

## EIGHT



### THE EVOLUTION OF THE PHRATRY

[85–98, 107–112; 130–154; 200–209, 214–219; 104–114]<sup>1</sup>

IN ORDER that this really endogamous system survive and discharge its functions in their full and lawful entirety, certain definite conditions were necessary. Economic, physiological, and social conditions had, of course, to be favorable. Separate families of the phratry, notwithstanding their growth in numbers, had to retain a common territory. The increase in numbers in some families had to be in excess of, or at least equal to, the loss in others, and in no cases could the dying out of entire clans occur. The people had to be more or less isolated from external influences if the imperative toward marriages within the phratry was to retain its original hold [104].

Among any primitive people powerful obstacles can stand in the way of the continuance of such conditions. Hence, notwithstanding the Gilyak love for their ancestral territory, the stress of economic conditions has forced individuals, separate families, and even entire clans to change their habitat and wander to places far removed from their ancient homes. In the course of a few years during my own first stay on Sakhalin, many families migrated from the Tym' valley to more remote regions of the Ainu territory in northern Sakhalin, or to the Amur. But none did so by choice.

One striking illustration was the village of Pilavo, the most southern Gilyak settlement on the western coast of Sakhalin, on the very border of the Ainu territory. Owing to a feud among clansmen, part of the clan moved 500 versts further to the north and named their new village after their metropolis—as North Pilavo. Another feud arose, and another group of clansmen went from Sakhalin to the Lower Amur, founding the larger village of Khez, which no longer exists. Finally a new feud arose and a third village was founded 1000 versts further on the middle Amur, near Khabarovsk, in the midst of the Gold (Nanai) territory. The many branches of this widely scattered clan, in spite of the breaking off of all their former bonds, have to this day remained exogamous, but they could not maintain the ancient matrimonial relations of the phratry.

The breaking up of clans in such a manner has continued up to the present time. This explains why the Gilyak, in real life as in epic tales, must so often travel hundreds of miles in search of a wife from the proper clan. Such heroic quests, however,

---

<sup>1</sup> [**Editor's note:** The AMNH English typescript and Shternberg, *Sem'ia*, are the closest in sequencing of materials in this chapter. The AMNH Russian typescript and Shternberg, *Gili-aki*, diverge significantly, as indicated in notes throughout the chapter.]

are not for the average man. Most frequently an individual will seek adoption into another clan and marry the widow of one of his new clansmen, thus severing all ties with his old phratry. In the case of migration, not only of single individuals but of entire families, the descendants often end up by marrying into neighboring clans not belonging to their original phratry.

Catastrophe itself has taken perhaps the greatest toll on phratry organization, not least when the Gilyak have come into contact with alien cultures, first Far Eastern and then European. Between the alcohol and the exploitation made manifest by these peoples, the Gilyak have suffered from numerous infectious diseases which play havoc among a primitive population lacking immunity. Many times before my very eyes, epidemics of smallpox, scarlet fever, diphtheria, and other diseases decimated the scanty population. Some of the smaller clans have been entirely wiped out, while among others, only one or two clansmen have survived. It must also be remembered that the population is so widely scattered that the depopulating process does not strike the different clans of a phratry with equal force; at any given moment one clan may remain intact, while another may lose the greater part of its members.

The social consequences of such epidemics can best be shown by one of my own experiences during my last trip to Sakhalin in 1910. When visiting an old friend on the Tym' River, I was greatly surprised to see many Gilyak married to women of prohibited categories. For instance, one of my friends, Churka, an old bachelor, had married the widow of his class "father" (agnatic uncle), i.e., his class mother. This was unheard of even within my memory. Nor was the Churka case the only one in the village. "What could we do?" they said, when I asked how such events could have transpired. "The epidemic (smallpox) of last year killed off many of our clansmen—what was to be done with their widows? It would be a sin to let the widows leave the clan, so the elders decided that the widows must be kept." It is easy to appreciate the havoc wrought. At once the entire kinship terminology was done away with. Such cases are the best explanation of the perplexities and inconsistencies found in some classificatory systems, and which have puzzled many very able investigators (such as Dr. Swanton), inducing them to deny the true meaning of Morgan's views on the classificatory system.<sup>2</sup>

