PART ONE

TRIBAL SOCIETY

SOLDIER WITH EMBLAZONED SHIELD
increase its numbers. Members of the same totem may not intermarry.

Totemism survives most completely among the lower hunting tribes of Australia; it is also found in forms more or less degenerate among more advanced tribes in America, Melanesia, Africa, India and other parts of Asia; and among the Indo-European, Semitic and Chinese peoples there are numerous traditions and institutions which have been assigned to a totemic origin. All these peoples are, or have been, organised in tribes, and therefore the view that they too were formerly totemic will be considerably strengthened if it can be shown that totemism is an inherent feature of the tribal system. In studying this subject, the Australian evidence is of primary importance, since it represents the most primitive stratum of which we have direct knowledge. Even in Australia, however, the form in which totemism has survived is not, as we shall see, its original form. If from an analysis of the present form of Australian totemism we can deduce its original form, and relate both to a coherent process of economic and social change, the result may be regarded as an approximation to the history of totemism, not only in Australia, but in other parts of the world.

The great majority of Australian totems are edible species of plants and animals. The remainder are mostly natural objects, like stones and stars, or natural processes, like rain and wind. These inorganic totems are secondary, being formed by analogy after the totemic system had fully developed. In seeking the origin of the system, we must concentrate on the plants and animals, and the fact that most of these are edible entitles us to presume that its origin is connected with the food supply.

The ceremonies for the increase of the totem species are performed at the beginning of the breeding season at a prescribed spot, called the "totem centre," on the hunting-ground of the clan to which the totem belongs. The totem centre is usually situated at an actual breeding place of the species in question. This point has been established by recent observers, but its significance has not been appreciated. If we ask what brought the ancestors of the wallaby clan to the spot where ceremonies
for the increase of wallabies are now performed, the answer can only be that they came there to eat wallabies.

At the present time the members of the clan are forbidden to eat, though not necessarily to kill, their totem species; but to this rule there are significant exceptions. Among some of the Central tribes, at the performance of the increase ceremony, the headman of the clan is not only permitted but obliged to eat a little of the species. As he explains, he must “get the totem inside him” in order to perform his magic. That this ritual infraction of the taboo is derived from the general practice of earlier times is proved by the tribal traditions, in which the clan ancestors are represented as feeding habitually or exclusively on their totem species. These traditions show that formerly, so far from being tabooed, particular species had been the principal source of food supply. They point to a time when the extremely low level of technique had imposed severe restrictions on the quest for food, resulting in a specialised diet. The totemic clan had its origin in a horde of food-gatherers attracted to the breeding ground of a particular species of animal or plant, which became its staple food. It remains to be seen how this state of affairs was transformed into its opposite.

The increase ceremonies are designed to represent dramatically the growth or gathering of the totem, if it is a plant, or, if it is an animal, its distinctive habits, gestures and cries, and in some cases the act of catching it and killing it. It is probable that the original function of such performances was practice in the behaviour of the species, whose habits had to be studied before it could be caught. At a later stage, owing to improvements in technique, this function was superseded by that of a magical rehearsal, in which, by mimicking in anticipation the successful operation of the quest for food, the clansmen evoked in themselves the collective and concerted energy requisite for the real task. Primitive magic is founded on the notion that, by creating the illusion that you control reality, you can actually control it. It is an illusory technique complementary to the deficiencies of the real technique. Owing to the low level of production, the subject is as yet imperfectly conscious of the objectivity of the external world, and
consequently the performance of the preliminary rite appears as the cause of success in the real task; but at the same time, as a guide to action, magic embodies the valuable truth that the external world can in fact be changed by man’s subjective attitude towards it. The huntsmen whose energies have been stimulated and organised by the mimetic rite are actually better huntsmen than they were before.

Each member of the clan has a strong sense of affinity or even identity with his totem species. The men who lived on wallabies, thriving when they thrived, starving when they starved, and dramatically impersonating them in order to control them, were literally flesh of their flesh and blood of their blood, and they expressed this distinctive relationship by saying that they were wallabies. Consequently, when the authority exercised by their oldest members was projected in the form of ancestor worship, the ancestors were worshipped in the form of wallabies.

It may therefore be inferred that the first stage in the evolution of totemism was the segmentation of the primitive horde, which divided in order to gain access to the principal sources of food supply. So long as the new groups thus created lost touch with one another, the change was merely quantitative—two hordes instead of one; but at some stage, comparable to a biological mutation, this change became qualitative. Instead of continuing to obtain their food independently by simple appropriation, they became integrated as a complex of interdependent clans, each producing for the others; and this principle of co-operation, on which the whole structure of tribal society is founded, was maintained by means of a taboo on eating the totem species. Each unit became a totemic clan, whose function was to produce a supply of its own species for the other clans. How this interchange of products was effected will be discussed later.

As the technique of production improved and new sources of food became available, these initial restrictions disappeared. In this way, having lost its economic basis, totemism was transformed into an exclusively magico-religious system providing a sanction for the established structure of society. The hunting of wallabies being no longer a specialised technique,
the function of the wallaby-men in relation to their totem species became purely magical—by performing the traditional ceremonies to make the wallabies increase and multiply for the benefit of the other clans. Meanwhile, the ceremonies themselves were adapted and developed. From being representations of the activities of the totem species as such, they became commemorations of events in the life of the clan ancestors, still conceived in their totemic form, and so served to reinforce the social code by transmitting to the youth the traditional history of the clan. With the further decline of the clan as an economic unit, even this function disappeared. All that remained was a sense of kinship inspired by common descent, a distinctive ancestral cult, the practice of exogamy, and a purely formal taboo on eating a particular species of animal or plant. These are the characteristic features of the clan in the more advanced stages of tribal society, and they can all be traced in the records of ancient Greece.

Membership of the clan was determined by descent. The earlier anthropologists believed that descent was traced through the mother before it was traced through the father. This view has been rejected by most contemporary authorities, though not by all. I believe that it is essentially correct.

Many instances are recorded from modern tribes of transition from matrilineal to patrilineal descent, but none of the reverse process at all. This in itself creates a presumption that the former is the earlier. Descent through the mother preponderates slightly in the hunting grades, but in the higher grades it declines, very rapidly in the pastoral, slowly in the agricultural. This suggests that the mode of reckoning descent is correlated with the mode of production.

Each of these modes of production is marked by a distinctive division of labour between the sexes. In the pre-hunting stage there was no production, only simple appropriation of seeds, fruit and small animals, and therefore there can have been no division of labour at all. With the invention of the spear, however, hunting became the men’s task, while the women continued the work of food-gathering. This division is universal among hunting tribes, and it was doubtless dictated in the first instance by the relative immobility of mothers. Hunting led to
the domestication of animals, and accordingly cattle-raising is normally men's work. On the other hand, the work of food-gathering, maintained, as we have seen, by the women, led to the cultivation of seeds in the vicinity of the tribal settlement; and accordingly garden tillage is almost universally women's work. Finally, when garden tillage had given place to field tillage and the hoe to the cattle-drawn plough, the work of agriculture was transferred to the men. These ever-shifting tensions between the sexes correspond to the gradual transition from matrilineal to patrilineal descent. The process began with hunting—hence the rather high incidence of patrilineal descent among modern tribes whose progress has been arrested at that stage; it was intensified by the introduction of stock-raising, but in the first phase of agriculture it received a temporary check.

Among the hunting tribes of Australia, where the two modes of descent are almost equally balanced, the incidence of patrilineal descent increases in proportion to the complexity of the elaborate system of exogamy peculiar to that continent—a system which has grown in some areas within living memory; and, since the simple forms are more primitive than the complex, it seems to follow that descent through the mother is more primitive than descent through the father. Other evidence points in the same direction. Thus, in two widely separated tribes, of which we happen to have exceptionally full information, we find elaborate regulations requiring the married men to hand over either the whole or the best part of their catch to their wives' parents. Similar regulations are found in Melanesia, and they point to a state of society in which the men went to live with the clan to which their wives belonged—a matrilineal clan centred in the women.

Another Australian tribe, the Yukumbil, has a tradition to the effect that formerly, when the men went hunting, they took their wives and children with them, but later they left the children behind in charge of an old woman. This tradition is in accord with what has just been said about the sexual division of labour which followed from the development of hunting. When the first camp was formed, the immobility of the women and the prolonged absences of the men required that it should
be in their charge. The clan was centred in the women, and the children belonged to the clan into which they were born.

I have argued that the evolution of the tribe, or group of exogamous clans, out of the primitive horde, which was, of course, endogamous,\(^\text{17}\) was determined by the advance from simple appropriation to co-operative production, and that the economic interdependence of the clans in the new system was secured by the taboo on the totem species, which obliged each clan to hand over to the others a share of the food it obtained on its own hunting ground. It remains to consider why the clans were exogamous. Why did they not continue to inbreed like the parent-horde? To answer this question we must recapitulate our argument. We have seen reason to believe that each clan subsisted originally on a specialised diet; that the men lived with the clan into which they married, and were obliged to surrender their products to the members of that clan. Thus, the practice of getting husbands from other clans enabled each to extend its diet by obtaining access to foods which it did not produce itself. The initial function of exogamy was to circulate the food supply.

The tribe is a multicellular organism which was evolved out of the primitive horde on the basis of a division of labour conditioned by the low level of production, effected by the rule of exogamy and the totemic taboo, supplemented by mimetic magic, and projected ideologically in the form of zoomorphic ancestor worship.

