Gilyak Cousin Marriage and Morgan's Hypothesis[1]

[113–129; 155–159, 168–185, 159–167; 219–235; 114–124]

COUSIN MARRIAGE must ultimately be deduced from the realization that close blood marriage between close blood relatives is harmful. We have seen that primitive man, for a number of reasons (be they religious conservatism, ideas associated with ancestor worship, or the desire for a peaceful organization of marriage), did not pass directly from marriage between brother and sister to marriage between remote relations or strangers. Our goal in this chapter is to trace the genetic link between the Gilyak system and that of Australia, to see how the Gilyak diverged from the Australian system at the stage when marriage between two-sided first-cousins first began to come into disrepute [**114**].[2]

The great transformation towards exogamous marriage took place with extreme slowness. Thus, as is the case even now among the Australian natives, the first form of exogamy adopted was that of enforced marriage between children of brother and sister. As the marriages occur uniformly from generation to generation, the group, in matrimonial order, is necessarily divided into two moieties which, following the generations, exchange their women by cross-cousin marriage. In its application to individual families, this system requires that the son of a brother marry the latter's sister's daughter, and conversely, the son of a sister, the latter's brother's daughter. In this system, husband and wife must be first-cousins, such that the wife of a man is, on the one hand, his father's sister's daughter, and on the other, his mother's brother's daughter, because the fathers of the couple are married to each other's sisters [**115**].

---

1   [***Editor's note:*** The AMNH English typescript presents material from this and the next chapter in a different manner than its Russian-language counterparts. For the virtues of discussing Morgan's work first in light of the Gilyak kinship system and then in the comparative context of other North Asian peoples, I have restored the sequencing from the AMNH Russian typescript. It loosely approximates corresponding sections of the two 1933 Soviet editions, which differ in both sequence and content. Earlier titles for this material included "Cousin Marriage and the Gilyak Marital Norms" and "Suggestions" (AMNH English typescript); "Cousin Marriage and Gilyak Marriage Norms" and "The Wide Distribution of Gilyak Cousin Marriage" (AMNH Russian typescript); "Cousin Marriage [continued]" and "The Gilyak Kinship System and Morgan's Hypothesis" (Shternberg, *Giliaki*); and "Cousin Marriage and Gilyak Marital Norms" and "The Gilyak Kinship System and Morgan's Hypothesis" (Shternberg, *Sem'ia*).]

2   [***Editor's note:*** Although this sentence is found only in the AMNH English typescript, it repeats the biological slant from the end of the last chapter and the end of this one.]

Such was the first stage in the restriction of marriage between persons closely related by blood. Further restrictions followed different lines among various peoples. In Australia these restrictions followed the most simple course. From first-cousin marriage they passed to marriage between second-cousins, and the former became prohibited.

No change in social organization accompanied this transformation. The group was still separated into moieties which exchanged women, with the difference being that a man no longer married his father's sister's daughter but the daughter of his male first-cousin, so that the descendants of brother and sister could again intermarry only in the second generation. Husband and wife were now one degree removed from each other on both the father's and mother's side. The principle of cross-cousin marriage (the exchange of women) remained intact, but the other principle—stating that marriage between the children of brother and sister was imperative, or at least the only orthodox route—was completely abandoned. In the end, it proved impossible to save both maxims.

These people, among whom the Gilyak are the most instructive representatives, also resolved to limit first-cousin marriage, believing it necessary to establish a more remote degree of relationship between the parties of a marriage union. But they were unwilling to sacrifice the principle they regarded as most important—the premise by which a mother marries her son to her brother's daughter. This principle was accordingly preserved, but in order to comply with the need for a lessening of the closeness of relationship between marriage partners, they gave up bilateral cousin marriage.[3] Among the Gilyak, as we know, the son of every woman claims her brother's daughter, while the reverse is not allowed; a brother's son may not marry the former's sister's daughter. The result was a reduction in the closeness of relationship between marriage partners; they are still first-cousins, but only on one side, that of the husband's mother, no longer on the side of the wife's mother. Thus at the same time the ancient fundamental principle, marriage with the mother's brother's daughter, remained intact, while the marriage mates were still first-cousins, if only unilaterally.

This deviation from the Australian system of limiting first-cousin marriage brought with it a radical change in the social organization: It changed the bipartite organization of the group with its classes to a pure clan organization, and in particular to the four-clan phratry we have found among the Gilyak.

