THE JOURNAL

OF THE

ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

OF

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

FEBRUARY 14TH, 1871.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., *President, in the Chair.*

MR. HODDER M. WESTROPP exhibited a worked-flint of triradiate form, said to have been found many years ago on Ashey Down, in the Isle of Wight.

The PRESIDENT, having made some remarks respecting the formation of the Institute, vacated the chair in favour of Professor Huxley, V.P., and read the following paper:—

I.—*On the* DEVELOPMENT *of* RELATIONSHIPS. By Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., Pres. Anth. Inst.

MR. MORGAN, whose remarkable memoir, entitled "A Conjectural Solution of the Origin of the Classificatory System of Relationship",* is doubtless well known to many gentlemen present, has now published, by the assistance of the Smithsonian Institution, his promised work on the same subject.† Those who have read his preliminary memoir will naturally have waited for the full development of his views, as well as of the facts on which they are based, with much interest; and they will not be disappointed, for Mr. Morgan's work is certainly one of the most valuable contributions to ethnological science which has appeared for many years.

It contains schedules, most of which are very complete, giving the systems of relationships of no less than 139 races or tribes; and we have, therefore (though there are still many lamentable deficiencies—the Siberians, South Americans, and true Negroes, being, for instance, as yet unrepresented), a great body of evidence

* "Proc. Am. Ac. of Arts and Sciences", vol. vii, Feb. 1868.

† "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family". By L. H. Morgan. 1870.

illustrating the ideas on the subject of relationships which prevail among different races of men.

Our own system of relationships naturally follows from the marriage of single pairs; and it is, in its general nomenclature, so mere a description of the actual facts, that most persons tacitly regard it as necessarily general to the human race, with, of course, verbal and unimportant differences in detail. Hence but little information can be extracted from dictionaries and vocabularies. They generally, for instance, give words for uncle, aunt, and cousin; but an uncle may be either a father's brother or a mother's brother, and an aunt may be either a father's sister or a mother's sister; a first cousin, again, may be the child of any one of these four uncles and aunts; but practically, as we shall see, these cases are in many races distinguished from one another; and I may add, in passing, it is by no means clear that we are right in regarding them as identical and equivalent. Travellers have, on various occasions, noticed with surprise some special peculiarity of nomenclature which came under their notice; but Mr. Morgan was the first to perceive the importance of the subject, and to collect complete schedules of relationships. The special points which have been observed have, indeed, been generally regarded as mere eccentricities, but this is evidently not the case, because the principle or principles to which they are due are consistently carried out, and the nomenclature is reciprocal generally, though not quite without exceptions.[1] Thus, if the Mohawks call a father's brother, not an uncle, but a father, they not only call his son a brother and his grandson a son, but these descendants also use the correlative terms.

We must remember that our ideas of relationships are founded on our social system, and that, as other races have very different habits and ideas on this subject, it is natural to expect that their systems of relationship would also differ from ours. I have elsewhere* pointed out, that the ideas and customs with reference to marriage are very dissimilar in different races, and we may say, as a general rule, that, as we descend in the scale of civilisation, the family diminishes, and the tribe increases, in importance. Words have a profound influence over thought, and true family-names prevail principally among the highest races of men. Even in the less advanced portions of our own country, we know that collective names were those of the tribe, rather than the family.

Even among the Romans the "family" was not a natural family in our sense of the term. It was founded,† not on mar-

* "On the Origin of Civilisation, and Primitive Condition of Man" Longmans, 1870.

† See Ortolan's Justinian, p. 126 *et seq.*

riage, but on power. The family of a chief consisted, not of those allied to him by blood, but of those over whom he exercised control. Hence, an emancipated son ceased to be one of the family, and did not, except by will, take any share in his father's property; on the other hand, the wife introduced into the family by marriage, or the stranger converted into a son by adoption, became regularly recognised members of the family, though no blood tie existed.

Marriage, again, in Rome, was symbolised by capture or purchase, as among so many of the lower races at the present day. In fact, the idea of marriage among the lower races of men generally is essentially of a different character from ours; it is material, not spiritual; it is founded on force, not on love; the wife is, not united, but enslaved, to her husband. Of such a system, traces, and more than traces, still exist in English law: our customs, indeed, are more advanced, and wives enjoy a very different status in reality to that which they occupy in law. Among the Redskins, however, the wife is a mere servant to her husband, and there are cases on record, in which husband and wife, belonging originally to different tribes, have lived together for years without either caring to acquire the other's language, satisfied to communicate with one another entirely by signs.

It must, however, be observed that, though the Redskin family is constituted in a manner very unlike ours, still the nomenclature of relationships is founded upon it, such as it is, and has no relation to the tribal system, as will presently be shown.

Mr. Morgan divides the systems of relationship into two great classes, the descriptive and the classificatory. The first, he says (p. 12), "which is that of the Aryan, Semitic, and Uralian families, rejecting the classification of kindred, except so far as it is in accordance with the numerical system, describes collateral consanguinei, for the most part, by an augmentation or combination of the primary terms of relationship. These terms, which are those for husband and wife, father and mother, brother and sister, and son and daughter, to which must be added, in such languages as possess them, grandfather and grandmother, and grandson and granddaughter, are thus restricted to the primary sense in which they are here employed. All other terms are secondary. Each relationship is thus made independent and distinct from every other. But the second, which is that of the Turanian, American Indian, and Malayan families, rejecting descriptive phrases in every instance, and reducing consanguinei to great classes by a series of apparently arbitrary generalisations, applies the same terms to all the members of the same class. It thus confounds relationships, which, under the descriptive system, are distinct, and enlarges

the signification both of the primary and secondary terms beyond their seemingly appropriate sense."

While, however, I fully admit the radical difference between, say, our English system and that of the Kingsmill Islanders, as shown in Table I* (opposite p. 27), they seem to me to be rather the extremes of a series, than to be founded on different ideals.

Mr. Morgan admits that systems of relationships have undergone a gradual development, following that of the social condition; but he also attributes to them great value in the determination of ethnological affinities. I am not sure that I exactly understand his views as to the precise bearing of these two conclusions in relation to one another; and I have elsewhere given my reasons for dissenting from his interpretation of the facts in reference to social relations. I shall, therefore, now confine myself to the question of the bearing of systems of relationships on questions of ethnological affinity, and to a consideration of the manner in which the various systems have arisen. As might naturally have been expected, Mr. Morgan's information is most full and complete with reference to the North American Indians. Of these, he gives the terms for no less than 268 relationships in about seventy different tribes. Of these relationships, some are for our present purposes much more important than others. The most significant are the following:

1. Brother's son and daughter.
2. Sister's son and daughter.
3. Mother's brother.
4. Mother's brother's son.
5. Father's sister.
6. Father's sister's son.
7. Father's brother.
8. Father's brother's son.
9. Mother's sister.
10. Mother's sister's son.
11. Grandfather's brother.
12. Brothers' and sisters' grandchildren.

Now let me call your attention to the Wyandot system as shown in Column 8 of Table I. It will be observed that a mother's brother is called an uncle; his son a cousin; his grandson a son when a male is speaking, a nephew when a female is speaking; his great-grandson a grandson. A father's sister is termed an aunt; her son a cousin; her grandson a son; her great-grandson a grandson. A father's brother is a father; his son a brother, distinguished, however, by different terms, ac-

* I have constructed this table from Mr. Morgan's schedules, selecting the relationships which are the most significant, and arranging them in a manner which seems to me more instructive than that adopted by Mr. Morgan.

cording as he is older or younger than the speaker; his grandson a son; his great-grandson a grandson. A mother's sister is a mother; her son is a brother, distinguished as before; her grandson a son when a male is speaking, a nephew when a female is speaking. A grandfather's brother is a grandfather; and a grandfather's sister is a grandmother. A brother's son is a son when a male is speaking, but a nephew when a female is speaking; while a sister's son is a nephew when a male is speaking, but a son when a female is speaking. Lastly, brothers' grandchildren, and sisters' grandchildren, are called grandchildren.

This system, at first, strikes one as illogical and inconsistent. How can a person have more than one mother? How can a brother's son be a son, or an uncle's great-grandson a grandson? Again, while classing together several relationships which we justly separate, it distinguishes between elder and younger brothers and sisters; and, in several cases, the relationship depends on the sex of the speaker. Since, however, a similar system prevails over a very wide area, it cannot be dismissed as a mere arbitrary or accidental arrangement. The system is, moreover, far from being merely theoretical, but is in every-day use. Every member of the tribe knows his exact relationship to every other, and this knowledge is kept up by the habit, general among the American tribes, and occurring also elsewhere, as, for instance, among the Esquimaux, the Tamils, Telugus, Chinese, Japanese, Feejeeans, &c., of addressing a person, not by his name, but by his relationship. Among the Telugus and Tamils an elder may address a younger by name, but a younger must always use the term for relationship in speaking to an elder. This custom is, probably, connected with the curious superstitions about names; but, however it may have arisen, the result is that an Indian addresses his neighbour as "my father," "my son," or "my brother," as the case may be: if not related, he says, "my friend."