The psychological effects of contact with other peoples have also been indirectly destructive. As so often happens, exposure to new opinions broadens the mental horizon and weakens the strength of religious imperatives. The representatives of a higher culture look down upon the institutions of a more primitive society, and the primitives themselves can begin to lose their unquestioning respect for their own institutions. At first, only a few will tend to transgress the law, but the few will then be followed by many. According to the Gilyak themselves, their marriage regulations have lost vigor since the advent of the Russians. But even before the arrival of the Russians, the Gilyak came in contact with Chinese and Manchu, not to mention the Tungus and Ainu. The Chinese, as we shall see later, supplied the Gilyak with wives and, together with the Ainu, furnished them with female slaves.

---

<sup>2</sup> [Editor's note: Cf. John Reed Swanton, *Contributions to the Ethnology of the Haida* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1905).]

Of similar significance were traveling merchants and hunting expeditions to the territories of neighboring tribes. The Amur Gilyak would often spend several years hunting and trading in the territories of the Ainu, and would bring home with them Ainu women. In turn, isolated Tungus and Ainu would settle among the Gilyak and form matrimonial alliances with them, being adopted into Gilyak clans. Indeed, not a single Gilyak clan can be said to be free from foreign, Ainu, or Tungus blood. A great many clans even embrace foreigners as their clan ancestors [*rodonachal'niki*].

The economic relations with peoples of more complex cultures was another factor of special significance. Before contact with the Chinese and Russians, Gilyak had no incentive to amass wealth. Property merely consisted of the necessities of life. No one tried to save, and the highest ambition of the able and lucky man was to divide his share with others. Trade with the Chinese brought new material goods that could not be consumed but were highly prized, and profitable to amass. Rich men arose as fortunate possessors of wealth, and others did not enjoy but craved such possession. The rich began to be conscious of their riches and position, and began to cherish the ambition to mate among their equals. The poor, in turn, began to make the marriage of their daughters a means of acquiring valuables. Finally the rise of capitalism precipitated the growth of individual marriage. The custom for several brothers to cohabit with one wife became less and less common. Indeed, while 100 years ago Mamiya Rinzo described such arrangements as a constant occurrence, at present they are becoming steadily rarer [105].<sup>3</sup>

### THE DYNAMICS OF THE DESTRUCTIVE CONDITIONS

Of all the conditions detrimental to the phratry—emigration, extinction, war, foreign immigration, hunting expeditions, and the fading of economic equality—likely the most powerful factor was catastrophe.

What effect did this have on the surviving clans? Let us recall table 3 of our four-clan phratry. We will assume that clan A, from which clan C took its wives, became extinct. What would be the result? What course would be adopted by clan C, which used to take women from A, and by clan B, which used to give its women to clan A? It is natural that the members of these clans should first look about for substitutes within the phratry itself, for outside of it no “pure” marriage is possible. But clan C cannot take women from D, because the latter supplies women to the former, and the simple exchange of women can under no circumstances be tolerated. For the same reason clan B may not give its women to D. The only way out would be for C to take women from B, and it would be best also from a religious point of view. The orthodox marriage is, as we know, with a woman of the mother’s clan. Thus, after the disappearance of clan A, the most closely related clan on the mother’s side for C is B, for from that clan A took its women; clan A, in its turn, supplied women to C. If that were the method adopted, the four-clan phratry would have been transformed into the three-clan phratry. But that method could be applied

<sup>3</sup> [Editor’s note: For a discussion of Rinzo’s account of Gilyak life, see Bruce Grant, *In the Soviet House of Culture: A Century of Perestroikas* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press), 49–51.]