In the Australian system, the restrictions of cousin marriage may extend to any degree without in any way affecting the division of the group, from the point of view of marriage, into exogamous moieties constantly exchanging women. Essentially

---

3   [***Editor's note:*** With bilateral cousin marriage, a male marries his mother's brother's daughter or father's sister's daughter so as to prohibit this bidirectional marriage reciprocity or "sister-exchange." Shternberg reasons that Gilyaks moved to sanction the male's marriage to his mother's brother's daughter only, a form of unilateral cousin marriage that we would now call matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. Some confusion resulted in both the English and Russian typescripts, owing to some of Shternberg's original English insertions to the AMNH Russian typescript. Instead of "they gave up two-directional cousin marriage," he used the more general, "they gave up cousin marriage." Shternberg, *Giliaki*, and Shternberg, *Sem'ia*, upgraded this to "they gave up cross-cousin marriage [*perekrestnyi brak*]," where context clarifies the direction.]

each moiety is a real clan, as marriages are forbidden within the division. The two divisions are supplemented by a complex system of classes, but these do not alter the situation; a man, no matter to what class he belongs, always remains in the same exogamous division. The classes, without affecting a man's relation to his division, appear to be a sort of mnemonic device which limits the man individually (not his descendants) in his selection of a wife to a group of women standing to him in definite degrees of relationship (in the four-class system, only first-cousins are marriageable; in the eight-class system, only second-cousins). As a matter of fact, the classes do not constitute an essential part of the Australian bipartite system. Among the Dieri, for instance, we find the restriction against first-cousin marriage identical to that of the Arunta (but while among the latter there are, in addition, eight classes, for mnemonic purposes the Dieri have no classes whatsoever) [**115–116**].

The Gilyak type of one-sided cousin marriage, which becomes understandable when studied in the light of its historical antecedents, has altogether escaped the attention of investigators of primitive marriage. Some scientists even assume a skeptical attitude and regard its very existence as improbable. Thus, almost simultaneously with my publication on the subject (Shternberg, 1901 *a*), the well-known comparative jurist Professor Josef Kohler published an article in which he quoted his correspondent to the effect that a similar type of marriage existed among the Hottentots. But he hesitated to accept the account for he regarded it as improbable.[4] A reviewer in *L'Année Sociologique* (1901–1902), who summarized the article, fully endorsed Kohler's attitude.[5] The reason for this skepticism is not difficult to see. The true character of this institution has very often been overlooked by observers who, while mentioning marriages between the children of a brother and sister, will not tell whether they are one-sided or two-sided. It is not sufficient to inform us that a man is permitted to marry the daughter of his mother's brother, because in cases where sisters are exchanged, the daughter of a man's mother's brother is at the same time the daughter of his father's sister [**116**].

Therefore in general treatises on human marriage, even such as Mr. Frazer's *Totemism and Exogamy,* this type of cousin marriage is not treated as an independent form in the evolution of marriage.[6] The ethnographic literature concerning this type of marriage, already known to J. F. McLennan, contains even now abundant data bearing witness to its wide distribution.[7] Particularly numerous traces are found among the Indonesian peoples and Dravidian tribes of India, among whom Morgan

---

[4] Josef Kohler, "Das Recht der Hottentots," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft,* no. 15 (1901), 341–342. For a full English-language discussion of Kohler's work, see Josef Kohler, *On the Prehistory of Marriage: Totemism, Group Marriage, Mother Right.* Translated from the German by R. H. Barnes and Ruth Barnes. Edited with an Introduction by R. H. Barnes (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press).

[5] [**Editor's note:** An equally partial reference to the *L'Anneé Sociologique* review, "11th year, p. 306" is found in Shternberg, *Sem'ia:,* 116. The more likely reference is to the "2nd year."]

[6] Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy,* vol. II (London: Macmillan, 1910), 788. [**Editor's note:** The reference to Frazer and this citation are not found in the AMNH Russian typescript.]