Thus the system is kept up by daily use; nor is it a mere mode of expression. Although, in many respects, opposed to the existing customs and ideas, it is, in some, entirely consonant with them: thus, among many of the Redskin tribes, if a man marries the eldest girl in a family, he can claim in marriage all the others as they successively come to maturity; this custom exists among the Shyennes, Omahas, Iowas, Kaws, Osages, Blackfeet, Crees, Minnitarees, Crows, and other tribes. I have already mentioned that among the Redskins, generally, the mother's brother exercises a more than paternal authority over his sister's children. I shall have occasion to refer again to this remarkable exaggeration of avuncular authority.

Mr. Morgan was much surprised to find that a system, more or less like that of the Wyandots, was very general among the Red-

skins of North America; but he was still more astonished to find that the Tamil races of India have one almost identical. A comparison of Columns 8 and 9 in Table I, will show that this is the case, and the similarity is even more striking in Mr. Morgan's tables, where a larger number of relationships is given.

How then did this system arise? How is it to be accounted for? It is by no means consonant, in all respects, to the present social conditions of the races in question; nor does it agree with tribal affinities. The American Indians generally follow the custom of exogamy, as it has been called by Mr. Maclennan, that is to say, no one is permitted to marry within the clan; and, as descent goes in the female line, a man's brother's son, though called his son, belongs to a different clan; while his sister's son does belong to the clan, though he is regarded as a nephew, and consequently as less closely connected. Hence, a man's nephew belongs to his clan, but his son belongs to a different clan.

Mr. Morgan, from several passages, appears to regard the system as arbitrary, artificial, and intentional.* He discusses, at some length, the conclusions to be drawn from its wide extension over the American continent, and its presence also in India. "The several hypotheses," he says, "of accidental concurrent invention, of borrowing from each other, and of spontaneous growth, are entirely inadequate."† With reference to the hypothesis of independent development in disconnected areas, he observes that it possesses "both plausibility and force." It has, therefore, he adds, (p. 501),'" been made a subject of not less careful study and reflection than the system itself. Not until after a patient analysis and comparison of its several forms upon the extended scale in which they are given in the tables, and not until after a careful consideration of the functions of the system, as a domestic institution, and of the evidence of its mode of propagation from age to age, did these doubts finally give way, and the insufficiency of this hypothesis to account for the origin of the system many times over, or even a second time, became fully apparent."

And again, "if the two families (*i. e.*, the Redskin and the Tamil) commenced on separate continents in a state of promiscuous intercourse, having such a system of consanguinity as this state would beget, of the character of which no conception can be formed, it would be little less than a miracle if both should develope the same system of relationship."‡ He concludes, then, that it must be due to "transmission with the blood from a common original source.

* See pp. 157, 392, 394, 421, 456, etc.

† Loc. cit., p. 495.

‡ Loc. cit., p. 505.

If the four hypotheses named cover and exhaust the subject, and the first three are incapable of explaining the present existence of the system in the two families, then the fourth and last, if capable of accounting for its transmission, becomes transformed into an established conclusion."*

That there is any near alliance between the Redskin and Tamil races would be an ethnological conclusion of great importance. It does not, however, seem to me to be borne out by the evidence. The Feejeean system, with which the Tongan is almost identical, is very instructive in this respect, and scarcely seems to have received from Mr. Morgan the consideration which it merits. Now, Columns 9, 10, and 11, of Table I, show that the Feejeean and Tongan systems are identical with the Tamil. If, then, this similarity is, in the case of the Tamil, proof of close ethnological affinity between that race and the Redskin, it must equally be so in reference to the Feejeeans and the Tongans. It is, however, well known that these races belong to very distinct divisions of mankind, and any facts which prove similarity between these races, however interesting and important they may be as proofs of identity in human character, and history, can obviously have no bearing on special ethnological affinities. Moreover, it seems clear, as I shall attempt presently to show, that the Tongans have not used their present system ever since their ancestors first landed on the Pacific islands, but that it has subsequently developed itself from a far ruder system, which is still in existence in many of the surrounding islands.

I may also observe that the Two-Mountain Iroquois, whose close ethnological affinity with the Wyandots no one will question, actually agree, as shown by Columns 3 and 4 of Table I, more nearly with this ruder Pacific, or, as Morgan calls it, "Malayan" system, than they do with that of the neighbouring American tribes.

For these and other reasons I think it is impossible to adopt Mr. Morgan's views either on the causes which have led to the existence of the Tamil system, or as to the ethnological conclusions which follow from it.

How, then, have these systems arisen, and how can we account for such remarkable similarities between races so distinct, and so distant, as the Wyandots, Tamils, Feejeeans, and Tongans? In illustration of my views on this subject, I have constructed the following Table (Table I), to which I will shortly direct your attention. Before doing so, however, I must make a few preliminary remarks. In all cases I have given the translation of the native words, and, following Morgan, when one word is used

* Loc. cit., p. 505. See also p. 497.

for several relationships, have translated it by the simplest. Thus in Feejeean, the word "*Tamanngu*,"—literally "Tama my," the suffix "*nngu*" meaning "my"—is applied not only to a father, but to a father's brother; hence, as the father is the more important, we say that they call a father's brother a father.

In most cases the origins of the terms for relationships are undeterminable; I have discussed some in my work on the "Origin of Civilisation;" other terms, as given by Mr. Morgan, have so far withstood the wear and tear of daily use as to be still traceable.

Thus, in Polish, the word for my great-uncle is, literally, "my cold grandfather:" the word for "wife" among the Crees is "part of myself;" that for husband among the Choctas is "he who leads me;" a daughter-in-law among the Delawares is called *Nah-hum*, literally, "my cook;" for which ungracious expression, however, they make amends by their word for husband or wife, *Wee-chaa-oke*, which is, literally, "my aid through life."

It might, *à priori*, be supposed that the nomenclature of relationships would be greatly affected by the question of male or female descent. This, however, does not appear to be the case. Under a system of female descent, combined with exogamy, as a man must marry out of his tribe, and as his children belong to their mother's tribe, it follows that a man's children do not belong to his tribe. On the other hand, a woman's children, whomsoever she may marry, belong to her tribe. Hence, while neither a man's nor his brother's children belong to the same tribe as himself, his sister's children must do so, and are, in consequence, often regarded as his heirs. In fact, for all practical purposes, among many of the Redskin and other tribes, a man's sister's sons are regarded as his children.

Elsewhere* I have shown that this remarkable custom prevails, not only among the Redskins, but also in various other parts of the world. Here, however, I will confine myself to the Redskins, amongst whom it may almost be laid down as a general proposition, that the mother's brother exercises a more than paternal authority over his sister's children. He has a recognised right to any property they may acquire, if he chooses to exercise it; he can give orders which a true father would not venture to issue; he arranges the marriages of his nieces, and is entitled to share in the price paid for them. The same custom prevails even among the semi-civilised races; for instance, among the Choctas the uncle, not the father, sends a boy to school.

* "Origin of Civilisation, and Primitive Condition of Man." Longmans, 1870. Pp. 106, 120.

Yet among these very tribes, a man's sister's son is called his nephew, while his brother's son is called his son.

Thus, although a man's mother's brother is called an uncle, he has, in reality, more power and responsibility than the true father. The true father is classed with the father's brother, and the mother's sister; but the mother's brother stands by himself, and, although he is called an uncle, he exercises the real parental power, and on him rests the parental responsibility. In fact, while the names of relationships follow the marriage customs, the ideas are guided by the tribal organisation. Hence we see that not only do the ideas of the several relationships, among the lower races of men, differ from ours; but the idea of relationship, as a whole, is, so to say, embryonic, and subsidiary to that of the tribe.

In fact, the idea of relationship, like that of marriage, was founded, not on duty, but on power. Only with the gradual elevation of the species has the latter been subordinated to the former.

I will now beg your attention to Table I (opposite p. 27), and begin with the Hawaiian, or Sandwich Isle system.