The keystone of this system was co-operation. So long as the concerted efforts of the whole community were necessary to maintain it at the bare level of subsistence, it was impossible for a few to live on the labour of the many,\(^\text{18}\) and the only social inequality was the prestige earned by individual merit. It is true that from an early period a privileged status was enjoyed by the oldest members, who, as the Greek proverb says, were weak in action, wise in counsel, but such privileges were dependent on the general consent.\(^\text{19}\) These primitive communities were democratic to a degree that Greek society never was.

Among the lower hunting tribes, the institution of totemism, though it has moved far from its origin in the actual technique
of production, is still a coherent system of practices and beliefs as definite and stable as the structure of the tribes themselves. It has grown up with the tribe, and with the tribe it declines. When, owing to economic changes that will be examined later, the structure of the tribe disintegrates, the idea that men and animals are kin decays, and the mimetic rite, with its wild cries, abandoned gestures, and ecstatic rhythm, dissolves into a multiplicity of collateral activities, out of which emerge the arts of poetry, music, and the dance.

The ancestor-worship characteristic of the early phases of tribal society is at once an expression and a confirmation of the authority exercised by the tribal elders. It is magical rather than religious. No prayers are addressed to the totem, only 'commands.' The worshippers simply impose their will on it by the compelling force of the ritual act, and this principle of compulsion corresponds to a condition of society in which the community is still supreme over each and all of its members. The more advanced forms of worship develop in response to the rise of a ruling class—hereditary magicians, priests, chiefs and kings. The totem is now tended with prayer and propitiation, it assumes human shape, and becomes a god. The god is to the community at large what the chief or king is to his subjects. The idea of godhead springs from the reality of kingship; but in the human consciousness, split as it now is by the cleavage in society, this relation is inverted. The king’s power appears to be derived from God, and his authority is accepted as being the will of God. Thus, the reality is strengthened by the idea which has grown out of it. Each acts upon the other.

As the royal clan extends its rule, the totem gods of subordinate clans are annexed and absorbed into its own, which thus becomes the god of the tribe, or of the league of tribes, or eventually of the state. Yet this new god still bears the marks of his origin. He is still regarded as incarnate, or capable of being incarnated, in his animal form, or the animal accompanies him as his traditional attendant, or myths are invented in which the clan ancestor is described as the son of the clan animal or of a woman who had lain with the clan god in his animal form. Religious symbolism is still permeated with reminiscences of the animal origin of the godhead.
With the development of tillage, the sky, as the source of grain, and the earth, as the receptacle of seeds, assume a new and universal importance, embracing the common interests of a whole area of tribes; yet even the new sky gods and earth goddesses that emerge out of these conditions usually betray some marks of a pre-anthropomorphic origin. The Greek Zeus is descended from the Indo-European sky god, and was probably anthropomorphic before the Greek-speaking peoples entered Greece; yet some of his characteristics point to a very primitive, perhaps original, association with the oak. Moreover, owing to the fusion of cultures brought about by migrations, federations, invasions and wars of conquest, it often happened that, even after he had become anthropomorphic, the god assimilated totemic elements from the more primitive strata with which he had been brought in contact. Thus, the Greek Zeus has a variety of origins. To the Achæan conquerors, he is a sky god with all the characteristics of a patriarchal pastoral monarch, but to the backward hill tribes of Arcadia he is Zeus Lykaios, almost certainly totemic, and to the people of Praisos in Crete, who had a taboo on sow’s flesh, it was a sow that gave him birth.22

It is therefore unfortunate that in studying the question of totemic survivals in Greek religion most scholars have confined their attention to the animal associations of the gods. The deities of the Greek pantheon are all the product of a long and complex process involving the fusion of tribes into peoples, the subjugation of one people by another, the propagation and aggregation of an unknown variety of cultures. In these conditions, to ask, as many have done, whether this or that god was originally Hellenic or pre-Hellenic, totemic or non-totemic, is to ask a question that has no meaning. The clearest evidence of totemism lies in a different direction.

Kreousa, the mother of Ion, belonged to the clan of the Erechtheidai.23 When she exposed her child, she adorned it with a gold necklace fashioned in the likeness of a pair of snakes; and in doing this she was following the traditional custom of her clan. It is a common practice among primitive tribes to mark children with scars, tattoos, paint or ornaments representing the clan totem.24 In this case the custom was explained
as a tribute to the memory of Erichthonios, who was the grandfather of Erechtheus. Erechtheus was said to have been a man with a snake’s tail; and his grandfather, according to one tradition, had been guarded at birth by a pair of snakes, while in another he was himself born in the form of a snake. In other words, the emblem of the Erechtheidai was a snake, and their clan ancestor was a snake man. The snake was the totem of the clan. Another snake clan was the Spartoi of Thebes, sprung from the dragon slain by Kadmos; and on the tomb of Epameinondas was a shield emblazoned with the figure of a dragon in token of his membership of that clan. The great Attic clans all had their traditional emblems, which they carried on their shields—the *triskelés* (swastika) of the Alkmaionidi, the horse of the Peisistratidai, the ox-head of the Eteoboutadai and others not yet identified. The significance of the *triskelés* is unknown. The horse of the Peisistratidai is evidently to be connected with their descent from the horse-god Poseidon. The ox-head has been identified by its appearance on Attic coins just at the time when the faction of Lykourgos, who belonged to the Eteoboutadai, was at the height of its power. The Eteoboutadai claimed descent from Boutes the Oxherd, and they held the priesthood of the Diipolia, famous for its ritual slaughter of an ox, which is clearly derived from the communal feast of a totemic clan. Another Attic clan, the Euncidai, who held the priesthood of Dionysos Melpomenos, traced their descent through Hypsipyle to Dionysus, the god of wine; and in one of their legends, when Hypsipyle was on the point of being put to death, she was saved by the unexpected appearance of her sons, who proved their identity by revealing the emblem of their clan, which was a golden vine. Finally, the Ioxidai of Lycia, descended from Theseus, were forbidden to burn asparagus, which they worshipped in memory of their ancestress Perigoune, who had sought refuge in a bed of asparagus when pursued by Theseus. The last example is perhaps the most remarkable. The taboo on the totem species has survived, and the species is still worshipped in its totemic form.

In pastoral society, cattle are used principally for milk, not for meat, and therefore the flesh of domestic animals,
especially female, is commonly tabooed. The totemic taboo has thus acquired a new economic function. Meanwhile, the increase ceremony of the hunting period has been transformed into the common meal at which the clansmen, together with the spirits of their dead, reunite from time to time under the presidency of their chief and partake sacramentally of meat from their sacred herds. Here we see the germ of the Diipolia, and also of the feasts of the Achæans described by Homer. Nestor regales his people on the flesh of bulls, which he has sacrificed to the tribal god, Poseidon. Many centuries later, the totemic sacrifice reappears in the ritual of the Orphic brotherhoods, in which, by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the bull Dionysus, men whom the class-struggle had humbled and oppressed fed on the illusion of a lost equality.

We have seen that one function of the totemic rite had been to transmit to the rising generation the traditions of the clan. Year by year those who had reached puberty were initiated into adult life by special ceremonies designed to instruct them in the social code, as expressed in sexual and dietary taboos, and to impress them with a sense of the inviolability of tribal custom as expounded by the elders. The significance of this crucial change—at once physical, mental and social—was expressed in the idea, which underlies all such ceremonies, that in becoming man or woman the child was born again.

Initiation was followed by marriage. It is probable that in the earliest period of tribal society the only restrictions on the mating of the sexes were those imposed by the rule of exogamy; and it is also possible that, in the stage of food-gathering, sexual intercourse was confined to the productive seasons of the year. The significance of these yearly marriages was enhanced by the subjective attitude of the partners, who saw in them the efficient cause of the seasonal process of which they were a part—they were performed as mimetic acts of ritual designed to promote the fertility of Nature; and at a later period, when the relations of the sexes had become monogamous, this magical function persisted in the ceremonial union or sacred marriage of a selected pair.

So long as they have pasture, cattle feed and breed of themselves, but by comparison with cattle-raising the work of
tilling, sowing and reaping is slow, arduous and uncertain. It requires patience, foresight, faith. Accordingly, agricultural society is characterised by the extensive development of magic. The clan structure survives as a pattern for the formation of secret sodalities, out of which arise organised priesthoods and eventually a god-king with the special function of promoting by mimetic magic the annual sequence from seedtime to harvest. His office begins by being annual, and he is consecrated by a coronation rite, based on the rites of initiation, which signifies that he is born again, no longer man, but god. In a series of ritual acts he has intercourse with a priestess, marks out the soil for distribution among the clans, turns the first sod with his sacred hoe, cuts the first ear of corn with his sacred sickle and, finally, at harvest he is put to death, to be replaced at the new year by a successor of unimpaired vitality. This elaborate system of agricultural magic was understood to mean that the fertility of the soil and the prosperity of the people depended on the physical vigour of the king, but objectively it was the magical manifestation of the high degree of centralised control without which organised agriculture would have been impossible. That is its positive side, but it has also a negative aspect in that magic, which began as an aid to real technique, is now becoming an obstruction.

The ritual of the god-king can be clearly traced in ancient Egypt and Babylonia, and also to some extent in Greece—for example, in the sacred marriage and ritual ploughing at Eleusis. It is probable therefore that some of the pre-Achaean monarchies, such as that of the Attic Kekrops, were of this agrarian and hieratic type.