[7] [**Editor's note:** See John Ferguson McLennan, *Primitive Marriage* (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1865), as well as his *Studies in Ancient History; Comprising an Inquiry into the Origin of Exogamy* (New York: MacMillan, 1886).]

discovered the Turanian system in its purest form, and among whom (for instance the Toda) even group marriage has survived. Abundant evidence may also be found in Dr. Rivers' article on cousin marriage in India.[8] In Indonesia no less an authority than Wilken makes the following statement: "Among the Batas, Rejangs and the natives of Ambonia, a sister's son is allowed to marry a brother's daughter, whereas a brother's son must not marry a sister's daughter."[9] Their kinship terminology also corresponds to this practice. A later observer, J. S. Neumann, describes this marriage custom in Indonesia still more expressively: "If a man does not wed the daughter of his mother's brother . . . the gods are angry. On the other hand, marriage with the daughter of a father's sister is not only forbidden, but punishable."[10]

In Africa, as we have seen above, one-sided cousin marriage is mentioned among the Hottentots; and though information on the subject from other parts of the world has until now been too scanty, it is only a question of time before fuller data will be forthcoming. For example, no information from northern and central Asia existed. However, today we have good information of cases regarding clear survivals of one-sided cousin marriage among the Buriat and some other people of the Ural-Altaic family. So it may be with other people about whom we do not yet have information.

MORGAN'S HYPOTHESIS AND THE GILYAK KINSHIP SYSTEM

The Gilyak system of kinship and marriage fully corroborates Morgan's fundamental hypothesis that kinship terms are the reflection of corresponding sexual norms. What in Morgan's case was mere speculation based on terms of relationship, we find fully realized among the Gilyak. When a Gilyak applies the term "wives" to a group of women, they are wives to him in the full sense of the word. When a Gilyak calls the well-known group of men "fathers," then they are indeed men who have rights of sexual access to his mother. When he calls the mother's brother "wife's father," that is due to the law according to which he must actually marry that man's daughter [**117**].

In the Gilyak system, even universal classificatory terms, such as "older brother" and "younger brother," or "older sister" and "younger sister," are terms of great importance matrimonially. In the first place, these terms regulate individual marriage in the mother's clan. The older brother must marry the older sister; the younger brother must marry the younger sister. These terms are of importance in levirate, as the widow passes to the younger *tuvng.*

The way Gilyak kinship terminology so strikingly details the terms of relationship can best be seen in the relations of brothers to their wives. Among a part of

---

8   Rivers, "Marriage of Cousins in India, " 626 et seq.
9   Wilken, *Bijdragen,* Series V, vol. I, 148. [**Editor's note:** I was unable to locate a comparable reference for the ethnologist George Alexander Wilken in the Library of Congress. One work by Wilken with which Shternberg may have been familiar is *Handleiding voor de vergelijkende Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indie* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1893).]
10   Frazer, *Totemism,* vol. II, 788. [**Editor's note:** While it is not clear which edition of Totemism Shternberg was referring to, Frazer did not include Neumann in the index to the 1910 English edition, *Totemism and Exogamy: A Treatise on Certain Early Forms of Superstition and Society* (London: Macmillan).]

the Gilyak population, as noted before, all brothers indiscriminately have the right to one another's wives, and their terms fully represent this pact. A man applies the term "wife" indiscriminately to all the wives of his brothers; the children of brothers, therefore, apply the term "father" to the latter. Among the other half of the Gilyak, only younger brothers have a right to wives of the older ones; this is also reflected in the terminology. The wife of my younger brother, with whom I can have no intercourse, I call by the prohibitive term *iokh,* but to the wife of my older brother I apply the same term as to my own wife. Again, the children of brothers apply only to the father's younger brothers the term *itk* (father), while they call his older brothers *atk.*

The objections put forward against Morgan's hypothesis in this connection were of a purely academic character. For instance, the famous argument was given repeatedly that the class term "mother" remained unexplained, as a man always knew who his mother was. This paradox is explained very simply among the Gilyak. They call "mother" every woman with whom individuals of the "father" class have a right to sexual intercourse. We can gather from the following how well aware the Gilyak are of the significance of the term.

We have just seen that among those Gilyak who only allow younger brothers to have access to the wives of the older ones, the children of brothers distinguish between the father's older brothers and his younger brothers (and call the latter "fathers"); between the father's brothers' wives they make no distinction, and call them indiscriminately "mothers." Why? The reason is close at hand. I call the wives of my father's younger brothers "mothers" because their husbands are my "fathers"; that is, they have access to my mother. The wives of my father's older brothers I also call "mothers" because my father has access to them, and they are, therefore, his wives.

The Gilyak also applies the term "mother" to the sisters of his wife's father, but this again corresponds with the actual relationship, for as we saw, father and son take wives from one and the same clan, the father taking a man's sister, the son taking the man's daughter. One's wife's father's sister, as group-wife of one's father, is really one's mother [**118**].