The Hawaiian language is rich in terms for relationships. A grandparent is *Kupuna,* a parent is *Makua,* a child *Kaikee,* a son-in-law, or daughter-in-law, is *Hunona,* a grand-child *Moopuna,* brothers in the plural are *Hoahanau;* a brother-in-law, or sister-in-law, is addressed as *Kaikoeke:* there are special words for brother and sister according to age and sex; thus, a boy speaking of an elder brother, and a girl speaking of an elder sister, use the term *Kai-kuaana;* a boy speaking of a younger brother, or a girl of a younger sister, uses the word *Kaikaina;* a boy speaking of a sister calls her *Kaikuwahine,* while a sister calls a brother, whether older or younger, *Kai-kunana.* They also recognise some relationships for which we have no special terms; thus, an adopted son is *Hunai;* the parents of a son-in-law, or daughter-in-law, are *Puliena;* a man addresses his brother-in-law, and a woman her sister-in law, as *Punaloa;* lastly, the word *Kolai* has no corresponding term in English.

It will be observed that these relationships are conceived in a manner entirely unlike ours; we make no difference between an elder brother or a younger brother, nor does the term used depend on the sex of the speaker. The contrast between the two systems is, however, much more striking when we come to consider the deficiencies of the Hawaiian system, as indicated in the nomenclature. Thus, there is no word for cousin, none for uncle or aunt, nephew or niece, son or daughter; nay, while there is a word indicating parent, there is said to be none for father or even for mother.

The principal features of this remarkable system, so elaborate, yet so rude, are indicated in the second Column of Table I. I have already mentioned that there is no word for father or mother; for the latter they say "parent female," for the former, "parent male;" but the term "parent male" is not confined to the true parent, but is applied equally to the father's brother, and mother's brother; while the term "parent female" denotes also father's sister and mother's sister. Thus, uncleships and auntships are ignored, and a child may have several fathers and several mothers. In the succeeding generation, as a man calls his brother's and sister's children his children, so do they regard him as their father: again, as a mother's brother and a father's brother are termed parents male, a mother's sister and father's sister, parents female; their sons are regarded as brothers, and their daughters as sisters. Again, a man calls the children of these constructive brothers and sisters, equally with those of true brothers and sisters, his children; and their children, again, his grandchildren.

The term "parent male", then, denotes not only a man's father,
but also his father's brother
and mother's brother,
while the term "parent female" in the same way denotes
not only a man's mother,
but also his mother's sister and
father's sister.

There are, in fact, six classes of parents; three on the male side, and three on the female.

The term, my elder brother, stands also for my
Mother's brother's son,
Mother's sister's son,
Father's brother's son,
Father's sister's son,
while their children, again, are all my grandchildren. Here there is a succession of generations, but no family. We find here no true fathers and mothers, uncles or aunts, nephews or nieces, but only
Grandparents,
Parents,
Brothers and sisters,
Children, and
Grandchildren.

This nomenclature is actually in use, and, so far from having become obsolete, being in Feejee combined with inheritance through females, and the custom of immediate inheritance, gives a nephew the right to take his mother's brother's property: a right which is frequently exercised, and never questioned, although

apparently moderated by custom. It will very likely be said that though the word "son", for instance, is used to include many who are really not sons, it by no means follows that a man should regard himself as equally related to all his so-called "sons." And this is true, but not in the manner which might have been *à priori* expected. For, as many among the lower races of men have the system of inheritance through females, it follows that they consider their sister's children to be in reality more nearly related to them, not only than their brother's children, but even than their very own children. Hence we see that these terms, son, father, mother, etc., which to us imply relationship, have not strictly, in all cases, this significance, but rather imply the relative position in the tribe.

Additional evidence of this is afforded by the restrictions on marriage which follow the tribe, and not the terms. Thus the customs of a tribe may, and constantly do, forbid marriage with one set of constructive sisters or brothers, but not with another.

The system shewn in column 2 is not apparently confined to the Sandwich Islands, but occurs also in other islands of the Pacific. Thus, the Kingsmill system, as shown in column 3, is essentially similar, though they have made one step in advance, having devised words for father and mother. Still, however, the same term is applied to father's brother, and a mother's brother as to a father; and to a father's sister and a mother's sister as to a mother: consequently, first cousins are still called brothers and sisters, and their children and grandchildren are children and grandchildren.

The habits of the Southsea Islanders, the entire absence of privacy in their houses, their objection to sociable meals, and other points in their mode of life, have probably favoured the survival of this very rude system, which is by no means in accordance with their present social and family relations, but indicates a time when these were less developed than at present. We know as yet no other part of the world where the nomenclature of relationships is so savage.

Yet a near approach is made by the system of the Two-Mountain Iroquois, which is, perhaps, the lowest yet observed in America. In this tribe a brother's children are still regarded as sons, and a woman calls her sister's children her sons; a man, however, does not regard his sister's children as his children, but distinguishes them by a special term; they become his nephews. This distinction between relationships, which we regard as identical, has its basis in, and is in accordance with American marriage customs. Unfortunately, I have no means of ascertaining whether these rules occur among the tribe in question, but they are so general among the Indians of North America that in all probability it is the case. One of these customs is that if a

man marries a girl who has younger sisters, he thereby acquires a right to those younger sisters as they successively arrive at maturity.* This right is widely recognised, and frequently acted upon. The first wife makes no objection, for the work which fell heavily on her, is divided with another, and it is easy to see that, when polygamy prevails, it would be uncomplimentary to refuse a wife who legally belonged to you. Hence a woman regards her sister's sons as her sons; they may be, in fact, the sons of her husband: any other hypothesis is uncomplimentary to the sister. Throughout the North American races, therefore, we shall find that a woman calls her sister's children her children; in no case does she term them nephews or nieces, though in some few tribes she distinguishes them from her own children by calling them stepchildren.

Another very general rule in America, as elsewhere, is that no one may marry within his own clan or family. It has been shown in Maclennan's *Primitive Marriage*, and in the *Origin of Civilisation*, that this rule is general in North America, and widely prevalent elsewhere. The result is, that as a woman and her brother belong to one family, her husband must be chosen from another. Hence while a man's father's brother and sister belong to his clan, and his mother's sister, being one of his father's wives, is a member of the family —one of the fire-circle, if I may so say—the mother's brother is necessarily neither a member of the fire-circle, nor even of the clan. Hence while a father's sister and mother's sister are called mother, and a father's brother father, throughout the Redskin tribes the marriage rules exclude the mother's brother, who is accordingly distinguished by a special term, and in fact is recognised as uncle. Thus we can understand how it is that of the six classes of parents mentioned above, the mother's brother is the first to be distinguished from the rest by a special name. It will however be seen by the table that among the Two-Mountain Iroquois his son is called brother, his grandson son, and so on. This shows that he also was once called "father" as in Polynesia, for in no other manner can such a system of nomenclature be accounted for. All the other relationships, as given in the table, are, it will be seen, identical with those recognised in the Hawaiian and Kingsmill system. Thus only in two respects, and two, moreover, which can be satisfactorily explained by their marriage regulations, do the Two-Mountain Iroquois differ from the Pacific system. It is true that these two points of difference involve some others not shown in the table. Thus while a woman's father's sister's daughter's son is her son, a man's father's sister's daughter's son is his nephew,

* See "Arch. Amer.", vol. ii, p. 109.

because his father's sister's daughter is his sister, and his sister's son, as already explained, is his nephew. It should also be added that the Two-Mountain Iroquois show an advance as compared with the Hawaiian system in the terms relating to relationships by marriage.

The Micmac system, as shown in column 5, is in three points an advance on that of the Two-Mountain Iroquois. Not only does a man call his sister's son his nephew, but a woman applies the same term to her brother's son. Thus, men term their brother's sons "sons", and their sister's sons "nephews"; while women, on the contrary, call their brother's sons "nephews", and their sister's sons "sons"; obviously because there was a time when, though brothers and sisters could not marry, brothers might have their wives in common, while sisters, as we know, habitually married the same man. It is remarkable also that a father's brother and a mother's sister are also distinguished from the true father and mother. In this respect the Micmac system is superior to that prevailing in most other Redskin races. For the same reason, not only is a mother's brother termed an uncle, but the father's sister is no longer called a mother, but is distinguished by a special term, and thus becomes an aunt. The social habits of the Redskins, which have already been briefly alluded to, sufficiently explain why the father's sister is thus distinguished, while the father's brother and mother's sister are still called respectively father and mother. Moreover, as we found among the Two-Mountain Iroquois that although the mother's brother is recognised as an uncle, his son is still called brother, thus pointing back to a time when the father's brother was still called father; so here we see that though the father's sister is called aunt, her son is still regarded as a brother; indicating the existence of a time when, among the Micmacs, as among the Two-Mountain Iroquois, a father's sister was termed a mother. It follows as a consequence that, as a father's brother's son, a mother's brother's son, a father's sister's son, and a mother's sister's son, are considered to be brothers, their children are termed sons by the males; but as a woman calls her brother's son a nephew, so she applies the same term to these constructive brother's sons.