FIG. 15. Gilyak fishermen with their dogs alongside a long dugout boat used to cross the Tatar Strait, 1890s. Photo by Lev Shternberg. Source: AAN f. 282, o. 2, d. 98, l. 44.

only as a last resort because C is *tuyma akhmalk* to B and as such is strictly forbidden to take women from B.

This interdict is so powerful that, as we have seen, it holds full sway even to the present day. The four-clan phratry had to be saved. There were two possible ways of achieving this end. One way would be the artificial splitting up of one clan (in our case, clan C) into two parts—a process familiar in North America. However, no reference can be found to such a practice in either traditional epics or modern custom. Meanwhile another and more natural method was offered. The process of depopulation affected more than one phratry, and an isolated clan, the fragment of another phratry, could easily be found. Such an orphan clan would undergo many sacrifices to achieve adoption, and in this way the matter could be settled to the satisfaction of all parties concerned [106].

So far we have assumed that only one clan, A, had become extinct. However, it may have happened that a phratry lost not one clan, but two and three. This occasion would call not merely for the adoption of one clan into the phratry but for the merging of several mutually alien clans into one common phratry.

Thus it came about that the fundamental principle of marriage was seriously impaired. Men began to marry women of foreign blood. And while it is true that in the following generation things resumed their normal course again (each man could marry his mother's brother's daughter), the psychological effect of the break was irreparable. Over the course of time, marriages of isolated individuals outside of the phratry were tolerated, though not considered quite proper.

Let us now analyze what would happen if clan A were merely to decrease in numbers instead of becoming completely extinct.

As clan A takes women from B and gives them to C, it may happen that some of the men of C will remain without wives, while part of the women of B will have no individual husbands. As in the first case, the best remedy here would be to adopt into the phratry a new and also depopulated clan, E, which would join A in giving

its women to C and in taking women from B. This would result in a five-clan phratry, and individuals of one clan would take women belonging to several different clans. This latter practice would tend to undermine the very foundations of the old psychology insofar as it would foster the indifference of individuals towards the ancient norm of prescribed marriage of all clansmen with women of their mother's clan. As a result we find in modern times many members of a clan married to women of several different clans.

But what would happen if the adoption of a fifth clan should prove impracticable, and it were decided that the only possible adjustment, the *ultimum refugium*, would be for those men of clan C who remained without wives on account of the depopulation of A to take some of the women of the prohibited *tuyma akhmalk* clan B, which is nearest to them on the mother's side? Thus the members of one clan would be taking women from two clans! Still another consequence would be even more disruptive, when B is the clan from which clan A also takes its wives. Thus *akhmalk* and *imgi* ("fathers-in-law" and "sons-in-law") would find themselves married to women of one clan (B), and in every generation these individuals would be married to "sisters," and as such, according to the norms of Gilyak marriage, would be group-husbands; meanwhile, their children would be brothers and sisters (*tuvng*). In the next generations, marriage would be prohibited between one part of clan C and one part of clan A, a complexity which would inevitably lead to new combinations and the further disintegration of the old system.

The sum of unfavorable conditions led to the following: (1) marriage with women of clans other than that of the mother began to be tolerated; (2) members of one clan were married to women of different clans; and (3) the ancient four-clan phratry lost its exclusiveness, being forced sometimes to adopt entire new clans. As a consequence of the irregular marriages of some individuals with women of different clans, each one of these clans came to be included under the classificatory terminology, and thus became equated to the original clans of the phratry [107].

### PERSEVERANCE OF OLD FORMS

In the face of these adverse conditions, however, the ancient norms have not lost their strength but continue to dominate in Gilyak minds. Marriage into the *akhmalk* clan still remains in the eyes of modern Gilyak the only "pure" marriage. Irregular marriages appear rather as exceptional events which for the time being break the accustomed rule, only to be drawn back into the established run of things. This may happen in various ways. In some instances, a man may, for some reason or another, marry outside of his mother's clan. His descendants, however, will resume taking wives from the old *akhmalk* clan. In other instances, where the restitution of the old order is impossible, the clan from which a man has taken his wife becomes the legal marriageable clan for his descendants, who in each generation follow the old rule and marry the mother's brother's daughter. Sometimes the descendants will take wives from the new or the old *akhmalk* clan according to circumstances, and both types of marriage will thenceforth be sanctioned by public opinion. An individual or clan may also have more than two clans from which to choose wives. But each individ-

ual, when entering a matrimonial union, will try to comply by looking for a wife in its mother's clan, the mother's brother's daughter being the preferred party.

This amalgamation of an old institution with a new one, and the adoption of all the regulations and restrictions born of the old one, resulted in extraordinary complications for kinship terminology as well as for group marriage itself. Under the old order, where only marriages with one definite clan were entered into, the procedures of group marriage were clear and simple: In each generation all "brothers" of a clan were partners to group marriage with all "sisters" of the same generation of another clan. Thus the wives of "brothers" call each other "sisters," while the husbands of "sisters" call each other "brothers," for such they are in actuality.

With the intrusion of irregular marriages, "brother" clansmen may be married to women of a number of different clans. But the wives, although they may be complete strangers to one another, will cling to the old custom and call each other "sisters," as group-wives to their brother-husbands. Similarly, "sister" clanswomen may be married to men of different clans, and the husbands, although strangers to each other, will have group rights over these women [108].

The following is another striking example of the extension of the old norms. In the days of "pure" marriage within the phratry, as we know, a clan was not permitted to give its own women to the clan from which it itself took its women (the clan of one's father's sister), nor to the clan from which the latter clan took its wives, the two prohibited clans being those of *akhmalk* and *tuyma akhmalk*, respectively. At the present time, when separate individuals of a clan may take wives outside of their mother's clan, the term "father-in-law" (*akhmalk*) [or, more precisely, wife's father—B. G.] is extended to all clans from which a clansman, even if he be the only one, has taken a wife. A situation may thus arise, for instance, when five men from clan A entered into willful matrimony with women of five different clans such that all of these clans and their *akhmalk* would then become *akhmalk* to clan A and would thereby become prohibited to the women of clan A (admittedly, only to the third generation).<sup>4</sup> If we add the two clans already presumed *akhmalk* of the first and second generations to clan A, that makes 12 clans prohibited to the women of clan A! One can imagine the havoc this would cause. Indeed, the tendency to extend prohibitive regulations might have led to serious difficulties in the way of marriage, for each new marriage reduces the number of clans that may be married into. However, the effect of these sweeping prohibitions is counterbalanced by the tendency of the clan and its individual members not to deviate except in extreme cases from the old norms and to take wives from one definite clan, the clan of the mother. Another check on the extension of matrimonial restrictions is the rule already mentioned, according to which the restrictions apply only to those families directly involved in irregular marriages.

Still greater complexity was wrought by the extended regulations. Formerly the classificatory kinship system extended beyond the clan of an individual to two other clans, that of the father-in-law and that of the son-in-law, with the terms corresponding to actual sexual relations. If, for instance, I (being male) should call the sisters of my "fathers-in-law" "mothers," this would correspond to the actual facts.

---

<sup>4</sup> [Editor's note: Gilyak marriage rules lost their sanction after two generations.]

For the sisters of my "fathers-in-law" would be the group-wives of my "fathers," while one of them would be my own mother. Or if I (being male) should call each "father-in-law" in the *akhmalk* clan "mother's brother," and his daughter my "wife," this would correspond to the actual matrimonial relations. At present when incidental irregular marriages have caused the classificatory system to be extended to a set of clans alien to the clansmen, the terms "fathers-in-law," "mothers," "mother's brother's daughters," and so on are applied to persons who have never been related to the given clan. As the number of persons drawn into the classificatory terminology continues to increase, familiarity with such relationships, once so easily attainable, becomes a feat of considerable difficulty. In view of the great importance of such knowledge in the life of the Gilyak, its acquisition has now become a real science, into which one is initiated from childhood, and which is fully mastered only on attaining maturity. It is not astonishing that the classificatory system should strike Europeans as amazingly confused and incomprehensible.