Also quite unfounded is Kunov's statement that classificatory terms merely indicate age-groups. In Gilyak practice, age plays no role in kinship terminology. My class "father," even if my junior, may not marry a woman that belongs to the class of my "wives," but must marry into the class of "wives" of my real father. On reaching maturity he becomes *de facto* my mother's husband.[11]

The Gilyak System and the Punaluan Family

This insight into Gilyak social organization serves to confirm and clarify not only Morgan's general hypothesis on the origin of the classificatory system of relationship but also his hypothesis of the development of the Turanian kinship system out of the

---

[11] [***Editor's note:*** No source for the German ethnologist Heinrich Cunow (1862–1936) is listed in any of the AMNH or Soviet versions. Shternberg may have been referring to Cunow's *Die Ver - wandtschafts-Organisationen der Australneger; ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Familie* (Stuttgart: Deik, 1894).]

Punaluan family. According to Morgan, the essential characteristic of the Punaluan family is "group marriage"—either the marriage of several sisters (one's own and collateral) with common husbands who are not necessarily related to each other, or the marriage of several brothers, own and collateral, with their wives, the latter again not being necessarily related (in both instances, however, they often are related). The old Gilyak family, with its obligatory marriage into one clan, represented a group marriage of all brothers, own and collateral, of a single clan with all sisters of the same generation from a specific clan, so the group-husbands were always "brothers" while their wives were always "sisters." This is evident from the kinship terminology— the wives of brothers call each other sisters.

At the present time, when marriage into different clans is tolerated, all brothers, own and collateral, continue to be group-husbands of their wives. We have shown, moreover, that even when sisters marry men of different clans, traces of group marriage persist, inasmuch as their children are considered brothers and sisters.

The structure of the Gilyak family permits us to establish the origin of the Hawaiian family on the basis of which Morgan postulated the Punaluan one. That family did not originally consist of several brothers in group marriage with wives who were unrelated to each other (or vice versa, several sisters in group marriage with husbands who were unrelated to each other). Such a family could not have given rise to the Turanian classificatory kinship system, for it presupposes the possibility of several groups of brothers or sisters, each being independently in a state of group marriage to the exclusion of the other groups. Thus the common terms for all brothers and their marital relations could not have arisen. The Gilyak family, in its pure and original form, presents a perfect picture of that primal family. It is an intra-clan organization. Each group marriage family represents a generation of men, all brothers, own and collateral, of a given clan in group marriage with an entire generation of women of another clan. These women must be "sisters" since daughters of fraternal relatives, as we have seen, are the wives of their fathers' sisters' sons. When by dint of circumstances these marriages became less orthodox, "brothers" began to take wives from different clans, and women began to marry into different clans. Sisters could find themselves in group marriage with husbands who were unrelated, while brothers could find themselves similarly united with women who were unrelated. The difference would be that whereas the aggregate of sisters would, with marriage into different clans, break up into several groups according to the different clans into which they married, as in the Punaluan family, the collective of brothers who always remain in one clan would remain intact. And as the Gilyak family represents the pure type of Punaluan family, Gilyak terminology is the most perfect form of the Turanian system. Indeed, we find there classificatory terms which must have existed in the original Turanian system but later, with the decay of the system of marriage, became obliterated. Thus, for example, in the Turanian form which Morgan in his time considered the most complete, the Tamil system, two of the most important classificatory terms are lacking—namely "husband" and "wife."

The Tamil system, according to Morgan, developed under conditions where "brothers" had common wives and "sisters" had common husbands. In accordance with this, a man in the Tamil system calls "father" not only his own father but all his father's brothers, and "mother" not only his own mother but all her sisters. He

Fɪɢ. 16. Gilyaks playing chess, 1890s. Photo by Lev Shternberg. *Source:* AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 98, l. 48.

calls the children of his father's brothers and his mother's sisters "brothers" and "sisters." Similarly there ought to exist a common term "wife" to be applied by a man not only to his individual wife but to the wives of his brothers and to his wife's sisters, as well as a common term "husband" to be applied by a woman to her own husband, his brothers, and the husbands of her sisters [**119**].