If the system of relationship is subject to gradual growth, and approaches step by step towards perfection, we should naturally expect that, from differences of habits and customs, the various steps would not among all races follow one another in precisely the same order. Of this the Micmacs and Wyandots afford us an illustration. While the latter have on the whole made most progress, the former are in advance on one point, for though the Micmacs have distinguished a father's brother

from a father, he is among the Wyandots still termed a father; on the other hand, the Wyandots call a mother's brother's son a cousin, while among the Micmacs he is still termed a brother.

Here we may conveniently consider two Asiatic nations—the Burmese and the Japanese—which, though on the whole considerably more advanced in civilisation than any of the foregoing races, are yet singularly backward in their systems of family nomenclature. I will commence with the Burmese. A mother's brother is called either father (great or little) or uncle: his son is regarded as a brother; his grandson as a nephew; his great-grandson as a grandson. A father's sister is an aunt; but her son is a brother, her grandson is a son, and her great-grandson a grandson. A father's brother is still a father (great or little); his son is a brother; his grandson a nephew; and his great-grandson a grandson. A mother's sister is a mother (great or little); her son is a brother; her grandson a nephew; and her great-grandson a grandson. Grandfathers' brothers and sisters are grandfathers and grandmothers. Brothers' and sisters' sons and daughters are recognised as nephews and nieces, whether the speaker is a male or female; but their children again are still classed as grandchildren.

Among the Japanese a mother's brother is called a "second little father"; a father's sister a "little mother" or "aunt"; a father's brother a "little father" or "uncle"; and a mother's sister a "little mother" or "aunt." The other relationships shown in the table are the same as among the Burmese.

The Wyandots, descendants of the ancient Hurons, are illustrated in the eighth column. Their system is somewhat more advanced than that of the Micmacs. While, among the latter, a mother's brother's son, and a father's sister's son, are called brothers, among the Wyandots they are recognised as cousins. The children of these cousins, however, are still called sons by males, thus reminding us that there was a time when these cousins were still regarded as brothers. A second mark of progress is, that women regard their mother's brother's grandsons as nephews, and not as sons, though the great-grandsons of uncles and aunts are still, in all cases, termed grandsons.

I crave particular attention to this system, which may be regarded as the typical system of the Redskins, although, as we have seen, some tribes have a ruder nomenclature, and we shall presently allude to others which are rather more advanced. A mother's brother is termed uncle; his son is a cousin; his grandson is termed nephew, when a woman is speaking, son in the case of a male. In either case his grandson is termed grandson. A father's sister is an aunt, and her son a cousin; but her grandson and great-grandson are termed, respectively, son and grandson,

thus reminding us that there was a time when a father's sister was regarded as a mother. A father's brother is called father, his son brother, his grandson son, and his great-grandson grandson.

A mother's sister is a mother, her son is a brother, her grandson is called nephew by a female, son by a male; her great-grandson is, in either case, called grandson. A grandfather's brother and sister are called grandfather and grandmother respectively.

A brother's son is called son by a male, and nephew by a female, while a sister's son is called nephew by a male, and son by a female, the reasons for which have been already explained.

Lastly, brothers' son's sons and daughters, sisters' son's sons and daughters, are all called grandsons and granddaughters. Thus we see that in every case the third generation returns to the direct line.

The two following columns represent the Tamil and Feejeean system, with which, also, that of the Friendly Islands very closely agrees. I have already called attention to this, and given my reasons for being unable to adopt the explanation suggested by Mr. Morgan.

It will be observed that the only differences shown in the table between the system of these races and that of the Wyandots, are, firstly, that the mother's brother's grandson is regarded, among the Wyandots, as a nephew by males, and a son by females; while, in the Tamil and Feejeean system, the reverse is the case, and he is termed son by males, and nephew by females. Secondly, that the father's sister's grandson is regarded as a son among the Wyandots, while in the Tamil and Feejeean system, he is, when an uncle is speaking, recognised as a nephew. The latter difference merely indicates that the Tamil and Feejeean systems are slightly more advanced than the Wyandot. The other difference is more difficult to understand.

But though the Redskin, Tamil, and Feejeean systems, differing as they do from ours in many ways, which, at first, seem altogether arbitrary and unaccountable, agree so remarkably with one another, we find, also, in some cases, remarkable differences among the Redskin races themselves. These differences affect principally the lines of the mother's brother, and father's sister. This is natural. They are the first to be distinguished from true parents, and new means have, therefore, to be adopted to distinguish the relationships thus recognised. In several cases other old terms were tried, with very comical results. These modes of overcoming the difficulty were so unsatisfactory, that, by the time a father's sister's son was recognised as a cousin, the necessity for the creation of new terms seems to have been generally felt.

Table II shows, as regards fourteen tribes, the result of the attempt to distinguish these relationships. Taking, for instance, the line which gives the terms in use for a mother's brother's grandson, we find the following, viz., son, stepbrother, grandson, and grandchild, stepson, and uncle; in the case of a father's sister's grandson (male speaking), we have grandchild, son, stepson, brother, and father; when a female is speaking, grandchild, son, nephew, brother, and father. Thus, for this single relationship we find six terms in use, and a difference of three generations, viz., from grandfather to son. At first the use of such terms seems altogether arbitrary, but a further examination will show that this is by no means the case.

Column 2 gives the system of the Redknives, one of the most backward tribes on the American continent as regards their nomenclature of relationships. Here, though a mother's brother and a father's sister are, respectively, uncle and aunt, their children are regarded as brothers, their grandchildren as sons, and their great-grandchildren as grandsons. The Munsee system shows a slight advance. Here, though the women call their sister's sons their sons, the males, on the contrary, term them nephews, and, consequently, apply the same term to their mother's brother's daughter's son, and their father's sister's daughter's son, because, as in the preceding case, mothers' brother's daughters, and fathers' sister's daughters, are termed sisters. The Micmacs (column 3) show another step in advance. Here, not only does a man call his sister's son nephew, but, in addition, a woman applies the same term to her brother's sons; consequently, not only a mother's brother's daughter's sons, if a male is speaking, but a mother's brother's son's son, if a female is speaking, and the corresponding relations, on the side of the father's sister, are termed nephews.

Among the Delawares a mother's brother's son, and father's sister's son, are distinguished from true brothers by a term corresponding to "stepbrother." They appear to have also felt the necessity of distinguishing a stepbrother's son from a true son, but having no special term, they retain the same word, thus calling a stepbrother's son a stepbrother. This principle, as we shall see, is followed by several other tribes, and has produced the most striking inconsistencies shown in the table. We find it again among the Crows, where a father's sister is called mother, her daughter again mother; but as her son cannot of course be a mother, he is called "father." The same system is followed by the Pawnees, as shown in columns 7 and 8; and the Grand Pawnees carry it a generation lower, and call their father's sister's grandson on the male side "father": a father's sister's daughter's son is however called a brother. Among the

Cherokees we find this principle most thoroughly carried out, and a father's sister's grandson is also called a father. This case is the more interesting because the circumstance which produced the system is no longer in existence; for, as will be seen, a father's sister is called an aunt. It is not at first obvious that a father's sister being called a mother would account for her son being called a father; but, with the Crow and Pawnee systems before us, we see that the Cherokees could not call their father's sister's sons "fathers", unless there had been a time when a father's sister was regarded as a mother.

The Hare Indians supply us with a case in which mother's brothers and father's sisters being distinguished from fathers and mothers, their children are no longer termed brothers, but are distinguished as cousins; while their grandchildren and great-grandchildren, on the contrary, are still termed sons and grandsons.

So far as the relationships shown in the table are concerned, the system of the Omahas, and of the Sawks and Foxes, is identical. A mother's brother is an uncle, and, for the reason already pointed out, in the case of the Delawares, his sons and son's sons, and even son's grandsons, are also termed grandsons. His daughter's sons, on the contrary, retain the old name of brother. A father's sister is an aunt, her children are nephews, and the descendants of these nephews are grandchildren.

Among the Oneidas a father's brother is an uncle, and his son is a cousin; his son's sons, however, are still sons. His daughter's son is a son when a female is speaking; but, for the reason already explained in the case of the Munsees, males term them nephews. The relationships connected with a father's sister are dealt with in a similar manner, except that a father's sister is still called mother.

The Otawa system resembles the Micmac, and is formed on the same plan, being, however, somewhat more advanced, inasmuch as the children of uncles and aunts are recognised as cousins, and a man calls his cousin's son, not his son, but his stepson. The Ojibwa system is the same, except that a woman also calls her mother's brother's daughter's son, and father's sister's daughter's son, her stepson, instead of her son. In some of the relationships by marriage, the same causes have led to even more striking differences. Thus, a woman generally calls her father's sister's daughter's husband her brother-in-law; but among the Missouri and Mississippi nations, her son-in-law; among the Minnitarees, the Crows, and some of the Chocta clans, her father; among the Cherokees, her stepparent; the Republican Pawnees, and some of the Choctas, her grandfather; and among the Tukuthes, her grandson!