These questions will be resumed after we have considered more closely the tribal institutions of early Greece and the causes which led to their decline.
II

EXOGAMY

The Indo-European languages are derived from the speech of a people which occupied some part of the Eurasian plain between the Baltic and the Caspian in the latter part of the third millennium B.C. The first appearance of Greek-speaking tribes in the Ægean basin has been provisionally dated about 1800 B.C.¹ At the end of the third millennium, the original people had broken up, migrating south, east and west, and the parent speech split into derivative languages, from which are descended the Indo-European languages actually surviving or preserved in written records.

Attempts to identify the original people by the evidence of archaeological remains are at present too conjectural to build on,² but we can draw certain conclusions about their culture from a comparative analysis of the linguistic data. This evidence suggests that, at the time of their dispersal, the primitive Indo-Europeans were a predominantly pastoral people with some knowledge of agriculture; that they were organised in clans and perhaps also in village settlements under some form of chieftaincy or kingship; that descent was reckoned in the male line, and that the women went to live with the clan into which they married. Thus, speaking in terms of the classification adopted in the last chapter, we may assign them to the Second Pastoral Grade. Further light is shed on their social history by a study of their terms of kinship.

In primitive languages all over the world terms of relationship are used in a way which to us is very strange. When I speak of my father, I refer to the man who begot me; but, when a primitive tribesman speaks of his father, he may be referring to his father's brother. His terminology does not distinguish between the two. With us, the term father denotes a physiological relationship determined by parenthood; in the primitive tribe it denotes a collective social relationship. And so with
THE CLASSIFICATORY SYSTEM OF RELATIONSHIP

G grandfather, g grandmother, U uncle and father-in-law, a aunt and mother-in-law, F father, m mother, C male cousin, c female cousin, B brother, s sister, N nephew, n niece, S son, d daughter. EGO is a man. With EGO as a woman, the brother's children are nephew and niece and the sister's are son and daughter.
the other terms. This is what is called the classificatory system. Its details vary among different peoples, but it is everywhere based on the same principle, which may be briefly explained as follows.

The term for "father" is applied not only to the actual father, but to the father's brothers, to the father's father's brothers' sons, to the father's father's father's brother's sons' sons, and so on. The term for "mother" is applied to the actual mother, to the mother's sisters, to the mother's mother's sisters' daughters, and so on. The terms for "brother" and "sister" are applied to the children of all those who are called "fathers" and "mothers."

On the other hand, while my father's brothers are my "fathers," my mother's brothers are denoted by a different term, which may be translated "uncle." The same term is applied to my father's mother's brothers' sons, and so on. Similarly, while my mother's sisters are my "mothers," my father's sisters are my "aunts," and the same term is applied to my mother's father's sisters' daughters, and so on.

The children of my father's brothers and of my mother's sisters are my "brothers" and "sisters," but the children of my father's sisters and mother's brothers are denoted by terms which in the most primitive types of the system are identical with the terms for "brother-in-law" and "wife," if I am a man, or for "husband" and "sister-in-law," if I am a woman. In the accompanying diagram these terms are translated male and female "cousin." Similarly, if I am a man, my brother's children are my "sons" and "daughters," but my sister's children are my "nephews" and "nieces"; and, conversely, if I am a woman, my brother's children are my "nephews" and "nieces," while my sister's children are my "sons" and "daughters." Lastly, my father-in-law is denoted by the same term as my mother's brother, and my mother-in-law by the same term as my father's sister.

This terminology is clearly designed to express the relationships characteristic of a community divided into two exogamous and intermarrying groups. My father and his brothers and sisters belong to Group A; my mother and her brothers and sisters belong to Group B. My father's brothers are
married to my mother's sisters, my father's sisters to my mother's brothers. With patrilineal descent, I belong to Group A; with matrilineal descent, to Group B. In either case, in my own generation, the members of my group are my "brothers" and "sisters," while those of the other group are my male and female "cousins." The generation below my own is divided in the same way between my "sons" and "daughters," on the one hand, and my "nephews" and "nieces," on the other. Lastly, my father-in-law is denoted by the same term as my mother's brother because he is my mother's brother; my mother-in-law is denoted by the same term as my father's sister because she is my father's sister. In many parts of the world the marriage system connoted by this terminology still survives. Where it does not, its former existence is proved by the survival of the terminology designed to express it.

The same reasoning suffices to explain the classificatory principle itself. A man applies to his wife's sisters the same term as he applies to his wife, and a woman applies to her husband's brothers the same term as she applies to him. Her sisters are not his wives, nor are his brothers her husbands; yet he calls her sisters "wives," and she calls his brothers "husbands." The nomenclature does not correspond to the reality. Accordingly, it was inferred by Morgan, who discovered the classificatory system, that this nomenclature is a survival from a previous condition in which it did correspond to the reality—a society in which, in each generation, the brothers of each group were mated collectively to the sisters of the other. On that assumption, the whole system explains itself. If each brother is husband to each sister, the offspring of this collective union will be the children of all: each man will stand to the children in the relation of father, each woman in the relation of mother. It will be seen that in such conditions the terminology does not express consanguinity as such but social relationships as determined by marriage.

Morgan's theory of the classificatory system was accepted in principle by Howitt, Rivers, Spencer and Gillen, but at the present day it is rejected by most authorities in western Europe and America. The principal objections urged against it are discussed in Appendix I. They all come from empiricists who
have not felt the need of defining their philosophical standpoint. The theory has been reasserted by the anthropologists of the Soviet Union, who maintain that it has only been abandoned elsewhere because its implications are incompatible with the bourgeois attitude to contemporary society. Morgan’s readers will remember that his argument led him to a remarkable prediction of the socialist revolution.

The opposition to Morgan on this issue has been strengthened by the assumption, which, despite some remarks of his own, has passed without question, that there is no trace of the classificatory system in the Indo-European group of languages. So far from this assumption being correct, the Indo-European terminology, including some well-known anomalies hitherto unsolved, is completely and coherently explained on the hypothesis that it is derived from the classificatory system. The evidence will be found in Appendix II. This conclusion is of considerable importance for the cultural history of the Indo-European-speaking peoples, because it shows that their tribal institutions were of the same character as those of other branches of the human race.

It was argued in the last chapter that the first stage in the evolution of the tribe was the segmentation of the primitive horde into two exogamous units. This is the stage reflected in the classificatory system. The subsequent stages varied in different parts of the world. In parts of Melanesia, India, and America the tribe consists of so many phratries and each phratry of so many clans. As Morgan showed, the phratry, in North America at least, is a group of interrelated clans created by the segmentation of a single original clan. At present the exogamous unit is the clan, but there is reason to believe that it was formerly the phratry.

The Indo-European tribal system belonged to the same type. Among the Greeks, the tribe, phratry and clan are represented by the phylé, phratria, and génos; among the Romans by the tribus, curia, and gens. The Dorian Greeks were divided into three tribes, the Ionians into four. The subdivisions of the Dorian tribes have not yet been precisely determined, but each of the four Ionian tribes was composed of so many phratries and each phratry of so many clans. Moreover, it appears that
among the Greeks, as among the North American Indians, the phratry was originally exogamous. The evidence for this conclusion lies in the special Greek usage of the primitive Indo-European term for brother.

The Greek *phrater*, derived from the Indo-European *bhrātṛ* which in the other languages yielded the term for "brother," denoted not a brother but a fellow-member of the phratry. At Athens, when a boy came of age, he was formally admitted to his father's phratry at the feast of the Apatouria, which means the feast of men "of the same fathers." In what sense were the *phrateres* "brothers" and sons "of the same fathers"? At Sparta, where the boys were organised in sodalities called *agēlai*, the term *kásios*, which is a variant of *kāsis*, "brother," was applied to all the brothers and male cousins in the same *agēla*, and another variant of the same word, *kāses*, was used at Sparta to denote a man "of one's own generation." The Ionian *phrateres* and the Dorian *kásioi* were originally, in each generation, the sons of the same father, the sons of the father's brothers, the sons of the father's father's brother's sons, and so on. They were brothers in the classificatory sense. The greater part of this conclusion was reached by Kretschmer, working solely on the internal evidence without reference to the classificatory system.

The Greek phratry was based on patrilineal descent. So, too, as we have just remarked, was the society of the Indo-European people at the time of its dispersal. Moreover, the ideal society of the Homeric Olympus, which was modelled, as we shall see later, on the real world, was strongly patriarchal. But there is another side to this picture, which we must now proceed to examine.

In the historical period, the people of Lycia were still matrilineal, both in succession and descent, and this feature of Lycian society is reflected in the tradition of Bellerophon, who migrated from Argos to Lycia, where he married the king's daughter and at the same time succeeded to a share in the kingdom. This form of succession, in which royal privilege is held by right of marriage, is remarkably common in the Greek genealogies. Thus, we are told that Temenos, one of the leaders of the invading Dorians, announced his intention of leaving
his kingdom to Deiphontes, who had married his daughter Hyrnetho. He was then murdered by his own sons, but the people insisted on giving the kingdom to Deiphontes. This tradition plainly embodies a conflict between matrilineal and patrilineal succession. Equally significant is the myth of the Calydonian hunt. When Meleager handed over the boar to Atalanta, his mother’s brothers took it from her on the ground that, if he relinquished it, it belonged to them “by right of birth.” Meleager belonged to his mother’s clan, which insisted on the booty he had acquired remaining in it. Further, in an Attic tradition we are expressly told that before the reign of King Kekrops women had enjoyed equal rights with men, there had been no marriage and children had been named after the mother.¹⁰

The people of Lycia had close traditional connections with the pre-Dorian peoples of Crete. It is clear from the archaeological remains of Minoan Crete and Mycenae that the women of this period enjoyed a social status far superior to their position in historical Greece.¹¹ Moreover, Minoan theology differed profoundly from the Homeric. The gods of Homer are entirely anthropomorphic; the Minoan are largely animal. The Homeric Olympus is ruled by Zeus and Hera, the monogamous pair, with the male as the dominant partner. The principal cult of Minoan society was the worship of a mother goddess, with a subordinate male partner, her son or her consort or both. For these reasons it is now generally agreed that the institutions of Minoan society were, to an extent not yet precisely defined, matrilineal.

