

Professor M. E. Chevreul was also elected a Foreign Honorary Member in Class I. Section 3.

Five hundred and ninety-first Meeting.

February 11, 1868. — MONTHLY MEETING.

The PRESIDENT in the chair.

The following paper was presented and read by the author: —

A Conjectural Solution of the Origin of the Classificatory System of Relationship.

By LEWIS H. MORGAN,

OF ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.

ABOUT twenty years ago I found among the Iroquois Indians of New York a system of relationship, for the designation and classification of kindred, both unique and extraordinary in its character, and wholly unlike any with which we are familiar. At the time I supposed it was a scheme devised by themselves, and confined to this particular stock of the American aborigines. Afterwards, in 1857, I had occasion to re-examine the subject, when the idea of its possible prevalence among other Indian nations suggested itself, together with its uses, in that event, for ethnological purposes. In the following summer I obtained the system of the Ojibwa Indians, of Lake Superior; and, although prepared in some measure for the result, it was with some degree of surprise that I found among them the same elaborate and complicated system which then existed among the Iroquois. Every term of relationship was radically different from the corresponding term in the Iroquois; but the classification of kindred was the same. It was manifest that the two systems were identical in their radical characteristics. It seemed probable, also, that both were derived from a common source, since it was not supposable that two peoples, although speaking dialects of stock-languages, as widely separated as the Algonkin and Iroquois, could simultaneously have invented the same system, or derived it by borrowing one from the other.

From this fact of identity, several inferences at once presented

themselves. Its prevalence among these stocks rendered probable its prevalence among the remaining stocks of the American aborigines. If then it should, upon investigation, be found to be universal among them, it would follow that the system was coeval, in point of time, with the commencement of their spread upon the American continent; and also, as a system transmitted with the blood, it might contain the necessary evidence to establish their unity of origin. And, in the next place, if the Indian family came in fact from Asia, that they must have brought the system with them from that continent, and have left it behind them among the people from whom they separated; and, further than this, that its perpetuation upon this continent would render probable its like perpetuation upon the Asiatic, where it might still be found; and, finally, that it might possibly furnish some evidence upon the question of the Asiatic origin of the Indian family.

Having found, before the close of 1859, that the system prevailed in the five principal Indian stock-languages east of the Rocky Mountains, as well as in several of the dialects of each, its universal spread through the Indian family had become extremely probable; and having also discovered traces of it both in the Sandwich Islands and in South-India, it seemed advisable to prosecute the investigation upon a more extended scale, and to attempt to reach, as far as possible, all the families of mankind. This would require an extensive foreign correspondence, which a private individual could not hope to maintain successfully. I then applied to the Secretaries of the several American Boards of Foreign Missions for the co-operation of their respective missionaries in foreign fields, which was cordially promised, and the promise amply redeemed. I also applied to Professor Joseph Henry, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, for the use of the name of that institution to insure attention to the circular and schedule by means of which the system of relationship of the different nations was to be obtained. Professor Henry not only complied with this request, but also, at my suggestion, procured a circular to be issued by the Secretary of State of the United States to the diplomatic and consular representatives of the government in foreign countries, commending the investigation to their attention. From this time onward, the foreign correspondence, except with the missionaries, was conducted through the Smithsonian Institution and the Department of State.

In verification of the results it will be sufficient to state, that, by personal explorations, continued through several years, in the Lake

Superior region, in the Hudson's Bay Territory, and in the territories between the Missouri River and the Rocky Mountains, and by correspondence with government officials and private individuals in other parts of North America, I have been able to bring together the system of relationship of upwards of seventy Indian nations, speaking as many independent dialects. Beside these, and by means of the foreign correspondence referred to, the system of the principal nations of Europe and Asia, of a portion of those of Africa, of Central and South America, and of the Islands of the Pacific, have also been obtained. The tabulated schedules, now in course of publication by the Smithsonian Institution, will cover four hundred and fifty pages of the Smithsonian Contributions, and represent four fifths and upwards, numerically, of the entire human family. These strictly personal statements would be inappropriate in this connection, except as they become necessary to show that the *solution* about to be presented rests upon a wide basis of ascertained facts.

I propose to present, in a brief form, 1st. The system of relationship of the Aryan Family: using the Roman form as typical. 2d. That of the Malayan Family: using the Hawaiian form as typical. 3d. That of the Ganowanian* Family: using the Seneca-Iroquois as typical. These are preliminary to the principal object, which is: 4th. To submit a *conjectural solution of the origin of the classificatory system of relationship*.

It may be premised that all of the systems of consanguinity and affinity, thus far ascertained, resolve themselves into two radically distinct forms, of which one will be called the *descriptive*, and the other the *classificatory*.

In the first, consanguineity are, in the main, described by a combination of the primary terms of relationship. There is a small amount of classification, by means of special or secondary terms introduced by civilians and scholars to relieve the burdensomeness of the system; but the great body of relatives, both by blood and marriage, are described. This is the system of the Aryan, Semitic, and Uralian families. In its origin, as the parent of the present form, it was purely descriptive, as is still exemplified by the Erse and Scandinavian, and by the condition of the Sanskrit, when this language ceased to be spoken. This system follows the streams of the blood, and is in

* Gä-no-wä'-ni-an: name proposed for the American Indian family. From Gä'-no, an arrow, and Wä-ä'-no, a bow; the family of the Bow and Arrow.

accordance with the nature of descents. It is, therefore, a natural system, for the reason that the relationships recognized are those which actually exist. But it assumes as its fundamental basis the antecedent existence of *marriage between single pairs*. Before this system could come into existence, mankind must have raised themselves to this state of marriage; after which this form of marriage, and not nature, teaches the descriptive system of relationship. It is important that this distinction should be noted.

In the second form, consanguinei are never described by a combination of the primary terms; but they are classified into categories, and the same term of relationship is applied, without distinction, to each of the members of the same category. This is the system of the Malayan, Ganowanian, and Turanian families. It suggests the probability that there might have been a state of society in the primitive ages in which marriage between single pairs was unknown, in which the family, in its modern sense, was unknown; but in which a system of relationship might have originated in *compound marriages in a communal family*, and thus be in strict accordance with the nature of descents, and, therefore a natural system because it recognized the relationships actually existing. This suggestion should also be noted.

1. *System of Relationship of the Aryan Family.*

A knowledge of the descriptive system became important for two principal reasons. First, it was necessary to find the limits of its spread to circumscribe the classificatory form: and, secondly, it was necessary to find the basis upon which it rested, to reach the instrumentalities by means of which the classificatory system, if it ever prevailed among the remote ancestors of the Aryan family, might possibly have been overthrown, and the descriptive substituted in its place.

As none of the characteristics of the former system are involved in the solution of the origin of the latter, it will be sufficient for my present purpose to present the substance of the Aryan form without comment. The Roman, as found in the Pandects* and Institutes of Justinian,† will be used as the typical system. Its completeness and perfection is due to the Roman civilians, and arose from a necessity for a code of descents, defining the relations of consanguinei to each other, to regulate the transmission of property by inheritance.

* Pand. Lib. XXXVIII. Tit. X. "De gradibus et adfinibus et noninibus eorum."

† Just. Inst. Lib. III. Tit. VI. "De gradibus Cognationum."

*Table of Roman System of Consanguinity.**(Lineal Line.)*

Great-grandfather's great-grandfather,	Tritavus.
“ “ grandfather,	Atavus.
“ “ father,	Abavus.
“ grandfather,	Proavus.
“ grandmother,	Proavia.
Grandfather,	Avus.
Grandmother,	Avia.
Father,	Pater.
Mother,	Mater.
Son,	Filius.
Daughter,	Filia.
Grandson,	Nepos.
Granddaughter,	Neptis.
Great-grandson,	Pronepos.
“ granddaughter,	Proneptis.
“ grandson's son,	Abnepos.
“ “ daughter,	Abneptis.
“ “ grandson,	Atnepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	Atneptis.
“ “ great-grandson,	Trinepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	Trineptis.

(First Collateral Line. Male.)

Brother,	Frater.
Brother's son,	Fratris filius.
“ daughter,	“ filia.
“ grandson,	“ nepos.
“ granddaughter,	“ neptis.
“ great-grandson,	“ pronepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	“ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

(First Collateral Line. Female.)

Sister,	Soror.
Sister's son,	Sororis filius.
“ daughter,	“ filia.
“ grandson,	“ nepos.
“ granddaughter,	“ neptis.
“ great-grandson,	“ pronepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	“ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

(Second Collateral Line. Father's Side.)

MALE BRANCH.

Father's brother,	Patruus.
“ brother's son,	Patruus filius, b. frater patruelis.
“ “ daughter,	“ filia, b. soror patruelis.
“ “ grandson,	“ nepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	“ neptis.
“ “ great-grandson,	“ pronepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

FEMALE BRANCH.

Father's sister,	Amita.
“ sister's son,	Amitae filius, b. amitinus.
“ “ daughter,	“ filia, b. amitina.
“ “ grandson,	“ nepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	“ neptis.
“ “ great-grandson,	“ pronepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

(Second Collateral Line. Mother's Side.)

MALE BRANCH.

Mother's brother,	Avunculus.
“ brother's son,	Avunculi filius, b. consobrinus.
“ “ daughter,	“ filia, b. consobrina.
“ “ grandson,	“ nepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	“ neptis.
“ “ great-grandson,	“ pronepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

FEMALE BRANCH.

Mother's sister,	Matertera.
“ sister's son,	Materteræ filius, b. consobrinus.
“ “ daughter,	“ filia, b. consobrina.
“ “ grandson,	“ nepos.
“ “ granddaughter,	“ neptis.
“ “ great-grandson,	“ pronepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

(Third Collateral Line. Father's Side.)

MALE AND FEMALE BRANCH.

Father's father's brother,	Patruus magnus.
“ “ brother's son,	Patruus magni filius.
“ “ “ daughter,	“ “ filia.
“ “ “ grandson,	“ “ nepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ neptis.
“ “ “ great-grandson,	“ “ pronepos.
“ “ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ proneptis.
* * *	* * *
“ “ sister,	Amita magna.
“ “ sister's son,	Amitæ magnæ filius.
“ “ “ daughter,	“ “ filia.
“ “ “ grandson,	“ “ nepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ neptis.
“ “ “ great-grandson,	“ “ pronepos.
“ “ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

(Third Collateral Line. Mother's Side.)

MALE AND FEMALE BRANCH.