Having thus pointed out the curious results to which some of the lower races have been led in their attempts to distinguish relationships, and endeavoured to explain those shown in Table II, I will now return to the main argument.

The Kaffir (Amazulu) system is given in Column 12, Table I. Here, for the first time, we find the father's brother regarded as an uncle, and the mother's sister as an aunt. In other respects, however, the system is not more advanced than the Tamil, Feejeean, or Wyandot. The mother's brother is called uncle,* his son cousin, his grandson son, and his great-grandson, grandchild. A father's sister, quaintly enough, is called father, the Kaffir word for which, *ubaba*, closely resembles ours. His son, however, is called brother; his grandson, accordingly, son; his great-grandson, grandchild. A father's brother, as already mentioned, is uncle; but, as before, his son is called brother; his grandson, son; and his great-grandson, grandson. So, also, a mother's sister is an aunt, but her son is a brother; her grandson a son; and her great-grandson, a grandson. As in all the preceding cases, grandfather's brothers and sisters are considered as, respectively, grandfathers and grandmothers. Brothers' sons and sisters' sons are called sons, and, lastly, their sons again are grandsons.

Excepting in the case of nephews this system, therefore, closely resembles the Tamil, Feejeean, and Wyandot; the other principal differences being, oddly enough, a more correct appreciation of uncles and aunts.

Column 13, Table I, exhibits the nomenclature in use among the Mohegans, whose name signifies "seaside people," from their geographical position on the Hudson and the Connecticut. They belong to the great Algonkin stock. Here, for the first time, a distinction is introduced between a father and a father's brother. The latter, however, is not recognised as an uncle; that is to say, a father's brother and a mother's brother are not regarded as equivalent relationships, but the former is termed stepfather. This distinguishing prefix is the characteristic feature; and, as will be seen, we find the terms, stepmother, stepbrother, and stepchild, (to the exclusion of cousin), as natural consequences of the stepfathership. Still, the mother's sister remains a mother, and her son a brother, and the derivation of this system from one similar to those already considered, is, moreover, indicated by the fact that the members of the third generation are still regarded as grandchildren.

The Crees and Ojibwas, or Chippewas (of Lake Michigan), who also belong to the great Algonkin stock, resemble the Mohegan in

* It is, however, significant that he calls his sister's sons "sons", and not nephews.

the use, though with some minor differences, of the prefix "step-", a device which occurs also in a more complicated form among the Chinese. In some points, however, they are rather more advanced, and, in fact, these tribes possess the highest system of relationship yet recorded among the Redskins of North America. A mother's brother is an uncle, and his son is a cousin; as regards his grandson, the tendency to the use of different terms, according as the speaker is a male or female, shows itself in the use by the former of the term stepson, where the latter say nephew, as in some of the ruder tribes. In both cases, mothers' brothers' great grandchildren are called grandchildren. A father's sister is an aunt, and the nomenclature with reference to her descendants is the same as in the case of the mother's brother. A father's brother is a stepbrother; his son is still called a brother by males among the Crees, but is called stepson by the Ojibwas; the other relationships in this line being the same as in the case of the mother's brother and father's sister.

No Redskin regards his mother's sister as an aunt, but the Crees and Ojibwas distinguish her from a true mother by the term stepmother, and her descendants are addressed by the same terms as those of the father's brother. The grandfather's brothers and sisters are called grandfathers and grandmothers. As before, brothers' sons, when a female is speaking, and sisters' sons, when a male is speaking, are called nephews; while brothers' sons, when a male is speaking, and sisters' sons, when a female is speaking, are no longer regarded as true sons, but are distinguished as stepsons. The grandchildren of these nephews and stepsons are, however, all termed grandchildren.

If, now, we compare this system with that of the Two-Mountain Iroquois, we find that out of twenty-eight relationships given in the table, only ten have remained the same. Of these, two are indicative of progress made by the Two-Mountain Iroquois, namely, the term for mother's brother and sister's son; the other eight are marks of imperfection still remaining in the Ojibwa nomenclature: points, moreover, not by any means characteristic of American races, but common, also, as we have seen, to the Hawaiian, Kingsmill, Burmese, Japanese, Tongan, Feejeean, Kaffir, and Tamil systems; as we shall also find, to the Hindi, Karen, and Esquimaux; in fact, to almost all, if not all barbarous peoples, and to some of the most advanced races.

Column 14 (Table I) shows the system of nomenclature as it exists in Hindi, and it may be added that the Bengali, Marathi, and Gujerathi are essentially the same, although the words differ. All these languages are said to be Sanskrit as regards their words; aboriginal, on the contrary, in their grammar. Hindi contains 90% of Sanskrit words, Guzerathi as much as 95%.

With three or four exceptions, it appears that the terms for relationships may be all of Sanskrit origin.

Here, for the first time, we find that a brother's son and a sister's son is termed a nephew, whether the speaker is a male or a female. Yet nephews' children are still termed grandchildren. Again, for the first time, the mother's brother, father's brother, mother's sister, and father's sister are regarded as equivalent, and the terms for their descendants are similar. The two former—*i.e.*, mother's brother and father's brother are termed "uncles;" the two latter—*i.e.*, mother's sister and father's sister are called aunts. Yet, as regards the next generations, the system is less advanced than the Ojibwa, for uncles' sons and aunts' sons are termed brothers, their grandsons nephews, and their great grandsons grandsons. It should, however, be observed that, in the first three languages, viz., the Hindi, Bengali, and Marathi, besides the simple term "brother," the terms "brother through paternal uncle," "brother through paternal aunt," "brother through maternal uncle," and "brother through maternal aunt," are also in use, and are less cumbersome than our English literal translation would indicate. The system, therefore, is transitional on this point. Lastly, a grandfather's brother is called "grandfather;" a grandfather's sister, "grandmother."

The Karens are a rude, but peaceable and teachable race, inhabiting parts of Tenasserim, Burmah, Siam, and extending into the southern parts of China. They have been encroached upon and subjected by more powerful races, and are now divided into different tribes, speaking distinct dialects, of which three are given in Mr. Morgan's tables. Though rude and savage in their mode of life, they are described as extremely moral in their social relations—praise which seems to be fully borne out by their system of relationships, as shown in column 17, Table I.

Column 18 shows the system of another rude people, belonging to a distinct family of the human race, and inhabiting a distant and very different part of the world. Like the Karens, the Esquimaux are a rude people, but like them they are a quiet, peaceable, and moral race. No doubt on some points their ideas differ from ours; their condition does not admit of much refinement,—of any great advance in science or art. They cannot be said to have any religion worthy of the name, yet there is perhaps no more moral people on the face of the earth, none among whom there is less crime; and it is, perhaps, not going too far to say that there is, as far as I can judge, no race of men which has to so full an extent availed itself of its opportunities.

It is most remarkable to find these two races of men, so distinct, so distant, so dissimilar in their modes of life, without a word in common, yet using systems of relationship which, in

their essential features, are identical, although by no means in harmony with the existing social condition: in both, uncles and aunts are correctly recognised, and their children are regarded as cousins; their grandchildren, however, are termed nephews, and the children of these so-called nephews are classed, as in all the previous cases, as grandchildren. Thus, out of the twenty-eight relationships indicated in the table, the Karens and Esquimaux agree with us in twelve, and differ in sixteen. As regards every one, however, of these sixteen they agree with one another, while in eight they follow the same system as every other race which we have been considering.

These facts cannot be the result of chance; there is one way, and as it seems to me, one way only, of accounting for them, and that is by regarding them as the outcome of a progressive development such as that which I have endeavoured to sketch. An examination of the several cases will confirm this view.

The Karen-Esquimaux system is inconsistent with itself in three respects, and precisely where it differs from ours. The children of cousins are termed nephews, which they are not; the children of nephews are regarded as grandchildren, and a grandfather's brothers and sisters are termed, respectively, grandfathers and grandmothers.

The first fact, namely, that a mother's brother's grandsons, and a mother's sister's grandsons, a father's sister's grandsons, and a father's brother's grandsons, are all termed "nephews," clearly points to the existence of a time when a mother's brother and a father's brother were regarded as fathers, a mother's sister and a father's sister as mothers, and their children, consequently, as brothers. The second, namely, that the great-grandchildren of uncles and aunts are regarded as grandchildren, similarly points to a time when nephews and nieces were termed, and regarded as sons and daughters, and their children, consequently, as grandchildren. Lastly, why should grandfather's brothers and grandfather's sisters be called grandfathers and grandmothers, unless there was a time when fathers' brothers and sisters were respectively called "fathers" and "mothers": unless the Karens and Esquimaux once had a system of relationship similar to that which still prevails among so many barbarous tribes, and which, to all appearance, has been gradually modified. Hence, though the Karens and Esquimaux have now a far more correct system of nomenclature than that of many other races, we find even in it clear traces of a time when these peoples had not advanced in this respect beyond the lowest stage.

