-204; adoption, 310. *See* Apes
Monogamy and polygyny, among monkeys and anthropoid apes, 176-195; in mankind, 208, 250-275
Moorish tribes of the Western Sahara, monogamy among the, 255
Morality, the primeval parricide at the bottom of, 110, 121, 122
Morocco, parental and filial affection in, 32; cousin marriage, 40, 41, 152; homosexual practices and inversion, 68; holiness ascribed to the sultanship, 112; deteriorating

influence of European civilisation on the chastity of native women, 225; pre-nuptial chastity among the Berbers, 231; monogamy and polygyny, 255, 256, 271; alleged "group-motherhood", 312; sexual bashfulness, 313
Mother, the sex-impulse of the boy fixated on his, 3, 11-13, 23, 24, 28-31, 58, 98, 136; the daughter jealous of and even wishing the death of her, 3, 13, 14, 23, 24, 30, 98; the first object of love generally the, 11; more fond of her son than of her daughter, 31, 32, 99; sexual intercourse or marriage between a son and his, 35, 38, 39, 130-134, 136-138, 141; the son's reverence for his, 136, 138. *See* Filial love, Maternal instinct
— substitutes, 12, 19, 20, 33-35
Mother-in-law, avoidance of the, 140
Mother-right, supposed to be intended to deflect the hatred towards the father by transferring it to the maternal uncle, 115, 116; not inconsistent with the Oedipus complex, 116; supposed to have prevailed in the primitive human group, 128, 129
Moths, effect of inbreeding among, 150
Mundrucûs (North Brazil), monogamy among the, 251
Muskrats, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 175
Myths and legends, alleged corroboration of the psycho-analytic findings relating to the Oedipus complex derived from, 55-58

Nagas (Assam), monogamy among the, 256
Nails, the paring of, feared in consequence of the castration threat, 63
Name, influence of a common, 77, 82, 145
Nandi (British East Africa), totemism unconnected with exogamy among the, 108
Narcissism, 10, 11
Natural selection, 86-88, 95-97, 159, 166, 167, 197, 198, 204-207
Nayādis (South India), monogamy among the, 257
Nayars (South India), alleged to have had group-marriage, 45; polyandry among the, 323-328
Negritos (Philippine Islands), monogamy among the, 259
— of Zambales (Luzon), marriage with women who are mother and daughter among the, 133; polygyny, 258, 259
Nephew, marriage between aunt and, 77, 137, 138
Neuroses, 7-10, 16, 22-24, 27
New Guinea, views on procreation among Papuans of, 120; sexual communism in, 288, 289
Nez Percés (Oregon), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 229
Niece, marriage between uncle and, 42, 43, 77
Nilo-Hamites, sexual communism among the, 287, 288
North American tribes, pre-nuptial chastity among, 227-230
Nukahiva (Marquesas Islands), polyandry in, 296, 297

"Object love", 11, 16
Oedipus complex, the, 3-123 *passim*; defined, 3; the nuclear complex of the neuroses, 10; a universal human characteristic, 10, 24; the initiation customs of little consequence with regard to, 63
— legend, the, possibly connected with an ancient royal custom, 56; supposed to have originated in an old dream material, 56, 57; the "Oedipus complex" of the Freudians wrongly called so after, 58, 86
Offspring, effects (real or imagined) of inbreeding on the, 83, 127 147-159; care taken of the, among animals, 166-206 *passim*; in mankind, 166, 206-218
Old persons, killed or abandoned, 101, 102
Onas (Tierra del Fuego), marriage with women who are mother and daughter among the, 133; the family, 215, 216; pre-nuptial chastity, 246
Operations, fear of, attributed to the castration threat, 63
Orang Kubu (Sumatra), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 246
Orang-utans, relations between the sexes and between parents and

young, and other social relations among, 89, 90, 179-181, 205, 206; sexual season, 198; small number of young, 205; long period of infancy, 205
Orinoco, Indians on the, monogamy among the, 251
Ossetes, alleged "group-motherhood" among the, 313
Otomacos (Orinoco), monogamy among the, 251