Mother's mother's brother,	Avunculus magnus.
“ “ brother's son,	Avunculi magni filius.
“ “ “ daughter,	“ “ filia.
“ “ “ grandson,	“ “ nepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ neptis.
“ “ “ great-grandson,	“ “ pronepos.
“ “ “ “ gr'ddaughter,	“ “ proneptis.
* * *	* * *
“ “ sister,	Matertera magna.
“ “ sister's son,	Materteræ magnæ filius.
“ “ “ daughter,	“ “ filia.
“ “ “ grandson,	“ “ nepos.
“ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ neptis.
“ “ “ great-grandson,	“ “ pronepos.
“ “ “ “ granddaughter,	“ “ proneptis.
* * *	* * *

(Fourth Collateral Line. Father's Side.)

MALE AND FEMALE BRANCH.

Father's father's father's brother,	Patrus major,
" " " brother's son,	Patruī majoris filius.
" " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " g't-grandson,	" " pronepos.
" " " sister,	Amita major.
" " " " sister's son,	Amitæ majoris filius.
" " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " great-grandson,	" " pronepos.

(Fourth Collateral Line. Mother's Side.)

MALE AND FEMALE BRANCH.

Mother's mother's mother's brother,	Avunculus major.
" " " brother's son,	Avunculi majoris filius.
" " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " g't-g'dson,	" " pronepos.
" " " sister,	Matertera major.
" " " " sister's son,	Materteræ majoris filius.
" " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " g't-gr'dson,	" " pronepos.

(Fifth Collateral Line. Father's Side.)

MALE AND FEMALE BRANCH.

Father's father's father's father's brother,	Patrus maximus.
" " " " bro's son,	Patruī maximi filius.
" " " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " " g't-g'dson,	" " pronepos.
" " " " sister,	Amita maxima.
" " " " " sister's son,	Amitæ maximæ filius.
" " " " " g'dson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " " g't-g'dson,	" " pronepos.

(Fifth Collateral Line. Mother's Side.)

MALE AND FEMALE BRANCH.

Mother's mother's mother's mother's brother,	Avunculus maximus.
" " " " bro's son,	Avunculi maximi filius.
" " " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " " g't-grandson,	" " pronepos.
" " " " sister,	Matertera maxima.
" " " " " sister's son,	Materteræ maximæ filius.
" " " " " grandson,	" " nepos.
" * " " " " g't-g'dson,	" " pronepos.

(Marriage Relations.)

Husband,	Vir. b. maritus.
Husband's father,	Socer.
" mother,	Socrus.
" grandfather,	Socer magnus.
" grandmother,	Socrus magna.
Wife,	Uxor. b. marita.

Wife's father,	Socer.
“ mother,	Socrus.
“ grandfather,	Socer magnus.
“ grandmother,	Socrus magna.
Step-father,	Vitricus.
“ mother,	Noverca.
“ son,	Privignus.
“ daughter,	Privigna.
Son-in-law,	Gener.
Daughter-in-law,	Nurus.
Brother-in-law (husband's brother),	Levir.
“ “ (sister's husband),	Maritus sororis.
“ “ (wife's brother),	Uxoris frater.
Sister-in-law (wife's sister),	Uxoris soror.
“ “ (husband's sister),	Gloss.
“ “ (brother's wife),	Fratria.
Relatives by father's side,	Agnati.
“ “ mother's side,	Cognati.
“ “ marriage,	Affines.

Each collateral line, when fully extended, reaches to “trinepos,” who is the sixth descendant in each line. If desirable to trace the line beyond him, he is made a new starting-point in the description, namely, “*fratris trinepotis filius*,” and on to “*fratris trinepotis trinepos*,” who is the twelfth descendant of my brother. In like manner, in the ascending series, “*tritavus*” becomes a new starting-point, which gives first “*tritavi pater*,” the father of *tritavus*, and on to *tritavi tritavus*, who is the twelfth ancestor of *Ego*. This exhausts the capacity of the nomenclature of this admirable system.

It will be observed that consanguinei are bound together in virtue of their descent, through married pairs, from common ancestors; that they are divided into a lineal and several collateral lines; and that the collateral are perpetually divergent from the lineal. The relationship of each person to the central *Ego* is accurately defined, and preserved distinct by means of a descriptive phrase. With the exception of the primary terms of relationship, which are those for father and mother, son and daughter, brother and sister, grandparent and grandchild, and husband and wife; and with the further exception of the terms for uncle and aunt which are found in the Sanskritic, Hellenic, Romaic, Germanic, and Slavonic stock-languages; and also with the exception of *nepos* and its cognates, which has an eccentric use,—the remainder of the system describes persons, leaving the relationship to implication. As before stated, the system, in its immediate origin, was purely descriptive. The Erse and Gaelic, which have no terms for uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, or cousin, is more strictly than the Roman the typical system of the Aryan family. This system will be dismissed without further

explanation, as the table will sufficiently illustrate the fundamental differences between this form and the classificatory which is next to be presented.

II. *System of Relationship of the Malayan Family.*

The Malayan is nearer the primitive system of relationship of the human family than any other hitherto discovered. This is a necessary inference from the fact that it is simpler, and therefore older, than the Ganowanian and Turanian systems, which prevail among the great body of the American Indian and Asiatic nations. It is also evident that the Malayan could not have been derived from either of the other forms, whilst both the Ganowanian and Turanian might have been, and presumptively were, engrafted upon an original form agreeing in all essential respects with the Malayan. It is a classificatory system as well as the most simple and elementary form of that system. The only relationships recognized are the primary. All consanguinei, near and remote, are classified under these relationships. Each term is in common gender; sex being indicated by adding the words *Kū-na* for male, and *Wū-hee'-na* for female. A full knowledge of the system may be obtained by passing through the several lines, and observing the relationship of each person to the central *Ego*.

In the lineal line we have *Kū-pū'-na*, grandparent, *Ma-kū'-a*, parent, *Kā'-kee*, child, and *Mū-pū'-na*, grandchild. The relationship of brother and sister is conceived in the twofold form of elder and younger; and there are double terms for each relationship, one of which is used by the males and the other by the females, as follows:—

Elder brother, male speaking,	<i>Kai-kū-ū'-na.</i>	Female speaking,	<i>Kai-kū-nū'-ne.</i>
Younger “ “ “	<i>Kai-ka-i'-na.</i>	“ “	<i>Kai-kū-nū'-ne.</i>
Elder sister, “ “	<i>Kai-kū-nū-he'-ne.</i>	“ “	<i>Kai-kū-ū'-na.</i>
Younger sister, “ “	<i>Kai-kū-wa-he'-ne.</i>	“ “	<i>Kai-ka-i'-na.</i>

For husband and wife the terms are respectively, *Kū'-na*, and *Wū-hee'-na*.

In the first collateral line, my brother's son and daughter are my son and daughter, each of them calling me father; and their children are my grandchildren, each of them calling me grandfather. My sister's children are also my sons and daughters, and their children are my grandchildren. The same is equally true whether I am a male or a female.

In the second collateral line, my father's brother is my father; his son and daughter are my brother and sister, elder or younger, and I

apply to them the same terms I do to my own brothers and sisters; the children of this collateral brother and sister are my sons and daughters; and the children of the latter are my grandchildren. Each of the persons named applies to me the proper correlative.

My father's sister, in like manner, is my mother; her children are my brothers and sisters, elder or younger; the children of these collateral brothers and sisters are my sons and daughters; and the children of the latter are my grandchildren.

My mother's brother is my father; and his children and descendants follow in the same relationships as in the previous cases. In like manner my mother's sister is my mother; and her children and descendants follow in the same relationships.

The third collateral line repeats the classification in the second. My grandfather's brother is my grandparent; his son is my father; the son of the latter is my brother, elder or younger; and the son and grandson of this collateral brother are my child and grandchild. My grandfather's sister and her descendants, and my grandmother's brother and sister and their descendants, follow in the same relationships as before. As far outward as consanguineity can be traced, the classification is the same. It will be seen more fully by consulting the following table.

HAWAIIAN SYSTEM OF RELATIONSHIP.

VOWEL SOUNDS.

ä, as in art; ä, as in at; ë, as in met; ÿ, as in it; ö, as in got; ü, as oo in food. Kū-ū = my.

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONS.	RELATIONSHIP IN HAWAIIAN.	SAME IN ENGLISH.
My great-grandfather	Kū-ū kū-pū-na	My grandparent.
" " grandfather's brother	" "	" "
" " sister	" "	" "
" " grandmother	" "	" "
" " grandmother's brother	" "	" "
" " sister	" "	" "
" grandfather	" "	" "
" grandfather's brother	" "	" "
" " sister	" "	" "
" grandmother	" "	" "
" grandmother's brother	" "	" "
" " sister	" "	" "
" father	mā-kū-ä kī-na	parent, male.
" mother	" wā-hee'-na	" female.
" son	kāi'-kee kī-na	child, male.
" daughter	" wā-hee'-na	" female.
" grandson	moo-pū-nā kī-na	grandchild, male.
" granddaughter	" wā-hee'-na	female.
" great-grandson	" kī'-na	" male.
" " granddaughter	" wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " great-grandson	" kī'-na	" male.
" great-granddaughter	moo-pū-nā wā-hee'-na	My grandchild, female.
" older brother	kūi-kū-ä-ä-na	brother, older.
" " (male speaking)	" "	" "
" " (female)	kūi-kū-ä-ä-ne	" "
" " (male)	kāi-kū-wā-hee'-na	" sister,
" " (female)	kūi-kū-ä-ä-nā	" "
" younger brother (male)	kāi'-kai-na	brother, younger.

