APPENDICES
APPENDIX I

NOTE ON THE CLASSIFICATORY SYSTEM OF RELATIONSHIP

It is not the purpose of the present note to consider the general validity of Morgan's theory of group marriage beyond pointing out that, so far as it is based on the classificatory system, it is internally consistent. What I want to consider is whether the classificatory system can be explained in any other way.

The first to reject Morgan's theory was McLennan, who argued, quite correctly, that what the classificatory terms denote is not consanguinity but social status; but, as Rivers pointed out, he was mistaken in supposing that this constituted an objection to the theory.\(^1\) McLennan's own view was that the classificatory system is merely a system of mutual salutations or modes of address and therefore unrelated to rules of marriage.\(^2\) This view, which still leaves the salutations unexplained, has long been abandoned.

In the present century, Morgan's interpretation has been attacked from several points of view. Thomas claimed to have reduced it to an absurdity by demonstrating its application to the relationship of mother and son.\(^3\)

If we are entitled to conclude from the fact that a man's wife bears the same name for him as all the other women he might have married, that he at one time was the husband of them all, then we are obviously equally entitled to conclude, from the fact that a woman's son is known to her by the same name as the sons of other women, either that during the period of group marriage she actually bore the sons of the other women or that the whole group of women produced their sons by their joint efforts. Finding that the term which is translated son is equally applied by the remainder of the group of women to the son of the individual woman whose case we have been considering, we may discard the former hypothesis and come to the conclusion that, if there was a period of group marriage, there was also one of group motherhood. This interesting fact may be commended to the attention of zoologists.

\(^1\) Rivers in AEPT 319f.  
\(^2\) McLennan SAH 270.  
\(^3\) Thomas KMA 123.
In putting forward this frivolous argument, which has been rebutted by Rivers, Thomas shut his eyes to the fact that, as interpreted by Morgan, the classificatory terms denote collective relationships. It may seem strange to us that the individual relationship between mother and child should not be recognised, but, since it is not recognised in the classificatory system, no matter how it is to be interpreted, it is merely specious to pretend that Morgan’s theory is vulnerable at this point. Perhaps the best answer to Thomas is Kleintitschen’s account of a native of New Brit. in, who boasted of having three mothers, and these likewise asserted, “All three of us bore him.”

More recently an attempt has been made to cut the ground from under Morgan’s feet by an expedient even more drastic than McLennan’s. Kroeber claims to have demonstrated that the accepted distinction between the classificatory and descriptive systems is entirely illusory and therefore devoid of social or historical significance. He begins by distinguishing the various kinds of relationship which are expressed in terminologies of kinship, and by this means he establishes the following categories: (1) the distinction of generations, e.g. between father and son; (2) the distinction between relatives by blood and relatives by marriage; (3) the distinction between lineal and collateral relationships, e.g. between son and nephew; (4) the distinction of sex of the relative; (5) the distinction of sex of the person through whom the relationship exists, e.g. between the father’s and the mother’s brother; (6) the distinction of sex of the speaker (in many languages different terms are used according as the speaker is a man or woman); (7) the distinction of age within the same generation, e.g. between elder and younger brother; (8) distinctions based on external conditions, e.g. in some languages the term for wife’s father varies according as the wife is alive or dead. These results are then applied to a comparison of the two types of system. For this purpose English is assumed to be typical of the descriptive system, while the classificatory is represented by five North American languages and seven Californian. The extent to which the above-mentioned categories are represented in these languages is then set forth in the following table. The languages are (1) English, (2) Arapaho, (3) Dakota, (4) Pawnee, (5) Skokomish, (6) Chinook, (7) Yuki, (8) Pomo, (9) Washo, (10) Miwok, (11) Yokuts, (12) Luiseño, (13) Mohave.

1 Rivers in AEPT 317. See further Briffault M 1. 747.
2 Kleintitschen quoted by Frazer TE 1. 305.
3 A. L. Kroeber in JRAI 39. 77.
From this array of statistics, Kroeber draws the following conclusions:

While in English the degree of recognition which is accorded the represented categories is indicable by a percentage of 100 in all cases but one, when it is 95, in Pawnee corresponding percentages range variously from about 10 to 90, and in Mohave from 5 to 95. All the other languages, as compared with English, closely approach the condition of Pawnee and Mohave. It is clear that this difference is real and fundamental. . . . Judged from its own point of view, English is the less classificatory, inasmuch as in every one of its terms it fails to recognise certain distinctions often made in other languages; regarded from a general and comparative point of view, neither system is more or less classificatory. In short, the prevalent idea of the classificatory system breaks down entirely under analysis.

And finally:

If it had been more clearly recognised that terms of relationship are determined primarily by linguistic factors, and are only occasionally, and then indirectly, affected by social circumstances, it would probably long ago have been generally realised that the difference between descriptive and classificatory systems is subjective and superficial.

In reaching this conclusion Kroeber has forgotten that the science of historical linguistics starts from the postulate that the evolution of
language is ultimately determined by social factors; and his attitude on this point is symptomatic of the extent to which the theoretical basis of anthropology has disintegrated since Morgan's time. He also appears to have forgotten that English is not the only type of the descriptive system nor his twelve American languages of the classificatory. As soon as his method is applied to other languages, his whole basis of comparison crumbles away.

As Morgan pointed out, the purest of the descriptive systems are Celtic, Norse and Semitic. All of these belong to the same type, which may be illustrated from modern Irish. Modern Irish contains only twelve terms of relationship: sean-a'hir grandfather, seana-mháhir grandmother, a'hir father, máhir mother, drioháir brother, driofuir sister, col ceahar cousin, mac son, inion daughter, fear husband, bean wife, celtle husband or wife. All other relationships are expressed by combination, e.g. drioháir ahar, father's brother, fear inme, daughter's husband.

Applying Kroeber's analysis to this system, we find that, if the compound terms are to be included in the total number along with the simple terms, no total can be fixed in Irish or in any other language, because in all languages such combinations can be formed at will indefinitely. If, on the other hand, we confine our attention to the primary terms, the total is 12, lower than Skokomish, and, moreover, a number of relationships are not expressed at all. The result is that, on Kroeber's showing, the differences between Irish and the other languages, American and English, are far more “real and fundamental” than the differences between English and the American. In short, Kroeber's method breaks down.

Further, these twelve American languages are even less representative of the classificatory system than English is of the descriptive. In systems of the Dravidian type, a common term is used for the mother's brother and the father-in-law. This is not because distinct relationships have been confused, but because, owing to the practice of cross-cousin marriage, which still survives among the Dravidian-speaking peoples (see p. 405), these two relationships are or may be united in a single person. This is a feature of the classificatory system, which Kroeber's second category, based on the assumption that blood and marriage are mutually exclusive, is incapable of expressing. Similarly, in systems of the Australian type, we find terms denoting relationships connected with the speaker by two,

1 This list has been compiled from my own knowledge of the West Kerry dialect, of which I am a fluent speaker. I have omitted the terms ibrcaíl and ainíin, which are recent borrowings from English and only used when the speaker is not concerned to be precise.
three or four intermediate relatives of different sexes. Applied to these, Kroeber's fifth category, based on the assumption that there is only one connecting relative, is meaningless.

The classificatory system is most highly developed in the Australian languages, and of the Australian systems there is none more elaborate than the Arunta. Let me give the Arunta system in full, because it is a marvel of complexity and coherence. These blackfellows, not having cattle to keep or corn to measure, cannot count beyond five, but they carry the facts of kinship in their heads with a facility which makes the white man seem stupid.

The data from which this table has been compiled are given by Spencer and Gillen A 41f. Variants, such as yurumbura for unkulla (woman speaking) and urumba for ichtella, have been omitted. There is also one descriptive term, quaiia-nurra, applied by a woman to her husband's actual mother.