Paressí (Central Brazil), monogamy among the, 253
Parricide, the primeval, 66, 91, 92, 100-114, 121, 122; among savages and barbarians, 101, 102
Paternal authority, 115
— care, among animals, 166-206 *passim*; in mankind, 166, 206-218 *passim*
— instinct, the, 81, 166, 167, 197, 205
Paternity, savage views on, 105-107, 116-121
Pederasty. *See* Homosexual intercourse
Pelang (off the coast of Celebes), marriage among the Alfurs of, 271, 272
Persia, ancient, next-of-kin marriage in, 38, 39, 154
Peru, endogamous communities in, 153
—, ancient, incest in the royal family of, 44, 56; myth of brother and sister marriage among the children of the sun in, 55, 56
Polyandry, 134, 235, 259, 279, 282, 296, 297, 316-329
Polybus, 86
Polygyny and monogamy, in mankind, 133, 208, 250-275; among monkeys and anthropoid apes, 176-195
Polynesia, close intermarriage practised by chiefs in, 155; pre-nuptial chastity, 240, 241; monogamy, 265; sexual communism or group-marriage and polyandry, 292-297
Preconscious system, the, 4
Priests, deflowering brides, 46, 48, 49
Primitive man, sexual season with, 197-199; and anthropoids evolved from a common type, 206; social conditions of, 207; the family consisting of parents and children with, 207, 208
Procreation, savage views on, 105-107, 116-121; the son's hatred towards his father supposed to be deflected by a tendentious denial of paternal, 116, 121
Promiscuity, hypothesis of a primitive state of, 127, 222, 223, 243, 247, 314. 334
Prostitution, 223, 224, 226, 229; male, attached to Canaanite temples, 69
Psycho-analysis, the method of, description of, 7, 8; criticism, 8-10
Puberty, the sexual instinct at the time of, 12, 23; commencement of the age of, 27, 28; homosexual tendencies in early, 69
Punjab, polyandry and group-marriage in the, 317, 329
Purupurus (River Purus), monogamy among the, 252
Pygmies of Central Africa, the family among the, 213, 214; monogamy, 266, 267

Queensland, North, sexual communism among the natives of, 300

Raccoons, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 175
Rajputs, clan exogamy unconnected with totemism among the, 108
Razors, fear of, attributed to the castration threat, 63
Reindeer, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 168, 169
Religion, the primeval parricide at the bottom of, 110, 111, 121, 122
Remorse, 66, 93, 100, 107, 108, 110, 121
Repression, 4-6, 11, 12, 33, 34, 59-88 *passim* (how the incestuous tendencies were repressed), 65 (the essence of repression), 89-123 *passim* (why the incestuous tendencies were repressed)
Reptiles, relations between the sexes and parental care among, 167
Retinitis pigmentosa, among children of related parents, 150
Rome, ancient, paternal and marital authority in, 33; phallic rites, 49, 50; old law against pederasty, 71; prohibition of marriage between kindred, 76, 144
Royal persons, brother and sister marriage among, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44, 55, 56, 154, 155