My younger brother	(female)	")	Kū-ū	kū-kū-nā-nē	My brother, younger.
"	sister	(male)	"	"	kū-kū-nā-hē-na	" sister,
"	"	(female)	"	"	kū-ka-i-na	" "
"	(a man's) brother's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife,	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wū-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-nā kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "
"	sister's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wā-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-na kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "
"	(a woman's) sister's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wā-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-na kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "
"	sister's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wā-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-na kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "
"	(a woman's) sister's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wā-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-na kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "
"	sister's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wā-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-na kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "
"	(a woman's) sister's son	"	"	"	kū-kee kū-na	child, male.
"	"	son's wife	"	"	hū-nó-nā	daughter-in-law.
"	"	daughter	"	"	kū-kee wā-hee-na	child, female.
"	"	daughter's husband	"	"	hū-nó-nā	son-in-law.
"	"	grandson	"	"	moo-pū-na kū-na	grandchild, male.
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	female.
"	"	great-grandson	"	"	kū-na	" "
"	"	granddaughter	"	"	wā-hee-na	" "

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONS.	RELATIONSHIP IN HAWAIIAN.	EXAMPLES IN HAWAIIAN.
My (a woman's) brother's granddaughter	Kū-nū moo-pū-nā wā-hee-na	" female.
" " " " great-grandson	" " kā'-na	" male.
" " " " granddaughter	" " wā-hee'-na	" female.
father's brother	mā-kū-ā kā'-na	parent, male.
" " " " brother's wife	" " wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " sister	" " "	" "
" " " " sister's husband	" " kā'-na	" male.
" " " " mother's brother	" " "	" "
" " " " brother's wife	" " wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " sister	" " "	" "
" " " " sister's husband	" " kā'-na	" male.
father's brother	" " "	" "
" " " " brother's son (<i>male speaking</i>)	kāi-kū-ā-ā'-na (older) kai-kai'-na (y.)	brother.
" " " " son's wife	" " wā-hee'na	wife or my female.
" " " " daughter	" " kái-kū wā-hee'-na	sister.
" " " " daughter's husband	" " kái'-ko ee'-ka	brother-in-law.
" " " " son's son	" " kái-kee kā-na	child, male.
" " " " daughter	" " kái-kee wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " daughter's son	" " kái'-kee kā'-na	" male.
" " " " daughter	" " kái-kee wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " great-grandson	" " moo-pū-na kā'-na	grandchild, male.
" " " " granddaughter	" " wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " " " great-grandson	" " ká'-na	" male.
" " " " " " granddaughter	" " wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " " " sister	mā-kū-ā wā-hee'-na	parent, male.
" " " " " " sister's son	kāi-kū-ā-ā'-na (o.) kai'-kai-na (y.)	My brother.
" " " " " " son's wife	" " wā-hee'na	wife or my female.
" " " " " " daughter	" " kái-kū wā-hee'-na	sister.
" " " " " " daughter's husband	" " kái'-ko ee'-ka	brother-in-law.
" " " " " " son's son	" " kái-kee kā'-na	child, male.
" " " " " " daughter	" " kái-kee wā-hee'-na	" female.
" " " " " " daughter's son	" " kái'-kee kā'-na	" male.

My father's sister's daughter	Kū-ū	wā-hee'na	My child female.
" " great-grandson	"	moo-pū-na kā-na	" grandchild, male.
" " granddaughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
" " great-grandson	"	kā'-na	" " male.
" " granddaughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
mother's sister	"	mā-kū-ā-kā'-na	parent, female.
" sister's son	"	kāi-ku-ā-ā'-ne (o.) kāi-kāi'-na (y.)	brother.
" son's wife	"	wā-hee'-na	wife or my female.
" daughter	"	kāi-kū wā hee'-na	sister.
" daughter's husband	"	kāi-ko-ee'-ka	brother-in-law.
" son's son	"	kāi'-kee kā'-na	child, male.
" daughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
" daughter's son	"	kā'-na	" " male.
" daughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
" great-grandson	"	moo-pū'-na kā'-na	grandchild, male.
" granddaughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
" great-grandson	"	kā'-na	" " male.
" granddaughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
brother	"	mā-kū-a kā'-na	parent, male.
brother's son	"	kāi-kū-ā-ā'-na (o.) kāi-kāi'-na (y.)	brother.
" son's wife	"	wā-hee'-na	wife or my female.
" daughter	"	kāi'-kū wā-hee'-na	sister.
" daughter's husband	"	kāi-ko-ee'-ka	brother-in-law.
" son's son	"	kāi'-kee kā'-na	child, male.
" daughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
brother's daughter's son	"	kāi'-kee-kā'-na	child, male.
" daughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
" great-grandson	"	moo-pū'-na kā'-na	grandchild, male.
" granddaughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
" great-grandson	"	kā'-na	" " male.
" granddaughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.
father's father's brother's son	"	mā-kū-ā kā'-na	parent, male.
" daughter	"	wā-hee'-na	" " female.

DESCRIPTION OF PERSONS.		RELATIONSHIP IN HAWAIIAN.		SAME IN ENGLISH.	
My father's father's brother's son's son	• • • • •	Kū-ū	kāi-kū-ā-ā-na (o.)	kāi-kāi'-na (y.)	My brother.
" " " " daughter	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-hee-na	"	" sister.
" " " " daughter's son	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-ā-na (o.)	kāi-kāi'-na (y.)	" brother.
" " " " " daughter	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-hee-na	"	" sister.
" " " " great-grandson	• • • • •	"	kāi-kee kā'-na	"	child, male.
" " " " granddaughter	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	" female.
" mother's mother's sister's son	• • • • •	"	mā-kū-ā kā'-na	"	parent, male.
" " " " daughter	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	" female.
" " " " son's son	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-ā-na (o.)	kāi-kāi'-na (y.)	brother.
" " " " daughter	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-hee-na	"	sister.
" " " " daughter's son	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-ā-na (o.)	kāi-kāi'-na (y.)	brother.
" " " " daughter	• • • • •	"	kāi-kū-ā-hee-na	"	sister.
" " " " great-grandson	• • • • •	"	kāi-kee-kā'-na	"	child, male.
" " " " granddaughter	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	" female.
husband	• • • • •	"	kā'-na	"	husband.
wife	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	wife.
husband's father	• • • • •	"	mā-kū-ā hū-nā-ai	"	father-in-law.
" mother	• • • • •	"	"	"	mother-in-law.
wife's father	• • • • •	"	"	"	father-in-law.
" mother	• • • • •	"	"	"	mother-in-law.
son-in-law	• • • • •	"	hū-no'-nā kā'-na	"	child-in-law, male.
daughter-in-law	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	" female.
brother-in-law (husband's brother)	• • • • •	"	kā'-na	"	husband or my male.
brother-in-law (sister's husband) (<i>female speaking</i>)	• • • • •	"	kāi'-na	"	husband or my male.
" (wife's sister's husband)	• • • • •	"	pū-nā-lū-ā	"	intimate companion.
" (wife's brother)	• • • • •	"	kāi-ko-ā-ka	"	brother-in-law.
sister-in-law (wife's sister)	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	wife.
" (husband's sister)	• • • • •	"	kāi-ko-ā-ka	"	sister-in-law.
" (brother's wife)	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	wife.
" " (<i>female speaking</i>)	• • • • •	"	kāi-ko-ā-ka	"	sister-in-law.
" (husband's brother's wife)	• • • • •	"	pū-nā-lū-ā	"	intimate companion.
" (wife's brother's wife)	• • • • •	"	wā-hee'-na	"	wife.

It will be observed that the several collateral lines are merged in the lineal line, by means of which the posterity of my brothers and sisters, and of my collateral relatives, become my posterity. This is a fundamental characteristic of the classificatory system. In the Hawaiian no blood relatives, however remote in degree, can fall without the relationship of grandparent, grandchild, brother, or sister. The system, nevertheless, is clearly defined, and is founded upon a knowledge of the degrees of relationship, numerically, by means of which the classification is perfected. When the Ganowanian and Turanian forms are compared with the Hawaiian, and the principles of each are understood, it will be seen that poverty of language has nothing whatever to do with the latter system. The relationships which seem to be unreal and arbitrary may be found, in the sequel, to be those actually existing when the system was formed.

In the Hawaiian there are five grades of relatives, as follows : Myself, my brothers and sisters, and my first, second, third, and more remote cousins, are the first grade. These are my brothers and sisters without distinction. My father and mother and their brothers and sisters, together with their several cousins, as before, are the second grade. These, without distinction, are my parents. My grandfather and his brothers and sisters, and my grandmother and her brothers and sisters, on the father's side and on the mother's side, together with their several cousins, as before, are the third grade. These are my grandparents. Below me, my sons and daughters and their several cousins are the fourth grade. These are my children. My grandsons and granddaughters, and their several cousins, are the fifth grade. These are my grandchildren.* The Hawaiian system now realizes the nine grades of relations of the Chinese (conceiving them reduced to five) more perfectly than the Chinese itself does at the present time. An ancient Chinese author remarks as follows : —

“ All men born into the world have nine ranks of relatives. My own generation is one grade ; my father's is one ; my grandfather's is one ; that of my grandfather's father is one ; and that of my grandfather's grandfather is one ; thus above me are four grades. My son's generation is one grade ; my grandson's is one ; that of my grandson's son is one ; and that of my grandson's grandson is one ; thus below me are four grades of relations : including myself in the estimate, there are in all nine grades. These are brethren ; and although each grade be-

* All the individuals of the same grade are brothers and sisters to each other.

longs to a different house, or family, yet they are all my relatives, and these are called the nine grades of relations." A strong presumption arises from a comparison of the Hawaiian and Chinese systems, that the latter, in its original form, was identical, in all essential respects, with the former.

It remains to notice a remarkable custom of the Hawaiians, which had not entirely disappeared at the epoch of the establishment of the American missions. This custom was mentioned by Judge Lorin Andrews in explanation of a particular Hawaiian relationship in the following language: "The relationship of "*Pinalua*" is rather amphibious. It arose from the fact that two or more brothers, with their wives, and two or more sisters, with their husbands, were inclined to possess each other in common. But the modern use of the word is that of *dear friend*, or *intimate companion*." This custom has an intimate connection with the solution about to be presented.

III. *System of Relationship of the Ganowanian Family.*

The American Indians, when related, address each other by the term of relationship, and never by the personal name. As a custom it is substantially universal. If no relationship exists, the form of address is "my friend." This custom of saluting by kin has tended to impart as well as preserve a knowledge of the system, and to render it perfectly familiar to all. They recognize all the relationships known to the Aryan system, besides several which the latter does not discriminate. The system, as presented in the Table below, with some modifications in the different stock-languages, is now in practical daily use throughout the Ganowanian family.

In addition to a remarkably opulent nomenclature of relationships, some of these languages have a double set of terms for particular relationships, one of which is used by the males, and the other by the females. It will also be found, in very many cases, that the relationship of the same person to myself, a male, is different when I am a female. Notwithstanding the great diversities created by the system, it is logical and self-sustained throughout.

To develop its prominent characteristics it will be necessary to pass through the several lines, as in the former case.

The relationships of grandfather and grandmother, and of grandson and granddaughter, are the most remote which are recognized either in the ascending or descending series. Ancestors and descendants

above and below them fall into the same categories respectively. In the collateral lines persons of common descent cannot fall without the relationship of brother or cousin. The relationship of brother and sister is conceived in the twofold form of elder and younger, and not in the concrete ; and there are special terms for each.

First Collateral Line.

With myself a male, my brother's son and daughter are my son and daughter, each of them calling me father. This is the first indicative feature of the system. My brother's grandchildren are my grandchildren, each of them calling me grandfather.

On the other hand, my sister's son and daughter are my nephew and niece, each of them calling me uncle. (Second indicative feature.) My sister's grandchildren are my grandchildren, each of them calling me grandfather.

With myself a female, the first relationships are reversed ; my brother's son and daughter are my nephew and niece, each of them calling me aunt ; whilst my sister's son and daughter are equally my son and daughter, each of them calling me mother. The children of these nephews and nieces, sons and daughters, are, without distinction, my grandchildren, each of them calling me grandmother. In each of the cases above named, as well as in those hereafter stated, the primary terms are used in their primary sense, *e. g.* I call my brother's son *my son*, when I speak to him, the same as though he were my own son.

Second Collateral Line.

My father's brother is my father, and calls me his son. (Third indicative feature.) His son and daughter are my brother and sister, elder or younger according to our respective ages. (Fourth indicative feature.) With myself a male, the children of this collateral brother are my sons and daughters, each of them calling me father ; whilst the children of this collateral sister are my nephews and nieces, each of them calling me uncle. The children of each are my grandchildren, each of them calling me grandfather. On the contrary, with myself a female, the children of this collateral brother are my nephews and nieces, each of them calling me aunt ; whilst the children of this collateral sister are my sons and daughters, each of them calling me mother. Their children in like manner are my grandchildren, each of them calling me grandmother.

My father's sister is my aunt. (Fifth indicative feature.) Her son and daughter are my cousins, each of them calling me cousin. With myself a male, the children of this male cousin are my sons and daughters, whilst the children of my female cousins are my nephews and nieces. On the contrary, with myself a female, the children of my male cousins are my nephews and nieces, whilst the children of my female cousins are my sons and daughters. The children of each of the latter are my grandchildren.

My mother's brother is my uncle. (Sixth indicative feature.) His son and daughter are my cousins, and their descendants follow in the same relationships respectively as in the last case.

My mother's sister is my mother. (Seventh indicative feature.) Her son and daughter are my brother and sister, elder or younger. (Eighth indicative feature.) The children and descendants of this collateral brother follow in the same relationships respectively as the descendants of my father's brother first above given.

Third Collateral Line.

This line is a counterpart in all respects of the first and second, with some additional relationships. My grandfather's brother is my grandfather. (Ninth indicative feature.) His son is my father; the son and daughter of this father are my brother and sister, elder or younger; the children of this collateral brother, myself a male, are my sons and daughters; of this collateral sister are my nephews and nieces, and their children are my grandchildren. With myself a female the same changes must be made as in the former cases.

My grandfather's sister is my grandmother; her daughter is my aunt; the children of this aunt are my cousins; and the children and descendants of the latter follow in the same relationships as before.

My grandmother's brother is my grandfather; his son is my uncle; the children of this uncle are my cousins; and the children and descendants of these cousins follow in the same relationships as before.

In like manner my grandmother's sister is my grandmother; her daughter is my mother; the children of this mother are my brothers and sisters, elder or younger; and the children and descendants of this collateral brother and sister follow in the same relationships as in previous cases.

The fourth and fifth collateral lines are counterparts of the first three, as will be found by consulting the subjoined Table.

In each of the foregoing the collateral lines are finally brought into and merged in the lineal line, which is a fundamental characteristic of the system. This also gives the tenth indicative feature. Certain relationships are here called "indicative," because they determine those which precede and follow them; and because they embrace so much which is radical and fundamental, that, when they are found present in different systems of relationship, the identity of these systems may be considered established.

The Seneca-Iroquois system of consanguinity and affinity, as given in the Table, now prevails, with modifications, in upwards of seventy Indian nations. Its radical characteristics are found in their several systems with such striking exactness as apparently to leave no doubt that it was derived into each stock-language with the blood from a common original source.

Another fact, not less significant, remains to be mentioned, namely, that the system of relationship of the people of South-India speaking the Dravidian language, and numbering upwards of twenty-eight millions, is identical, with the exception of two or three unimportant particulars, with the Seneca-Iroquois. The same system, greatly modified by Sanskritic influence, also prevails among the people of North-India speaking the Gaura language, and numbering upwards of one hundred millions; and also, with further modifications, among the Chinese and Japanese.

For the purpose of comparison, and also for reference to the Asiatic form in the solution of the origin of the classificatory system, the Seneca-Iroquois and the Tamil systems are placed side by side in the following Table.

Comparative Table of the System of Relationship of the Seneca-Iroquois Indians of New York, and of the People of South-India speaking the Tamil Dialect of the Dravidian Language. *Ennamy.*

	Description of Persons.	Seneca-Iroquois.		Tamil.		Translation.
		Relationship in Seneca-Iroquois.	Translation.	Relationship in Tamil.	Translation.	
1	My great-grandfather's father	hoc'sote	My grandfather	En muppáddan	My 8d grandfather	
2	" " mother	oc'sote	grandmother	muppáddi	" " grandmother	
3	great-grandfather	hoc'sote	grandfather	púddi	" " grandfather	
4	" " grandmother	oc'sote	grandmother	paiddan	" " grandmother	
5	grandfather	oc'sote	grandfather	paiddi	" " grandfather	
6	grandmother	oc'sote	grandmother	takkáppán	" " grandmother	
7	father	há'-mih	father	táy	" " father	
8	mother	no-yeh'	mother	mákan	" " mother	
9	son	há-sh'-wuk	son	mákal	" " son	
10	daughter	ka-ah'-wuk	daughter	mákal	" " daughter	
11	grandson	há-yá'-da	grandson	péran	" " grandson	
12	granddaughter	ka-yá'-da	granddaughter	pétti	" " granddaughter	
13	great-grandson	há-yá'-da	grandson	irandám péran	" " grandson	
14	great-granddaughter	há-yá'-da	granddaughter	" "	" " granddaughter	
15	great-grandson's son	há-yá'-da	grandson	múdam péran	" " grandson	
16	" " daughter	há'-je	granddaughter	" " pétti	" " granddaughter	
17	elder brother	há'-je	elder brother	tannáyán, bannán	" " elder brother	
18	" " sister	ah'-je	" " sister	akkárl, bámakáy	" " sister	
19	younger brother	há'-gá	younger brother	tambí	" " younger brother	
20	" " sister	há'-gá	" " sister	" "	" " sister	
21	brothers	da-yá'-gui-dan'-no-dá	brothers	taugálochi, bangay	" " brothers (Sanskrit)	
22	sisters	" "	sisters	si kotharee	" " sisters	
23	brother's son	há-ah'-wuk	son	sákotharekál	" " son	
24	son's wife	ka-sól'	daughter-in-law	mákan	" " son	
25	daughter	ka-ah'-wuk	daughter	máramákal	" " daughter	
26	daughter's husband	oc-ná'-hose	son-in-law	" "	" " daughter	
27	grandson	há-yá'-da	grandson	marumákán	" " son-in-law & nephew	
28	great-grandson	há-yá'-da	granddaughter	péran	" " grandson	
29	" " granddaughter	há-yá'-da	grandson	pétti	" " granddaughter	
30	sister's son	há-yá'-wan-da	granddaughter	irandám péran	" " grandson	
31	son's wife	ka'-sá	nephew	" " pétti	" " granddaughter	
32	daughter	ka-yá'-wan-da	daughter-in-law	mákal	" " nephew	
33	daughter's husband	oc-ná'-hose	niece	máramákal	" " niece	
34	grandson	há-yá'-da	son-in-law	mákan	" " son	
35	granddaughter	há-yá'-da	grandson	péran	" " grandson	
36	great-grandson	há-yá'-da	granddaughter	pétti	" " granddaughter	
37	" " granddaughter	há-yá'-da	grandson	irandám péran	" " grandson	
38	brother's son	há-sól'-neh	nephew	" " pétti	" " granddaughter	
39	brother's son	há-sól'-neh	nephew	marumákán	" " nephew	

Description of Persons.		Relationship in Seneca-Iroquois.	Translation.	Relationship in Tamil.	Translation.
40	brother's son's wife	ka-sá	My daughter-in-law	En mákál	My daughter
41	daughter	ka-soh'-neh	" niece	" marumákál	" son
42	daughter's husband	oc-na'-hose	" son-in-law	" mákan	" grandson
43	grandson	ha-yá'-da	grandson	" péran	granddaughter
44	granddaughter	ka-yá'-da	granddaughter	" irandam péran	" 2d grandson
45	great-grandson	ha-yá'-da	grandson	" pértti	" granddaughter
46	granddaughter	ka-yá'-da	granddaughter	" mákán	" son
47	son's son	ha-ah'-wuk	daughter-in-law	" máramákál	" dm'ter-in-law & niece
48	son's wife	ka-sá	daughter	" mákál	" daughter
49	daughter	ka-ah'-wuk	son-in-law	" mákan	" son
50	daughter's husband	oc-na'-hose	grandson	" péran	" grandson
51	grandson	ha-yá'-da	granddaughter	" pértti	" granddaughter
52	granddaughter	ka-yá'-da	grandson	" irandam péran	" great-father
53	great-grandson	ha-yá'-da	granddaughter	" pértti	" little-father (if younger)
54	granddaughter	ka-yá'-da	father	" periya thakkappan	" mother (th'n my father)
55	father's brother	há-nih		" seriya	"
56	brother's wife	uc-no'-ese	step-mother	" táy	" elder brother
57	son (older than myself)	há-je	elder brother	" támayán	" younger brother
58	son (younger than myself)	há-gá	younger brother	" tambl	" cousin & sister-in-law
59	son's wife	ah-ge ah'-ne-ah	sister-in-law	" maítun (o.) anni (y.)	" elder sister
60	daughter	ah-je	elder sister	" akkari b, tamakáy	" younger sister
61	daughter (older than myself)	ka'-já	younger sister	" tangachelit b, tangay	" brother-in-law & cousin
62	daughter (younger than myself)	há-yá'-o	brother-in-law	" maítman	" son
63	son's son	ha-ah'-wuk	son	" mákan	" nephew
64	son's wife	ha-soh'-neh	nephew	" máramákán	" daughter
65	daughter	ka-ah'-wuk	daughter	" mákál	" niece
66	daughter's son	ka-soh'-neh	niece	" má'-mákál	" nephew
67	daughter's wife	há-yá'-wáir-da	nephew	" máramákán	" son
68	daughter	ha-ah'-wuk	niece	" mákán	" niece
69	daughter	ka-ah'-wuk	daughter	" mákál	" daughter
70	great-grandson	ka-yá'-da	grandson	" péran	" grandson
71	granddaughter	ka-yá'-da	granddaughter	" pértti	" granddaughter
72	father's son	ah-ge'-huc	aunt	" attai	" aunt
73	father's sister	hoc-no'-ese	step-father	" máman	" uncle
74	sister's husband	ah-gare'-seh	cousin	" attán b, máittán	" cousin
75	son	ah-gare'-seh	cousin	" mácheban	"
76	son's wife	ah-geah'-ne-ah	sister-in-law	" tangay	" younger sister
77	daughter	ah-gare'-seh	cousin	" mácheban	"
78	daughter's husband	ah-geah'-ne-ah	sister-in-law	" tangay	" cousin
79	daughter	ah-gare'-seh	cousin	" mácheban	"
80	daughter's husband	há-yá'-o	cousin	" máttuni	" elder or younger bro'r
81	son's son	há-ah'-wuk	brother-in-law	" máchebi b, máchehárl	" nephew
82	son's wife	há-ah'-wuk	son	" annim (o.) tambi (y.)	"
		ha-soh'-neh	nephew	" mákan	" son