   In reality these terms are absent from the Tamil as well from the Iroquois systems. Thus among the Tamil a man calls his wife *en mainavi*; his brother's wife, *en anni* or *en maittuni*; and his wife's sister, *en korlunti* or *en maittuni.* The case is similar with the term for "husband" (cf. Morgan's table). Among the Gilyak the terms "husband" and "wife," *pu* and *ang'rei,* apply to all persons who are parties to a group marriage. The justice of Morgan's interpretation of kinship terms is thus strikingly vindicated.

CᴇRᴛᴀɪN AsPᴇᴄᴛs ᴏF ᴛʜᴇ TᴜRᴀNɪᴀN-GᴀNᴏᴡᴀNɪᴀN Sʏsᴛᴇᴍ ᴡʜɪᴄʜ MᴏRɢᴀN FᴀɪLᴇD ᴛᴏ INᴛᴇRᴘRᴇᴛ

The principle of cousin marriage supplies the key to certain kinship terms occurring in the Turanian-Ganowanian system. Thus Morgan was much perplexed by the apparently inexplicable fact that I, a male, call my cousins' children, both children of father's sister and mother's brother, nephews and nieces. Among the Seneca-Iroquois, on the other hand, the opposite rule prevails. In his *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity among the Human Family,* Morgan declares this fact to be inexplicable.

The discrimination in the relationship of cousin is a remarkable fact in the Tamil system. It is now found in the systems of but a small portion of the Turanian family. From the structure and principles of the Turanian system, as has been remarked before, with reference to the Ganowanian, it was predetermined that this relationship, when developed, would be applied and restricted to the children of a brother and sister. It was probably unknown in the primitive system . . . . It is the only particular in which it differs materially from the Seneca-Iroquois form, and in this the Seneca is more in logical accordance with the principles of the system than the Turanian. It is difficult to find any explanation of the variance.[12]

In 1877 with his book *Ancient Society*, Morgan came quite near to the solution. "This shows," he wrote, "that among the Tamil, at the time of the introduction of the Turanian system, all my female cousins were my wives, while this was not true of my male cousins."[13] As near as Morgan stood to the true cause, however, it did not prevent him from regarding the peculiarity as anomalous. He was far from the suspicion that he was dealing with a system of cross-cousin marriage, for what he thought was an accidental peculiarity was the very foundation of the Turanian and Ganowanian system. That the Turanian system resulted from cross-cousin marriage follows also from other terms which for Morgan were inexplicable, and which he did not attempt to interpret. Thus among the Tamil, if I am male, then my sister's son's wife is my daughter (as in the Gilyak and the Australian terminologies); the husband of my sister's daughter is my son (as in Australian cousin marriage); the husband of my father's sister's daughter is my brother (as in the Gilyak and Australian terminologies); my wife's father is "wife's father" and "uncle" (wife's father and mother's brother among the Gilyak; wife's father and father's brother or mother's brother among the Australians); my wife's mother is "wife's mother" and "aunt" (aunt and father's sister among the Gilyak, wife's mother and father's sister or mother's sister among the Australians); the wife of my brother is my "cousin" (that is, mother's brother's daughter or father's sister's daughter); and, finally, my father's sister's son's wife and mother's brother's son's wife are my "sister" (typical bilateral cross-cousin marriage). We encounter corresponding terms if I am a woman. All this bears witness to the fact that the Turanian system was a system of bilateral cross-cousin marriage, although the case of the Batak and tribes of central India attest that bilateral cross-cousin marriage, even in its original home, begins to give way to unilateral cross-cousin marriage of the Gilyak type.[14]

We must now interpret the variation of the Ganowanian system when contrasted with the Tamil. Specifically, when I am male, the children of all my male

---

[12] Cf. Morgan, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1871), 391.

[13] Morgan, *Ancient Society*, 427. [**Editor's note:** The AMNH Russian typescript indicates that Shternberg was using a Russian edition. Shternberg, *Sem'ia,* cross-referenced p. 444 of an unidentified English edition. The Russian edition is not listed in the original.]