Russia, the law of marriage in Soviet, 77

Sacrifice, 102, 103, 109-114, 122
Sakai (Malay Peninsula), sexual morality among the, 239; monogamy, 262; marriage, 272-274
Samoa, totemism unconnected with exogamy in, 108; pre-nuptial chastity, 240, 241
Santals (Bengal), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 235; fraternal polyandry and sexual communism, 235, 283
Scandinavia, endogamous communities, in, 153
Scotland, consanguineous marriages in, 155, 156
Seals, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 167-169
Semang (Malay Peninsula), monogamy among the, 261
Senoi (Malay Peninsula), monogamy among the, 261
Sexual characters, secondary, 27, 158
— communism, 129, 130, 276-323, 328-330
— indifference, due to companionship in men and animals, 72-75, 88, 142, 143, 146, 147, 158; leading to aversion when the act is thought of, 75, 76, 80, 143
— intercourse, with a holy person held to be beneficial, 48; regarded as a mysterious cause of evil, 51; evil effects ascribed to illicit, 83, 127, 153; with strangers, *see* Hospitality
— licence at feasts, 198, 236
— season, with monkeys, 197-204; with primitive man, 197-199; the author's theory of the origin of the, 204
— selection, Darwin's theory of, 222
Sexuality, in infancy, 10, 11, 25-27, 65; what Freud means by, 14-16. *See* Incestuous tendencies
Sheep, the maternal instinct in, 309, 310
Shilluk (White Nile), slaying of the divine king among the, 113
Siamangs, 179
Sikhim, polyandry and group-marriage in, 317
Sinhalese, polyandry among the, 316, 328, 329
Sirmur (Punjab), polyandry in, 329
Sister, a son's erotic love of his mother transferred to his, 34; incestuous intercourse between brother and, 35, 36, 39, 143; marriage between brother and, 36-40, 43-45, 55, 56, 79, 80, 129-131, 134, 135, 138, 143, 154, 155. *See* Fraternal love
—, half-, marriage with a, 36, 37, 76, 79, 154
Slave Coast (West Africa), pre-nuptial chastity on the, 231
Slavs, Southern, prohibition of marriage between cousins among the, 144
Social organisation, the primeval parricide at the bottom of, 110, 121, 122
— relations expressed in terms of blood-relationship, 81-83
— tendencies, all, according to Freud, only special differentiations of the sexual instinct, 15
Sodomy. *See* Homosexual intercourse
Son, sexually attached to his mother, 3, 11-13, 23, 24, 28-31, 58, 98, 136; hostile to his father and even wishing his death, 3, 13, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29, 32, 33, 58, 98, 100-122; the father more fond of his daughter than of his, 31, 32, 99; the mother less fond of her daughter than of her, 31, 32, 99; sexual intercourse or marriage between a mother and her, 35, 38, 39, 130-134, 136-138, 141; reverence for his mother felt by the, 136, 138. *See* Filial love
Sons, primeval, killing their father, 66, 91, 92, 100-114, 121, 122; eating him, 91-93, 109, 110; loving and admiring him, 93, 100, 103, 107
Sororate, the, 44, 259, 282, 315, 316
South American tribes, views on procreation among, 117, 120; sexual morality, 230, 231; monogamy, 250-254
South Sea Islands, "the consanguine family" of Morgan alleged to persist in the, 45; proportion of the sexes, 265
Sparta, polyandry in, 321
Squirrels, flying-, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 175

Stoned to death, the primeval father, 92
Strangers, brides deflowered by, 47, 48; regarded as almost supernatural beings, 48, 314, 315; sexual intercourse with, *see* Hospitality
Sucking, 25, 26, 136, 137
Sumatra, exogamy unconnected with totemism among tribes in, 108
Sweden, promiscuous intercourse of wedding guests at old country weddings in, 236

Tafilelt (Sahara), polygyny at, 255
Tagbanuas of Palawan, monogamy among the, 259
Tarahumare (Mexico), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 230
Taveta (British East Africa), totemism unconnected with exogamy among the, 108
Teeth, knocking out of, as an initiation rite, 62, 63
Tenderness, 12, 15
Tepehuane (Mexico), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 230
Tibet, polyandry and group-marriage in, 134, 316-322
Tickling, 26
Tikopia, class endogamy in, 155
Tinguianes (Luzon), monogamy and concubinage among the, 258, 259
Tiyyans. *See* Izhuvans
"Tobias nights", the, 50-52
Todas (Nilgiri Hills), polyandry and group-marriage among the, 318, 322
Tonga, pre-nuptial chastity in, 240
Torres Islands, supposed sexual communism in, 295
Totemism, 102-110, 122, 127, 128
Tounsawah (Celebes), alleged sexual communism among the Alfurs of, 272
Trobriand Islands (British New Guinea), views on procreation in the, 118; incestuous dreams, 137; sexual intercourse or marriage with an aunt, 137, 138
Tuareg, monogamy among the, 254, 255
Tungus, sexual communism among the, 279

Ulladans (Cochin State), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 235
Uncle, the original love of the father displaced on to an, 34; marriage between niece and, 42, 43, 77. *See* Maternal uncle
Unconscious system, the, 3-8, 10
Urabunna (Central Australia), "group-marriage" among the, 299, 300