Column I gives the terms of relationship. Where different terms are used, or the same terms used differently, according to the sex of the speaker, the distinctions are marked by the signs m (male speaking) and f (female speaking). The other duplicate terms mark distinctions of external conditions, in most cases of residence, e.g. annua is used only of those who live in a local group different from the speaker's, while the corresponding use of spulla is confined to those who live in the speaker's own local group (see Notes and References p. 420) and only those called annua are marriageable to the speaker.

Column II gives the moiety (A or B), section (1 or 2) and subsection (a or b) to which each set of relatives belongs. It is assumed that the speaker belongs to B1a.

The remaining columns give the relationships covered by each term or pair of terms, grouped as far as possible according to the degree of affinity and abbreviated as follows: B brother, s sister, Bo brother or sister, Ee elder, Yy younger, F father, m mother, S son, d daughter, Sa son or daughter, H husband, w wife. Thus, FFEBSS is the father's father's elder brother's son's son.

(The table follows on the next page.)

The reader is now able to judge for himself how far the difference between the classificatory and descriptive systems is "subjective and superficial." Yet, despite its apparent complexity, the principle on which this structure rests is quite simple.

As has been explained in Chapter II, the classificatory system was evolved to express the relationships characteristic of a community divided into two exogamous and intermarrying groups. The effect of this division is that I must marry a daughter of my mother's
| kullia     | B1a | EB | FEBs | mesS | FFEBSs | FmesSS | mFEBSd | mmesdS |
| quaia m    | B1a | es | FEBd | mesd | FFEBSd | FmesSd | mFEBSd | mmesdS |
| ungaraticha | B1a | YB | FYBS | mysS | FFYBS | FmysSD | mFYBSd | mmysdS |
| itia       | B1b |    |      |      | FSdS   | FmBSD | mFSSd  | mmBSSd |
| ipmnuna    | A1b |    | FsSd | mBSd | FFBDd | FmsdSd | mFBSSd | mmssSd |
| unkulla chimmia m | A1a | wB | sH   | sHB  | FFSS   | FmBSS | mFsdS  | mmBdS  |
| umbirna m  | A1a | H  | HB   |      |        |        |        |        |
| anua f     | A1a | w  | ws   |      |        |        |        |        |
| apulla f   | A1a | Hs | Bw   | Bws  | FFSSd  | FmBSD | mFsdS  | mmBdS  |
| anua m     | A1a |    |      |      |        |        |        |        |
| apulla m   | A1a |    |      |      |        |        |        |        |
| indinga f  | A1a |    |      |      |        |        |        |        |
| apulla f   | A1a |    |      |      |        |        |        |        |

<p>| oknia      | B2a | F  | FB   | FFBS | FmsS   |
| winchinga  | B2a | Fs | FFBd | Fmsd  |
| uwinna     | B2b | wm | Hm   | wmB   | HmB   | mFSSd | mmBSd |
| murra      | A2a | m  | ms   |       |        | FBSd  | mmsd  |
| mia        | A2a | mB |      |       |        | FBS   | mmsS  |
| gammona    |     |    |      |       |        |        |        |
| umba       | A2b | wF | HF   | wFB   | HFB   | FFSSd | FmBDd |
| irundra m  | A2b | wF | HF   | wFB   | HFB   | FFSSd | FmBSSd |
| nimmera f  |     |    |      |       |        |        |        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arunga</td>
<td>B1a</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>FFBs</td>
<td>wFm</td>
<td>HFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipmunna</td>
<td>B1b</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mmB</td>
<td>wmF</td>
<td>HmF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulla</td>
<td>A1a</td>
<td>Fm</td>
<td>FmB</td>
<td>wFF</td>
<td>HFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimma</td>
<td>A1b</td>
<td>mF</td>
<td>mFBs</td>
<td>wmm</td>
<td>Hmm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allira</td>
<td>B2a</td>
<td>S(m)</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>FBSSd</td>
<td>msSSd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mura</td>
<td>B2b</td>
<td>dH(f)</td>
<td>Sw(f)</td>
<td>FsdSd</td>
<td>mBsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammona</td>
<td>A2a</td>
<td>dH(m)</td>
<td>Sw(m)</td>
<td>FsSS</td>
<td>mBSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>A2a</td>
<td>S(m)</td>
<td>FsSd</td>
<td>mBsd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umba</td>
<td>A2b</td>
<td>S(f)</td>
<td>Sd</td>
<td>FBdSd</td>
<td>msdSd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Arunga    | B1a     | SS(m)    | BSS(m)   | FBSSa    | msSSS    |
| Ipmunna   | B1b     | dS(f)    | sdS(f)   | FBddSd   | msddSd   |
| Chimma    | A1b     | dS(m)    | Bdd(m)   | FBdSd    | msdSd    |
| Apulla    | A1a     | FBdSd    | msSdS    | FsddS    | mBddS    |
| A1a       |         |          |          |          |          |
| Anua f    |         | A1a      | SS       | sSS      | FBdSS    | msdS    |
| Apulla f  |         |          |          |          |          |
| Indinga f |         | A1a      | Sd       | sSd      | FBdSd    | msdSd   |
| Apulla f  |         |          |          |          |          |
| Oknia     | B2a     | SSS(m)   | SdS(f)   |
| Winchinga | B2a     | SSd(m)   | Sdd(f)   |
| Uwinna    |         |          |          |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mura</th>
<th>B2b</th>
<th>ddS(^d)(m)</th>
<th>dSS(^d)(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gammona</td>
<td>A2a</td>
<td>dSS(m)</td>
<td>ddS(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mia</td>
<td>A2a</td>
<td>dSd(m)</td>
<td>ddd(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irundera m</td>
<td>A2b</td>
<td>SdS(^d)(m)</td>
<td>SSS(^d)(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nimmera f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>itia</th>
<th>B1a</th>
<th>SSSS(^d)(m)</th>
<th>dddS(^d)(f)</th>
<th>dSdS(^d)(m)</th>
<th>SdSS(^d)(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ipmunna</td>
<td>B1b</td>
<td>SddS(^d)(m)</td>
<td>SSSd(^d)(f)</td>
<td>ddSS(^d)(m)</td>
<td>dSSS(^d)(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbirna m</td>
<td>A1a</td>
<td>dddS</td>
<td>SdSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| anua f           | A1a | SSSS          | dSdS          |               |               |
| apulla f         |     |               |               |               |               |

| anua m           | A1a | dddd          | SdSd          |               |               |
| apulla m         |     |               |               |               |               |

| indinga f        | A1a | SSSS          | dSdd          |               |               |
| apulla f         |     |               |               |               |               |

| unkulla m        | A1b | SSdS\(^d\)    | dSSS\(^d\)    |               |               |
| unkulla f        | A1b | SddS          | ddSS          |               |               |
| ilchella f       | A1b | Sddd          | ddSd          |               |               |
brother and father’s sister. That is the rule of cross-cousin marriage.

This rule presupposes, of course, that marriage is restricted to members of the same generation. In many tribes this restriction is expressed concretely by dividing each of the two moieties into two sections. My father belongs to one section of moiety A (A1); my mother belongs to one section of moiety B (B1). With patrilineal descent, I belong to my father’s moiety but to the other section (A2); and similarly my wife belongs to the other section of my mother’s moiety (B2). I marry into my mother’s moiety, but not into her section.

In the Arunta and allied tribes, instead of the normal type of cross-cousin marriage, in which husband and wife are cross-cousins of any degree, marriage is forbidden between cross-cousins of the first degree. My wife is therefore a daughter, not of my mother’s brother and father’s sister, but of my mother’s mother’s brother’s daughter (who is also my mother’s father’s sister’s daughter) and of my father’s father’s sister’s son (who is also my father’s mother’s brother’s son). And this rule is expressed by dividing each section into two subsections, with the result that my cross-cousins of the first degree are separated from my cross-cousins of the second.

It is hard to see how one could desire a more definitive proof of the direct connection between the classificatory system of relationship and the marriage system.

Let me re-state briefly the essential differences between the descriptive and classificatory systems. In English, my father and mother, my brothers and sisters, and my sons and daughters, are sharply distinguished, in each generation, from their collaterals. Outside these limits, the terminology is less precise: my father’s brother is equated with my mother’s as my uncle, my father’s brother’s children with my father’s sister’s children as my cousins. Further, each of the terms father, mother, husband, wife, denotes a specific individual. A nomenclature of this type corresponds to the basic unit of civilised society, which is the individual family, consisting of two parents and their children. In the classificatory system, my father and mother, my brothers and sisters, my sons and daughters, are each equated with certain of their collaterals in an

1 Thus, referring to the sixth and following lines of the table, the reader will see that my cross-cousins of the first degree (the children of my father’s sister and mother’s brother) belong to A1b, whereas those cross-cousins of the second degree who stand to me in the relation of wife (husband), wife’s brother (husband’s brother), wife’s sister (husband’s sister), etc., belong to A1a. Without the division of the section into subsections, all these would belong indiscriminately to A1.
infinite series. On the other hand, my father’s brothers and sisters are distinguished from my mother’s, my father’s brother’s children from my father’s sister’s children, and so on. Further, in the more primitive forms of the system, my father-in-law is equated with my mother’s brother, my mother-in-law with my father’s sister, my wife with the daughters of my mother’s brother and my father’s sister. Such a nomenclature can only be explained as the product of a society based on the collective intermarriage of two exogamous groups.

The question of the significance of the classificatory system has recently been re-opened by Radcliffe-Brown, who, so far from agreeing with Kroeber that there is no connection between kinship terminology and social institutions, maintains that, at least in Australia, the classificatory system can be completely explained by reference to the present social institutions of the Australian tribes.¹

As against Morgan and those who follow him, it can be shown that there is a very thorough functional relation between the kinship terminology of any tribe and the social organisation of that tribe as it exists at present. If this is so, there is no reason whatever to suppose that the kinship terminology is a survival from some very different form of social organisation in a purely hypothetical past.

It will be understood that the point which Radcliffe-Brown is attacking here is that part of Morgan’s theory in which he maintained that marriage was collective between all the members of the corresponding groups. Radcliffe-Brown’s arguments require to be closely examined, because they represent the first attempt to offer an alternative to Morgan which will bear more than a moment’s examination.

According to Radcliffe-Brown, “the active principles at work in determining the system are the result of the strong solidarity of the individual family,” which he defines as “the group formed by a man and his wife or wives and their dependent children.”² The argument proceeds as follows:

The most important of these principles may be spoken of as that of the equivalence of brothers. It applies of course equally

¹ A. R. Radcliffe-Brown in O 1. 34, 202, 322, 426.
² O 1. 435, cf. 438: “While the family is the primary economic unit in both production and consumption, the horde unites a number of families in a wider economic group in which there is regular co-operation in hunting and other activities, and a regular sharing of food.” The truth is, of course, that the family has grown out of the horde, not the horde out of the family.
to two sisters. Now this principle is universally applied in all Australian systems of terminology. Everywhere the brother of a father is called a father, and therefore his children are called brother and sister, and similarly the sister of a mother is called mother and her children are also called brother and sister. This principle is not merely a matter of terminology. It is a most important sociological principle which runs through the whole of Australian life. It depends on the fact that there is a very strong, intimate and permanent bond between two brothers born and brought up in the same family. This solidarity between brothers, which is itself an expression or result of family solidarity, is a very obvious thing to anyone who studies the aborigines at first hand. It shows itself, moreover, in certain institutions.

Radcliffe-Brown goes on to describe the rule of the levirate, which entitles a man to marry his deceased brother’s wife or wives, and the rule of the sororate, which entitles a man to marry two or more sisters. “In this custom of the sororate,” he says, “we have sisters treated as being socially equivalent, just as with brothers in the levirate.”

The argument continues thus:

The principle of the equivalence of brothers as an active principle in determining social structure may be regarded as a special example of a more general tendency, the presence of which is readily discovered in the social structure of the simpler cultures. Wherever the structure includes small groups of strong solidarity and having important and varied functions, when an individual is brought into some close social relation with one member of the group, there is a tendency to bring him into close relation with all the other members of the group. . . . If there is a strong, intimate and permanent bond between two persons A and B, then, when a third person C is brought into an important social relation with B, there is a tendency to bring him into close relation with A. The resulting relation between C and A will depend of course on the kind of relation between A and B.

His conclusion is therefore as follows:

Without considering in any way how the Australian social organisation may have arisen in a distant past about which we shall never obtain any direct knowledge, we may say that as it exists at present an analysis of it reveals this important active principle of the solidarity of brothers, and we may say that on this principle the existing system is built.

Thus, according to Radcliffe-Brown, the social unit on which the classificatory system is based is the individual family. Now, we have
already seen that the descriptive system of modern Europe is also
based on the individual family. It is therefore pertinent to enquire
how a similar cause has produced such different results.

If the classificatory system is based on the individual family, it
should follow that a clear distinction is drawn between those who
are members of my family and those who belong to other families.
In the descriptive system this distinction is drawn; in the classifica-
tory system it is not. That is precisely the difference between them.
I am bound to my brother by a strong, intimate and permanent
bond. Our father is bound to his brother by a similar bond. There-
fore, it is argued, we apply to our father’s brother the same term
as we apply to him, and we apply to our father’s brother’s sons the
same term as we apply to each other. But neither our father’s
brother nor our father’s brother’s sons belong to our family. Instead
of reflecting the solidarity of the family, the classificatory system
cuts right across it. And this contradiction reveals itself most sharply
in what Radcliffe-Brown regards as the keystone of the system—the
relation between brothers:

The basic principle of the classification is that a man is always
classed with his brother and a woman with her sister. If I apply
a given term of relationship to a man, I apply the same term to
his brother.

What is here described as the basic principle is not in accordance
with the facts. In most forms of the classificatory system, both in
Australia and elsewhere, there are two entirely different terms for
ever elder and younger brother and for elder and younger sister. Thus, I
have one term for my elder brother and another for my younger
brother, and the term I apply to my elder brother I also apply to
my father’s elder brother’s son, while the term I apply to my
younger brother I also apply to my father’s younger brother’s son.
In the Arunta language, my elder brother and my father’s elder
brother’s son are kullia, while my younger brother and my father’s
younger brother’s son are itia. So far from reflecting the solidarity of
brothers, the classificatory system contradicts it by dividing sons of
the same family and uniting sons of different families.

If the classificatory system is to be explained on the principle of
the equivalence of brothers, that principle must be interpreted in
another way. The wife applies the same term to her husband’s
brothers as she applies to him, and the husband applies the same
term to his wife’s sisters as he applies to her. The husband and his
brothers are treated as equivalent by the wife; the wife and her
sisters are treated as equivalent by the husband. "If," we are told, "there is a strong, intimate and permanent bond between two persons A and B, then, when a third person C is brought into an important social relation with B, there is a tendency to bring him into close relation with A. The resulting relation between C and A will depend, of course, on the kind of relation between A and B." What, then, is the close relation between a man (A) and his wife's sister (C) and how does it depend on the kind of relation between the man and his wife (B)? We have seen that by the rule of the sororate a man marries two sisters. As Radcliffe-Brown remarks, "in many Australian tribes the ideal arrangement is considered to be that a man who marries the eldest of the sisters should also marry the second, and that he should then transfer his right to the third and fourth to his younger brother." Why then does the husband apply the same term to his wife's sister as he applies to his wife? Radcliffe-Brown says it is because his wife's sister is "socially equivalent" to his wife. But, in the case of the sororate, the usage is capable of a simpler explanation. She is his wife. The sororate marks a point at which the classificatory system still coincides with present practice. But why does the wife apply to her husband's brother the same term as she applies to her husband? It is recorded by Howitt that in the Dieri tribe, when two brothers married two sisters, they commonly lived together in a group marriage of four.¹ In such a case the woman called her husband's brother husband because he was her husband; and similarly the father's brother was a father, the mother's sister a mother—the correspondence between the nomenclature and the reality was complete. In this evidence of Howitt's we have an instance of the actual practice of the form of marriage which Morgan had deduced from the classificatory system.

The Dieri practice was as follows. Each man, besides his "primary wife" (tippamalku), had one or more "secondary wives" (pirrauru), each of whom might be the "primary wife" of another man; and each woman had, besides her "primary husband," one or more "secondary husbands," each of whom might be the "primary husband" of another woman. These relations, both primary and

¹ Howitt NTSEA 181. This explicit statement seems to have been overlooked by Malinowski when he wrote (FAA 113): "If groups of men and women, who are pirraurus to each other respectively, normally and permanently live in marital relations, no one of our authorities, who plead so strongly for the character of group marriage in the relation in question, would omit to mention such an important feature, which would support their views in the highest degree." See further Briffault M 1. 726.
secondary, were confined to those men and women who stood to one another in the relationship of husband and wife. Again, the husbands were all "brothers," the wives were all "sisters," the father's brothers were all "fathers," the mother's sisters all "mothers" and so on. If we disregard the distinction between primary and secondary, which is readily explained as a development in the direction of individual marriage, this practice is group marriage, neither more nor less. Similar customs have been recorded over a wide area of Australia, also from North America, Siberia and Tibet.¹

These facts, which establish the general character of the Dieri practice, are not in dispute. There are, however, certain difficulties regarding the precise nature of the necessarily complex relations which such a form of marriage involves; and these difficulties were seized on by Thomas, followed by Malinowski, to discredit the value of the evidence as a whole. I do not propose to examine their criticisms now: it must suffice to say that they are not nearly so destructive as they are claimed to be and to draw attention to some remarks on this subject by Radcliffe-Brown:

Some of the earlier writers, such as Howitt and Spencer, have given a false picture of the Australian family by entirely neglecting the economic aspect and regarding marriage as only a matter of sexual union. . . . We have nothing like complete or even satisfactory information about the pirrauru and piraungaru customs of the tribes round Lake Eyre, and it is now perhaps too late to make any thorough investigation, but we can be quite satisfied that, when Spencer and Gillen say that "a group of women of a certain designation are actually the wives of a group of men of another designation," they are using the word wife in a way in which it cannot be used if we are to apply it to the ordinary marriage relation either in Australia or among ourselves.

It is not true that Howitt and Spencer entirely neglected the economic aspect of Australian marriage. Howitt described at length the rules among the Kurnai which required a man to supply food to his wife's relatives, and Spencer did the same for the Arunta.² Moreover, Howitt pointed out that the pirrauru marriage itself had an economic function in that the man was provided with food by his secondary wives when their primary husbands were away.³ It is true that our information is not complete nor entirely free from

¹ Bancroft NRPSNA 1. 81, Ridgeway EAG 2. 105. The whole subject is dealt with by Briffault M 1. 614–781.
² Howitt NTSEA 756 (see p. 423), Spencer and Gillen A 491.
³ Howitt NTSEA 184–5.
difficulties, but the evidence collected by Howitt and Spencer is far too substantial to be dismissed with the remark that it is now perhaps too late to make a thorough investigation. The thoroughness with which those observers did their work can be judged from a comparison of their books on the *Native Tribes of South-East Australia* and the *Arunta* with Radcliffe-Brown’s on the *Andaman Islanders*. And, lastly, since the word “wife” must necessarily mean something different according as it is applied to group marriage or to individual marriage, this objection seems to rest on a mere misapprehension—a misapprehension, moreover, against which Howitt expressly warned his readers when he wrote: “In speaking of the marriage relations, I shall have occasion to use the terms husband and wife, and it must be clearly understood that in so doing I do not use them in the sense in which we use them.”

It is, of course, easy to define the marital relation in such a way as to exclude group marriage, but such definitions add nothing to the argument.

The difference between Morgan and Radcliffe-Brown in this matter springs from a fundamental difference of method. Morgan explained the classificatory system by means of the hypothesis that, in so far as it includes under a single term relationships now regarded as distinct, it reflects an antecedent condition of society in which those relationships were not differentiated. Radcliffe-Brown explains the system by referring it to his principle of equivalence, and he seeks to give this principle a basis in reality by correlating it with the solidarity of the family. But, as we have seen, this correlation is illusory, and the principle is left in the air. Morgan believed that the structure of society at any stage can only be understood by studying the changes in virtue of which it has become what it is. Radcliffe-Brown believes that, with the help of “active principles,” the present structure of Australian society, at least so far as the classificatory system is concerned, can be understood without reference to its past. Yet Morgan’s attitude, so far from giving a “false lead,” as Radcliffe-Brown says it did, represents the attitude of progressive thinkers in all branches of modern science, and in the present instance it enabled Morgan to explain consistently what Radcliffe-Brown has only explained by contradicting himself.

1 Howitt NTSEA 175.
APPENDIX II

THE INDO-EUROPEAN TERMS OF RELATIONSHIP

The importance of the classificatory system for the history of Indo-European culture was pointed out by Morgan himself, who was convinced that the descriptive systems characteristic of those languages in their historical form are not original;¹ but subsequent workers in this field have been more concerned to refute his conclusions regarding primitive marriage than to apply them to their own languages.

It is an interesting illustration of the neglect of the subject of relationship by sociologists that only recently has any attempt been made to use European systems of relationships as instruments for the study of social organisation. When the lesson taught by the study of the classificatory system has been learnt, much light will be thrown on the nature of Indo-European and Semitic social organisation by means of the terminology of relationships.²

The result of this neglect is that, while recent progress in comparative linguistics has sufficed to establish the form of the kinship terminology of common Indo-European, it contains a number of admitted anomalies which have never been explained. It is these anomalies which I propose to examine here, and I shall take up the problem from the point where it was left in Chapter II. It was shown there (1) that the I.E. *bhrātēr and *syesōr were displaced in Greek by *adhphōs and *adhphē, which were originally descriptive epithets, owing to the influence of matrilineal institutions; and (2) that the Greek *phrāter was employed in a sense which indicates that its original usage had been classificatory.

As Kretschmer observed, analogous displacements are found in Spanish, Catalan and Portuguese.³ Thus, the Spanish *fraile and *sor denote a brother or sister in religion, the terms for brother and sister in the descriptive sense being *hermano and *hermana, i.e. Latin *frater and *soror, *germano, *own brother” and "own

sister.” Exactly the same displacement has occurred in Irish. The Modern Irish bráthair and siúr denote a brother or sister in religion, the terms for brother and sister in the descriptive sense being dearbh-bhráthair and dearbh-shiúr, properly “true brother” and “true sister.”

There was no common I.E. term for cousin. The Greek is anépsiōs, used also of a nephew; and in the other languages the same term, representing I.E. *anépōtios, fluctuates between the nephew and the grandson. What this term denoted originally is a question to which I shall return. On the other hand, the Old Irish bráthir was applied both to the brother and to the father’s brother’s son, and in the Slavonic languages the terms for cousin are simply the terms for brother and sister with the addition of a descriptive epithet denoting the degree and at the same time distinguishing them from the true brother and sister. In parts of Yugoslavia, however, the term for brother is restricted to those who belong to the same braistvo orphatry—that is to say, it is used exactly like the Greek phrater.

If we compare the Greek and Latin terminologies, we find that the Greek is on the whole the less primitive of the two. Greek has lost the primitive terms for brother, sister, grandfather, grandson, and many of its other terms are derivatives of adelphós. Latin has preserved the primitive terms for these relationships, and its terms for the children of the father’s brother and mother’s sister, although derivative in form, are based, as we shall see, on a primitive distinction. On the other hand, it has lost the primitive terms for son and daughter. Another remarkable feature is the designation of the mother’s brother by a diminutive of the term for grandfather (avonculus—avos).

It is a world-wide rule among primitive peoples that a man may marry the daughter of his father’s sister or of his mother’s brother, but not the daughter of his father’s brother or of his mother’s sister; and this rule, known as cross-cousin marriage, corresponds, as we have seen, to the social structure presupposed by the classificatory system—the bisection of the community into exogamous and intermarrying groups. In the more primitive forms of the classificatory system the daughters of my father’s sister and of my mother’s brother are actually called my “wives” if I am a man or my “husband’s sisters” if I am a woman; and similarly the sons of my father’s sister and of my mother’s brother are called my “husbands” if I am a woman or my “wife’s brothers” if I am a man.

1 Durham TOLCB 151.
2 Frazer TE 1. 181, 491, 572, 2. 141, 224, 244, 249, 250, 256, 271, 365, 399, 405, 581, 607, 615, 3. 350.
3 Howitt NTSEA 180.
advanced forms of the system these terms are replaced in this connection by terms denoting a male or female marriageable cousin. On the other hand, in all types of the system, the children of my father’s brother and of my mother’s sister, whom I am forbidden to marry, are my “brothers” and “sisters.” The parents of my cousins are distinguished on the same principle. My father’s sister and my mother’s brother are denoted by terms which may be translated “aunt” and “uncle,” but my father’s brother is my “father” and my mother’s sister is my “mother.”

In classical Latin, there are no specific terms for the children of my father’s sister or of my mother’s brother, but the children of my father’s brother are my patruels and the children of my mother’s sister are my consobrini. These terms are properly epithets of frater and soror, which indeed are frequently expressed—frater patruelis or frater consobrinus as opposed to frater germanus. Moreover, the epithets are not indispensable: frater and soror often stand alone for the children of the father’s brother or of the mother’s sister—that is to say, they are used in the classificatory sense.

Further, in the classificatory system, as we have just remarked, my father’s brother is my “father” and my mother’s sister is my “mother,” but my father’s sister is my “aunt” and my mother’s brother is my “uncle.” Similarly, in Latin, my father’s brother is my patruus, which is merely an extension of pater, and my mother’s sister is my matertera, which is an extension of mater, but my father’s sister is my amita and my mother’s brother is my avonculus.

Two features of the Latin terminology remain to be accounted for. In the first place, the primitive terms for son and daughter have disappeared. They have also disappeared in Celtic, and, as Vendryes has remarked, this feature of the Italo-Celtic group must have originated in some social change which took place before the differentiation of Celtic and Italic. The Latin filius and filia are properly adjectives, which have been conjecturally connected with feo, “suck.” They are therefore analogous to the Latin patruelis and consobrinus and the Greek adelphós, whose function as descriptive

---

1 The term consobrinus was sometimes used generally of any first cousin, but its original sense is fixed by its etymology (*consuesrinus). The *ermes matruelis for the mother’s brother’s son and amitinus for the father’s sister’s son are late, being formed by analogy during the codification of imperial Roman law.

2 Cic. Planc. 11. 27, Fin. 5. 1. 1, Plaut. Aul. 2. 1. 3.

3 Cic. Clu. 24. 60, Att. 1. 5. 1, Cat. 66. 22, Ov. M. 1. 351.

4 Vendryes PLC 26.

5 Walde VWIS 1. 830.
epithets has already been explained; and it may be added that
differentiation of the classificatory terms by descriptive epithets
is found in all parts of the world as a means of transition from the
one system to the other. It may therefore be inferred that the Latin
filius and filia originated as epithets of the primitive terms, which
they subsequently supplanted.

In the second place, why is the term for mother’s brother (avon-
culus) a diminutive of the term for grandfather (avos)? In the classi-
 ficatory system, the father’s father is normally included under the
same term as the mother’s mother’s brother. This is because, in the
conditions of cross-cousin marriage, he is the mother’s mother’s
brother. I shall have more to say on this point later, but it is already
clear that, if my mother’s mother’s brother was my avos, my own
mother’s brother might naturally be called my avonculus.

All the principal features of the Latin terminology have now been
explained on the hypothesis that they are derived from the classi-
 ficatory system; and this, in conjunction with the preceding analysis
of the Greek terms for brother, creates a presumption that the Indo-
European terminology as a whole is to be explained in the same way.

It was pointed out in Chapter II that a comparative analysis of
the linguistic data has established that common Indo-European was
spoken by a predominantly pastoral people with some knowledge
of agriculture, and that marriage was patrilocal—that is to say, the
woman went to live with her husband’s people. With this evidence
to guide us, let us compare the Indo-European terminology with a
typical form of the Dravidian.

The classificatory systems of the Dravidian languages of India
were collected and analysed by Morgan, and, as Rivers has shown,
some of them are still associated with the actual practice of cross-
cousin marriage, on which, as we have seen, the whole system is
based. The example I have chosen is Telugu. The Telugu terminol-
ogy conforms to a type of the classificatory system which has a
particularly wide distribution, being common not only to Telugu,
Tamil and Canarese, but to a very large number of languages in
North America.\^n

\^n 1 Morgan SCAHF 313, 533, Spencer and Gillen NTCA 85, A 41f,
Rivers T 492, Frazer TE 2. 509, 553.
\^n 2 Rivers in JRAS 1907. 621.
\^n 3 The Telugu system is given in full by Morgan SCAHF 523f. The duplicate
terms serve in most cases to indicate the age of the person in question
in relation to the speaker, e.g. anna elder brother, tammudu younger
brother. The accepted interpretation of the I.E. terms is given by Meillet
IECLI 389.

\^n Cga
The table which follows contains three columns. The first gives all the terms of relationship which have been traced in common Indo-European. The second gives the terms of relationship in Telugu. The third gives, first, the accepted meaning of each I.E. term in its descriptive sense, which is also one of the meanings of the corresponding term in Telugu, and this is followed by the other meanings also borne by the same term in Telugu. It will be understood that these last are not exhaustive, because each category is infinite, but they are sufficient to define the category in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*ayos</th>
<th>tata</th>
<th>grandfather, father’s father’s brother, mother’s mother’s brother.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ayia</td>
<td>avva</td>
<td>grandmother, father’s father’s sister, mother’s mother’s sister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*potér</td>
<td>tandri</td>
<td>father, father’s brother, father’s father’s brother’s son, mother’s sister’s husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mātér</td>
<td>talli</td>
<td>mother, mother’s sister, mother’s sister’s daughter, father’s brother’s wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*syékuroś</td>
<td>mama</td>
<td>father-in-law, mother’s brother, mother’s mother’s brother’s son, father’s sister’s husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>menamama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*suekrūś</td>
<td>atta</td>
<td>mother-in-law, father’s sister, father’s father’s sister’s daughter, mother’s brother’s wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>menatta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bhrātēr</td>
<td>anna</td>
<td>brother, father’s brother’s or mother’s sister’s son, father’s sister’s daughter’s or mother’s brother’s daughter’s husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tammudu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*suesōr</td>
<td>akka</td>
<td>sister, father’s brother’s or mother’s sister’s daughter, father’s sister’s son’s or mother’s brother’s son’s wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chellelul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*daiuēr</td>
<td>bava</td>
<td>brother-in-law, father’s sister’s or mother’s brother’s son, father’s brother’s daughter’s or mother’s sister’s daughter’s husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maradi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*g(e)lōu-</td>
<td>vadine</td>
<td>sister-in-law, father’s sister’s or mother’s brother’s daughter, father’s brother’s son’s or mother’s sister’s son’s wife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maradalu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sunus</td>
<td>koduku</td>
<td>son; brother’s son, sister’s daughter’s husband, father’s brother’s son’s son, mother’s sister’s son’s son, father’s sister’s daughter’s son, mother’s brother’s daughter’s son (man speak-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ing); sister’s son, brother’s daughter’s husband, father’s brother’s daughter’s son, mother’s sister’s daughter’s son, father’s sister’s son’s son, mother’s brother’s son’s son (woman speaking).