This contrast between the Homeric tradition and the realities that lay behind it is very striking, and it is not the only one. For reasons which will appear in a later chapter, such fundamental institutions of primitive society as the tribe, the clan, initiation, which are clearly traceable in Greece both before and after Homer, are hardly mentioned in the Homeric poems. Therefore, when Homer presents us with Zeus and Hera as husband and wife, we shall do well to remember the remark of Herodotus, that it was Homer and Hesiod who made the Greek theogony. As Cook has shown, the Homeric view of Zeus and Hera is a reconstruction of two earlier traditions in
which these partners were entirely unrelated. In the one, the consorts were Hera and Herakles, with the goddess as the dominant partner; in the other they were Zeus and Dione, with the god as the dominant partner. The first pair is Minoan, the second Indo-European. Zeus and Dione are both Greek in name, and their joint worship can be traced to Dodona, the district which according to Aristotle, was the original home of the Hellenes. The fusion of peoples resulting from the Indo-European immigration was symbolised in the union of the immigrant father god with the indigenous mother goddess, the precedence given to the former marking the decline in the status of women.

It is, of course, true that the interpretation of mythological data is often uncertain, but fortunately the present case does not rest on mythology alone. It is supported by evidence of a peculiarly precise and rigorous kind, which places the main conclusion beyond question.

The I.E. *bhrātēr, "brother," has survived in that sense in all the derivative languages except Greek and Hittite; and similarly the I.E. *syesōr, "sister," has survived in all except Greek and Modern Albanian. These three languages are all known to have been deeply affected by non-Indo-European speech—Hittite by Sumerian and Akkadian, Albanian by Turkish, Greek by the pre-Greek languages of the Ægean basin. The Greek derivatives of I.E. *bhrātēr and *syesōr are phrāter and ēor. The first of these is used, as we have seen, to denote a fellow-member of the phratry; the second survives only in a gloss of Hesychios. The Greek for brother and sister is adelphōs and adelphē, properly phrāter adelphos and ēor adelphos, a brother or sister "of the same womb" as opposed to (phrāter —ēor) ēpatros, a brother or sister "by the same father." In Homeric Greek we also find kastignētos and kasakiētē, used in such a way as to indicate that they too originally connoted relationship through the mother. This evidence, which was collected by Kretschmer, is decisive. After their entry into the Ægean, the Greek-speaking peoples adopted matrilineal descent, and the new significance of phrāter and ēor was indicated by the use of descriptive epithets, which eventually supplanted them. They retained, however, the patrilineal
organisation of the phratry, and in that connection the term *phrater* survived. The women had no organisation corresponding to the phratry, and consequently the term *éor* disappeared. The linguistic data are completely explained on this hypothesis, and on any other they are unintelligible.

Some archaeologists, while recognising this distinction between the Indo-European and non-Indo-European peoples of the Ægean, have tended to assume that its significance was primarily racial.¹⁸ This is a misapprehension. The patrilineal institutions of the primitive Indo-Europeans are explained by their mode of production, which was predominantly pastoral. It has already been pointed out that pastoral society is characterised by a marked tendency towards patrilineal descent. Moreover, at a later stage of our enquiry we shall find reason to believe that, at a still earlier period, Indo-European society had been matrilineal. In the same way, the subsequent decline of mother-right in Greece is not a matter of race, but belongs to the common history of the whole population.

It is characteristic of hunting tribes that the huntsman does not appropriate his catch, but brings it home to be distributed.¹⁷ So long as the technique of hunting was too low to permit of individual production, consumption as well as production was necessarily collective.¹⁸ But when men began to hunt singly, there arose a contradiction between the mode of production, which was now individual, and the mode of consumption, which was still collective; and in this contradiction lay the germ of private property. Similarly, a man tended to claim what he had acquired with his own hands for himself and his immediate relatives, and in this claim lay the germ of the individual family.¹⁹ But it was a long time before these disruptive tendencies became strong enough to disturb the outward structure of society. Their first effect was to intensify clan co-operation, which was extended in every direction, covering the whole field of social life.²⁰ Clan was bound to clan by an elaborate system of reciprocal services, out of which arose a spirit of constructive rivalry, each vying with the others for prestige. The man who had acquired a surplus of game or plunder signalised his success by inviting another clan to feast with his own. Such an invitation was also a challenge, because it imposed on the clan that
accepted it a moral obligation to return it, if possible with interest. Failure to do so meant loss of prestige. At a later stage, if the obligation was not returned, it might be commuted into some form of labour service. The clans were no longer equal. Co-operation had been transformed into competition.

In parts of North America, these tendencies have developed into the system known as “potlatch.” They can be clearly traced in Chinese tradition, and more faintly in the exchange of gifts which is a feature of the Homeric poems. When Glaukos exchanged shields with Diomedes, gold for bronze, Homer can only explain it by saying that Glaukos lost his head; but it is more likely that Glaukos was expecting a return such as Mentes promised Telemachos after being presented with an heirloom. It is easy to see how these hospitable exchanges might develop into barter.21

The growth of private ownership derived a powerful impetus from the domestication of cattle. Game is perishable and land is immovable, but wealth in the form of cattle is durable and easy to steal or to exchange.22 Being necessarily nomadic, pastoral tribes are quick to increase their wealth by cattle raids and war; and since warfare, which had grown out of hunting, was waged by the men, it reinforced the tendency, already inherent in pastoral society, for wealth to accumulate in their hands. Constantly on the move, these turbulent tribes plunder one district after another. The male captives are killed, the women are carried off as chattels, their skill at the loom being measured in terms of cattle. But warfare requires unity of leadership, and consequently these tribes develop a type of kingship which is primarily not magical, but military. In reward for their successful leadership, the kings receive the lion’s share of the spoils, and the wealth thus amassed promotes social inequalities which shake the whole fabric of tribal society, beginning at the top. The details of this process will be studied in the next chapter. At present we are concerned with its effect on the rules of inheritance.

The Jewish tribes which eventually settled in the land of Canaan were a pastoral people of this character. As Robertson Smith has shown, it is probable that the Semitic stock was originally matrilineal, but when the Jews took to agriculture
they were already strongly patriarchal. All property, real and
dpersonal, was transmitted in the male line. The land was in-
alienable; the acquired goods were distributed among the sons.23
But what happened if a man had no sons? In the Book of
Numbers (xxvii. 8) we read: “If a man die, and have no son,
then ye shall cause his inheritance to pass unto his daughter.”
This meant that the usufruct passed to the man she married,
who, of course, would belong to another clan. Accordingly
it was enacted (xxxvi. 8): “And every daughter that pos-
sesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel,
shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father,
that the children of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance
of his fathers.” The word which in the English version is
translated “family” means properly a clan.24 The heiress was
compelled to marry into her own clan. Only in that way could
the property be retained in the male line. The principle of
exogamy, on which the structure of the tribal system depends,
and with it the liberty of the woman, have been sacrificed to
the interests of private property.

In Greece this process was slower to develop, because, as
we have seen, the tendency to father-right had been tem-
porarily reversed, but it is at least possible that the breakdown
of exogamy had begun among the ruling families before the
Dorian conquest. A remarkable feature of the pre-Dorian
genealogies is the large number of instances in which a man
marries the daughter of his brother or father’s brother;25 but,
since the historical value of these genealogies is open to ques-
tion, it is better not to rely on them. Clearer evidence of the
explosive effects of the new wealth derived from the plunder of
Minoan Greece is provided by traditions of the same period
relating to homicide within the kin.