Veddas (Ceylon), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 237, 238; monogamy, 264, 265
Virginity, men's preference for, 247-249. *See* Defloration of brides

Wahehe (East Africa), totemism unconnected with exogamy among the, 108; pre-nuptial chastity, 233
Wateita (East Africa), brother and sister marriage among the, 39
Weddings, sexual orgies at, 236
Welsh, prohibition of marriage between cousins among the, 144
Whales, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 167, 168
Wishes, unconscious processes described as, 4, 6; dreams as manifestations of, 21
Wives, mother substitutes, 34; custom of supplying guests with temporary, 281, 282, 287, 291, 298, 314, 315; temporary exchange of, 282, 314
Wolves, relations between the sexes and paternal care among, 168, 170, 171
Women, contempt for, attributed to the castration threat, 64

Yahgans (Tierra del Fuego), the family among the, 215; pre-nuptial chastity, 246
Yoruba (West Africa), pre-nuptial chastity among the, 231

Záparo Indians (Ecuador), polyandry among the, 316
Zoroastrianism, homosexual practices abhorred by, 71. *See* Persia

Printed in Great Britain by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh.*

By the same Author

THE HISTORY OF HUMAN MARRIAGE

FIFTH EDITION, ENTIRELY REWRITTEN

3 vols. 8vo. £3 3s. net

DR. HAVELOCK ELLIS in *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*.—"A work elaborated with such patient care and thought, with so constant an eye to its larger outlines, that it constitutes one of the chief scientific monuments of our time."

PROFESSOR B. MALINOWSKI in *Nature*.—"This book is and will remain an inexhaustible fount of information, a lasting contribution towards the clearing up of some of the most obscure aspects of human evolution, and it marks an epoch in the development of sociological method and reasoning."

MR. A. E. CRAWLEY in *The Observer*.—"One of the most thorough, closely reasoned, and exhaustive studies ever made on any subject."

Man.—"One of a small number of books which will hold a permanent place as a landmark in anthropological literature. . . . A book which has attained the dignity of a classic."

The New Statesman.—"Recognised throughout the world as a standard monograph of comparative sociology. . . . As a storehouse of universal information on marriage customs, the book is unrivalled in the literature of any country."

The Times Literary Supplement.—"This impressive work is in every way worthy of a European scholar of the first rank."

A SHORT HISTORY OF MARRIAGE

8vo. 10s. 6d. net

MR. C. E. M. JOAD in *The Spectator*.—"This book is based upon the last edition of the larger work, but it is far from being a mere rehash of its contents. It is a complete and completely authoritative work in itself, and if one did not know of the existence of the earlier three volumes, one might very well take it as a compendium of human knowledge on the subject with which it deals."

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON

By the same Author

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MORAL IDEAS

2 vols. 8vo. 14s. net each

DR. R. R MARETT in *Mind.*—"Dr. Westermarck's work fills me with profound admiration . . . There is no book in any language that deals concretely with the evolution of morality on so grand a scale or in so authoritative a way."

DR. W. R. SORLEY in *The Bookman.*—"Dr. Westermarck is the only writer who can claim to have systematically examined the whole of the evidence, and to have produced a comprehensive treatise on the development of men's ideas of good and evil. . . . He is to be congratulated on having produced a standard work on a subject of first-rate importance. It is distinguished alike by breadth of view and mastery of detail, by skilful marshalling of evidence and by sound judgment."

EARLY BELIEFS AND THEIR SOCIAL INFLUENCE

8vo. 7s. 6d. net

DR. R. R. MARETT in *Nature.*—"We have here in compact and lucid shape the mature reflections of one whose command of fact and independence of mind entitle him to rank among the foremost exponents of anthropology in all that variety of aspects constituting its social side."

PAGAN SURVIVALS IN MOHAMMEDAN CIVILISATION

8vo. 8s. 6d. net

The Times Literary Supplement.—"The subject here treated by Dr. Westermarck does not appear hitherto to have attracted much attention. . . . The present volume may be regarded as a sort of postscript or footnote to his more solid works; but, though its pages number less than two hundred . . . they are packed as full with matter as they will hold."

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON