

culate-dotted macrospores. It grows in damp springy soil, not in water, in the Willamette Valley, maturing in August and September.

694. *SELAGINELLA RUPESTRIS* Spring, var. *TROPICA* Spring. *S. struthioloides* Presl.

695. *EQUISETUM LÆVIGATUM* A. Braun ; Gray, Man. p. 655.

696. *EQUISETUM LIMOSUM* L.

697. *MARSILIA VESTITA* Hook. & Grev. Ic. Fil. t. 159.

698. *AZOLLA CAROLINIANA* Willd. *A. microphylla* Kaulf.

699 - 701. *NITELLÆ* species, not determined.

The *Musci*, *Hepaticæ*, and *Lichenes* are under examination, and will be separately published.

Six hundred and forty-second Meeting.

March 12, 1872. — MONTHLY MEETING.

The CORRESPONDING SECRETARY in the Chair.

Mr. C. S. Pierce made a communication on the photometric measurement of the stars, and exhibited an instrument for this purpose devised by Zöllner.

Mr. Lewis H. Morgan presented the following paper on Australian Kinship; with Appendices, by Rev. Lorimer Fison.

There are five classes of facts, preserved in the institutions of savage and barbarous nations, which are now attracting increasing attention. In connection with inventions and discoveries, they have been the instrumentalities by means of which mankind traversed the successive stages of savagery, of barbarism, and of civilization. When these facts are fully ascertained and compared, and the logical deductions are gathered into definite propositions, the most instructive portion of the ancient experience of mankind will be recovered and utilized.

It seems probable that the advancement of man through the successive stages of savagery and of barbarism was greater in degree than it has been since in the stages of civilization. When the savage had raised himself to a barbarian, and the latter had risen to the pastoral and agricultural conditions, this improved man, although still a barbarian, was further removed from the primitive savage than the philosopher of the present age is above this same barbarian. Be this as it may, the experiences of these several conditions are successive links of a common chain, each of which is necessary to the interpretation of

the other. Modern institutions plant their roots in the period of barbarism, into which their germs were transmitted from the previous period of savagism; and the experiences of both conditions, through unnumbered ages, were a necessary prerequisite to their possible realization.

These facts, which, apart from inventions and discoveries, are crystallized in domestic institutions, are so many results of the gradual formation in the mind of man of certain ideas, passions, and aspirations, and of their subsequent development through successive stages of progress. Those holding the most prominent position may be generalised as growths of the particular ideas with which they severally stand connected.

They are the following:—

- I. The Growth of the Idea of the Family.
- II. The Growth of the Idea of Government.
- III. The Growth of the Idea of Articulate Language.
- IV. The Growth of Religious Ideas, or of Religions.
- V. The Growth of the Idea of Property.

With respect to the first, the facts which preserve and reveal the stages of its growth are embodied in systems of consanguinity and affinity, and in marriage laws.

With respect to the second, the germ of this idea must be sought in the tribal organization, or totemic system, and followed down through the stages of personal government perfect in every band into other forms both personal and national, and lastly national and territorial.

With respect to the third, human speech undoubtedly is a development from the rudest and simplest forms of expression. Gesture language must have preceded articulate language, and if so, thought necessarily preceded speech. In like manner the monosyllabical form preceded the syllabical, as the latter preceded the language of concrete words. Thought also presided over each of these successive stages of progressive development. As a growth from the human brain, it is the most original, unique, and extraordinary of its products.

The fourth subject is environed with such intrinsic difficulties that it will probably never receive a perfectly satisfactory exposition.

And, lastly, the idea of property was slowly formed in the human mind, remaining feeble and nascent through immense periods of time. It required all the experience of the ages of barbarism to nourish and develop the germ, and to prepare the human brain to accept its mas-

tery, and to surrender itself to its powerful influence. Its dominance as a passion marks the epoch of civilization commenced. We must recognize this remarkable passion as the only power able to master the hindrances and overcome the obstructions in the pathway of civilization. Property and civilization are substantially convertible terms. A minute knowledge of the processes of evolution of this idea would constitute in some respects the most extraordinary chapter of the mental history of mankind.

The materials to be presented in this paper tend to illustrate, and are confined to, the state of marriage, of the family, and of the tribal organization among the Australian aborigines.

Systems of consanguinity and the tribal organization as they are now found to exist among savage and barbarous nations are chiefly important from the light they seem to throw upon the growth of the idea of the *family* through successive stages of development. Some of these systems of consanguinity are either primitive or quite near the primitive form, whilst others are in different stages of advancement. They indicate with substantial certainty that the *Communal Family*, founded upon the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, was the first and earliest form of the family in the primitive ages; or, at least, the earliest we are as yet able to recognize. Between this and the *Barbarian Family* (second stage of the family) there was a wide interval. The tribal organization intervened between these forms, and produced the gradual transition from one into the other. It seems to have been the primary object of this organization to break up the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, although the same result was reached among the Australian aborigines by a sexual organization anterior, in the order of time, to the totemic system. Brothers and sisters were necessarily of the same tribe, and marriage between them was permanently abolished by the prohibition of intermarriage in the tribe. The tribal organization tended to inaugurate marriage between single pairs, since it forced individuals to seek wives from other tribes, or to acquire them by negotiation, by purchase, and by capture. This tendency, however, was retarded by the subdivision of the same people into several tribes, which furnished each other with wives; but more especially by a system of regulated cohabitation, running by *conjugal* right (*jura conjugalia*)* through a large circle of related persons.

* The Romans made a distinction between *connubium*, which related to wedlock, considered as a civil institution, and *conjugium*, which was a mere physical union.

Communal marriage and the communal family continued for ages after the introduction of the totemic system. The latter underwent changes within itself before it reached its ultimate form, some of which it will be the object of this paper to illustrate. There are nations of savages now existing which have been tribally organized in all probability for thousands of years, including their remote ancestry, amongst whom it is still in a transition stage.

The *Patriarchal Family* (third stage of the family) when considered in its highest type* came in with the dawn of civilization. As a form of the family it made but a slight impression upon human affairs, for want of universality. But as an example, as well as the creation of a family with a single male head, it was an advance upon any form before that time known, and heralded by the force of the innovation the advent of the *Civilized Family*, or the family in its fourth stage. It thus leaves but two forms through the immense periods anterior to civilization. When the facts are more fully ascertained, it is probable that several well-marked types both of the communal and of the barbarian family will be discovered and indicated, with perhaps one or more permanent forms between the two. For the present it will facilitate investigation if but the four successive forms above indicated are recognized.

Kinship and consanguinity, as used, are not convertible terms. The former relates to the connection through tribes and classes, while the latter relates to the connection by blood through common descents.

The preceding observations have been made to point out the bearing of the facts about to be presented.

The annexed papers on Australian kinship were furnished to the writer by the Rev. Lorimer Fison, an English missionary now resident in Australia, who received the principal facts from the Rev. W. Ridley, an English clergyman, and another English gentleman, T. E. Lance, Esq., both of whom have spent many years among the Australian aborigines, and enjoyed excellent opportunities for observation. They contain original information of an interesting character, show-

* Polygamy, restricted in the main to chiefs, yielded a low form of the patriarchal family; but the form intended to be indicated is identified with the pastoral state, and with a limited agricultural subsistence. It presupposes a growth of the idea of government beyond that of chief and followers, or even that of an oligarchy of chiefs, and also a considerable development of the idea of property, with an increased amount as well as stability of subsistence.

ing a phase of the tribal organization, together with a sexual organization, antecedent to the former in point of time, not hitherto known, except generally, as the writer believes.*

We may further observe that the tribal institution was one of the oldest of the human family. Commencing in savagery and traversing the remainder of this period and the whole period of barbarism, it has probably been more influential than any other single institution upon human advancement. The nations of the Aryan and Semitic families were tribally organized in the remote past, lived and progressed under it, and only emerged from it, or laid it aside, when they had reached the commencement of their civilized careers. Property overthrew tribalism. In like manner the nations of the Turanian family were thus organized in the barbarous ages, some of them retaining it to the present day, whilst others have worked out from it into partial civilization. The American aborigines and the nations of Central Africa are still living in the tribal state; and this is true also of the Malayan and Australian families, where they have attained to a condition as far advanced as this organization presupposes. There are Polynesian nations still below the tribal state, amongst whom there is evidence of the intermarriage of brothers and sisters until a comparatively recent period.

Island nations progress much slower than continental. Some of them are still savage, and, if not absolutely stationary, are nearer the primitive condition than any other portion of mankind. At the same time their present state points to an anterior condition as far below it, as all the centuries of their experience, with some degree of continuous progress, necessarily implies. The Australians are savages. Belonging to the Alforan race, they rank below the Malayan, the Polynesian, and the Ganowanian. Their domestic institutions, therefore, must approach the primitive type as nearly as those of any other people. It is for the last-named reason that the facts of their social organization, about to be presented, possess a high degree of importance.

Three memoranda, furnished by Mr. Fison, are hereto annexed, and marked A, B, and C. They have been prepared with so much care and precision that but little can be added to render them more complete. Since, however, they were written at different times, it may prove an advantage to the reader to have them presented in a form

* A brief notice of this system is given in McLennan's "Primitive Marriage," p. 118, and also in Tylor's "Early History of Mankind," p. 285.

uniting the three papers in one, thus giving him the option of the secondary or the original. An organization simple to savages may be embarrassing to ourselves until its principles are mastered; but with a reasonable share of attention it can be intelligently followed to the end.

The form of the tribal organization and of kinship under it to be presented, prevails among that portion of the Australian aborigines who speak the Kamilaroi language. They inhabit the Darling River country north of Sidney. It is also found in other Australian nations.

First. The Kamilaroi people are divided into six tribes, standing with reference to the right of marriage in two divisions, as follows:—

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Iguana (Duli), | 4. Emu (Dinoun), |
| 2. Kangaroo (Murriira),* | 5. Bandicoot (Bilba), |
| 3. Opossum (Mute), | 6. Blacksnake (Nurai). |

Originally the first three tribes were not allowed to intermarry with each other, but were allowed to do so with the other three; and *vice versa*. This restriction is not anomalous, and would not of itself invade the fundamental structure of the tribe.† It is now modified in certain definite particulars, but not carried to the full extent of permitting marriage into any tribe but that of the individual. No person can marry into his or her own tribe. Descent is in the female line, the children following the tribe of the mother. These are the essential characteristics of the tribal organization wheresoever this institution is found; and the Kamilaroi tribe, in its external features, is at once perfect and complete.

Secondly. But there is a further division of the people into eight classes, four of which are male and four female, with a regulation in respect to marriage which changes the nature of the tribe itself, or, rather, demonstrates that the tribal organization is in process of development into its true ultimate form. One only of the four classes of

* Paddymelon, a species of kangaroo.

† The Seneca-Iroquois are divided into eight tribes, as follows:—

- | | | | |
|----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1. Wolf. | 2. Bear. | 3. Beaver. | 4. Turtle. |
| 5. Deer. | 6. Snipe. | 7. Heron. | 8. Hawk. |

“Originally, with reference to marriage, the Wolf, Bear, Beaver, and Turtle, being brothers to each other, were not allowed to intermarry. The four opposite tribes, being also brothers to each other, were not allowed to intermarry. Either of the first four tribes, however, could intermarry with either of the last four, the relation between them being that of cousins. . . . In process of time, however, the rigor of the system was relaxed, until the prohibition was confined to the tribe of the individual. . . . They can now marry into any tribe but their own.”—*League of the Iroquois*, p. 83.

males can marry into one only of the four classes of females. More than this, if the male belongs to one of the first three tribes, the female must belong to one of the opposite three. The first restriction is in opposition to the true ideal of the tribe, because, as will hereafter be seen, a portion only of a tribe is allowed to marry with a portion only of another tribe, demonstrating the proposition before advanced, that the totemic system among the Kamilaroi was in the incipient stages of development.

The classes are the following :—

<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>
1. Ippai.	1. Ippata.
2. Kumbo.	2. Buta.
3. Murri.	3. Mata.
4. Kubbi.	4. Kapota.

All the Ippais, of whatever tribe, are brothers to each other; all the Kumbos are the same, and so are the Murris and Kubbis respectively. In like manner, all the Ippatas, of whatever tribe, are sisters to each other; all the Butas are the same, and so are the Matas and Kapotas respectively. In the next place, all the Ippais and Ippatas are brothers and sisters to each other, whether children of the same mother or collateral consanguinei, and in whichever tribe they are found, Kumbo and Buta are the same; and so are Murri and Mata, Kubbi and Kapota, respectively. Mr. Fison, quoting from the letter of Mr. Lance, remarks, "All Ippais are brothers, and all Ippatas are their sisters, and so also with Kubbis and Kapotas. If a Kubbi meets a Kapota whom he has never seen or heard of before, they address each other as brother and sister." The Kamilaroi, therefore, resolve into four great groups or circles of brothers and sisters. This is the first distinctive feature of the Australian system of kinship, disclosing an organization older than the tribes founded upon sex, and more archaic than any constitution of society hitherto discovered.

The term *classes* will perhaps answer for these subdivisions, although not entirely satisfactory. The classification is apparently sub-tribal, but in reality sexual. It has its primary relation to a law of marriage as remarkable as it is original.

Brothers and sisters are not allowed to marry. They are necessarily of the same tribe, except as they are tribal brothers and sisters through the class connection. Therefore the classes stand to each other in a different order with respect to the right of marriage, or the

privilege of cohabitation, which better expresses the relation. One class of males, as before stated, can marry but one class of females. Such was the original law, thus:—

Ippai	marries	Kapota,	and	no	other.
Kumbo	“	Mata	“	“	“
Murri	“	Buta	“	“	“
Kubbi	“	Ippata	“	“	“

This exclusive scheme has been modified in one particular, as will be hereafter shown.

It is thus seen that each male in the selection of a wife, or rather in the range of the conjugal privilege, is limited to one fourth part of all the Kamilaroi females. Ippai, in the Emu, Bandicoot, and Blacksnake tribes, can marry Kapota in the Iguana, Kangaroo, and Opossum tribes; and Kumbo, in the same first three, can marry Mata in the last three. On the other hand, Murri and Kubbi in the last three can marry Buta and Ippata respectively in the first three tribes. This, however, is not the most remarkable part of the system. Theoretically, every Kapota is the wife of every Ippai, every Mata is the wife of every Kumbo, every Buta of every Murri, and every Ippata of every Kubbi. Upon this material point the information communicated by Mr. Lance to Mr. Fison is specific. The latter, after observing that Mr. Lance had “had much intercourse with the natives, having lived among them many years on frontier cattle stations on the Darling River, and in the trans-Darling Country,” quotes from his letter as follows: “If a Kubbi meets a stranger Ippata, they address each other as *Goleer* = Spouse. . . . A Kubbi thus meeting an Ippai, even though she were of another tribe, would treat her as his wife, and his right to do so would be recognized by her tribe.” (See Memo. B.) *A fortiori* every Ippata within the immediate circle of his acquaintance would also be his wife.

Here we find, in a direct and definite form, communal marriage, or a legalized system of cohabitation in a great communal family, with the family itself as comprehensive as the range of the conjugal privilege. Under these *jura conjugalia* a domestic institution was formed, giving to one quarter of all the males the conjugal privilege with one quarter of all the females of the Kamilaroi nation; and making it the basis, originally, of their social organization. It is but a step from promiscuous intercourse; or the same thing, in reality, with a method. Moreover, it is deeply significant as a revelation of an existing state of marriage, and of the family in a nation of savages. It is the first

direct evidence of a condition of society which had previously been deduced from systems of consanguinity and affinity as extremely probable, if not substantially certain.*

Thirdly. Whilst the children remained in the tribe of their mother, they passed into another class of the same tribe. This will be made apparent by the following table:—

<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>		<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>
1. Ippai marries	Kapota.	Their children are	Murri and	Mata.
2. Kumbo “	Mata.	“ “ “	Kubbi “	Kapota.
3. Murri “	Buta.	“ “ “	Ippai “	Ippata.
4. Kubbi “	Ippata	“ “ “	Kumbo “	Buta.

If we follow out these descents, we find that in the female line Kapota begets Mata, and Mata, in turn, begets Kapota. It is the same in the male line; for Ippai begets Murri, and Murri, in turn, begets Ippai. Further than this it will be seen, by crossing from one class into another, that the blood of each male and female ancestor passes through each of the classes; thus Ippai begets Murri, Murri begets Ippata, Ippata begets Kumbo, Kumbo begets Kapota, Kapota begets Mata, Mata begets Kubbi, and Kubbi begets Buta.

Fourthly. Out of the preceding statements we have the full constitution of the tribes, with the several classes belonging to each. The classes are in pairs of brothers and sisters, and the tribes themselves are constituted in pairs, as follows:—

<i>Tribes.</i>	<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>	<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>
1. Iguana (Duli)	All are	Murri and Mata, or	Kubbi and	Kapota.
2. Emu (Dinoun)	“	Kumbo “	Buta, “	Ippai “
3. Kangaroo (Murriira)	“	Murri “	Mata, “	Kubbi “
4. Bandicoot (Bilba)	“	Kumbo “	Buta, “	Ippai “
5. Opossum (Mute)	“	Murri “	Mata, “	Kubbi “
6. Blacksnake (Nurai)	“	Kumbo “	Buta, “	Ippai “

* “Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family, Smithsonian Contributions,” Vol. XVII. p. 480 et seq. Mr. John F. McLennan, in “Primitive Marriage,” was the first to collect and point out the evidence of promiscuous intercourse, more or less general, amongst barbarous nations. In this remarkable work, which is noteworthy for its originality, logical acuteness, and thoroughness of research, he remarks: “We have examples of general promiscuity, and examples of modified promiscuity, in which, with a pretence of marriage, the woman may bestow her favors upon any one, under certain restrictions as to rank and family.” (p. 117.)

The necessary connection of the children with a particular tribe is proven by the law of marriage and descent. Thus Iguana-Mata must marry Kumbo ; her children are Kubbi and Kapota, and necessarily Iguana in tribe. Iguana-Kapota must marry Ippai ; her children are Murri and Mata, and also Iguana in tribe. In like manner, Emu-Buta must marry Murri ; her children are Ippai and Ippata, and Emu in tribe. Emu-Ippata must marry Kubbi ; her children are Kumbo and Buta, and also of the Emu tribe. The same is true with respect to marriages in the two remaining pairs of tribes. It will also be seen that each tribe is made up, theoretically, of the descendants, in the female line, of two supposed female ancestors. Why Mata and Kapota are found in the Iguana, Kangaroo, and Opossum, and not in the other tribes, and why Buta and Ippata are found in the Emu, Bandicoot, and Blacksnake, and not in the first three tribes, is not explained, except that it is a part of the constitution of the tribal system as it now exists among the Kamilaroi.

Moreover, as we find that the Iguana, Kangaroo, and Opossum tribes are counterparts of each other in the classes they contain, it follows that they are subdivisions of one original tribe. Precisely the same is true of Emu, Bandicoot, and Blacksnake, in both particulars ; thus reducing the six to two original tribes, with marriage in the tribe interdicted. It is further shown by the fact the first three tribes could not intermarry, nor the last three, with each other. The prohibition which prevented intermarriage when either three tribes was one would follow the subdivisions, who were of the same descent, though under different tribal names. Exactly the same thing is found among the Seneca-Iroquois. If we did not know, from tradition, that the Bear and the Deer were the original tribes, and that the Bear became subdivided into the Wolf, Bear, Beaver, and Turtle, and the Deer into the Deer, Snipe, Heron, and Hawk, we should infer, that the first and the second four respectively were subdivisions of one original tribe, from the single fact that anciently neither of the first four tribes were allowed to intermarry, nor either of the last four. It was for the same reason. They were known to be of the same descent, although under four independent tribal names, and consequently the prohibition continued to assert itself after the separation. In the course of time, as the autonomy of the tribe became complete, this restriction was removed, just as it is now in process of removal among the Kamilaroi, as will presently be shown.

A tribe is not a group or horde occupying a particular territory, but a circle of consanguine; the fact of consanguinity being preserved by the tribal name. They are mingled in the same family, since husband and wife are necessarily of different tribes. The Kamilaroi tribe would consist of two supposed female ancestors and their children, and all their descendants in the female line in a continuous series. It would include the two mothers and their children, and all the children of their lineal female descendants; the children of the females only belonging to the tribe, whilst the children of the males would belong to the tribes of their respective mothers. The tribe is also the unit of organization in the political as well as, social system of barbarous and savage nations. Among the Kamilaroi there was an antecedent and still powerful organization upon the basis of sex, which might well claim this fundamental position. It afterwards became enfolded in the tribal organization, with the principles of which, when fully developed, it would stand in antagonism. The two organizations could not, at one and the same time, occupy the starting-point of a social and political system. One must give way. It will become apparent in the sequel that the tribal organization is gradually subverting the classes among the Kamilaroi.

Fifthly. Marriage also was restricted to particular classes, as we have seen. Consequently, when there were but two tribes, one half of all the females of one tribe were the wives of one half of all the males of the other tribe. After the subdivision of the two original tribes into six, the benefit of marrying out of the tribe, which was the chief advantage of the tribal organization, was arrested, if not substantially neutralized, by the restrictions mentioned. It resulted in continuous in-and-in marriages, without the near degree of own brother and sister. There are but four descents in Kamilaroi kinship, because there are but four supposed female ancestors from whom all the people are descended. Mata and Kapota, who are found in Iguana, Kangaroo, and Opossum, must marry into Emu, Bandicoot, and Blacksnake; and Buta and Ippata, who are found in the last three, must marry into the first three. Thus two entire tribes are excluded in marriage from each tribe, as well as one half of the remaining tribe. This was the original law of marriage; but it has since been relaxed, as will be elsewhere explained.

If a diagram of descents is made of the descendants of Ippai and Kapota, for example, and carried to the fifth generation, giving to each intermediate pair two children, a male and a female, the following re-

sults will appear. The children of Ippai and Kapota are Murri and Mata. As brothers and sisters they cannot marry. At the second degree the children of Murri married to Buta are Ippai and Ippata, and of Mata married to Kumbo are Kubbi and Kapota. Of these Ippai marries his cousin Kapota, and Kubbi marries his cousin Ippata. It will be noticed that the eighth class are reproduced from the original pair in the second and third generations. In the next, or third degree, there are two Murris, two Matas, two Kumbos, and two Butas ; of whom the Murris marry the Butas, their second cousins, and the Kubbis the Matas, also their second cousins. At the fourth generation there are four each of Ippais, Kapotas, Kubbis, and Ippatas, who are third cousins. Of these the Ippais marry the Kapotas, as before, and the Kubbis the Ippatas. At the fifth generation there are eight each of Murris and Butas, Kumbos and Matas. They are fourth cousins, of whom the Murris marry the Butas, and the Kumbos the Matas. A similar chart of the other marriageable classes will produce like results. It is thus made apparent that near consanguinei not only intermarry constantly, but are compelled to do so by this sexual organization. One of the primary objects secured by the tribal organization, when fully developed, so as to allow marriage into every tribe but that of the individual, was thus defeated.

Sixthly. We come next to an innovation upon the original constitution of the tribes, which reveals a movement, still pending, in the direction of the true ideal of the tribe. It is shown in two distinct particulars : First, in allowing the first three and the second three tribes respectively to intermarry to a limited extent ; and, secondly, to marry into classes not before permitted. Thus Iguana-Murri can now marry Mata in the Kangaroo tribe, his sister ; whereas originally he was restricted to Buta, in the opposite three tribes. So Iguana-Kubbi can now marry Kapota, his sister, in the Kangaroo tribe, whereas he was at first restricted to Ippata, in the opposite three tribes. In like manner Emu-Kumbo can now marry Buta, his sister, in the Blacksnake tribe, and Emu-Ippai can marry Ippata, his sister, in the same tribe, contrary to original limitations. Each class of males in each of the three tribes seems now to be allowed one additional class of females in the two remaining tribes, from which they were before excluded. Mr. Fison, however, in his table (Memo. C), does not show a change to the full extent here indicated.

This innovation would have been a retrograde movement, but that it

tended to break down the classes, and thus give to every male the right to marry any female in any tribe but his own, which, we have seen, is the law of the tribal organization in its ultimate form. When in its final stage it necessarily assures a greatly increased tendency to marriage between single pairs, leading to the establishment of the barbarian family, with a great curtailment of the range of the conjugal privilege. The line of progress among the Kamilaroi was evidently from classes into tribes, followed by a tendency to overthrow the classes, and to render the tribe, instead of the class, the unit of organization. In this movement the overshadowing system of cohabitation was the resisting element. It is the first instance in which we have been able to look far down into the incipient stages of the tribal organization, and even through it upon an anterior condition so truly archaic as an organization of society upon sex. It seems to afford a glimpse at the absolutely primitive state of man. The tribe, as it progressed toward its ultimate form, seems to have advanced, *æquo pede*, with the curtailment of the range of the conjugal privilege, which, among the Kamilaroi, still verges upon promiscuity. The inference is plain, that ages upon ages passed away whilst the tribal organization, even among the most highly endowed races, was passing through its successive phases. Among the Australian aborigines it is still in a rudimentary state, although possessing the more prominent characteristics. They might not have effected the overthrow of the classes for thousands of years to come, had they remained undiscovered and undisturbed in their insular homes; whilst more favored continental nations, commencing in a similar condition, have first advanced this organization through its successive stages, and then worked their way out from it into civilization. It seems probable that the tribes among the Fijians and Micronesian Islanders, where the totemic system is known to exist, will be found in the same transitional stage. The innovations described were clearly in the nature of reformatory movements to reduce the excessive amount of in-and-in marriage among consanguinei. Facts such as these illustrating the successive stages of development of the tribal organization are of the highest importance and of peculiar value. Marriage and the family are involved at every stage of this progress, and the growth of the idea of each must be traced through all the shades of man's experience in the tribal state, before the conception of the barbarian family is reached, which is then but the family in its second stage.

It must be admitted that the Kamilaroi classes are older than the

tribes. They resolve the people into groups of brothers and sisters; and by a second grouping, with respect to marriage, a conjugal system was established but little short of promiscuity. The resulting family was communal, and coextensive with the range of the privileges, but broken up into smaller communal families consisting of such persons as were immediately associated for mutual protection and subsistence. The classes, founded upon sex, the first and most obvious division of the species, was perhaps the germ of the tribe founded upon consanguinity. The true family, resting upon marriage between one man and one woman, with an exclusive cohabitation, was neither conceivable nor attainable in savage life. Man was still perceptibly gregarious, with an irresistible tendency toward communism in wives and in living, but, under the teachings of experience, with some measure of restriction as to numbers of the former.

This division into male and female classes, with a prohibition of the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, shows plainly enough that such marriages were common anterior to the establishment of the classes, and that the classes owe their origin to a desire to break up the practice. The tribal organization embodies the same prohibition as its central idea; whence the inference from each source that such marriages were normal in the previous period. Moreover, the classes did not look beyond this result; for we have seen that it compels in-and-in marriages beyond this degree by positive institution. If any doubt could rest upon this question, it is entirely removed by the Malayan system of consanguinity, which is decisive and in point.*

When the two original tribes came in over the classes, with the progress of experience, no substantial change was effected in the previous condition. The subsequent division of these tribes into six, with the maintenance of the same law of marriage and descents, left the social condition essentially the same; except, by retaining larger numbers of people under a common tribal system, it brought persons more distantly connected into the marriage relation. This was a beneficial tendency. The next movement was more important, namely, allowing the tribes which were subdivisions of an original one, to marry into each other. Although tribally brothers and sisters, they had been separating in degree through as many centuries as had elapsed since their division, except as their blood had intermingled through common descents. In

* Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family, pp. 454, 482.

the next place, by allowing the males to marry into two classes of females, instead of one, a still greater advance was made, and of a radical character. These changes must be regarded as reformatory movements tending to the realization of the true ideal of the tribe, in which, as elsewhere stated, a man can marry a woman of any tribe but his own, and also of any foreign nation. The Kamilaroi tribal system is below this final stage. Beside this, it still retains a conjugal system more stupendous and extraordinary than any hitherto found in any nation of barbarians, or in any other nation of savages.

The social state of the Kamilaroi, with the classes in full vigor, but enveloped in a tribal organization progressing gradually to their overthrow, seems much nearer the primitive constitution of society than any organized form previously known. It has, in all probability, remained in this condition substantially for centuries, the changes above indicated representing the whole amount since the tribal idea was developed. It does not follow that this form of the system was indigenous in Australia, since it may have been carried, with their remote island ancestors, from a primitive Asiatic seat, and maintained, with slight changes, through the intermediate periods of time. The antiquity of the tribal organization is without known limits. It is, at least, coeval in its germ with the time when brothers and sisters ceased to intermarry. The hypothesis of its propagation from an original centre into all the families of mankind is much more in harmony with ascertained facts than any other, looking to its spontaneous or indigenous development in many different places and in different ages. Original ideas, absolutely independent of previous knowledge and experience, are necessarily few in number, and as rare as original germs of animal life. Were it possible to reduce the present sum of human ideas to underived originals, the numerical result would be startling. Human experience has run in such uniform channels as to suggest the presence of a governing element incorporated in the original constitution of man, which predetermined the direction and limits of this experience. This argument leads to an original man; and to his development, through growth and specific reproduction, which necessarily must have been progressive, logical, and homogeneous. The tribal organization seems to have sprung from this class of primary conceptions.