Tribal society recognises two major crimes—incest and
witchcraft.26 Incest is violation of the rules of exogamy;
witchcraft is the misapplication for individual ends of magic,
which was designed for the service of the community. Man-
slaughter between clans is common, but it is not a crime—that is
to say, it is not punished by the community at large but settled
by the clans to which the individuals concerned belong. The
manner of its settlement is a matter of some importance.
When a man has been killed, his fellow clansmen must avenge him. The obligation is instantaneous and absolute. It is entirely irrespective of the circumstances of the case. The clan to which the victim belonged apply to the clan of the offender for compensation. If suitable compensation is granted, the affair is at an end. If not, the victim’s clansmen seek out the offender and kill him; or, if they cannot kill him, they kill another member of his clan. In the latter case, the other clan is now placed under the same obligation, and so there arises a vendetta, which may last for generations.\(^{27}\)

These laws can be studied in detail among the higher hunting and agricultural tribes of North America; they can also be traced among the primitive Germanic tribes and among the Greeks. In Attic law, the terms for “prosecution” and “defence” mean properly to pursue and to flee,\(^{28}\) and even in the historical period prosecution for homicide was left to the initiative of the victim’s kinsmen.\(^{29}\) In the Homeric poems, the manslayer has the alternatives of paying compensation or leaving the country. Compensation is given in movable goods, though the mythological evidence suggests that in earlier times it had also taken the form of labour service.\(^{30}\)

But what happened when a man killed a fellow clansman? So long as the clan was based on collective ownership, compensation was impossible, but at the same time one of the principal causes of crime was absent, and therefore homicide within the clan was extremely rare. In Greece, however, during the period we are considering, as among the Germans in the last period of the Roman Empire, it became common. Enriched by wars of conquest, the ruling families embroiled themselves in internecine struggles of succession and inheritance.\(^{31}\)

The clan owed its solidarity to the fact that, so long as the technique of production was too low for the individual to be self-sufficient, he could only exist as a member of a cooperative group. Throughout the history of tribal society, clan kinship is of all ties the most sacred. The horror excited by homicide within the clan is well described by Grönbech, writing of the primitive Norsemen. After explaining that homicide between clans is “not a crime against life itself, not even to be reckoned as anything unnatural,” he goes on:
On the other hand, from the moment we enter into the clan, the sacredness of life rises up in absolute inviolability, with its judgment upon bloodshed as sacrilege, blindness, suicide. The reaction comes as suddenly and unmistakably as when a nerve is touched by a needle.\textsuperscript{32}

Among the Norsemen, the man who had killed a fellow clansman was cursed and cast out of the clan. He became an outlaw. Unless, as sometimes happened, he was adopted into another clan, he ceased to exist as a member of society.\textsuperscript{33} Cut off from the clan, in which alone he had had his being, he went mad and died of starvation. So in Greece. The man who had killed a fellow clansman was hounded out of the community, pursued by the curses of his kinsfolk, or, as they expressed it, by his victim's avenging spirits, the Erinys or Arai, who drove him mad and sucked his blood until he was nothing but a heap of bones.\textsuperscript{34}

These Erinys were conceived of as snakes. In Greece, as elsewhere, the snake became a generalised symbol for the spirits of the dead—the reason being doubtless that the snake casts its slough and so appears to renew its life. In the legend of Ædipus, as treated by the Attic poets, the Erinys embodies the curse inherited from Laios by his son and his son's sons. In Pindar the sons of Ædipus are destroyed by the Erinys in retribution for their father's parricide. That was the Dorian tradition, being recorded as such by Herodotus. In the Odyssey, however, the Erinys that persecuted Ædipus was his mother's, and in other legends the function of the Erinys is to avenge the manslaughter of a kinsman in the female line. Thus, they were invoked by Althaia against her son Meleager, who had murdered her brother; they persecuted Alkmion for the murder of his mother, Eriphyle, and Orestes for the murder of Clytemnestra.\textsuperscript{35} The Erinys were the ancestral spirits of a community which traced descent through the mother, and their prominence in these traditions of the Mycenean Age reflects the dynastic conflicts precipitated in the ruling class of a matrilineal society by the rapid growth of property.

The word erinys is probably not Indo-European, and there are other indications pointing to an Ægean origin. In the
HOMERIC POEMS, AND AGAIN IN THE MYSTICAL TRADITION OF
ELEUSIS, THE ERYNES APPEAR ALSO AS PUNISHERS OF PERJURY. 16
THE CRIME OF PERJURY PRESUPPOSES THE ORDEAL BY OATH, WHICH, AS
DIAMOND HAS SHOWN, MARKS AN ADVANCED STAGE IN THE DEVELOP-
MENT OF LAW. IT DOES NOT APPEAR UNTIL THE GROWING INTERESTS OF
PROPERTY AND TRADE HAVE PROMPTED THE PUBLICATION OF A WRITTEN
CODE—AS, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE HITTITE CODE, AND EVEN THERE IT IS
ONLY EMPLOYED IN DEFAULT OF INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE. NOW, IN
THE CODE OF THE CRETAN CITY OF GORTYNA, THE ORDEAL BY OATH
IS PRESCRIBED MORE EXTENSIVELY THAN IN ANY OTHER ANCIENT CODE
BEFORE THE DEVELOPMENT OF WHAT DIAMOND DEFINES AS MATURE
LAW. MOREOVER, IN THE GREEK TRADITION THE INSTITUTION OF THIS
ORDEAL WAS ASCRIBED TO THE CRETAN LAWGIVER, RHADAMANTHYS. 17
THERE IS NO DIFFICULTY IN SUPPOSING THAT THE LEGAL SYSTEM OF
MINOAN CRETE, WHICH LEFT A DEEP IMPRESSION ON THE FOLK MEMORY
OF THE GREEKS, HAD ADVANCED TO THIS POINT, BUT THE HIGH DE-
VELOPMENT OF LAW AT GORTYNA, WHICH WAS NOT A GREAT COM-
MERICAL CITY, IS AN APPARENT ANOMALY THAT REQUIRES TO BE
EXPLAINED. THE EXPLANATION SEEMS TO BE THAT MINOAN CULTURE
WAS IN PART ABSORBED BY THE GREEK-SPEAKING CONQUERORS OF
CRETE.

IT MAY BE CONCLUDED THEREFORE THAT THE INDO-EUROPEAN
IMMIGRANTS INTO THE ÆGEAN TOOK OVER THE CULT OF THE ERYNES
WHEN THEY ADOPTED MATRILINEAL DESCENT. AT THE SAME TIME, AS
WE SHALL SEE IN THE NEXT CHAPTER, THEY WERE NOT WITHOUT ANCESTRAL
SPIRITS OF THEIR OWN.
III

PROPERTY

When the Homeric chieftain counts his possessions, he enumerates his household goods, his slaves, and his livestock, but he does not mention the pastures on which his cattle graze, and it is at least doubtful whether he regards even the land he cultivates as his own, except where it is a gift from his people. That so many modern readers have failed to appreciate this fact is due to the influence of an environment in which private property has come to be regarded as a self-evident and unchallengeable right. Yet, even in England, it is little more than a century since the peasants were driven by the Enclosure Acts from the last of the common fields, and in the Middle Ages, before the first enclosures, there was no private ownership of land as we understand it.¹

Nilsson maintains that the Homeric similes belong to the latest stratum in the evolution of the poems.² In one of these, two men are described, with measures in their hands, dividing equally a piece of common ploughland.³ Modern commentators have been at pains to reconcile this passage with their preconceptions by interpreting it to mean that two brothers are dividing their father’s estate; but the men are not described as brothers, and, if the land had been their father’s estate, it would not have been described as common.⁴ The natural interpretation of the words is that the land is being divided for use, not for ownership, and this accords with a recognised feature of primitive land tenure in other parts of Europe and elsewhere. With the notable exception of Ridgeway, modern scholars have failed to see that the Homeric evidence on this subject can only be understood in the light of a comparative analysis of land tenure in primitive society generally. This is one of the urgent tasks awaiting the attention of archaeologists, and, of course, it is far too complex to be attempted here. There is, however, an alternative approach. If it is true that men’s
ideas about the world are ultimately conditioned by their
economic relations, it should be possible to discover something,
about those relations by examining the ideas in which they are
reflected.

The three Fates—_Moïræ_ in Greek, _Parcae_ in Latin, _Nornen_ in
German—are still part of the common stock of the European
literary tradition. They are the goddesses who sit and spin the
thread of human destiny, ordaining for each man at birth the
principal events of his life, and especially the last of all—his
death. The present chapter will be devoted to an analysis of
this conception.

The basic meaning of the word _moïra_ is a share or portion.
As John the Deacon remarked in his commentary on Hesiod,
the Moirai (goddesses of Fate) are “dispensations” or “divisions.”
With _moïra_ is associated another word, _láchos_, a portion given
or received by the process of casting lots. One of the Moirai
bore the name of Lachesis, the goddess of Allotment. In this
sense _láchos_ is synonymous with _kléros_, which, commonly used
of a lot or holding of land, originally denoted a piece of wood
used for casting lots.

The Attic clan of the Gephyraioi was descended from a
branch of the stock of Kadmos which had settled in Boiotia,
where “it was allotted the portion of Tanagra.” Whether this
expression is intended literally is more than we can say; but
we know that elsewhere it has been customary for immigrant
tribes to cast lots for the occupied territory. It will be remem-
bered how the tribes of Israel occupied the Promised Land:

_Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, When ye are passed over Jordan into the land of Canaan, then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you. . . . And ye shall dispossess the inhabitants of the land and dwell therein; for I have given you the land to possess it. And ye shall divide the land by lot for an inheritance among your families; and to the more ye shall give the more inheritance, and to the fewer ye shall give the less inheritance: every man's inheritance shall be in the place where his lot falleth; according to the tribes of your fathers ye shall inherit (Num. xxxiii. 51–4). And_ Joshua said unto the children of Israel, How long are
ye slack to go to possess the land which the Lord God of your fathers hath given you? Give out from among you three men from each tribe: and I will send them, and they shall rise and go through the land, and describe it according to the inheritance of them; and they shall come again to me. . . . Ye shall therefore describe the land into seven parts, and bring the description hither to me, that I may cast lots for you here before the Lord our God (Joshua xviii. 3–6).