In reality, as we have seen, the complexity and the seeming incongruity of the system is due to the intrusion of the new practice of free marriage upon an old system which still clings to its ancient norms, according to which marriage must be between blood relatives and with the mother's clan [109].

### THE PLACE OF GILYAK MARRIAGE IN THE GENERAL EVOLUTION OF MARITAL INSTITUTIONS

Since we have seen that the fundamental form of Gilyak marriage is between a sister's son and her brother's daughter, it must be regarded as a variation on the theme of cousin marriage. [We say "variation," for in the common forms of cousin marriage the children of brother and sister are permitted to marry indiscriminately. The exchange of women moreover is not only permitted but required, so that cousins marry each other's sisters—a practice strictly tabooed among the Gilyak.] [111]<sup>5</sup>

How did this type of marriage originate? This leads us to the consideration of cousin marriage as an important stage in the evolution of marriage. I shall therefore take the liberty to dwell on this point.

As far back as 1900, in a paper presented to the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (subsequently published in *The Ethnographic Review* [*Etnograficheskoe Obozrenie*] and in other articles),<sup>6</sup> I was led to the conclusion that cousin marriage

<sup>5</sup> [Editor's note: The preceding two sentences are in brackets because they appear to have been added to the AMNH English typescript only, signaled in the AMNH Russian typescript by an editor's insertion arrow. While Shternberg recognizes that Gilyaks followed a form of prescriptive matrilineal cross-cousin marriage, he theorizes an earlier stage of reciprocal "cousin marriage," sometimes known as sister-exchange, after Morgan, to explain the rise and nature of exogamy. Shternberg, *Sem'ia*, 112–114, which the AMNH English typescript abridges, is the clearest source for this discussion. It is especially appropriate in this chapter to remember that page numbers in bold, referring to Shternberg, *Sem'ia*, indicate locations for what is often only similar, rather than exact, material.]

<sup>6</sup> [Editor's note: Previous versions of the text include no citations for the report to the Russian Geographical Society or the article "Theories of Clan Life." Shternberg's article "Endogamiia i Eksogamiia" was published in 1904 in the ESBE. The AMNH English typescript directs the reader to the three 1904 installments of Shternberg, "Giliaki."]

constitutes the original form of exogamy and lies at the root of the classificatory kin system of group marriage and the clan itself. I pointed out that clan exogamy is not merely a restrictive institution, but one that regulates sexual relations, the main function of which is to assure to every clan a constant supply of wives, the latter being related to the clan by ties of consanguinity—a factor which is of vast importance in the different stages of society.

In recent works (such as those of Rivers, Crawley, Frazer) as well as in the work of their predecessors in the field of Australian and Dravidian marriage (Fison and Howitt, Spencer and Gillen, Kohler, and others), one finds ample demonstration of the wide distribution of that form of marriage at the present time.<sup>7</sup> The Australian marriage system demonstrates conclusively that cousin marriage presented the first conscious attempt to restrict marriage between brothers and sisters, and that the entire subsequent evolution of marriage constitutes a set of progressive limitations on the marriage of first-cousins [112].<sup>8</sup>

One cardinal issue for us still goes unexplained. I refer to the question as to why cousin marriage requires unions between the children of brother and sister (cross-cousins) while prohibiting marriages between the children of two brothers or of two sisters (parallel-cousins), although the blood relationship here is just as close in the former. W. H. R. Rivers, for example, refuses even to look for an explanation of this remarkable fact. He writes,

Cousin marriage bears every evidence of being a survival. It is very difficult to see how such a regulation could have had any direct psychological foundation, to conceive any motive which should make the marriage of the children of brother and sister desirable, while the marriage of the children of two brothers or of two sisters is so strictly forbidden.<sup>9</sup>