[14] [**Editor's note:** The above paragraph, abridged and redirected in the AMNH English typescript, has been modified to correspond more closely to the three Russian-language counterparts in order to emphasize Shternberg's theory of the ceding of bilateral cross-cousin marriage to a unilateral system.]

cousins, i.e., the children of my father's sister's son and of my mother's brother's son, are my sons and daughters. Contrary to Morgan's opinion, this is a real deviation from the system and permits one of two explanations. The most plausible explanation is that owing to certain circumstances, the Seneca Indians were obliged to adopt a system like that of the Aleut, according to which all cousins, agnatic as well as cognatic, were indiscriminately parties to a group marriage. The other possible explanation is analogous to the one made use of above in the interpretation of the development of the Gilyak phratry. Let us recall table 3 of the Gilyak four-clan cognatic phratry. Clan A takes wives from clan B and the latter from D. Now, suppose that the number of women in clan B became greatly decreased, and therefore, members of both clans A and B have been forced to take wives from one common clan, D. The members of A and B, being cousins, will be married to sisters of clan D; according to the rules of group marriage their children will be brothers and sisters. Thus we have the Seneca case where a man calls the children of his male cousin "son" and "daughter," and which has so perplexed Morgan [**120**].

Thus the Australian system, based on the principle of cross-cousin marriage (exchange of women) merely requires a division of the group into two exogamous divisions. The group presents what one might call a two-clan phratry. Quite different is the case of unilateral cross-cousin marriage, as found in the Gilyak system. Here the dual division becomes impossible. From the moment bilateral cousin marriage (that is, reciprocal marriage between the children of brother and sister) was prohibited, the dual division (two-clan phratry) proved insufficient. One clan took women from the other, but the latter had to look for women outside the first clan; on the other hand, marriages outside the particular ethnic group were not permitted. It became necessary to supplement the original dual division by a set of new exogamous divisions. The first step in that direction was the formation of the four-clan phratry which we have studied among the Gilyak. The process was a plausible one; we shall see that the four-clan phratry, in an incipient state, exists also in the Australian system.

Let us imagine a community of the Australian type, embracing two divisions which in each generation exchange women in such a way that the children of a sister marry the children of her brother, so that the wife of a man is the sister of his sister's husband. Let us further imagine, for the sake of simplicity, that each division consists of only one generation of brothers and sisters, one's own and collateral, and that they stand to each other in different degrees of cousin relationship. The group of male cousins in one division we shall indicate by capital letters, A^1 A^2 A^3 A^4; their sisters shall be indicated by small letters, a^1 a^2 a^3 a^4. In the other division the male cousins will be B^1 B^2 B^3 B^4; and their sisters b^1 b^2 b^3 b^4—each letter embracing a group of own brothers or sisters. The powers of these letters stand for the different degrees of the cousin relationship between the various groups. Consecutive groups will be first-cousins, while the degree of relationship between the other groups will be indicated by the difference of their powers. The same powers of different letters indicate that the individuals of the corresponding groups are first-cousins both through the father and through the mother: A^1, a^1 are first-cousins of B^1, b^1; A^2, a^2 are first-cousins of B^2, b^2, etc. The representatives of groups indicated by different letters and with consecutive powers will be second-cousins: thus A^1 and B^1 will be second-cousins of B^2

and b^2, and A^2 and a^2 will be second-cousins of B^3 and b^3, etc. (the difference of the powers indicating the degree of cousinship).

First Division	Groups of men:	A^1 A^2 A^3 A^4 A^5 A^6
	Their sisters:	a^1 a^2 a^3 a^4 a^5 a^6
Second Division	Groups of men:	B^1 B^2 B^3 B^4 B^5 B^6
	Their sisters:	b^1 b^2 b^3 b^4 b^5 b^6

As the heteronomous groups of the males and females with the same powers are first-cousins who must intermarry, A^1 marries b^1, sister of B^1; B^1 marries a^1, sister of A^1. Similarly, A^2 marries b^2; B^2 marries a^2, etc. Thus the arrangement of marriages can be represented in the following table.

First Division	$(A^1 + b^1) + (A^2 + b^2) + (A^3 + b^3) + (A^4 + b^4)$, etc.
Second Division	$(B^1 + a^1) + (B^2 + a^2) + (B^3 + a^3) + (B^4 + a^4)$, etc.

In each preceding generation the marriages occurred in the same order, that is, between the children of two women, each of whom is married to the other's brother, so that the marriage-mates are first-cousins both through the father and through the mother. This form of marriage we term bilateral cross-cousin [*perekrestnyi*] marriage.