The land was to be distributed by lot among the tribes, and the territory of each tribe was to be subdivided by lot among the “families” or clans.8 In the seventh Olympian, Pindar relates how the island of Rhodes was divided into three moírai by the sons of Helios. That these three moírai correspond to the three immigrant tribes is clear from the Homeric version of the same tradition.9 That they were distributed by lot is not expressly stated, but it may be inferred from the myth, which Pindar relates in the same poem, of the origin of the island. When the Olympian gods cast lots for the newly-conquered world, Helios was absent and so left without a kléros.10 The omission was rectified by assigning to him the island of Rhodes, then beneath the sea, which he had already descried rising to the surface, and this arrangement was ratified by an appeal to Lachesis.11

The same myth, though without mention of Helios and Rhodes, is related in the Iliad.12 The sons of Kronos divided the world into three moírai, for which they cast lots, and Zeus was warned by Poseidon that he must keep within his moíra. Similarly, we are told by Hesiod that Hekate received from Zeus a moíra of land and sea, retaining in perpetuity the share allotted to her at the time of the original division or dasmós.13

The evidence of mythology is supported by historical tradition. After their conquest of the Peloponnese, the Dorian chieftains divided the country into three portions, for which they cast lots.14 It is probable therefore that the portion of Tanagra was allotted to the descendants of Kadmos in the same way.

In the Odyssey, when King Nausithoos led the Phæacians to their new home, he “divided the ploughlands.”15 According
to Herodotus, the people of Kyrene invited settlers from Greece to participate in a "re-division of the land." Some time later the territory of Kyrene was again divided by an arbitrator from Arcadia, who divided the land into three notrai and the inhabitants into three tribes. These tribes were artificial units created for the purpose of dividing the land. Even after its basis in kinship had crumbled away, the tribal system still seemed the necessary foundation for any form of ordered society. Thus, when the dispossessed Attic peasants of the time of Solon demanded a re-division of the land, their demand was an appeal to ancient tribal practice; and similarly the Athenian institution of the klerouchia, in which conquered territory was divided among settlers from Athens, marked the persistence, in new conditions, of the tribal conception of land settlement.

Besides dividing the ploughlands, King Nausithoos "made temples." Besides distributing the land among the tribes, the arbitrator of Kyrene reserved certain estates for the king as chief priest of the community; and the Athenians assigned similar reservations to the priesthood in their settlement of Lesbos. These reservations, or teméne, were estates "set apart" for the use of priests, chiefs and kings.

The Homeric evidence shows clearly that, while power or privilege was in the gift of the king, land was in the gift of the people, who bestowed on their leaders, in reward for military service, estates which differed from the others in that they were not assigned by lot to tribe or clan, but by special gift to an individual. Thus, Bellerophon was rewarded by the King of Lycia with royal honours, while the people bestowed on him a témenos of the best arable land. Æneas was warned by Achilles, whom he had come to fight, that, even if he should win, he could not hope for royal honours from Priam, who had sons of his own to provide for, nor for a témenos from the people. In the same way, the elders of Aitolia (presumably the chiefs of the clans) tried to induce Meleager to fight for them by offering him a témenos of the most fertile land in the country. Appropriation of the land cannot have proceeded far in a community in which the most fertile part of it could be bestowed by common consent on an individual. The Homeric témenos represents the
germ of private property in land developing within a collective tribal system.

Booty was distributed in the same way. Just as the island of Rhodes, allotted to Helios, is described by Pindar as his lâchos or géras, his lot or his privilege, so the same terms—moïra or lâchos, géras or tîmê—are applied to the share of the spoils allotted to each warrior. The process of distribution is called, as before, a dasmós; and just as the king received a têmenos which was “set apart” for him, so in the distribution of booty he received a “chosen gift” reserved from the general allotment. And here, too, the ultimate authority seems to have been vested in the people. “How can the Achæans give you a géras?” Achilles cries to Agamemnon, who has demanded a substitute for Chryseis. “The spoils we have taken have already been divided, and it would not be right for the people to bring them together again.” Nevertheless, it appears that the king was in a position to assign other shares to his vassals, and he is sometimes accused of keeping more than his share to himself. He is beginning to claim as a right what was properly a gift from his people. The same ambiguity appears in respect of the kingship itself. Once assigned to a particular family, it tended to become hereditary, because military leadership is a specialised occupation, but it was still subject to popular ratification. Telemachos hoped to succeed to his father’s kingdom, but all he claimed as his right was the inheritance of his personal property. When the sons of Temenos murdered their father in order to keep the kingship in the family, the people restored it to Deiphontes.

In the year 484 B.C. the Athenian people proposed to distribute a surplus from the silver mines among the whole citizen body, but Themistokles persuaded them to devote it to the construction of a fleet instead. The collective distribution characteristic of tribal society had become incompatible with the interests of the state. It is an illuminating incident, because it shows how tenaciously the common people had clung to the primitive conception of property.

As it was with land and booty, so it was with food. In ancient times, so Plutarch writes, when meals were administered by Moïra or Lachesis on the principle of equality, everything was
decently and liberally arranged; and in support of this contention he points out that the old word for a meal meant properly a division. His etymology is correct: das is cognate with damos. The motrai of meat were divided equally and distributed originally by lot; but the chine, which was the choicest portion, was reserved as a geras for the chief who presided at the meal. When Menelaos invited his guests to sit down to table at Sparta, he handed to them the chine which the attendants had set before him. The swineherd Eumaios paid the same compliment to the disguised Odysseus—a dramatic touch, because he gave his lord the lordly portion without knowing who he was.

Plutarch goes on to remark that the equality of the common meal was destroyed in course of time by the growth of luxury (he should, rather, have said the growth of property) but persisted in the public distribution of meat at state sacrifices. These state sacrifices, on which vast sums were spent under the Athenian democracy, served an economic need, because they provided the lower classes with their only opportunity of eating roast meat; and the principle on which they rested—that the citizens met to share food with their god—shows that they were derived from the communal feast of the primitive clan.

Lastly, the conditions on which the king or chief enjoyed all these privileges are stated in a famous passage of the Iliad: "Why have the people of Lycia conferred on us the highest honours—pride of place and precedence in food and drink? They regard us as gods, and they have bestowed on us a temenos of rich ploughland. Therefore we must be foremost in the fray, that the people may say, These kings of ours, who feed on our fat herds and quaff our choicest wine, can fight." Royal honours were the gift of the people granted in recognition of military service.

After the democratic revolution, the use of the lot became an integral element in the administration of the Athenian state, and Greek writers are unanimous in regarding it as a distinctive characteristic of a democratic constitution. It may therefore be added to those other elements in ancient democracy which we have already traced back to a tribal origin. The truth is
that ancient democracy was essentially the reassertion by the common people of their lost equality.\textsuperscript{36} 

All the key-words we have been considering—\textit{moīra, klēros, lēchos, dasmós}—reappear in the terminology of the Greek laws of inheritance.\textsuperscript{38} The property that a man inherits from his father is his \textit{klēros}, or in poetry his \textit{moīra}. In earlier times, the father had divided his property among his sons before he died, and we learn from a passage in the \textit{Odyssey} that this \textit{dasmós} had been effected by lot. In Attic law, the property was inherited by the sons; in default of sons, by the daughters; in default of children, by the brothers; in default of any close relative, by the fellow clansmen. Similar rules of priority are prescribed in the Code of Gortyna and in Hebrew Law; and, as Morgan pointed out, we have only to reverse the order to see that they correspond to the gradual restriction of the right of inheritance from the circle of the clan to the individual family, thus marking the transition from collective to private ownership.\textsuperscript{37} Even in democratic Athens, this transition had not been completed. The right of testamentary disposition, which is one of the characteristics of mature law, was only recognised in default of legitimate issue.\textsuperscript{38} Thus the son’s claim on his father’s property was the last vestige of the time when all property had been owned collectively by the clan. And the transition had proceeded so surreptitiously that the regulations governing the disposal of private property were still expressed in terms that had their origin in primitive communism.

It may therefore be concluded that in its application to food, booty and land the idea of Moira reflects the collective distribution of wealth through three successive stages in the evolution of tribal society. Oldest of all was the distribution of food, which goes back to the hunting period. Next came the distribution of chattels and inanimate moveables acquired by warfare, which was a development of hunting; and, last, the division of land for the purposes of agriculture.

The use of the lot was, of course, a guarantee of equality. The goods were divided as equally as possible, and then the portions were distributed by a process which, since it lay outside human control, was impartial. And for the same reason it was regarded as magical, as an appeal to the Moirai or spirits
of the Lot, who determined each man's portion. With the growth of private property, the use of the lot became increasingly restricted, and the popular conception of the Moirai was modified accordingly. They became the goddesses who determined for each man his lot in life.

Besides these divisions of wealth, the word moīra was also applied to divisions of function. Here again we find traces of a social order which had vanished from the real world reflected in the ideal world of Olympus.

Before making war on the Titans, Zeus swore to the gods that, if victorious, he would not only respect the privileges of those who already had privileges, but bestow others on those who at present had none. The result was that, when the war was over, he was invited to assume the sovereignty. Zeus became king in reward for military service. After becoming king, he assigned to the gods their several privileges or functions. The gēras of Hephaistos was fire; the moīra allotted to Atlas was to hold up the sky; the moīra of the nymphs was to care for mortals in early manhood; to Apollo was assigned music and dancing, while lamentation was the lāchos of Hades. Once Aphrodite, whose moīra or timē was love-making, was caught working at the loom, and Athena protested to Zeus that, since Aphrodite had stolen her klēros, she would no longer pursue the vocation which she had received from the Moirai. In Æschylus, the Erinyes accuse Apollo of robbing them of the lāchos which the Moirai had bestowed on them at birth; and Asklepios was punished for the same reason—in seeking to raise the dead, he had trespassed on the moīra of Hades.