*daughter kuthuru
daughter; brother’s daughter, sister’s son’s wife, father’s brother’s son’s daughter, mother’s sister’s son’s daughter, father’s sister’s daughter’s daughter, mother’s brother’s daughter’s daughter (man speaking); sister’s daughter, brother’s son’s wife, father’s brother’s daughter’s daughter, mother’s sister’s daughter’s daughter, father’s sister’s son’s daughter, mother’s brother’s son’s daughter (woman speaking).

*gem(e) { alludu manalludu
daughter’s husband; sister’s son, father’s brother’s daughter’s son, mother’s sister’s daughter’s son, father’s sister’s son’s son, mother’s brother’s son’s son (man speaking); brother’s son, father’s brother’s son’s son, mother’s sister’s son’s son, father’s sister’s daughter’s son, mother’s brother’s daughter’s son (woman speaking).

*snusos { kodalu menakodalu
son’s wife; sister’s daughter, father’s brother’s daughter’s daughter, mother’s sister’s daughter’s daughter, father’s sister’s son’s daughter, mother’s brother’s son’s daughter (man speaking); brother’s daughter, father’s brother’s son’s daughter, mother’s sister’s son’s daughter, father’s sister’s daughter’s daughter, mother’s brother’s daughter’s daughter (woman speaking).

*anepoiko manamadu
*anepothia manamaralu
grandson, brother’s or sister’s grandson.

magadu husband.

pendlama wife.

*jeneler todikodalu
husband’s brother’s wife.

saddakudu wife’s sister’s husband.
(The Telugu terms for the generations above the grandparents and below the grandchildren are based on the terms for grandparents and grandchildren, like the Latin proauos, abauos, pronepos, abnepos.)

The striking feature of the I.E. terminology is that, while it recognises no less than five different relationships by marriage, it appears to have no terms at all for cousins, nephews, nieces, uncles and aunts. Even more puzzling is the lack of a designation for the mother's brother, because in primitive society this relationship is universally of special significance. Delbrück supposed that the mother's brother was originally equated with the grandfather;¹ but while he was right in refusing to believe that there was no term for this relationship, his explanation involves the assumption, which, as Schrader has pointed out, is unsupported by the evidence, that the term for grandfather was specially associated with the mother's father.² On the accepted interpretation of the I.E. system, it is necessary to suppose either that it had evolved no terms for these important relationships, which is incredible, or else that it had lost them, which is to say that the accepted interpretation is inadequate.

If we compare the Telugu terminology with other types of the classificatory system, we see that it belongs to a fairly advanced type. The terms for husband, wife, husband's brother's wife, and wife's sister's husband, are descriptive, and there is no distinction, such as we find in Australian languages, between the father's parents and the mother's, or between the son's children and the daughter's.³ It is however, significant that, while the mother's mother's brother is included under the term for grandfather, the father's mother's brother is not; and conversely, the father's father's sister is included under the term for grandmother, but the mother's father's sister is not. With cross-cousin marriage, the mother's mother's brother is the father's father and the father's father's sister is the mother's mother, while the father's mother's brother is the mother's father and the mother's father's sister is the father's mother. It may be inferred that the two Telugu terms for grandparents were originally confined to the father's father and the mother's mother. The other two terms, for the mother's father and the father's mother, have been lost.

On the other hand, in common with Tamil and Canarese,

¹ Delbrück IV 501.
² Schrader s.v. Oheim.
³ Howitt NTSEA 160, 169; see above, p. 393. The two categories of grandparents are shown in the diagram on p. 24 by the arrangement of the lines connecting the grandparents with the great-grandparents, and the two categories of grandchildren are shown in the same way.
Telugu has duplicate terms for brother and sister, distinguishing the elder and younger in each case. This is a primitive feature, which has disappeared from other Indian languages, and in Australia it is associated with the rule that a man must marry the daughter of his father's elder sister or his mother's elder brother.¹ Lastly, although, as normally in the classificatory system, the father's brothers are equated with the father and the mother's sisters with the mother, in practice they are usually distinguished by descriptive epithets—pettandri or "great father" for the father's elder brother and pinatandri or "little father" for his younger brother.

In those parts of the Dravidian area where the practice of cross-cousin marriage survives, the nomenclature is natural, because it coincides with the reality; but, where that form of marriage has been abandoned, the classificatory system has become an encumbrance, because it treats as identical relationships now entirely distinct. The nomenclature is contradicted by the facts it was designed to represent. For this contradiction to be resolved, it is necessary that the terminology should be reorganised on the descriptive principle. The special features of the Telugu system which have just been mentioned are all steps in this direction, but for the complete transformation we must turn to Indo-European. The I.E. evidence is sufficient to establish not only the fact of the transition but the manner in which it was carried out. Each term was restricted to one of its several applications, the nearer relationships being preferred to the more remote and relationships through the husband to relationships through the wife. The result was that many relationships were left without a designation. These were eventually re-named, but in most cases only after the parent-language had broken up.

Let us begin with I.E. *auos, corresponding to the Telugu tata, which was applied to the grandfather and the mother's mother's brother. In Latin, as we have remarked, this term was used to denote both the grandfather and also, in a modified form, the mother's brother (avonculus). It appears therefore that, like tata, the I.E. *auos originally denoted the father's father, who was equated with the mother's mother's brother. Its subsequent history may be reconstructed as follows. On the one hand, in the Latin

¹ Spencer and Gillen NTCA 64–6. This, the only age distinction characteristic of the classificatory system, may have referred originally to seniority in respect of initiation: see Rivers SO 187–9. In Arunta and many other Australian languages, while the elder brother is distinguished from the elder sister, there is only a single term for the younger brother and sister; i.e. the latter, not having reached puberty, were treated as sexless.
avos, Armenian haw, and Old Norse aði, it was applied to the grandfather. On the other, in the Latin avonculus, Old Irish amnair, Old High German oheim, and Lithuanian avynas, it was modified by an element -en affixed to the stem1 and transferred from the mother’s mother’s brother to the mother’s brother. The corresponding term for the mother’s father and father’s mother’s brother was lost. Finally, in the French oncle, Welsh ewythr, and Modern German Oheim, the modified form has been generalised as “uncle.”