As already mentioned, the European nations follow, almost without exception, a strictly descriptive system, founded on the marriage of single pairs. The principle is, however, departed

from in a few very rare cases, and in them we find an approach to the Karen-Esquimaux system. Thus in Spanish, a brother's great-grandson is called "grandson." Again, in Bulgarian, a brother's grandson and sister's grandson are called "*Mal vnook mi*," literally, "little grandson my." A father's father's sister is termed a grandmother, and a father's father's brother a grandfather, as is also the case in Russian. The French and Sanskrit, alone, so far as I know, among the Aryan languages, have special words for elder and younger brother. Among Aryan races the Roman and the Germans alone developed a term for cousin,* and we, ourselves, have, even now, no word for a cousin's son. The history of the term "nephew" is also instructive. The word "*nepos*," says Morgan,† "among the Romans, as late as the fourth century, was applied to a nephew as well as a grandson, although both *avus* and *avunculus* had come into use. Eutropius, in speaking of Octavianus, calls him the nephew of Cæsar, "*Cæsaris nepos*," (Lib. vii, c. i). Suetonius speaks of him as *sororis nepos* (Cæsar, c. lxxxiii), and afterwards (Octavianus, c. vii) describes Cæsar as his greater uncle, *major avunculus*, in which he contradicts himself. When *nepos* was finally restricted to grandson, and thus became a strict correlative of *avus*, the Latin language was without a term for nephew, whence the descriptive phrase, *Fratris vel sororis filius*. In English, *nephew* was applied to grandson, as well as nephew, as late as 1611, the period of King James' translation of the Bible. Niece is so used by Shakspeare in his will, in which he describes his granddaughter, Susannah Hall, as 'my niece.'"

So that even among the most advanced races we find some lingering confusion about nephews, nieces, and grandchildren.

Thus, then, we have traced these systems of relationships from the simple and rude nomenclature of the Sandwich Islanders up to the far purer and more correct terminology of the Karens and Esquimaux. I have endeavoured to show that the systems indicated are explicable only on the theory of a gradual improvement and elevation, and are incompatible with degradation: that as the valves indicate the course of the blood in our veins, so do the terms applied to relationships point out the course of past history. In the first place, the moral condition of the lower races, wherever we can ascertain it, is actually higher than that indicated by the phraseology in use: and, secondly, the systems themselves are, in almost all cases, inexplicable, except on the hypothesis that they were themselves, preceded by still ruder ones.

* So that of many nations it may be said, literally as well as figuratively, that "les nations n'ont pas de cousins."

† Loc. cit., p. 35.

Take, for instance, the case of the Two-Mountain Iroquois: they call a mother's brother an uncle, but his son they regard as a brother. This is no accident, for the idea is carried out in the other relationships, and occurs also in other races. On the theory of progress it is easily accounted for: if a father's brother was previously called a father, his son would, of course, be a brother; and when the father's brother came to be distinguished as an uncle, some time would, no doubt, often elapse before the other changes, consequent on this step, would be effected. But how could such a system be accounted for on the opposite theory? How could a father's brother's son come to be regarded as a brother, if a father's brother had always been termed an uncle? The sequence of terms for the relationships connected with a father's sister, on the two hypotheses of progress on the one hand, and degradation on the other, may be illustrated as in the Table III (p. 27).

In the first, or lowest stage, the sequence is mother, brother, son, grandson, as in the Sandwich and Two-Mountain Iroquois system. In the next stage, the mother's sister being recognised as an aunt, and the other relationships remaining the same, we have the sequence aunt, brother, son, grandson, as among the Micmacs. When a brother's son becomes a nephew, we have aunt, brother, nephew, grandson, as in the Burmese, Japanese, and Hindi systems. In the next stage, an aunt's son being distinguished as a cousin, we have aunt, cousin, nephew, grandson, as among the Tamils and Feejees. The two last stages would be aunt, cousin, aunt's grandson, grandson; and, lastly, aunt, cousin, aunt's grandson, aunt's great-grandson. Thus, out of these six stages, five actually exist.

On the other hand, on the theory of retrogression, we should commence with the highest system; namely, aunt, cousin, aunt's grandson, and aunt's great-grandson. The second, mother, cousin, aunt's grandson, aunt's great-grandson. The third, mother, brother, aunt's grandson, aunt's great-grandson. The fourth, mother, brother, nephew, aunt's great-grandson. The fifth, mother, brother, son, aunt's great-grandson. And the last, mother, brother, son, grandson. Thus, it will be observed that, except, of course, the first and last, they have not a stage in common; and, though there may be some doubt whether the sequence suggested on the second hypothesis is the one which would be followed, it cannot, be maintained that we could ever have the systems which would occur in the case of progress, as shown in Table III, and the first four of which are actually in existence.

Whenever, then, the son or daughter of an uncle, or aunt, is termed a brother, as in the case of seven of the races referred to

PROGRESS.					
Mother's brother, called uncle. With Mother's brother's son, called brother.	14	Do., do., Mother's brother's grandson=son.	23	Do., do., Do., do., great-grandson=grandson.	54
DEGRADATION.					
Mother's brother, called father. With Mother's brother's son, called cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., great-grandson=cousin. =nephew.	0 0
PROGRESS.					
Father's sister=aunt, With Father's sister's son=brother.	11	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=son.	21	Do., do., Do., do., do., do.,=grandson.	62
DEGRADATION.					
Father's sister=mother, With Father's sister's son=cousin.	4	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., do., do.,=cousin. =nephew.	0 0
PROGRESS.					
Father's brother=uncle, With Father's brother's son=brother.	4	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=son.	0	Do., do., Do., do., do., do.,=grandson.	7
DEGRADATION.					
Father's brother=father, With Father's brother's son=cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., do., do.,=cousin. =nephew.	0 0
PROGRESS.					
Mother's sister=aunt, With Mother's sister's son=brother.	4	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=son.	0	Do., do., Do., do., do., do.,=grandson.	7
DEGRADATION.					
Mother's sister=mother. With Mother's sister's son=cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., grandson=cousin.	0	Do., do., Do., do., do., do.,=cousin. =nephew.	0 0
Totals.....	33−4=29		44		130

Grand Total..... 207 indicating progress.

in the Table, we may be sure that there was once a time when that uncle, or aunt, was termed a father or mother: whenever a cousin's son is termed a son, as again in seven races, we must infer, not only that those cousins were once regarded as brothers, but that brother's sons were once termed sons. Again, when great-uncles and aunts are termed grandfathers and grandmothers—when great-nephews and nieces are termed grandchildren, as in the case of all the races we have been considering, we have, I submit, good reason to infer that those races must once have had a system of nomenclature as rude as that of the Hawaiians or Kingsmill Islanders.

But it may be asked: admitting that the seventeen races, illustrated in Table I, are really advancing, are there not cases of the contrary? The answer is clear, out of the 139 races whose systems of relationship are more or less completely given by Mr. Morgan, there is not one in which evidence of degradation is thus indicated. To show this clearly and concisely, I have prepared the following table (p. 24). It will be seen that, taking merely the relation of uncles and aunts with reference to their children, there are 207 cases indicating progress. On the other hand there are four cases, the Cayuda, Onondaga, Oneida, and Mohawks, among whom, while a father's sister is called a mother, her son is called a cousin. These cases, however, are neutralised by the fact that the sons of these cousins are called sons. We have, therefore, a very large body of evidence indicating progress, and collected among very different races of men, while there appear to be none which favour the opposite hypothesis.

In my work on the Origin of Civilisation, I have endeavoured to show that relationship is, at first, a matter, not of blood, but of tribal organisation; that it is, in the second place, traced through the mother; in the third, through the father: and that only in the fourth stage is the idea of family constituted as amongst ourselves. To obtain clear and correct ideas on this subject, it is necessary to know the laws and customs of various races. The nomenclature, alone, would, in many cases, lead us into error, and, in fact, has often done so. When checked by a knowledge of the tribal rules and customs, it is, however, most interesting and instructive. From this point of view especially, Mr. Morgan's work is of great value. It has been seen, however, I differ greatly from him as to the conclusions to be drawn from the facts which he has so diligently collected.

Of course, I do not deny that these facts may, in some cases, indicate ethnological affinities; but they have not, I think, so great an importance in solving questions of ethnological relationships as he supposes; I do not, however, in any way, undervalue their import-

ance; they afford a striking evidence in favour of the doctrine of development, and are thus a very interesting and important contribution to the great problem of human history.