In the earliest phase of tribal society the only division of labour had been sexual, but, with the development of stock-raising, tillage and handicrafts, specialised occupations tended to become hereditary in particular clans. In ancient Greece we meet with many such craft clans: the Homeridai (rhapsodes), the Asklepiadai (physicians), the Iamidai, Branchidai and Krontidai (soothsayers), the Euneidai (lyre-players), the Kerykes and Theokerykes (heralds). At Sparta, the heralds all belonged to the clan of the Talthbyiadai: as Herodotus remarks, heraldry was the gēras of the clan. And there are many other clans whose name bears a vocational significance:
the Poimenidai (herdsmen), Aigeirotomoi (hewers of poplar), Bouzygai (ox-spanners), Phreorychoi (well-diggers), Daidalidai and Kropidai (sculptors); Hephaistiadai, Aithalidai, Eupyridai and Pelekes (armourers and smiths).

Discussing the Attic craft clans, one contemporary historian declares that they must have been guilds and, considering it improbable that such guilds could have existed in primitive Attica, he concludes that “these names were fancy choices.”\textsuperscript{43} No doubt many of them were guilds—that is to say, professional associations to which admission was obtained by some form of co-option; but, as Grönbech has shown, the guild is descended from the clan.\textsuperscript{44} The mediæval guild is simply an advanced form of the craft clan. The only structural difference between them is that membership of the guild is not determined by birth, except in so far as the son becomes eligible by following his father’s vocation; and even the primitive clan commonly admits strangers by adoption. Since the craft clan is a widespread feature of the higher stages of tribal society, there is no difficulty in supposing that it existed in primitive Attica; and, even if it did not, at least there existed the primitive clans out of which the craft clans subsequently evolved. If this historian had given any attention to the history of primitive society, he would have had no need to resort to fancies.

The Asklepiadai claimed descent from Asklepios, the god of physicians; the Iamidai from Apollo, the god of prophets; the Kerykes from Hermes, the god of heralds; the Talthybiadai and Theokerykes from the herald Talthybios; the Daidalidai from Daidalos, the sculptor; the Bouzygai from Bouzyges, said to have been the first man to harness cattle to the plough.\textsuperscript{45} In all these cases the vocation of the clan coincides with the traditional function of the eponymous god or hero from whom it claims descent.

Here again endless confusion has been introduced by recent historians owing to their ignorance of the structure of the primitive clan. Of the clans just mentioned, some certainly—the Homeridai and Asklepiadai, for example—and others probably were guilds in the historical period. So far as their origins are concerned, that point, as we have seen, is immaterial; but it is not established by the fact that their first
ancestor is mythical. Wade-Gery defines the Athenian génos as "a group of Athenians connected by fictional common ancestry—fictional, because the alleged ancestor is always mythical." This is simply a non sequitur. The fact that the first ancestor of the clan is mythical does not disprove its claim to common descent. If it did, the common descent characteristic of totemic clans throughout the world would be a fiction, because in these cases the first ancestor is not a human being at all. These current misapprehensions would be easier to excuse if the true nature of the clan, in Greece and elsewhere, had not been explained sixty years ago by Morgan.

The physician Asklepios is a mythical projection of the human physician. Apollo as prophet and Hermes as herald were fashioned in the image of real prophets and real heralds. If Talthybios was a historical person, which is doubtful, he belonged to the clan which subsequently named itself after him. The hero Bouzyges is nothing more than an impersonation of the traditional function of the Bouzygai. According to Herodotus, it was Homer and Hesiod who "gave the gods their titles, distinguished their privileges and crafts, and fixed their form." Some of these attributes may have been older than Herodotus allows, but his essential point is correct—they were derivative, not primitive. Invading tribes had overrun the Ægean, and so the sons of Kronos conquered the world; the invading tribes had divided the land by lot, and so the sons of Kronos divided the world; the kings of these tribes owed their sovereignty to military service, and so did the King of Olympus. The parallel will be pursued in the next chapter. In the same way, the division of labour among the gods, as it appears in the Homeric poems, is simply the reflex of the division of labour which had been effected in the real world by the primitive system of clan crafts—a system in which a man's vocation in life was determined by the clan into which he was born.

This brings us to the important question: how did the Moirai become spinners—Klootho, Atropos and Lachesis?

Klootho, who is spinning personified, is the oldest of the three, because, while Homer speaks of the Moirai collectively as Klothes, he never mentions the other two. Atropos appears in later literature as the "goddess of the abhorred shears who
slits the thin-spun life”—an image apparently based on the process of cutting the web from the loom. "I have rolled up like a weaver my life: he will cut me off from the loom." But this notion is not found in early Greek literature, nor does it conform to the meaning of the word as the Greeks interpreted it—she who cannot be turned back, whose thread cannot be unspun. And even this interpretation, which can be traced back to Æschylus, is not easily reconciled with the operations of spinning or weaving. It is not hard for the spinner to unwind what she has spun, nor for the weaver to unravel what she has woven. Penelope is a standing instance to the contrary. It is possible therefore that this interpretation rests on a false etymology. The word is based on the idea of turning (trépo)—of that there is no doubt; it may be, however, that the prefix is not privative but intensive. In that case, Atropos is simply a variant of atraktos, with interchange of p and k—not "she who cannot be turned," but the Turner—a personification of the spindle.

There remains Lachesis, the goddess of Allotment. Her place by the side of Klotho and Atropos suggests that originally she, too, must have carried some connotation germane to the art of spinning—either the allotment of the unworked wool among the spinners or, what comes to the same thing, the amount of wool required to fill the spindle.

How then did these Klotho or Moirai become spinners of destiny? The answer must be sought in the function of their human prototypes. We must also observe—the tradition is insistent on this point—that a man’s destiny is spun by the Moirai at the time of his birth. What were the women of the clan engaged in spinning at the birth of a child? To this question there seems to be only one answer. They were making its clothes.

The primary function of clothes is, of course, to protect the body, but among primitive peoples this function is commonly encrusted with magical practices and beliefs founded on the notion that there exists an intimate relation between a man’s clothes and his life. The same idea underlies the custom of decorating the body by scarification, tattooing, painting, and the use of detachable ornaments.
In ancient Greece the newborn child was wrapped in swaddling bands and adorned with amulets such as necklaces and rings. These articles were known collectively as gnorismata, or tokens, because they were sufficiently distinctive to identify the child. When an unwanted child was exposed, its tokens were exposed with it. This was done even when, so far from hoping it might survive, its parents were determined it should perish. Thus, when the infant Cyrus was handed over to a shepherd with instructions that it was to be left a prey for the wild beasts of the hills, it was richly attired in embroidered linen and ornaments of gold; and, when the shepherd substituted for it his own stillborn child, he transferred these tokens from the one to the other. The custom of exposing the tokens cannot therefore in general have been prompted by the hope of subsequent recovery, although in particular cases that may have been a secondary motive; and the fact that the child was not simply killed, but left to die, and its clothes abandoned with it, suggests that at one time exposure was a ritual act based partly on the belief that the child’s life was bound up with its clothes, which bore the marks of its origin.

Were these marks totemic? The question is worth raising, because it is a widespread practice among primitive tribes to mark the children by tattooing or other means with the totemic sign of the clan to which they belong.

The Arabic wasm is a mark branded on camels. According to Robertson Smith, it was originally a totemic sign placed, not only on camels, but on their owners. Moreover, as he points out, the word itself is cognate with ism, which is the Arabic for name. Now, precisely the same equation is found in Indoeuropean. The Latin nota and nomen, the Greek onotazo and ónoma, are derived from the same base. Some scholars have hesitated to accept this equation, because its significance is not immediately apparent. But the Semitic analogy makes it plain. The mark and the name are the same thing, both representing, the one in graphic and the other in spoken form, the clan totem incarnate in the bearer. This explains why in primitive society the name is universally hedged round with taboos.

Is there any evidence that the gnorismata were totemic? The
Spartoi of Thebes had two emblems—the snake and the spear. The story was that the body of every member of this clan was marked with a spear from birth; but, since birthmarks are not hereditary, it has been plausibly suggested that the spear was a totemic tattoo. The clearest instance, however, is the snake necklace exposed with the infant Ion. As we remarked in the first chapter, the snake was the totem of the clan.

In the *Oresteia*, Orestes proves his identity to his sister by showing her a garment she had woven for him as a child—probably, as the scholiast observes, his swaddling bands; and in it are animal designs. These animal designs were a traditional *motif* in the metal ornaments and embroidered swaddling bands in which infants were attired. There are several instances in the comedies of Menander. Syriskos is examining the tokens of a foundling: “Here’s an iron ring plated with gold, and on the seal is carved—is it a bull or a goat?” And again: “Doris, go and fetch the casket with the embroideries in it—you know, the one I gave you to keep. . . . Isn’t this a he-goat or an ox or some such beast? . . . That’s the attire they found me in as a child.” These animal designs on the *gnortsmata* are clearly derived from an earlier custom of marking the child with the totem of its clan.

The significance of the totemic emblem was twofold. It signified that the child that bore it was a reincarnation of the clan ancestor, and had inherited by right of birth the traditional duties and privileges of the clan. Therefore, as mythical projections of the women who wove the swaddling-bands embroidered with the clan-totem the Moirai represented the authority of ancestral custom which determined from birth the part allotted to the individual in the life of the tribe.