Let us now imagine the moment when the society first became aware of the harmfulness of bilateral cross first-cousin marriage and established bilateral cross second-cousin marriage as the orthodox form. Henceforth A^1 no longer marries his first cousin b^1, but his second-cousin b^2. Similarly, B^1 marries a^2, and so on. In this new order the marriages appear as follows:

First Division	$(A^1 + b^2) + (A^2 + b^1) + (A^3 + b^4) + (A^4 + b^3) + (A^5 + b^6) + (A^6 + b^5)$
Second Division	$(B^1 + a^2) + (B^2 + a^1) + (B^3 + a^4) + (B^4 + a^3) + (B^5 + a^6) + (B^5 + a^6)$

It is easy to see that from this moment, within each of the two divisions, there are formed two matrimonially isolated sections, the odd-numbered members (namely, of division) constituting one section, the even-numbered members constituting the other. Thus four groups have arisen [**121**].

This four-group division may be represented as follows:

First Division	Section 1	$(A^1 + b^2) + (A^3 + b^4) + (A^5 + b^6)$ and other odd members
	Section 2	$(A^2 + b^1) + (A^4 + b^3) + (A^6 + b^5)$ and other even members
Second Division	Section 3	$(B^1 + a^2) + (B^3 + a^4) + (B^5 + a^6)$ and other odd members
	Section 4	$(B^2 + a^1) + (B^4 + a^3) + (B^6 + a^5)$ and other even members

Section 1 now may not intermarry with Section 4, because the children of these two groups are two-way first-cousins. The reason is quite clear. In case the families intermarry in consecutive order—$(A^1 + b^2)$ with $(B^2 + a^1)$—their children will be two-sided first-cousins, for their fathers are married to each other's sisters; in other cases—in families $(A^1 + b^2)$ and $(B^4 + a^3)$—the children will not be second-, but third- or fourth-cousins, a condition avoided in the Australian system. Similarly, Sections 3 and 4 may also not intermarry. On the contrary, Sections 1 and 3 and Sections 2 and 4 are marriageable in the consecutive order of the families. For example, in the families $(A^1 + b^2)$ of Section 1 and $(B^1 + a^2)$ of Section 3, as may be seen from the powers, the father (A^1) of the first family is first-cousin of the mother (a^2) of the second family; and, vice versa, the father of the second family, B^1, is first-cousin of the mother of the first family, b^2. Moreover, both the fathers are also first-cousins, as well as both the mothers; therefore their children are second-cousins both on the father's and on the mother's side.

In the Australian system, however, these matrimonial sections of the two divisions could not develop into real clan units as each pair of the marriageable sections remained so only in one generation. The members of the next generation were bilateral cross first-cousins, the descendants of brother and sister, and could not as such intermarry. Therefore these sections could not become standardized as hereditary units, but remained mere classes of generations, with the practical function of mnemonically fixing the matrimonial norms.

A very different part was assumed by the four-section division in marriage of the Gilyak type. The point of departure was the same—the realization of the harmfulness of marriage between first-cousins. Whereas in the Australian marriage system the question was solved by the introduction of two-sided second-cousin marriage and the categorical prohibition of first-cousin marriage (with the preservation of sister-exchange marriage), in the Gilyak system the transformation consisted of the prohibition of two-sided first-cousin marriage. Marriage remained imperative between first-cousins, but only between one-sided ones, that is, either on the mother's or on the father's side. Reciprocal marriage between two families was thus prohibited; two men could in no way marry each other's sisters—two-sided cousin marriage had become impossible.

Let us now see how this rearrangement led to the Gilyak type of the phratry. We remember the two-sided phratry with marriage divisions for cousins of the first degree. For ease of orientation, we reproduce our second table here [**122**].

| First Division | $(A^1 + b^1) + (A^2 + b^2) + (A^3 + b^3) + (A^4 + b^4)$, etc. |
| Second Division | $(B^1 + a^1) + (B^2 + a^2) + (B^3 + a^3) + (B^4 + a^4)$, etc. |

In this table the community is represented at the moment when in every group, e.g., $(A^1 + b^1)$ or $(B^2 + a^2)$ the man and the wife are two-sided first-cousins, and each pair of corresponding families with the same powers in different divisions, e.g., $(A^1 + b^1)$ or $(B^1 + a^1)$, exchange women in every generation.