Others have attempted to explain this phenomenon, but their explanations often have been purely mechanical. Kohler, for instance, sees the source of the custom in "the dual organization of society." This is a strange explanation indeed, for the dual organization is itself a consequence of cousin marriage as "an automatic result of the fact that the name of the family is inherited . . . The children of the brother and sister may marry because by their names they belong to opposite phratries."<sup>10</sup> Frazer

<sup>7</sup> A realization of this fact led Crawley to remark that "cousin marriage generally is the most favorite connection among early peoples." Cf. Crawley, "Exogamy," 57.

<sup>8</sup> The best analysis of the Australian marriage in that sense is given by James Frazer in his monumental work *Totemism and Exogamy* (London: Macmillan, 1910), vol. 4. [Editor's note: This note is found only in the AMNH English typescript. Shternberg, *Sem'ia*, contains a later, laconic reference to Frazer, without such praise.]

<sup>9</sup> W. H. R. Rivers, "Marriage of Cousins in India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (July 1907), 623.

<sup>10</sup> Kohler, *Zur Urgeschichte der Ehe*, 121. [Editor's note: Although the page numbers do not correspond to Shternberg's entry, an early German edition of Kohler's work was printed in serial form as "Zur Urgeschichte der Ehe: Totemismus, Gruppenehe, Mutterrecht," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft* 12 (1897): 187–353. For an excellent English edition see 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, 1975).]



also arrives at the same conclusion. "The reason," he writes, "why both these first-cousins (that is, the children of two brothers or of two sisters) are prohibited from marrying is that they belong to the same exogamous clan, and are therefore barred by the fundamental law which forbids a man to marry a woman of his own exogamous clan."<sup>11</sup> The fundamental error of all these writers is that they confuse effect with cause. They regard so-called "cross-cousin marriage" as the result of the division of a group into two exogamous classes, without so much as asking themselves why this came about.

In fact, the division into two exogamous classes was the result of the new institution of marriage between the children of brother and sister which replaced the ancient endogamous consanguineous marriage. Until then the group of descendants of a single clan ancestress was indivisible; marriages took place within the group, usually between brothers and sisters. Only when these marriages had been recognized as harmful, and marriage between the children of brother and sister had become the rule, was the originally integral group divided into two exogamous halves. One half was made up of the brothers, with their wives and children; the other, of the sisters, with their husbands and children. Thus the dual division is seen to be a consequence of cross-cousin marriage. In exploring this, we must look to the well-known conservatism of primitive man, especially with reference to an institution like marriage which is so intimately governed by religious ideas and prohibitions. The main tendency is to preserve *quand même* as much as possible of the old forms, even though the essence of the institution is no longer there. Only under its old exterior can a new institution be introduced.

Keeping in mind this fundamental conservatism, let us consider the conditions under which the great transformation in the history of marriage took place. During the period which preceded cousin marriage, the favored orthodox form of marriage was between brother and sister, with marriage between blood relatives of different generations prohibited. The matrimonial formula then was that marriages were to be concluded between the children of brother and sister, while the latter themselves were husband and wife, and parents of the young couple. When it became necessary to prohibit blood marriage in the first degree (between blood brothers and sisters) and to pass to marriages in the second degree (that is, to first-cousins), the issue for the conservative mind was that these cousins should be, as before, children of brother and sister (although the latter were no longer husband and wife), but not children of brothers, or children of sisters. In preserving the old form (a fact always of paramount importance in the eyes of primitive man), the substance of the change becomes disguised from the deity—a common and pious way of deceiving the supernatural powers [113].

---

<sup>11</sup> Frazer in Crawley, "Exogamy," 57. [Editor's note: The closest reference in Crawley's article reads, "Families of the one great family cannot intermarry because they belong to that family, and they marry into the other great family because it is 'the other side.'" However, the line, from p. 55, is not from Frazer, who does not appear in the article. The AMNH Russian typescript and Shternberg, *Giliaki*, contain no reference for this line, found in the AMNH English typescript. Shternberg, *Sem'ia*, 112, note 5, refers to Frazer, *Totemism and Exogamy* (London, 1910).]