From the materials which he has so laboriously collected, and for which Ethnologists owe him an immense debt of gratitude, I have endeavoured to show:

Firstly, that the terms for, what we call, relationships, are, among the lower races of men, mere expressions for the results of marriage customs, and do not comprise the idea of relationship as we understand it: that, in fact, the connection of individuals *inter se;* their duties to one another; their rights; the descent of their property: are all regulated more by the relation to the tribe than by that to the family; that when the two conflict, the latter must give way.

Secondly, that the nomenclature of relationships is, in all the cases yet collected, explainable in a clear and simple manner on the hypothesis of progress.

Thirdly, that while two races in the same state of social condition, but, of which, the one has risen from the lowest known system, the other sunk from the highest, would, necessarily, have a totally different system of nomenclature for relationships; and that we have not a single instance of such a system as would result from the latter hypothesis.

Fourthly, that some of those races which approximate most nearly to our European system, differ from it upon points only explainable on the hypothesis that they were once in a much lower social condition than they are at present.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. W. C. DENDY expressed his admiration of the lucid mode in which Sir John Lubbock had illustrated his elaborate tables of affinity. In alluding to the similarity of appellations it was curious to note the almost identity of terms of relationship between races whose homes were half the globe asunder—Iroquois, Tamil, Feejeean, and Hawaiian—especially as the cranial forms (and may be the quality of the hemispherical ganglion) were in contrast. The frailty of their canoes or rafts would seem to contraindicate miscegenation or emigration, in explanation, or even the carnal intercourse of the sandal-wood traders. Granting the existence of such intercourse, however, it does not point to any grand ethnic principle, but rather the slavish adoption of the ideas of others by tribes of low intellect.

The author of this elaborate and valuable paper glances at his favourite theme, the emancipation from the primitive degradation of Man. It will require, however, more strict comparison between the present and remote conditions of races ere we may form inductions with regard to the development and progress of human intellect, especially as tradition and travel seem occasionally to demonstrate regress

TABLE I.—S

1.	2. HAWAIIAN.	3. KINGSMILL.	4. TWO-MOUNTAIN IROQUOIS.	5. MICMACS.	6. BURMESE.	7. JAPANESE.	8. WYANDOT.§
Mother's brother	Parent male.	Father.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Father, G. or L.,‡ or uncle.	Second little father.	Uncle.
" " son	Brother, E. or Y.†	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Cousin.
" " son's son, M.S.*	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.
" " " F.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Nephew.	?	?	Nephew.
" " " grandson	Grandchild male.	Grandchild male.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.
Father's sister	Parent female.	Mother.	Mother.	Aunt.	Aunt, G. or L.	Little mother, or aunt.	Aunt.
" " son	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Cousin.
" " son's son, M.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.
" " " F.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Nephew.	?	?	Son.
" " " grandson	Grandchild male.	Grandchild male.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.
Father's brother	Parent male.	Father.	Father.	Little Father.	Father, G. or L.	Little father, or uncle.	Father.
" " son	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or
" " son's son, M.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.
" " " " F.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Nephew.	?	?	Son.
" " " grandson	Grandchild male.	Grandchild male.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.
Mother's sister	Parent female.	Mother.	Mother.	Little mother.	Mother, G. or L.	Little mother, or aunt.	Mother.
" " son	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or
" " son's son, M.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.
" " " " F.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Nephew.	?	?	Nephew.
" " " grandson	Grandchild male.	Grandchild male.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.
Grandfather's brother	Grandparent male.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.
" sister	Grandparent female.	..	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.
Brother's son, M.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.
" " F.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
Sister's son, M.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
" " F.S.	Child male.	Child male.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.
Brother's son's son	Grandchild male.	Grandchild male.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.
Sister's son's son	Grandchild male.	Grandchild male.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.

* Male speaking or female speaking. † Elder or Younger. ‡ Great or Little. § The Seneca substantially ag

TABLE II.—S

1.	2. RED KNIVES.	3. MUNSEE.	4. MICMAC.	5. DELAWARE.	6. CROW.
Mother's brother	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Elder Brother.
" " son	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Son.
" " son's son, M.S.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Stepbrother.	Grandchild.
" " " " F.S.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Stepbrother.	Grandchild.
" " daughter's son, M.S.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Grandchild.
" " " " F.S	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Grandchild.
" " grandson	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.
Father's sister	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Little mother.	Mother.
" " son	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Father.
" " son's son, M.S.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	?
" " " F.S.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Son.	?
" " daughter's son, M.S	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	?
" " " " F.S	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	?

TABLE I.—SYSTEMS OF RELATIONSHIPS.

5. MICMACS.	6. BURMESE.	7. JAPANESE.	8. WYANDOT.§	9. TAMIL.‖	10. FEEJEEAN.	11. TONGAN.	12. KAFFIR.	13. MOHIGAN.	
ele.	Father, G. or L.,‡ or uncle.	Second little father.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Un
ther, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Stepbrother.	Bro
.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	?	Son.	Stepchild.	Ne
hew.	?	?	Nephew.	Son.¶	Son.¶	?	?	Stepchild.	
ndchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	?	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Gra
nt.	Aunt, G. or L.	Little mother, or aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Father.	Stepmother.	Au
ther, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Bro
.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	?	Son.	Stepchild.	Ne
hew.	?	?	Son.	Son.	Son.	?	?	Stepchild.	
ndchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	....	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Gra
tle Father.	Father, G. or L.	Little father, or uncle.	Father.	Father, G. or L.	Father.	Father.	Uncle.	Stepfather.	Un
ther, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepfather.	Bro
.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Stepchild.	Ne
hew.	?	?	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Boy.	?	....	
ndchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Gra
tle mother.	Mother, G. or L.	Little mother, or aunt.	Mother.	Mother.	Mother.	Mother.	Aunt.	Mother.	Au
ther, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Bro
n.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Stepchild.	Ne
hew.	?	?	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Boy.	?	Stepchild.	
ndchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	....	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Gra
ndfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Gra
ndmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Gra
n.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Stepson.	Ne
hew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Stepson.	Ne
hew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Nephew.	Ne
n.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Son.	Son.	Son.	Boy.	Son.	Son.	Ne
ndchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Gra
ndchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Gra

‡ Great or Little.

§ The Seneca substantially agrees.

‖ The Telugu and Canarese substantially agree with the Tamil.

TABLE II.—SYSTEMS OF RELATIONSHIPS.

3. NSEE.	4. MICMAC.	5. DELAWARE.	6. CROW.	7. REPUBLICAN PAWNEE.	8. GRAND PAWNEE.	9. CHEROKEE.	10. HARE.	11. OMAHA.	SAWK A
	Uncle.	Uncle.	Elder Brother.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Mother's brother.	Uncle.	Uncle.
E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Son.	Child.	Child.	Child.	Cousin.	Uncle.	Uncle.
	Son.	Stepbrother.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Son.	Uncle.	Uncle.
	Nephew.	Stepbrother.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	?	Uncle.	Uncle.
	Nephew.	Nephew.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Son.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother
	Son.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Son.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother
ild.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Nephew.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Uncle.	Uncle.
	Aunt.	Little mother.	Mother.	Mother.	Mother.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.
E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Father.	Father.	Father.	Father.	Cousin.	Nephew.	Nephew
	Son.	Son.	?	Brother.	Father.	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandc
	Nephew.	Son.	?	Brother.	Father.	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandc
	Nephew.	Nephew.	?	Father.	Brother.	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandc
	Son.	Son.	?	Father.	Brother.	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandc

[*To face page* 27.

LATIONSHIPS.

EAN.	11. TONGAN.	12. KAFFIR.	13. MOHIGAN.	14. HINDI.	15. CREE.	16. OJIBWA (Lake Michigan).	17. KAREN.	18. ESQUIMAUX. (Northumberland Inlet.)
	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.
	Cousin.	Cousin.	Stepbrother.	Brother.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.
	?	Son.	Stepchild.	Nephew.	Stepson.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	?	?	Stepchild.	?	Nephew.	Nephew.	?	Nephew.
	?	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.
	Aunt.	Father.	Stepmother.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.
	Cousin.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Brother.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.
	?	Son.	Stepchild.	Nephew.	Stepson.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	?	?	Stepchild.	?	Nephew.	Nephew.	?	Nephew.
	....	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.
	Father.	Uncle.	Stepfather.	Uncle.	Stepfather.	Stepfather.	Uncle.	Uncle.
E. or Y.	Brother.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepfather.	Brother.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Cousin.	Cousin.
	Son.	Son.	Stepchild.	Nephew.	Stepson.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Boy.	?	....	?	Nephew.	Nephew.	....	Nephew.
	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.
	Mother.	Aunt.	Mother.	Aunt.	Stepmother.	Stepmother.	Aunt.	Aunt.
E. or Y.	Brother.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother.	Brother, E. or Y.	Stepbrother.	Cousin.	Cousin.
	Son.	Son.	Stepchild.	Nephew.	Stepson.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Boy.	?	Stepchild.	?	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	....	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.
her.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.	Grandfather.
ther.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.	Grandmother.
	Son.	Son.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Stepson.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Nephew.	Son.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Nephew.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Boy.	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Stepson.	Stepson.	Nephew.	Nephew.
n.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.
n.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Grandchild.

lugu and Canarese substantially agree with the Tamil.