Here we can imagine the moment of transition from a bilateral system of cross-cousin marriage to a unilateral one. And yet, to accomplish this immediately was not possible. For in both divisions, having already followed a system of exchanging sisters,

one-sided first-cousins as such do not yet exist. Thus for the new transformation it was necessary first to take the previous steps, namely, to prohibit the exchange of sisters. The most rational solution would have been the Australian one, marriage between second-cousins. But, in contrast to the Australian case, where this could be exercised in both divisions (see above), here, as a result of the Gilyak prohibition on the exchange of women, this move could only be achieved within one division. Hence, for instance, with A^1 married to b^2, the brother of the latter, B^2, may no longer marry a^1. Therefore, B^2 has to take as his wife his third-cousin, a^4. Applying this new rule to our schematic series, instead of the table above we obtain the following table of marriages.[15]

First Division	$(A^1 + b^2) + (A^2 + b^1) + (A^3 + b^4) + (A^4 + b^3) + (A^5 + b^6) +$
	$(A^6 + b^5) + (A^7 + b^8) + (A^8 + b^7)$
Second Division	$(B^1 + a^3) + (B^2 + a^4) + (B^3 + a^1) + (B^4 + a^2) + (B^5 + a^7) +$
	$(B^6 + a^8) + (B^7 + a^5) + (B^8 + a^6)$

Now, in the following generation it becomes possible to move to this new principle—one-sided cousin marriage without women exchange—as all marriageable first-cousins are one-sided cousins, every mother being able to marry her son to her brother's daughter. It will become more evident when we subdivide each division into two sections, where one has even-numbered members and the other has odd-numbered ones. In this way we arrive at the following table:

First Division	Section 1 (odd members)	$(A^1 + b^2) + (A^3 + b^4) + (A^5 + b^6) + (A^7 + b^8)$
	Section 2 (even members)	$(A^2 + b^1) + (A^4 + b^3) + (A^6 + b^5) + (A^8 + b^7)$
Second Division	Section 3 (odd members)	$(B^1 + a^2) + (B^3 + a^4) + (B^5 + a^6)$
	Section 4 (even members)	$(B^2 + a^1) + (B^4 + a^3) + (B^6 + a^5)$

In analyzing this table, we find that in the first division, the powers of women are the same as the powers of men in the second division (b^2 and B^2 as one example). The children of these families will be one-sided first-cousins and, according to the principle that a sister's son marries her brother's daughter, the sons of the first division will marry the daughters of the second. The reverse will not be permissible.

On the other hand, in comparing the odd members of the first division with the even members of the second division, we find that in the families of the same order (for instance, in the first pairing of the first division and the second pairing of the second division, in the third pairing of the first division and the fourth pairing of the second division, and so on), the men of the first division are brothers of the women of the second division, and accordingly their children will be one-sided first-cousins.

---

15 [***Editor's note:*** This paragraph has been altered from the AMNH English typescript to more closely correspond to the three Russian-language counterparts.]

To review: The sons of Section 2 marry daughters of Section 3. Sons of Section 3 marry daughters of Section 1. Sons of Section 4 marry daughters of Section 2. This is because, for example, the women of Section 1 are the sisters of the men in Section 4, and the women of Section 2 are sisters to the men of Section 3. The resulting condition is identical with that which we found among the Gilyak.[16]

As exchange marriage between two groups is not tolerated, the descendants of the intermarrying sections, in the following generation, will be always one-sided cousins, and marriages will be uniformly concluded between the same groups and in the same order of the families. Thus the exogamous sections, unlike those of Australia, will become hereditary, i.e., real clans. Then, however, we are in the presence of the four-clan Gilyak phratry, obviously evolved from the primary dual division.[17]

We have now succeeded, I believe, in tracing an intimate genetic link between the Gilyak system and that of Australia, from which the former diverged at the stage when marriage between two-sided first-cousins first began to come into disrepute. The Australian system solved the problem by adopting two-sided second-cousin marriages and by rigorously prohibiting marriages between the descendants of brother and sister in the first generation—a prohibition which became fixed in the institution of classes, as among the Arunta. The Gilyak system prohibited sister-exchange [*pere - mennyi*] marriage, while preserving obligatory one-sided marriages between the children of brother and sister, and fixing its matrimonial code in the institution of the four-clan phratry.[18]

---

[16] [***Editor's note:*** The paragraph above from the AMNH English typescript has been simplified to restore the meaning in the AMNH Russian typescript.]

[17] [***Editor's note:*** In the 1933 Soviet editions, this paragraph contains three further expository sentences.]

[18] [***Editor's note:*** The AMNH Russian typescript concludes this chapter with two more short algebraic tables theorizing the rise of unilateral cross-cousin marriage.]