The transference of *avos to the mother’s brother implies the loss of some other term which had previously denoted that relationship. The lost term was *suēkuros, comprising the mother’s brother, the father-in-law, and the father’s sister’s husband. This term was appropriated by the father-in-law. The feminine *suēkrus was appropriated in the same way by the mother-in-law, with the result that no term remained for the father’s sister. This was supplied in Latin by amita, which is probably based on the “baby-word” *ama. We also find Old High German ano, “grandfather,” and ana, “grandmother,” Old Prussian ane, “grandmother,” and Lithuanian anyta, “mother-in-law”—all based on the baby-word *ana. Now, with cross-cousin marriage, the father’s sister is identical with the mother-in-law, and in the Telugu type of the classificatory system both are included under the same term. It is therefore probable that the Latin amita and Lithuanian anyta are of common origin, both being formed by extension of the stem from a primitive I.E. term (*ama or *ana) for the mother’s mother and father’s father’s sister, just as the Latin avonculus and Lithuanian avynas were formed from the primitive I.E. term for the father’s father and the mother’s mother’s brother. Thus, the I.E. terms for grandparents developed in the same way as the Telugu.

The father’s brother was distinguished from the father by extension of the stem: Latin patruus, Greek pátrōs, Old High German fatureo, Sanskrit pitruyaha.2 The analogous term for the mother’s sister is confined to Italo-Celtic: Latin matertera, Welsh modryb.

The I.E. *bhṛātṛ and *suesr continued in Latin to include the children of the father’s brother and mother’s sister, though eventually they were supplanted in this connection by their descriptive epithets. In Greek they ceased to be used as terms of relationship. In Slavonic, on the other hand, they were extended to the children of the father’s sister and mother’s brother. In the other languages

1 Ernout-Meillet s.v. Avonculus. The Anglo-Saxon eam was used both of the uncle and of the grandfather: Morgan ÆCAHF 32.
2 The Greek métrōs, “mother’s brother,” has no parallel in the other languages and was formed by analogy from pátrōs.
they were restricted to the true brother and sister, with the result
that new terms had to be found for the two categories of cousin which
they had denoted.

The I.E. *daiyēr, comprising the brother-in-law and the son
of the father’s sister or mother’s brother, was appropriated by
the brother-in-law (Latin levir, Greek daēr, Armenian taygr,
Sanskrit devār, Old Slavonic deveri, Lithuanian deveris). The feminine
*g(e)lōu– was appropriated in the same way by the sister-in-law
(Latin glos, Greek gilos, Russian zolva). This removed the remaining
terms for cousin.

The I.E. *sunus and *dhguhter were appropriated by the true son
and daughter, except in Italo-Celtic, where they disappeared. This
removed the designations for a man’s brother’s children and a
woman’s sister’s children. The I.E. *gmen(e)–, which had comprised
the daughter’s husband, a man’s sister’s son and a woman’s brother’s
son, and its feminine *snusōs, were appropriated by the daughter’s
husband and son’s wife respectively (Latin gener nurus, Greek
gambrōs nyōs, Sanskrit jāmātār snusā, Old Slavonic zeti snuxa, Armenian
nu, Anglo-Saxon snoru). This removed the remaining terms for
nephews and nieces.

We have seen that, with cross-cousin marriage, my father’s father
is my mother’s mother’s brother. So, speaking as a man, my son’s
son is my sister’s daughter’s son. Therefore, just as I.E. *ayos was
divided between the grandfather and the mother’s brother, the
latter being eventually generalised as “uncle,” so its reciprocal,
*anēpōtios, was divided between the grandson and the sister’s son,
the latter being generalised as “nephew.” But, whereas the second
use of *ayos was marked by modification of the stem, the second use
of *anēpōtios was not, and consequently the division was less definite.
In Sanskrit it was restricted to the grandson (napāt, fem. napti); in
Old Irish it was transferred to the sister’s son (nía, fem. nechī); in
Greek (anēpsiōs), Old Norse (nēf, fem. nipt), Old High German
(nevo, fem. niťila) and Old Slavonic (netiśi, fem. nertera) it was
generalised as “nephew”; in Latin (nepos, nepīs), Old Lithuanian
(nepūtis), Anglo-Saxon (nepa) and Albanian (fem. mbese) it fluctuated
between the grandson and the nephew.\footnote{The Italian nipote is used indiscriminately of the grandson and the
nephew. The English nephew and niece were used of grandchildren as late as
the sixteenth century, and the Dutch neef, like the Greek anēpsiōs, covers the
nephew, grandson and cousin: Morgan SCAHF 31, 35.}

\footnote{Latin ianitrices, Greek ianāteres, Sanskrit yātar, Old Slavonic jetry.}
classificatory system, probably belongs to the latest period of the parent language, in which, as we have seen, the social unit was the group of brothers living with their wives, who came from other groups.

All the I.E. terms have now been examined, and they are seen to have constituted originally a coherent and comprehensive terminology closely similar to the Telugu type of the classificatory system.

Reverting to Greek and Latin, we observe that several terms are based on Lallwörter, or "baby-words," e.g. Latin amītā, Greek pappōs "grandfather," theōs "uncle." Similar formations are common in the other languages: Old High German muoma "mother's sister," Welsh tad "father," and mam "mother," Russian otets "father," and djadja "uncle." These Lallwörter probably originated as terms of intimate address applied to close relatives. They have supplied formal terms of relationship in many primitive languages, and probably underlie I.E. *petēr and *mātēr. These two, however, are the only I.E. terms that have been traced to this origin. The remainder were formed in other ways. It is therefore remarkable that they should have been supplanted in so many cases by Lallwörter during the period in which the derivative languages were evolved. There is no parallel to this process in the evolution of the Romance languages out of Latin. It may therefore have resulted from the instability of the formal terms during the disintegration of the classificatory system.

It is worth considering more precisely how far the classificatory system had been superseded at the time when common Indo-European broke up.

On the one hand, the primitive distinction between elder and younger brother had already disappeared, and this in itself implies a system of a fairly advanced type. Further, the consistency displayed in the subsequent development of *syēkuros, *syēkrūs, *daiuēr, and *g(e)lōu-, indicates that these terms were already established in the descriptive sense. On the other hand, the history of *bhṛātēr and *syesōr in Greek, Latin and Slavonic, and the ambivalence of the reciprocals *ayōs and *anēpōtios, suggest that these had not entirely divested themselves of the classificatory usage.

If the Latin filius and filia originated as descriptive epithets, they must have done so at a time when the primitive terms were still current in the classificatory sense; and, since they bear no relation to the corresponding terms in Celtic, the primitive terms must have remained classificatory as late as the differentiation of Celtic
and Italic. This hypothesis, that the Italo-Celtic group was characterised by the exceptional persistence of the classificatory usage, accords with other indications that it was the first group to emerge.

We have seen that one of the features of the I.E. classificatory system during the period of its disintegration was a tendency to distort existing terms by extending their meaning without regard to distinctions of generation. The term *augos, which properly belonged to the second ascending generation, was extended to the mother’s brother, and the term *anēpōtios, belonging to the second descending generation, to the sister’s son. And this development was due in both cases to the need for new terms to designate the relatives by blood as distinct from the relatives by marriage. Here may perhaps be found the key to one of the unsolved problems of the American Indian terminologies.

In the languages of the Rocky Mountain Nations and the Eastern and Western Tinnieh the cross-cousins have been differentiated from the brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law by assigning them to the category of straight cousins—that is, by equating them with the brothers and sisters. In Seneca-Iroquois, Ojibwa, and Dakota they have been kept distinct from the straight cousins and at the same time differentiated from the brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law by the development of distinctive terms. In Dakota the terms for the cross-cousins are simply the terms for brother-in-law and sister-in-law with the addition of a suffix. In all these languages the contradiction arising from the abolition of cross-cousin marriage has been resolved with the minimum of change, and the result is that in them the system of relationships has remained relatively stable.

In many other languages, however, including those of the Missouri, Upper Missouri, Gulf, Prairie, Great Lake, and parts of California, the cross-cousins have been transferred to categories outside their own generation, and by this means a fresh contradiction has been introduced, which has had more or less extensive repercussions on the other denominations, leading in some cases to the dislocation of the whole system.