Still, we ask: If cousin marriage is to be regarded as the first stage of exogamy, as the first restrictive movement against marriages between near blood relatives, how shall we explain its strict—nay, almost categorical—character? It seems that with the realization of the harmfulness of marriage between blood relatives and the benefits of exogamy, the most reasonable attitude to have adopted would have been to favor marriages between persons of the remotest degree of relationship. Marriages between cousins should have been tolerated, at least in early stages, as a necessary evil, *malum necessarium*, to be eliminated later as an antisocial institution. Nonetheless, among primitive peoples everywhere the reverse is the case: Cousin marriage of a certain degree is either obligatory or at least more favored than unions between more remote kin or even absolute strangers.

The best example of this strange fact is furnished by the evolution of marriage in Australia. To judge from the class organization and from statements made by natives themselves, these peoples are fully aware of the harmfulness of marriage between near blood relatives, and they have therefore exercised extraordinary inventiveness in their efforts to reduce it. So complicated an organization as the eight-class system of the Arunta [Aranda] was especially invented to prevent marriages of first-cousins. In the presence of such a system, one would think that only marriages between the most remote relatives would be favored, while marriages between second-cousins would be barely tolerated. As a matter of fact, however, even "third-cousins are too remote; beyond this relationship, marriage is forbidden."<sup>12</sup> Thus marriage between cousins, excluding only those of the first degree, is not only permitted, but prescribed; and the Australians are no exception. The Dravidian natives of India, so numerous and so far advanced in culture in comparison with the Australians, are no exception [113–114].<sup>13</sup>

If cousin marriage were but the first step in the limitation of unions between near blood relatives, the first stage of exogamy, then it must have given way long ago. If it persisted so obstinately, as for example among Dravidians, there must have been other essential reasons than the mere prevention of inbreeding. To my mind the strength of cousin marriage is based on two important psychological factors. The first factor is the natural tendency of every kin group, and particularly of every mother, to supply descendants with wives. In the early stages of human development, the struggle between the sexes must have played as important a part as it did in the rest of the animal kingdom. Thus one of the most vital problems of human society was to diminish this struggle by means of various regulations. The institution of marriage—prescribed marriage between individuals belonging to definite groups—was just such a sexual regulation that satisfied this essential need.

Before the establishment of exogamy, this need could be satisfied by the practice of marriages between brothers and sisters. With the establishment of exogamy, cross-cousin marriage could solve the problem most successfully. From birth on, the sons of a woman are the husbands of her brother's daughters, while the latter's sons

---

<sup>12</sup> Crawley, "Exogamy," 61.

<sup>13</sup> [Editor's note: The additional reference to Dravidians is found in the AMNH Russian and English typescripts only.]

are her daughter's husbands. This combination is equally satisfactory to the father of the family, for his children marry the children of his sister [114].

The other psychological factor favoring cousin marriage is of a religious nature. In such marriages the family hearth, with its ancestral gods, unites persons not alien to each other, but of common descent through both father and mother. Thus husband and wife may equally count on the favors of their common ancestral gods—a consideration of vital importance to primitive man, to whom the securing of divine goodwill through the performance of religious rituals figures among life's most urgent deeds, the most important means in the struggle for survival. This explains why that form of marriage came to be not merely favored, but religiously enforced, as among many Dravidian peoples of India with whom marriage is quite compulsory whenever a brother has a daughter, and his sister a son. Thus with these two factors—the natural tendency to regulate sexual relations by giving the right to marriage to every member of the related group, and the assurance to partners in marriage of the help of powerful ancestral gods—we find essential reasons for the persistence of cousin marriage.

With these remarks established, we may now turn to the history of the evolution of cousin marriage itself.