83	My father's sister's son's daughter	(male speaking)	ka-ah'-wuk	My daughter	En mārūmākāl	My niece
84	"	(female)	ka-sol'-neh	" niece	mākāl	" daughter
85	" daughter's son	"	ha-ya'-wan-da	" nephew	mākan	" son
86	"	(male)	ha-ah'-wuk	" son	mārūmākan	" nephew
87	" daughter	(female)	ka-yā'-wān-da	" daughter	mākāl	" daughter
88	"	"	ka-ah'-wuk	" niece	mārūmākāl	" niece
89	" great-grandson	"	ha-yā'-da	" grandson	pērtti	" grandson
90	" granddaughter	"	ka-yā'-da	" granddaughter	mānan	" granddaughter
91	mother's brother	"	hac-no'-seh	" uncle	māmā	" uncle
92	brother's wife	"	ah-gā'-ng-ah	" aunt-mother	māttōpān	" aunt
93	" son	(male speaking)	ah-gere'-seh	" cousin	māchētan	" cousin
94	"	(female)	ah-ge-ah'-ne-ah	" cousin	"	"
95	son's wife	"	ah-gere'-seh	" sister-in-law	tangay	" younger sister
96	daughter	(male speaking)	ah-gere'-seh	" cousin	māttōmī	" cousin
97	"	(female)	ha-ya'-o	" brother-in-law	māchēhāl	"
98	daughter's husband	"	ha-ah'-wuk	" son	annan (O.) tam bi (Y.)	" elder or younger bro'r
99	" son	(male speaking)	ha-sol'-neh	" nephew	mākan	" nephew
100	" daughter	(female)	ka-ah'-wuk	" daughter	mārūmākāl	" son
101	"	"	ka-sol'-neh	" niece	mākāl	" niece
102	daughter's son	"	ha-yā'-wān-da	" nephew	mārūmākān	" daughter
103	"	"	ka-yā'-wuk	" son	mārūmākān	" nephew
104	" daughter	"	ka-yā'-wān-da	" niece	mākāl	" niece
105	" daughter	"	ka-yā'-wuk	" daughter	mārūmākān	" nephew
106	"	"	ka-yā'-da	" grandson	mākāl	" daughter
107	great-grandson	"	ha-ya'-da	" grandson	pērtti	" grandson
108	granddaughter	"	ka-yā'-da	" granddaughter	pērtti	" granddaughter
109	mother's sister	"	no-yeh'	" mother	pērtti	" mother, great or little
110	" sister's husband	"	hac-no'-e	" step-father	pērtti	" father, "
111	" son	(older than myself)	ha'-je	" elder brother	takkappān (P. or S.)	" elder brother
112	"	(younger "	ha'-gā	" younger brother	tam bi	" younger brother
113	son's wife	"	ah-gē-ah'-ne-ah	" sister-in-law	"	" sister-in-law & cousin
114	daughter	(older than myself)	ah'-je	" elder sister	māttōmī	" elder sister
115	"	(younger "	ka'-gā	" younger sister	akkāl b. tāmākay	" elder sister
116	daughter's husband	"	ha-yā'-o	" brother-in-law	tangēchēh, b. tangay	" younger sister
117	son's son	"	ha-ah'-wuk	" son	māttōmān	" bro'r-in-law & cousin
118	"	(male speaking)	ha-sol'-neh	" nephew	mākan	" son
119	" daughter	"	ka-ah'-wuk	" daughter	mārūmākān	" nephew
120	"	"	ka-sol'-neh	" niece	mākāl	" daughter
121	daughter's son	"	ha-ya'-wān-da	" nephew	mārūmākāl	" niece
122	"	"	ha-ah'-wuk	" son	mārūmākān	" nephew
123	" daughter	"	ka-yā'-wān-da	" niece	mārūmākāl	" son
124	"	"	ka-ah'-wuk	" daughter	mārūmākāl	" niece
125	great-grandson	"	ha-yā'-da	" grandson	pērtti	" daughter
126	granddaughter	"	ka-yā'-da	" granddaughter	pērtti	" grandson
127	father's father's brother	"	hac-sole	" grandfather	paaktin (P. and S.)	" grandfather, g't or lit.
128	" brother's son	"	ha'-nh	" father	takkappān (P. and S.)	" father, great or little

174	My father's father's father's sister's daughter	oc'-sote	My grandmother	En pādā (P. and S.)	My grandmother, g't or lit.
175	" " " daughter's daughter	no-yeh'	" mother	" tāy (P. and S.)	" mother, great or little
176	" " " dau'ters dau'ter (male speaking)	ah'-je	" elder sister	" tāmākāy b, tāngāy?	" sister, elder or younger
177	" " " " daughter's daughter	ha-soh'-neh	" niece	" mā'rāmākkāi	" niece
178	mother's mother's brother	ha-yā'-da	grandfather	" pērti	granddaughter
179	" " " brother's son	hoē'-sote	grandfather	" isvādām pādān	" 2d grandfather
180	" " " son's son	hoē'-sote	uncle	" pādām (P. or S.)	grandfather, g't or lit.
182	" " " son's son (male speaking)	ah-ge-ah'-ne-o	" cousin	" m-in-ān	" uncle
183	" " " son's son (female "	ha-ah'-wuk	" son	" m-itānān	" uncle
184	" " " son's son	ha-yā'-da	" grandson	" mā'rāmākkān	" nephew
185	mother's mother's sister	oc'-sote	grandmother	" pērtā	grandchild
187	" " " daughter's daughter	oc'-sote	grandmother	" irādām pādāi	" 2d grandmother
188	" " " dau'ter's dau'ter (older than myself)	no-yeh'	" mother	" pādāi (P. or S.)	grandmother, g't or lit.
189	" " " dau'ter's dau'ter (female speaking)	ah'-je	" elder sister	" tāy (P. or S.)	mother, great or little
190	" " " " daughter's daughter	ka-yā'-wān-da	" niece	" akkārl	elder sister
191	husband	ka-yā'-da	granddaughter	" māfāi	daughter
192	wife	da-yakē'-ne	husband	" pērti	granddaughter
193	husband's father	da-yakē'-ne	wife	" kāpānān, b, puruśān	husband
194	" mother	hā-ga'-sā	" father-in-law	" mānāvī, b, pūnchātū	wife
195	wife's father	ong-gā'-sā	mother-in-law	" mānān, b, māmānār	uncle & father-in-law
196	" mother	oc-nā'-hose	father-in-law	" mānū, b, mānūai	uncle & mother-in-law
197	son-in-law	oc-nā'-hose	mother-in-law	" mānūn	uncle & father
198	daughter-in-law	oc-nā'-hose	son-in-law	" mānū	uncle & father
199	step-father	ka'-sā	daughter-in-law	" māpīlāi, b, mā'rāmākkān	son-in-law & nephew
200	" mother	hoē'-no'-esc	step-father	" mā'rāmākkal	daughter-in-law & niece
201	" son	hoē'-no'-esc	step-mother	" sōriyā, tāy	(Widows cannot marry.)
202	" daughter	hū'-no	step-son	" māfān	my little mother
203	" brother	ka'-no	step-daughter	" māfān	son
204	" sister			" āpān (o.) tāmbi (y.)	daughter
205	brother-in-law (husband's brother)	hā-yā'-o		" akkārl (o.) tāngāy (y.)	bro'r, older or younger
206	" (sister's husband, male speaking)	ah-ge-ah'-ne-o	brother-in-law	" māitānān	" sister, "
207	" (" female "	hā-yā'-o	" "	" māitānān	bro'r-in-law & cousin
208	" (wife's brother)	ah-ge-ah'-ne-o	" "	" māitānān	" "
209	" (wife's sister's husband)	no relation	" "	" māitānān	" "
210	" (husband's sister's husband)	no relation	" "	" māitānān	" "
211	sister-in-law (husband's sister)	ka-yā'-o	sister-in-law	" sakānān	" "
212	" (brother's wife, male speaking)	ah-ge-ah'-ne-o	" "	" koruntāi (o.) māitānāi	sister-in-law & cousin
213	" (brother's wife, female speaking)	ka-yā'-o	" "	" nātānē	" "
214	" (husband's brother's wife)	ah-ge-ah'-ne-o	" "	" āpūi (o.) māitānāi (y.)	" "
215	" (wife's brother's wife)	no relation	" "	" āpūi (o.) māitānāi (y.)	" "
216	" "	no relation	" "	" āpūakattā	" "
217	widow	gō-no-kw'-yes'-hā'	ab widow	" tāmākāy (o.) tāngāy (y.)	" "
218	whower	ho-no-kw'-yes'-hā'	ab widower	" kīmpūn	" "
219	twins	tas-groēk'-hā	twins		widow.
					twins (Sanskrit)

The identity of the Seneca-Iroquois and the Tamil is demonstrated by a bare inspection. It is no part of my present purpose to attempt to show how this identity can be explained; but it may be premised that there are but four hypotheses conceivable for its explanation, which are the following:— 1. By borrowing one from the other. 2. By accidental invention by different peoples in disconnected areas; treating the system as arbitrary and artificial. 3. By spontaneous growth or development in similar conditions of society and in disconnected areas; treating the system as natural. 4. By inheritance, with the blood, from a common original source.