In Punca, the father’s sister’s children are classified with the son and daughter (woman speaking) or with the sister’s son and daughter (man speaking). Consequently, the father’s sister’s grandchildren are equated with the grandchildren, the father’s sister’s son’s wife is equated with the son’s wife, the father’s sister’s daughter’s husband with the daughter’s husband. A similar series
of interrelated displacements is found in Winnebago. Again, in Minnitaree, the mother’s brother’s children are equated with the son and daughter, the mother’s brother’s grandchildren with the grandchildren, the mother’s brother’s son’s wife with the son’s wife, and the mother’s brother’s daughter’s husband with the daughter’s husband. The same series, more or less extended, is found in Creek and Pawnee.

In Minnitaree, the father’s sister’s children are equated with the father and mother, and consequently the father’s sister is equated with the grandmother. The proper term for the father’s sister has accordingly disappeared. Further, in pursuance of the same principle, the father’s sister’s husband is equated with the grandfather, the father’s sister’s daughter’s husband with the father, the father’s sister’s son’s wife with the mother, and the father’s sister’s son’s children with the brother and sister. Again, in Miami, the mother’s brother’s son is equated with the mother’s brother, the mother’s brother’s daughter with the mother, the mother’s brother’s son’s wife with the mother’s brother’s wife, the mother’s brother’s daughter’s husband with the father, the mother’s brother’s daughter’s children with the brother and sister. This series is also found in Punca and Arapaho, where, on the same principle, the mother’s brother’s son’s wife is equated with the mother’s brother’s wife and the father’s sister.

In Minnitaree, where the mother’s brother’s children are equated with the son and daughter, the mother’s brother is equated with the elder brother. This is because, as normally in the classificatory system, the term for son (man speaking) includes the brother’s son. If my mother’s brother’s son is my “son,” my mother’s brother is my “brother.” And further, if I call my mother’s brother “elder brother,” he calls me “younger brother.” Accordingly, in this language the sister’s children (man speaking) are equated with the younger brother and sister.

In Two-Mountain Iroquois the cross-cousins are equated with the brother and sister. If my father’s sister’s children are my “brother” and “sister,” my father’s sister is my “mother.” Accordingly, the term for the father’s sister has been supplanted by the term for mother. Further, if I call my father’s sister “mother,” she calls me “son” or “daughter.” Accordingly, in this language the brother’s children (woman speaking) are equated with the son and

---

1 If I call my mother’s brother’s son “son,” he calls me (his father’s sister’s son) “father.” The terms are reciprocal and hence the two dislocations are complementary to one another.
daughter.\textsuperscript{1} The same equation is found in Cayuga, Crow, Mandan, Pawnee, Achaotinneh (Slave Lake), Hare Indian and Kutchin, and in all save the last two it is accompanied by the corresponding equation of the father's sister with the mother. Similarly, in Chickasaw, where the father's sister is equated with the grandmother, the term for granddaughter includes the brother's daughter (woman speaking); and in Choctaw and Achaotinneh, where the parents-in-law are equated with the grandparents, the term for granddaughter includes the son's wife.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} This analysis shows that Rivers (SO 182) was mistaken in supposing that the Two-Mountain Iroquois terminology supported his objections to Morgan's interpretation of the Polynesian type of the classificatory system. I have not attempted to deal with these systems here, because they have not yet been properly collated. In some (not all) of the Polynesian languages, the mother's brother is equated with the father, the father's sister with the mother, all cousins with the brother and sister, all nephews and nieces with the son and daughter. This is Morgan's "Hawaiian system," which he believed to be the original form of the classificatory system, corresponding to the endogamy of the primitive horde (his "consanguine family"). Against this, Rivers maintained that those languages which lack the above-mentioned distinctions have lost them (HMS 2. 173, SO 175); but this view is not borne out by the evidence, so far as it has been collected. The terms for "mother's brother" and "father's sister," where such exist, are either isolated forms, confined to one language or locality and therefore not referable to the primitive Polynesian system, or else compounds based on the Polynesian words for the primary relationships of father, mother, brother, sister, which are distributed with remarkable uniformity over the whole area, e.g. tuatina "mother's brother," from tua "brother" and tina "mother," nganeitama "father's sister," from ngane "sister" and tama "father." Similarly, the Tongan term for the mother's brother's son or daughter is compounded of the three primary terms for mother, brother, son or daughter, while the Fijian for cross-cousin is a word meaning concumbens. All these terms are manifestly derivative, and so therefore are the distinctions they serve to mark.

\textsuperscript{2} Other instances of the identification of reciprocal terms are GF = GS (Spokane, Yakama), gm = gd and mF = dS (Spokane), wF = dH (Seneca),\textsuperscript{*} wm = dH (Yakama), and HF = Sw (Mandan). The equations Hl' = Sw and Hm = Sw are also found in the system of the Kingsmill Islands, which belongs to the Polynesian type. It seems probable that this principle is derived from a very primitive stage of the classificatory system, in which the second ascending and second descending generations were designated by the same terms—that is, the grandparents were equated with the grandchildren. It is applied consistently in the Arunta system (see pp. 392–4), where the father's father is equated with the son's son and the mother's mother with the daughter's daughter. This explains why, in the same system, the son's son's son is equated with the father, the daughter's daughter's daughter with the mother, and the children of the son's son's son and daughter's daughter's daughter with the brother and sister.
It will be found that this principle of consecutive dislocation, arising from the need for differentiating the primitive relationships, suffices to explain almost all the characteristic irregularities of the American Indian terminologies, and so turns the tables on those who have derived encouragement from these anomalies in their opposition to Morgan's theory of the classificatory system.

In the Dakota language, according to Riggs, there is only one word for grandfather and father-in-law. Following the mode of reasoning sometimes employed, it might be deduced from this that these two relationships were once identical. Worked out to its implications, the absurd conclusion would be that marriage with the mother was once customary among the Sioux.¹

If Kroeber had been less preoccupied with abstractions and more intent on objective analysis of the available data, he would have hesitated before committing himself to this superficial criticism. The only difference at this point between Dakota and Indo-European is that, whereas Dakota has transferred the father-in-law to the grandfather and left the mother's brother where he was, Indo-European transferred the mother's brother to the grandfather and left the father-in-law where he was. So far from constituting a *reductio ad absurdum* of Morgan's theory, this evidence confirms it by showing that, when the classificatory system began to collapse, the process followed the same course in different hemispheres. And the reason why these dislocations went much further in the American Indian languages than they did in Indo-European is that the American Indians have failed to advance beyond the tribal system, whereas the Indo-European-speaking peoples advanced so rapidly that, after a period of instability which was relatively brief, their whole terminology was reconstructed on an entirely new foundation.

All this and other related problems require of course much 'closer and more comprehensive treatment than has been attempted here, but it may be suggested that their solution will be found by

¹ Kroeber in JRAI 39.82. Similar dislocations are found in the Banks Islands, New Hebrides, and parts of Africa (Rivers HMS 1. 28–31, 192, Seligman MBNG 707, PTNS 117, 258), and they may have been promoted to some extent by the practice, which occurs sporadically, of marriage with the father's sister, mother's brother's wife, or wife's brother's daughter (Rivers HMS 1. 47–9, 100, Eggan SANAI 274, Frazer TE 2. 387, 510). Such marriages, which by their nature are necessarily exceptional or occasional, cannot have been the cause of the dislocations, but they may have determined their direction.
the reapplication and extension of Morgan's methods rather than by accepting the standpoint of Malinowski, who declares (in *Man* 30. 22) that "the plain fact is that classificatory terminologies do not exist and never could have existed."