¶ Eighteen American Races agree with the Tamil and Feejeean on this point.

LATIONSHIPS.

EE.	9. CHEROKEE.	10. HARE.	11. OMAHA.	12. SAWK AND FOX.	13. ONEIDA.	14. OTAWA.	15. OJIBWA (Lake Superior).
	Uncle.	Mother's brother.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Uncle.
	Child.	Cousin.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.
	Grandchild.	Son.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Son.	Stepson.	Stepson.
	Grandchild.	?	Uncle.	Uncle.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Grandchild.	Son.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Grandchild.	Son.	Brother, E. or Y.	Brother, E. or Y.	Son.	Son.	Stepchild.
	Grandchild.	Grandson.	Uncle.	Uncle.	Grandson.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.
	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Mother.	Aunt.	Aunt.
	Father.	Cousin.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.
	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Son.	Stepson.	Stepson.
	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Nephew.
	Father.	Son.	Grandchild.	Grandchild.	Son.	Son.	Stepchild.

TABLE III.—SYSTEMS OF RELATIONSHIP UPON THEORY OF PROGRESS.

	FIRST STAGE.*	SECOND STAGE.†	THIRD STAGE.‡	FOURTH STAGE.§	FIFTH STAGE.	SIXTH STAGE.‖
Father's sister	Mother.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.	Aunt.
„ „ son	Brother.	Brother.	Brother.	Cousin.	Cousin.	Cousin.
„ „ „ son.....	Son.	Son.	Nephew.	Nephew.	Aunt's grandson.	Aunt's grandson.
„ „ „ „ son..	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Grandson.	Aunt's great-grandson.

* This is the system of the Sandwich Islands, Kingsmill Islands, Two-Mountain Iroquois, etc. † System of the Micmacs.
‡ This is the system of the Burmese, Japanese, Hindi. § This is the Tamil and Feejeean systems. ‖ Our system.

SYSTEMS OF RELATIONSHIP UPON THEORY OF DEGRADATION.

	FIRST STAGE.	SECOND STAGE.	THIRD STAGE.	FOURTH STAGE.	FIFTH STAGE.	SIXTH STAGE.
Father's sister	Aunt.	Mother.	Mother.	Mother.	Mother.	Mother.
„ „ son	Cousin.	Cousin.	Brother.	Brother.	Brother.	Brother.
„ „ „ son.....	Aunt's grandson.	Aunt's grandson.	Aunt's grandson.	Nephew.	Son.	Son.
„ „ „ „ son..	Aunt's great-grandson.	Aunt's great-grandson.	Aunt's great-grandson.	Aunt's great-grandson.	Aunt's grandson.	Grandson.

of even enlightened people, as in Assyria, Arabia, and Egypt—nomadic tribes now wandering among the ruins of these once gorgeous temples.

Regarding the islanders of Oceania, it is clear that they are now about in the same state as when Cook and other navigators, in the past century, lighted on their shores.

Mr. HYDE CLARKE observed that it was not impossible to establish a linguistic connection among the several groups, which had been regarded as incapable of the intercommunication of such terms as those recorded by Sir John Lubbock. Thus, in the neighbourhood of the Karen were the linguistic analogues of Sour or Savara. This and the Thug showed relationship with the Esquimaux, and so with the adjoining American tribes, and thus two extremes were brought together; again, there were ancient grammatical relationships between the languages of High Asia (as the Caucaso-Tibetan group) and those of the Caffre tribes in South Africa. He would proceed further to illustrate a point in Sir John's first class, and on which there was a note in his *Origin of Civilisation*, which contained the germ of a series of interesting facts, illustrative of the origin of words. It is the accepted belief that "mother" (*Maker, Meker, Ma, Ama*, etc.) and "father" are the most ancient words, and various reasons have been given for *Ma* being a natural effort of all children. This, however, is nothing more than an error. *Ba* and *Ma* cannot be accepted as the first words, nor as distinctive of Father and Mother. Just as in Hawaiian, the earliest idea was of Parent, and that of Male and Female Parent came after. This is shown by the fact that there are several roots, *Ma, Ta (Da), Sa, Ba (Pa), Wa, Na, Ya*, signifying either Father or Mother, according to the language in which employed. *Ma* is used as Mother in a most extensive class of languages, but it is Father in Georgian and Manchoo, Mon (Siam), Tuluva, Australian, Irula, and Tlatskana (N. W. America). *Pa* is Mother in Australian and Tuluva (India). *Da* is Mother in some African languages; *Wa* is Father in Savara, Yarukala, W. Africa, etc.; but Mother in Irula, etc. *Ya* is Father in Chinese, in Japanese Toda, etc.; but Mother in Talain, Circassian, Tibetan, Kolarian, Dravidian, etc. Some languages retain still several roots. Thus Gondi (India) uses for Mother *Ba, Ma, Ya, Wa*. The process of selecting for father, mother, grandmother (old woman, nurse) etc., from the roots for Parent was comparatively late. The original root appeared to be *A* worked with the affixes of ancient comparative grammar, *M, T (D), S, B (P, W), N*, and perhaps *L*. He considered one practical value of Sir John's paper was that it gave us a new means of testing the spread of common ideas and terms among various races.

Mr. C. S. WAKE said that much light was thrown on the source of the curious classification of relationships treated of in Sir John Lubbock's very valuable paper by tracing the original meaning of the words used. Taking those which, according to Mr. Morgan, are employed by the Sandwich Islanders, it is evident that they embody certain ideas which are applicable to general rather than to particular classes. Thus,

kupuna (a great-grandfather, &c.) means "an ancestor", and implies the idea of a *source* or *spring*, and also of *growth*; *makua kana* (father, uncle, &c.) signifies "full-grown man"; *makua wahina* (mother, aunt, &c.) is "full-grown woman"; *kaikee kana* (son, nephew, &c.) is literally the "child (or 'small') man"; *hunona* (a niece- or nephew-in-law) appears to be connected with the Vitian *none*, a "child", *vuno*, a "child-in-law". The words *kana* (man), and *wahina* (woman), would seem to be themselves explainable in a similar manner. The former is probably connected with *kano*, which means "the inmost substance of a thing, the flesh"; and the latter may be traced to a root signifying "to feed, nourish", found also in *ohana*, a "family".

Mr. BLYTH, Mr. LUKE BURKE, and Mr. A. L. LEWIS, also joined in the discussion.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK observed that he had not overlooked the cases of decadence mentioned by Mr. Dendy; nor had he ever denied that particular races might sink in the scale of civilisation; he maintained, however, that such races also diminish in numbers; that progressive races tend to encroach on those which are falling back, so that, as a whole, the history of mankind is one of progress. He also briefly referred to the other points raised in the discussion.

ORDINARY MEETING, MARCH 6TH, 1871.

DR. CHARNOCK, F.S.A., *Vice-President, in the Chair.*

THE Minutes of the last Meeting were read, and confirmed.

The following new members were announced: CUDDALORE PUTTAH LUTCHMEEPATHY NAIDOO GAROO, 14, Frederick Street, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.; HENRY COOK, Esq., Wantage, Berks; DANBY P. FRY, Esq., Poor Law Board, Whitehall Place, S.W.; CHARLES EDWARD MOORE, Esq., Middle Temple, E.C.; JOSEPH SHARPE, Esq., LL.D., 36, Queensborough Terrace, Hyde Park, W.; JESSE TAGG, Esq., 5, Outram Villas, Addiscombe; and W. J. W. VAUX, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., Royal Society of Literature, (*Honorary Member*).

The following presents were announced, and the thanks of the meeting voted to the respective donors:—

FOR THE LIBRARY.

From Dr. THURNAM, F.R.S.—Ancient Rock-Tombs at Ghain Tiffiha and Tal Horr, and the Human Remains found therein.

From Dr. J. BARNARD DAVIS, F.R.S.—Del Cervello nei due Tipi brachicefalo e dolicocefalo italiano. By Prof. C. Luigi Calori.

From the AUTHOR.—The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. By Charles Darwin, M.A., F.R.S., etc. 2 vols.