The first assumes territorial connection, and the consequent Asiatic origin of the Ganowanian family: and it may therefore be dismissed. The second is an impossible hypothesis. As the system embodies upwards of twenty independent particulars, the improbability of their accidental concurrence in the Seneca-Iroquois and the Tamil increases with the addition of each particular from the first to the last; becoming, finally, an impossibility. The third hypothesis is substantial. It assumes that the system is natural in its origin, and in accordance with the nature of descents; consequently, it must further assume that the ancestors of the Seneca-Iroquois and of the Tamilian people of India, if created in separate and independent zoölogical provinces, must not only have passed through the same experiences, but also have developed, through great reformatory movements, precisely the same sequence of customs and institutions, to have wrought out by natural development or organic growth the Ganowanian system in America and the Turanian system in Asia; the two remaining identical after having been transmitted with the blood through centuries of time. It will be found, in the sequel, and after the most critical examination, that the fourth hypothesis, that of its transmission with the blood from common ancestors, will prove the most satisfactory.

I am aware that the foregoing presentation of the Aryan, Malayan, Ganowanian, and Turanian systems of relationship is far too brief and incomplete to render entirely satisfactory the following solution of the origin of the classificatory system. But it will serve to indicate some of the conclusions to which the facts appear to tend.

The origin of the classificatory system, in view of its character and spread among the families of mankind, becomes a matter of deep importance. It is to be presumed that the recognized relationships were those which actually existed at the time the system was formed: If

this be true, then the system embodies a record of primitive customs and institutions of great significance. We have seen that the system of the Aryan family is a natural system, following the streams of the blood; but that it was founded upon marriage between single pairs. Wherefore it rests exclusively upon this form of marriage, and not upon natural suggestion. It is, at least, supposable that a state of society might have existed in the primitive ages in which marriage between single pairs, as well as the family in its modern sense, was entirely unknown. Whilst mankind were in this state, a system of consanguinity might have arisen entirely different from the Aryan form, and yet follow the streams of the blood, and be in strict accordance with the nature of descents. For example, it might rest, as before intimated, upon compound marriages in a communal family. In some such state of society as this the classificatory system must have originated.

I propose to take up the Malayan system of relationship as the earliest stage of the classificatory, and to submit a conjectural solution of its origin upon the assumed concurrent existence of certain customs and institutions. It will rest for the most part upon the assumed *intermarriage or cohabitation of brothers and sisters* in a communal family. After this I shall present a further conjectural solution of the origin of the remainder, or Turanian portion of the system, upon the basis of the *Tribal Organization*. These are the essential conditions; but they draw to themselves other customs and institutions of hardly secondary importance.

These solutions will enable us to construct upon them, as foundations, a great series of customs and institutions, in the order of their development, by means of which the human family raised itself through a long and savage experience from a state of promiscuous intercourse to a knowledge of the family in its modern sense.

Mankind, if one in origin, must have become subdivided at a very early period into independent nations, followed by the rapid formation of dialects and stock-languages, the latter repeated over and over again to the present time. Unequal progress has been made by these several stocks. Some of them still remain in a condition not far removed from the primitive; others are found in all the intermediate stages of progress on to complete civilization. It is not improbable that all the customs and institutions of mankind which have arisen at different epochs are still existing in some portions of the human family. Those

which have been most effective for man's advancement must have been of slow growth, and of still slower diffusion among the nations. They are to be regarded as the great remaining landmarks of man's progress, whilst the mass of minor influences which contributed to their adoption have fallen out of knowledge.

The customs and institutions relating to the family state, and in the probable order of their origination, may be stated as the following:—

- I. Promiscuous Intercourse.
- II. Intermarriage, or Cohabitation, of Brothers and Sisters. Giving
- III. The Communal Family. (First Stage of the Family.)
- IV. The Hawaiian Custom. Giving, with II.,
- V. The Malayan Form of the Classificatory System of Relationship.
- VI. The Tribal Organization. Giving
- VII. The Turanian and Ganowanian Systems of Relationship.
- VIII. Marriage between Single Pairs. Giving
- IX. The Barbarian Family. (Second Stage of the Family.)
- X. Polygamy. Giving
- XI. The Patriarchal Family. (Third Stage of the Family.)
- XII. Polyandria.
- XIII. The Rise of Property, with the Settlement of Lineal Succession to Estates. Giving
- XIV. The Civilized Family. (Present Stage of the Family.)
Causing
- XV. The Overthrow of the Classificatory System of Relationship, and the Substitution of the Descriptive.

Given, the second and fourth customs, the origin of the Malayan system can be demonstrated from the nature of descents, and the relationships shown to be those actually existing. In like manner, the second, fifth, and sixth of these customs and institutions being given, the origin of the Turanian and Ganowanian systems can be explained in the same manner, and to the same effect. Whether, given the Turanian system of relationship, the antecedent existence of these customs and institutions can be legitimately inferred, will depend upon the probability of their prevalence from the nature of human society, and from what is known of its previous conditions. It may be confidently affirmed that this great sequence of customs and institutions, although in part hypothetical, will organize and explain the body of ascertained

facts, with respect to the primitive condition of mankind, in a manner so singularly and surprisingly adequate as to invest it with a strong probability of truth.

All of these, except the first three, have existed within the historical period, and still prevail in large portions of the human family. The assumption, as to them, is limited to their mutual relations as members of a series.

With respect to the first three, namely, Promiscuous Intercourse, the Intermarriage of Brothers and Sisters, and the Communal Family, their prevalence will be assumed; although there is strong evidence tending to render probable the first two, and decisive evidence of the existence of communal families in the barbarous nations of the present time.

The Hawaiian custom, which has been explained, is the fourth in the series. It is a compound form of polygynia and polyandria, since, under one of its branches, the several brothers live in polygynia, and their wives in polyandria; and, under the other, the several sisters live in polyandria, and their husbands in polygynia. In other words, it is promiscuous intercourse within prescribed limits. Its existence, as a custom, seems to imply antecedent unregulated promiscuous intercourse, involving the cohabitation of brothers and sisters as its most common form; thus finding mankind in a state akin to that of the inferior animals. It seems probable that the Hawaiian custom still embodies the evidence of an organic movement of society to extricate itself from a worse condition than the one it produced. In effect, it was a compact between several brothers to defend their common wives, and a like compact between the husbands of several sisters to defend their common wives, against the violence of society; thus implying the existence of a perpetual struggle amongst the males for the possession of the females.

And this brings us to an important general proposition, namely, that the principal customs and institutions of mankind have originated in, and can only be explained as, great reformatory movements of society. If this sufficiently explains the origin of the Hawaiian custom, it must be regarded as one of a series of similar movements, by means of which mankind emerged from a state of promiscuous intercourse, and through a long and painful experience attained to marriage between single pairs, and finally to the family as it now exists.

I propose now to submit a conjectural solution of the origin of the

Malayan system upon the basis of the assumed intermarriage of brothers and sisters, and upon the Hawaiian custom.

It will be remembered that under this system the primary relationships only are recognized and named. These terms are applied to consanguinei in a definite manner, by means of which they are reduced to as many great classes as there are primary relationships. No distinction is made between lineal and collateral consanguinei, except that they are distributed into classes. In a word, all consanguinei are either fathers or mothers to each other, or brothers or sisters, sons or daughters, grandparents or grandchildren. It follows that a knowledge of the degrees, numerically, forms an integral part of the system, with certainty of parentage within prescribed limits.

I. All the children of my several brothers, myself a male, are my sons and daughters. Reason: I cohabit with all my brothers' wives, who are my own wives as well (using the terms *husband* and *wife* in the sense of the custom). As it would be impossible for me to distinguish my own children from those of my brothers, if I call any one my child, I must call them all my children. One is as likely to be mine as another.

II. All the grandchildren of my several brothers are my grandchildren. Reason: They are the children of my sons and daughters.

III. With myself a female, the foregoing relationships are the same. The reason must be sought in the analogies of the system. As my several brothers are my husbands, their children by other wives would be my step-children, which relationship being unrecognized they naturally fall into the category of my sons and daughters. These must be the relationships, or none.

IV. All the children of my several sisters, myself a male, are my sons and daughters. Reason: I cohabit with all my sisters, who are my wives.

V. All the grandchildren of my several sisters are my grandchildren. Reason: They are the children of my sons and daughters.

VI. All the children of my several sisters, myself a female, are my sons and daughters. Reason: I cohabit with all the husbands of my sisters, who are my husbands as well. This difference, however, exists. I can distinguish my own children from those of my sisters, to the latter of whom I am a step-mother. But since this relationship is not discriminated they fall into the category of sons and daughters.

VII. All the children of several own brothers are brothers and sisters to each other. Reason: These brothers cohabit with all the mothers of these children. Among their reputed fathers none of these children can distinguish their own father; but among the wives of these several brothers, they can distinguish their own mother: whence, as to the former, they are brothers and sisters to each other, but as to the latter, whilst the children of a common mother are brothers and sisters to each other, these are step-brothers and step-sisters to the children of their mother's sisters. They thus, for reasons stated in similar cases, fall into the relationships of brother and sister.

VIII. The children of these collateral brothers and sisters are also brothers and sisters to each other; the children of the latter are brothers and sisters again; and these relationships continue downward amongst their descendants indefinitely, at equal removes from the common ancestor. An infinite series is thus created, which becomes a fundamental part of the system. It is not easily explained. The Hawaiian custom, as stated, is limited to several own brothers and their wives, and to several own sisters and their husbands. To account for this infinite series, it must be further assumed that this privilege of barbarism extended wherever the relationship of brother and sister was recognized to exist; each brother having as many wives as he had sisters, and each sister having as many husbands as she had brothers, whether own or collateral.

IX. All the children of several own sisters are brothers and sisters to each other; all their children are brothers and sisters again; and so downward indefinitely. Reasons as in VII. and VIII.

X. All the children of several own brothers on the one hand, and of their several own sisters on the other, are brothers and sisters to each other; the children of the latter are brothers and sisters again; and so downward indefinitely. Reasons as in VII. and VIII.