The connection between Moira and the clan totem is established by another line of argument. The *datmon* of the Orphics and Pythagoreans was the guardian spirit assigned to every man at birth who decided all the crucial issues of his life. This is the function of the Egyptian *ka*, the Mexican *nagual*, and the North American *manito*—all individual totems evolved out of the collective totem of the clan, with which in many cases they are combined. And besides this individual *datmon*, we also find traces of a hereditary *datmon*, the *datmon génnes* of Æschylus, or
datmon of the clan. Further, the words datmon and motra are constantly associated in such a way as to indicate that their meaning is essentially the same. The Greek for "trying one's luck" is "to ascertain one's motra," or, alternatively, "to put one's datmon to the test." Empedokles says that there are two kinds of datmones or moirai that inaugurate man's life at birth. Iphigeneia cries out in the same breath against the evil datmon which brought her from the womb and the Moirai who delivered her mother of a child so miserable. That this significance of datmon is fundamental is proved by its etymology; for datmon is cognate with dalis, a meal, and with dasmos, a division—it is the Apportioner or ancestral spirit who determines each man's motra.

The functions of the Moirai were not confined to birth. They were also associated with re-birth, with marriage and with death. At Athens, when a man returned home after being reported dead and duly lamented by his kinsfolk, he was readmitted to the community by a ceremony consisting of a mimic birth, and he was described as deuteropotmos, one who had received a second potmos—potmos being synonymous with motra in the sense of that which "falls to one's lot." In myth, it was the Moirai who attended at the bridal bed of Zeus and Hera. In cult, the Greek bride offered a lock of her hair to Artemis and the Moirai. Antiphon says of the bridal night that "this night inaugurates a new potmos, a new datmon." And, finally, the phrase motra thandou (portion of death), corresponding to motra biostoio and motra gamou (portion of life, portion of marriage), shows that man had his portion in death as well as life. All this will become clear when we have had an opportunity of examining the interconnection in primitive thought of the ideas relating to birth, adoption, initiation, marriage and death.

I have argued that the Moirai originated as a symbol of the economic and social functions characteristic of the primitive tribe—the sharing of food, the sharing of booty, the sharing of land, and the division of labour between the clans. These functions were maintained under the direction of the tribal elders, the accepted exponents of ancestral custom. If, therefore, the Moirai symbolised the authority of ancestral custom,
it becomes pertinent to enquire why they were conceived in female form.

Among the arguments advanced by Robertson Smith in support of his contention that the Semitic peoples were originally matrilineal is the fact that in the Semitic languages tribal units are treated as feminine. "If," he says, "at the time when the use of genders was taking shape, the effective bond of blood had been reckoned through the father, it is simply incredible that the tribal unity could have been personified as the mother of the stock." The same argument applies to Greek. The normal type of the clan name is based on the element -ida-, which is an extension of the suffix -id by another suffix, -a. Both these suffixes are feminine, and in the dialects of north-west Greece clan names of this type were actually declined as feminine. Thus, the typical Greek clan name, which in historical times was applied exclusively to men, was originally restricted to the women.

A tribe in which the principle of mother-kin is fully operative has the following characteristics. The children belong to the mother’s clan. When they grow up, the men marry women of other clans and go to live with the clan into which they marry. The women remain in their own clan. Therefore the descent of the clan is traced through the women and its affairs are administered by the women. If therefore the Moirai represented the authority of tribal custom as vested in the elders of the clan, and if those elders were women, then we may say that in origin the Moirai were simply the ancestral spirits of the clan.

So, as we have seen, were the Erinyses. Were the Moirai and the Erinyses originally identical? I think not. True, they had much in common. Both were female; both were worshipped exclusively by the female sex. If, as we have suggested, the Erinyses were of Αegean origin, their sex is explained by the matrilineal institutions of pre-Hellenic Greece. The name of the Moirai, on the other hand, is Indo-European. Yet, as we saw in the last chapter, the Indo-European immigrants into Greece were patrilineal. This apparent contradiction can be resolved on the hypothesis that the origin of the Moirai lies in the primitive culture of the Indo-European peoples before
their dispersal; and this hypothesis is supported by some independent evidence.

In the first place, there is a striking resemblance between the Greek Moirai and the Germanic Norns. They, too, were associated with birth, marriage and death; they, too, were spinners of fate.\(^73\) The Germans cannot have derived this conception directly from the Greeks; nor is it likely that they derived it through Latin, because the Roman concept of the Parcae as spinners was merely a literary borrowing from Greek and as such confined to the educated classes. If the Parcae, as spinners, had exercised any influence on popular thought, we should expect to find traces of it in the widespread Gallic and Germanic cults of the Matres Deae.\(^74\) Yet, though the evidence is plentiful, there is only one instance in which these deities are identified with the Parcae, and none in which they are represented as spinners. The Norns require closer investigation than they have yet received, but, with this reservation, it may be suggested that their affinities with the Moirai must be due to a common Indo-European origin.

In the second place, the significance of Moira in relation to the sharing of food shows that the idea had its roots in the hunting period—a stage which, at the time of the dispersal, Indo-European society had left far behind; and, as we saw in the first chapter, one of the characteristics of that stage is the relatively high incidence of matrilineal descent. It appears therefore that in the idea of Moira we have one of the oldest traditions of the Indo-European peoples.

Unlike the Erinyes, the Moirai have no animal associations. This too follows naturally from the hypothesis I have advanced. As ancestral spirits of a matrilineal society, the Erinyes maintained their connection with the female ancestors; but when, before its dispersal, the Indo-European-speaking people adopted patrilineal descent, the Moirai ceased to represent the ancestors, who were now men, and so were cut off from their totemic origin.

Yet, though their origins were distinct, their functions are closely related. \(\text{Æschylus says that in the beginning the world was ruled by “the threefold Moirai and the unforgetting Erinyes.”}\(^75\) The women of Thebes cry out against “Moirai, giver
of evil and the shade of Œdipus, the black Erinys.” When
Agamemnon repented of having robbed Achilles of his géras
or moíra, he attributed his blunder to the malice of Zeus, Moira
and Erinys. In the post-Homeric period, Moira is often re-
placed in this connection by Dike, or Justice. Thus, when
Agamemnon and Menelaos have refused burial, which is the
moíra of the dead, to the body of Ajax, the dead man’s kins-
man utters a curse upon them in which he invokes Zeus, Erinys,
and Dike, “who brings to fulfilment.” The epithet telesphóros,
which is here applied to Dike, was also a traditional epithet
of Moira. In the Oresteia, the parents who have been struck
down by their children cry out on the name of Dike and on
the thrones of the Erinys. Finally, Herakleitos says that, if
the Sun were to exceed his métra or measures, he would be
detected by the Erinys, the ministers of Dike.76 In a later
chapter we shall find that these “measures” are really “por-
tions,” the idea of métron being a post-Homeric development
of moíra.

These passages make it clear, first, that the function ascribed
in Attic poetry to Dike had previously belonged to Moira, and,
secondly, that both were functionally related to the Erinys.
The nature of their relationship appears to be that, whereas
Moira or Dike is offended by violation of the established por-
tions or limits set to human conduct, the actual punishment
of the offender is effected by the agency of the Erinys. The
Moirai decree what shall be, and the Erinys see to it that their
decrees are carried out. This traditional co-operation between
the Moirai and Erinys corresponds to the fusion of cultures
which underlies Greek civilisation, and the superior authority
enjoyed by the Moirai reflects the dominance of the Indo-
European element in it.

In explaining his blunder, Agamemnon coupled with Moira
and Erinys the name of Zeus. How did Zeus stand in relation
to the Moirai? According to Æschylus, when Zeus first be-
came king, he was powerless to override the authority of the
Moirai. In the Homeric poems, Zeus stands to the Moirai in
the same equivocal relationship as the king stood to his people.
When Sarpedon is about to die, Zeus is sorely tempted to save
him, which suggests that he could if he would, but he desists
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when Hera indignanty warns him that, if he violates the decrees of Fate, other gods will seek to do the same. On the other hand, such stereotyped phrases as *mōtra theōn* and *epeklósanto theōi* imply that the authority of the Moirai is already fading before the growing power of the gods, and their eventual subordination is revealed at a later period in the cult title *moiragētes*, "leader of the Moirai," borne by Zeus at Olympia and by Apollo at Delphi. The new gods have conquered. The tribe has been superseded by the state.

Having explained their sex, we have no difficulty in understanding why the function of the Moirai was symbolised by the spindle. Spinning was the women's task. So, before the development of field tillage, was agriculture. The significance of Moira in this connection is clearly brought out when we contrast it with another element in Greek thought which had its origin in the work of the men.

In pastoral society, the men tend the flocks, the women work the wool which the men bring home. The notion of pasture underlies a word whose social importance eventually eclipsed that of Moira—the word *nómoσs*. This too originally signified a division or portion, but, whereas *mōtra* was applied primarily to cultivated land, *nómoσs* was confined to pasture. Now, private property was naturally much slower to develop in uncultivated land than in cultivated. Long after the *mōtra* of the clan had been split up into family holdings, the pastures remained common, their use being regulated by customary rights. In this way the word *nómoσs* acquired the sense of a common usage or acknowledged custom, and so at a still later stage custom as by law established. Thus, both Moira and Nomos have their roots in the economic relations of tribal society; but, whereas at the beginning of the historical period the primitive significance of Moira is already in decay, the idea of Nomos does not reach maturity until long afterwards in the democratic city-state. The decline of Moira and the rise of Nomos correspond to the transition from the matrilineal tribe to the patrilineal state.

We have not yet finished with the idea of Moira. After its first roots in the social organism have withered, it sends out fresh roots, through which it renews its vitality by adapting
itself to the new modes of thought set in motion by the ever-
changing organism on which it feeds; and so the continuity
which underlies its successive transformations is simply the
continuity of society itself.