XI. All the brothers of my father are my fathers; and all the sisters of my mother are my mothers. Reasons as in I., III., and VI.

XII. All the sisters of my father are my mothers; and all the brothers of my mother are my fathers. Reasons: My father cohabits with all his sisters, and my mother cohabits with all her brothers.

XIII. All the children of my collateral brothers and sisters are, without distinction, my sons and daughters.* Reasons as in I., III., IV., and VI.

XIV. All the children of the latter are my grandchildren. Reasons as in II.

XV. All the brothers and sisters of my grandfather, and all the brothers and sisters of my grandmother, are my grandparents. Reason : They are the fathers and mothers of my father and mother.

Every blood-relationship recognized under the Malayan system is thus explained from the nature of descents, and is seen to be the one actually existing, as near as the parentage of the individual could be known, with the exception of a limited number, which seem to have originated in the analogies of the system. The system, therefore, follows the streams of the blood, instead of thwarting or diverting its currents. It appears to have originated in the intermarriage or cohabitation of brothers and sisters in a communal family, the assumption of which, as a custom, is necessary to explain its origin from the nature of descents. When the Hawaiian custom, which finds its type in the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, intervened, it brought into the communal family other males and females ; but it must have left the previous usage unaffected, otherwise several of the Malayan relationships would have become untrue to the nature of descents, and changed, as we shall hereafter see, in the case of the Turanian and Ganowanian systems.

The origin of the several marriage relationships may be explained, with more or less of certainty, upon the same principles.

This solution of the origin of the Malayan system, although it rests, aside from the Hawaiian custom, upon the assumed intermarriage of brothers and sisters, is sufficiently probable in itself to deserve serious attention. It reveals a state of society in the primitive ages, not confined to the islands of the Pacific, with the evidence of its actual existence still preserved in this system of relationship, which we shall be reluctant to recognize as real, and yet toward which evidence from other and independent sources has long been pointing. It finds mankind, during the period anterior to the Hawaiian custom, in a barbarism so profound that its lowest depths can scarcely be imagined. It is partially shadowed forth by the fact, that neither the propensity to pair, now so powerfully developed, nor marriage in its proper sense, nor the family, except the communal, were known ; and, above all, that the sacredness of the tie which binds brother and sister together, and raises them above the temptations of animal passion, had not then dawned upon the barbarian mind.

In the next place we are to submit a conjectural solution of the

origin of the remainder, or Turanian portion of the system upon the basis of the tribal organization.

No evidence has been presented of the prevalence of the Hawaiian custom in Asia or America, or of the intermarriage of brothers and sisters as a general custom. Neither is it necessary for the purpose in hand that such evidence should exist. This solution is founded upon the assumed existence of the Malayan system in Asia anterior to the epoch of the tribal organization; and if these together are sufficient to explain the origin of the Turanian system, this system then becomes to some extent evidence of the existence of both customs, as well as of the Malayan system in Asia.

The Turanian system was undoubtedly engrafted upon an original form agreeing in all essential respects with the Malayan. About half of the Malayan relationships must be changed, leaving the other half as they are, to produce the Turanian system. It is clear that the Malayan could not be derived from the Turanian, since the former is the simpler, and therefore the older form; neither could the Turanian be developed out of the Malayan, since it contains additional and distinctive elements. But a great change of social condition might have occurred which would supply the new element; and such, in all probability, was the history of the transition from the one into the other. How this change was effected is the question. It will be seen, at a glance, that it was only necessary to break up the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, to change the Malayan into the Turanian form, provided the changes in parentage, thus produced, were followed to their logical results.

Following, step by step, the supposed sequence of customs and institutions which developed the classificatory system of relationship by organic growth, it will next be assumed that the Malayan form, as its first stage, prevailed upon the continent of Asia, among the ancestors of the present Turanian family, at the epoch of the Malayan migration to the islands of the Pacific. In other words, it may be conjectured that the Malayan family took with them from Asia the form which then prevailed, and preserved it to the present time, whilst they left the same form behind them in the stock from which they separated. With the Malayan system thus prevalent in Asia, it may be supposed that another great organic movement of society occurred, which resulted, in the course of time, in the establishment of the tribal organization. This institution is so ancient and so wide-spread that its origin must

ascend far back toward the primitive ages of mankind. It still prevails, or has prevailed, among the principal Asiatic and American Indian nations, and also among the ancestors of several of the present Aryan nations. It is explainable, in its origin, and only explainable, as a reformatory movement to break up the intermarriage of blood relations, and particularly of brothers and sisters, by compelling them to marry out of the tribe. With the prohibition of intermarriage in the tribe, the cohabitation of brothers and sisters was permanently abolished, since they were necessarily of the same tribe. It would neither overthrow the Hawaiian custom, although it abridged its range, nor the communal family, which harmonized with tribal life; but it struck at the roots of promiscuous intercourse by abolishing its worst features, and thus became a powerful movement toward the ultimate realization of marriage between single pairs and the true family state.

A tribe is a group of consanguinei, with descent limited either to the male or to the female line. Where descent is limited to the male line, the tribe would consist of a supposed male ancestor and his children, together with the descendants of his sons in the male line forever. It would include this ancestor and his children, the children of his sons, and all the children of his lineal male descendants, whilst the children of the daughters of this ancestor, and all the children of his female descendants, would be transferred to the tribes of their respective fathers. Where descent is limited to the female line, the tribe would consist of a supposed female ancestor and her children, together with the descendants of her daughters in the female line forever. It would include the children of this ancestor, the children of her daughters, and all the children of her lineal female descendants, whilst the children of the sons of this ancestor, and all the children of her male descendants, would be transferred to the tribes of their respective mothers. Modifications of this form of the tribe may have existed, but this is the substance of the institution. No man can marry a woman of his own tribe, whether descent is in the male or female line. All of its members are consanguineal. This prohibition is a fundamental characteristic of the tribal organization. The knowledge of a common tribal descent is preserved by a tribal name, such as wolf, bear, or horse.

If the principles resulting from the tribal organization, so far as they relate to parentage, are now applied to that part of the Turanian system, which is distinctively Turanian, the relationships will be found to be those actually existing, and to be in accordance with the nature

of descents. It will also interpret the manner in which the Turanian element became incorporated in the system.

I. All the children of my several sisters, myself a male, are my nephews and nieces. Reason: Since under the tribal organization my sisters ceased to be my wives, their children can no longer be my children, as in the Malayan, but must stand to me in a different and more remote relationship. Whence the origin of the relationships of nephew and niece.

II. All the children of these nephews and nieces are my grandchildren. This can only be explained from the analogy of the system. No relationships outside of nephew, cousin, and grandson, are recognized; that of grandchild, being the one recognized under the previous system, would be apt to remain until a new relationship was created.

III. All the children of my several brothers are still my sons and daughters. Reason: The tribal organization does not prevent my brother's wives from being my wives as well. The changes in the system are confined exclusively to those which depended upon the intermarriage of brothers and sisters.

IV. All the children of my several brothers, myself a female, are my nephews and nieces; and all their children are my grandchildren. Reasons as in I. and II.

V. All the children of my several sisters, myself a female, are still my sons and daughters; and their children are my grandchildren. Reason: I cohabit with all the husbands of my several sisters, who are my own husbands as well.

VI. All the sisters of my fathers are my aunts. Reasons: Since, under the tribal organization, my father does not cohabit with his sisters, they can no longer stand to me in the relation of mothers, but must be placed in one more remote. Whence the relationship of aunt.

VII. All the brothers of my mother are my uncles. Reason as in VI. Whence the relationship of uncle.

VIII. All the children of my several uncles and aunts are my cousins. Reasons as in VI. Since they cannot be my brothers and sisters, for the reasons named, they must stand to me in a more remote relationship.

IX. All the children of my father's brothers are my brothers and sisters, and so are all the children of my mother's sisters, as in the Malayan, and for the reasons there given.

X. All the children of my male cousins, myself a male, are my nephews and nieces, and all the children of my female cousins are my

sons and daughters. Such is the classification in the nations of South-India. Unless I cohabit with all my female cousins, and am excluded from cohabitation with the wives of my male cousins, these relationships cannot be explained from the nature of descents. In the American Indian family this classification is reversed; the children of my male cousins, myself a male, are my sons and daughters, and of my female cousins are my nephews and nieces. The latter are explainable from the analogy of the system. It is a singular fact that the deviation upon these relationships is the only one of any importance between the Tamil and the Seneca-Iroquois. It has undoubtedly a logical explanation of some kind. If it is attributable to the slight variation upon this privilege of barbarism above indicated, a singular solution of the difference in the two systems is thereby afforded.

XI. All the brothers of my grandfather and of my grandmother are, without distinction; my grandfathers and grandmothers. Reasons as to former same as in the Malayan; as to the latter, the analogy of the system.

The same course of explanation can be applied to the more remote collateral lines, and to several of the marriage relationships, with substantially the same results; but the solution has been carried far enough for my present purpose. All of the indicative relationships of the classificatory system have now been explained, and are seen to be the relationships which existed in the communal family, as constituted first under the Malayan system, and ultimately under the Turanian. If the progressive conditions of society in the ages of barbarism, from which this solution is drawn, are in part hypothetical, the system itself, as thus explained, is found to be of organic growth, as well as simple and natural. In any other view it must be regarded as an artificial and arbitrary creation of human intelligence. The probable existence of this series of customs and institutions, so far as their existence is assumed, is greatly strengthened by the simplicity of the solution which they afford of the origin of the classificatory system in two great stages of development.

An exposition of the entire series of customs and institutions named together with a discussion of the historical evidence relating to each of them, are necessary to a full appreciation of the probable correctness of this solution. But they cover too wide a field, and embrace too many considerations, to be treated at the present time. I have presented the naked outline, and what seemed to be the controlling propositions. This discussion, at most, is but the introduction of the subject.

The present existence of the classificatory system, with the internal evidence of its transition from the Malayan to the Turanian form is in itself a powerful argument in favor of the existence of the customs and institutions previously assumed; and also in favor of the origination of the remainder of the series in the order stated. All except the first and second, and perhaps the fourth, still prevail in portions of the human family, and are known to have existed as far back in the past as the oldest historical records ascend, with abundant evidence of the previous existence of some of them from time immemorial.

It yet remains to present a few facts with reference to the order of their origination as a great progressive series founded upon the growth of man's experience, and also with reference to their reformatory character. The establishment of this series, as a means for recovering the thread of man's history through the primitive ages, is the principal result of this solution of the origin of the classificatory system.

For the purpose of presenting a few of these facts, it will be necessary to recapitulate the series.

1. Promiscuous Intercourse. — This expresses the lowest conceivable stage of barbarism in which mankind could be found. In this condition man could scarcely be distinguished from the mutes, except in the potential capacity of his endowments. Ignorant of marriage in its proper sense, of the family except the communal, and with the propensity to pair still undeveloped, he was not only a barbarian, but a savage, with a feeble intellect and a still feebler moral sense. His only hope of elevation rested in the fierceness of his passions, and in the improvable character of his nascent mental and moral powers. The lessening volume of the skull and its low animal characteristics, as we recede in the direction of the primitive man, deliver a decisive testimony concerning his immense inferiority to his civilized descendants. The implements of stone and flint found over the greater part of the earth attest the rudeness of his condition when he subsisted chiefly upon fish; leaving it doubtful whether, to become a fisherman, he had not raised himself from a still more humble condition. That the ancestors of the present civilized nations were, in the primitive ages, savages of this description, is not improbable; neither is it a violent supposition that they, as well as the ancestors of the present barbarous nations, once lived in a state of promiscuous intercourse, of which, as to the latter, their systems of consanguinity and affinity still embody the evi-

dence. To raise mankind out of this condition could only be accomplished by a series of reformatory movements, resulting in the development of a series of customs and institutions for the government of their social life. The anchorage secured by each of these customs and institutions tended to hold society in its advanced position, and to prevent a relapse.

2. Intermarriage, or Cohabitation, of Brothers and Sisters. — This practice, which the previous condition necessarily involved, would tend to regulate, as well as to check, the gregarious principle. It would probably be the normal condition of society under this principle; and, when once established, would be apt to perpetuate itself through indefinite, or, at least, immensely long, periods of time. It gives the starting-point and the foundation of the Malayan system of relationship, which, in turn, is the basis of the Turanian and Ganōwanian. Without this custom it is impossible to explain the origin of the system from the nature of descents. There is, therefore, a necessity for the prevalence of this custom amongst the remote ancestors of all the nations which now possess the classificatory system, if the system itself is to be regarded as having a natural origin.

4. The Hawaiian Custom. — The existence of this custom is not necessary to an explanation of the origin of the Malayan system. All it contains bearing upon this question is found in the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, where the brothers live in polygynia and the sisters in polyandria; but it holds a material position in the series, for the reason that it was an existing and still prevalent custom in the Sandwich Islands at the epoch of their discovery. It finds its type in the previous custom, out of which it naturally arose. So far as it brought unrelated persons into the household, it was a positive advance upon the previous condition, tending to check promiscuous intercourse, and to relieve society from the evils of continuous intermarriage among blood relatives. It also tended to develop still further the idea of the communal family, and to move society in the direction of marriage between single pairs. Its reformatory character is implied from the fact, that it imposed upon the several brothers, who shared their wives in common, the joint obligation of their defence against the violence of society, the necessity for which would naturally exist in such a state of society as this custom presupposes.

5. The Communal Family. — Such a family resulted necessarily from the intermarriage of brothers and sisters. The union of effort

to procure subsistence for the common household led to communism in living. This probable organization of society in the primitive ages, and which continued long after the intermarriage of brothers and sisters was abolished, has not been sufficiently estimated in its relation to the early condition of mankind. Without being able to affirm the fact, there are strong grounds for supposing that most barbarous nations at the present time, although marriage between single pairs exists, are now organized more or less into such families, and practise communism as far as the same can be carried out in practical life. The American aborigines have lived, and still live, to a greater or less extent, in communal families, consisting of related persons, and practise communism within the household. This feature of their ancient mode of life can still be definitely and widely traced amongst them. It also entered into and determined the character of their architecture,—as witness the long bark house of the Iroquois, designed to accommodate twenty families of related persons; the polygonal dirt lodge of the Minnitarees and Mandans, designed for several families; the long houses of the Columbia River Indians, each large enough to accommodate several hundred persons; and, finally, the massive communal edifices of the Village Indians of New Mexico, Mexico, and Yucatan, some of them large enough for fifty or a hundred families, and giving rise to fables of *palaces*, which, without much doubt, were communal houses filled with Indians living in communism. In the communal family, as first described, is to be recognized the family in its first stage.

6. The Malayan System of Relationship.—This holds the rank of a domestic institution, and takes its place in the series as the basis of the Turanian system.

7. The Tribal Organization.—That this institution was designed to work out a reformation with respect to the intermarriage of brothers and sisters may be fairly inferred from the conspicuous manner in which it accomplishes this result. The state of society revealed by the Malayan system demonstrates its necessity. The origin of this most ancient and remarkable organization seems from the stand-point of this discussion to find a full and satisfactory explanation. It is not supposable that it came into existence all at once, as a complete institution; but rather that it was of organic growth, and required centuries upon centuries for its permanent establishment, and still other centuries for its spread amongst existing nations. It was probably the greatest of all the institutions of mankind in the primitive

ages in its influence upon human progress, as well as the most widely distributed in the human family. This gave, also, the Turanian system of relationship.

8. Marriage between Single Pairs. — Instances of marriage between single pairs may have, and probably did, occur in all periods of man's history ; but they must have been exceptional, from the necessity of the case, in the primitive ages. After the tribal organization came into existence, and the cohabitation of brothers and sisters was broken up, as well as all intermarriage in the tribe, there must have been a very great curtailment of the license of barbarism. Women for wives became objects of negotiation out of the tribe, of barter, and of capture by force. The prevalence of these practices throughout Asia and America is well established. Wives thus gained by personal effort, and by purchase, would not be readily shared with others. In its general tendency it would lead to individual contracts to procure a single wife for a single husband, and thus tend directly to inaugurate marriage between single pairs. The immense influence of the tribal organization upon human progress toward the true family state cannot be overestimated.

9. The Barbarian Family. — In the early ages this stage of the family could scarcely be distinguished from the communal.

10. Polygamy. — In its relation to pre-existing customs and institutions polygamy is essentially modern. It presupposes a very great advance of society from its primitive condition, with settled governments, with stability of such kinds of property as existed, and with enlargement of the amount, as well as permanence, of subsistence. It seems to spring out of antecedent customs, akin to the Hawaiian, by natural suggestion. If this be so, then polygamy must be regarded as having been a reformatory institution. Considered from this standpoint, instead of a retrograde movement, it was a powerful advance in the direction of the true family.

11. The Patriarchal Family. — Polygamy resulted in the establishment of the patriarchal family, or the family in its third stage. A family with a single male head was an immense advance upon the communal. It necessitated, to some extent, a privileged class in society, before one person would be able to support several sets of children by several different mothers. Polygamy in its higher forms belongs to the dawning ages of civilization.

12. Polyandria. — This custom requires no further notice.

13. Property. Considered as an Institution.— It is impossible to overestimate the influence of property upon the civilization of mankind. It was the germ, and is still the evidence, of his progress from barbarism. The master passion of the civilized mind is for its acquisition and enjoyment. Governments, institutions, and laws, all resolve themselves into so many agencies designed for the creation and protection of property. But, above all, the desire of parents to transmit it to their children was the great turning-point between barbarism and civilization. When this desire, which arose with the development of property, was consummated by the introduction of lineal succession to estates, it revolutionized all the social ideas of barbarous society. Marriage between single pairs became the first condition to certainty of parentage; and thus, in course of time, became the rule, rather than the exception; the interests of property required individual ownership to stimulate personal exertion; and the protection of the state became necessary to render it stable. With the rise of property, considered as an institution, with the settlement of its rights, and, above all, with the established certainty of its transmission to lineal descendants, came the first possibility among mankind of the true family in its modern acceptation. All previous family states were but a feeble approximation.

14. The Family.— As now constituted, the family is founded upon marriage between one man and one woman. A certain parentage was substituted for a doubtful one; and the family became organized and individualized by property rights and privileges. The establishment of lineal succession to property as an incident of descent overthrew, among civilized nations, every vestige of pre-existing customs and institutions inconsistent with this form of marriage. The persistency with which the classificatory system has followed down the families of mankind to the dawn of civilization furnishes evidence conclusive that property alone was capable of furnishing an adequate motive for the overthrow of this system and the substitution of the descriptive. There are strong reasons for believing that the remote ancestors of the Aryan, Semitic, and Uralian families possessed the classificatory system, and broke it up when they reached the family state in its present sense.

Upon this family, as now constituted, modern civilized society is organized and reposes. The whole previous experience and progress of mankind culminated and crystallized in this one great institution.

It was of slow growth, planting its roots far back in the ages of barbarism, — a final result, to which the experience of the ages had steadily tended. The family, which in this view of the case is essentially modern, is the offspring of this vast and varied experience of the ages of barbarism.

Since the family was reached, it has also had its stages of progress, and a number of them. The rise of family names, as distinguished from the single personal name common in barbarous nations, is comparatively modern in the Aryan family. The Roman GENS is one of the earliest illustrations. This people produced the triple formula to indicate the *name of the individual*, of the *Gens* or *great family*, and of the *particular family* within the *Gens*. Out of this arose, in due time, the doctrine of agnation, to distinguish the relationship of the males, who bore the family name, from that of the females of the same family. Agnatic relationship was made superior to cognatic, since the females were transferred, by marriage, to the families of their husbands. This overthrew the last vestige of tribalism, and gave to the family its complete individuality.

15. The Overthrow of the Classificatory System of Relationship and the Substitution of the Descriptive. — Without attempting to discuss the fragments of evidence tending to show that the Aryan, Semitic, and Uralian families once possessed the classificatory system, it will be sufficient to remark, that, if such were the fact, the rights of property and the succession to estates would have insured its overthrow. These are the only conceivable agencies sufficiently potent to accomplish so great a change. Without such a change the family, as now constituted, would have remained impossible.

In conclusion I may remark, that the probable truth of this solution cannot be fully appreciated from the limited presentation of the facts contained in this article. At most it will but serve to invite attention to the great sequence of customs and institutions which seem to mark the successive stages of man's progress through the periods of barbarism, and to indicate the intimate relations which this remarkable system of consanguinity appears to sustain to the condition, experience, and advancement of mankind during the primitive ages. The manuscript containing the body of the evidence is now in course of publication by the Smithsonian Institution.