The barbarian family, which has been frequently named, is more easily characterized than defined. Its nucleus was a pair, of which the man regarded the woman as his principal wife, and the woman the man

as her principal husband, but without an exclusive cohabitation. Associated with them for mutual subsistence and protection were other similar pairs, living with their children in a common household, with a restricted but not prohibited cohabitation. The barbarian family, as it now exists in the Ganowanian family, approaches the civilized family. It is founded upon marriage between single pairs, with fragmentary families of near kindred united in a common household; but with the conjugal privilege above indicated either extinct, or reduced to narrow limits. At the time of their discovery the more advanced were living in large communal houses, and practising communism in living as far as the same could be carried out in practical life. Conjugal fidelity was exacted of the women, but not of the men. Where a man can put away his wife at pleasure, as he may in most barbarous nations, and always could among the old Romans, continence is not the highest virtue.*

Mr. Fison in Memorandum A has deduced theoretically the Turanian system of consanguinity from Kamilaroi kinship. It is both ingenious and interesting, and fully sustained by the principles of the tribal system. The actual system, when procured, will probably agree with the theoretical substantially, but fall below it in some particulars. Mr. Fison furnished schedules of consanguinity and affinity of the Yarras, near Melbourne, and of the Murray bands near Victoria, but neither is sufficiently perfect to establish the exact character of the system. It is partly Malayan, but chiefly Turanian in form, and evidently in the transition stage from one into the other. This was to have been expected from the condition of the tribal organization among the Kamilaroi, and which is presumptively in the same stage among the Yarras and Murray bands.

It is perhaps unnecessary to remark that the Kamilaroi people have each a personal name to distinguish the individual. When we say Ippai marries Kapota, we simply mean that a male of the Ippai class marries a female of the Kapota class.†

* The American Indians describe *divorce*, "throwing a woman away"; thus adding contempt to injury. The Romans divorced their wives of their own volition; but the right was subject to the obligation of restoring the dower of the wife. Ovid, as we know, put away two wives, and Cicero two. *Divortium*, whence *divorce*, originally related to the putting away of a wife exclusively.

† Savages seem to have a tendency to classify persons into groups. The tribes of the Maranoa district, Queensland, who speak the Unghi dialect, divide the males into classes according to age. Up to seventeen or eighteen years of age a male is

In the light of this discussion some of the excrescences of modern civilization, such as free love and Mormonism, are seen to be relics of the old savagism not yet eradicated from the human brain. The nations of the Aryan family assume not only to be civilized, but to be far advanced in civilization; whereas this is strictly true of a small minority only. Barbarism and savagism still lurk in all cities, and in all corners of civilized lands, repressed by law and restrained by superior intelligence. We have the same identical brain, perpetuated through reproduction, which worked in the skulls of savages and barbarians in bygone ages; and it has come down to us laden and saturated with the thoughts, aspirations, and passions with which it was busied through the intermediate periods. It is the same brain grown older and larger with the experience of the ages. These outcrops of barbarism are so many revelations of its anterior proclivities; a kind of mental atavism.

Finally, out of a few germs of thought, planted in the human brain in the primitive ages, have been evolved all the institutions of mankind. Beginning their growth in the period of savagery, fermenting through the period of barbarism, they have reached their fruition in the period of civilization. The evolution of these germs of thought was guided by a natural logic, which formed an essential attribute of the brain itself. So unerringly does this principle perform its functions in all conditions of experience, and in all periods of time, that its results are uniform, coherent, and traceable in their courses. These results alone will in time yield convincing proofs of the unity of origin of the human family. The mental history of mankind, which is crystallized in civil and domestic institutions, and in inventions and discoveries, is presumptively the history of a single species, perpetuated through individuals, and developed through experience. Among the original germs of thought, as stated at the outset, which have exercised the most powerful influence upon the human mind, and upon human destiny, are those which relate to the *family*, to *government*, to *language*, to *religion*, and to *property*. They had a definite beginning, a logical progress, but can have no final consummation, because they are still progressing, and must ever progress.

Andoo; from eighteen to about thirty he is Howalah, and is allowed to marry; from thirty to about fifty he is Muidara, and after fifty he is Ngara. Beside this they have the class divisions of the Kamilaroi, and the tribes. This information was communicated to Mr. Fison by Mr. A. S. P. Cameron.

APPENDICES.

AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES. By REV. LORIMER FISON.

Memorandum A.

The Rev. W. Ridley, M. A., Presbyterian clergyman, who has spent many years among the Australian aborigines, kindly wrote a short paper for me on a "comprehensive social classification," which he had found among those savages. "The same system," he observes, "with the same names, prevails among tribes speaking different dialects; and even where different names are used, the same system substantially exists."

Among the tribes speaking the Kamilaroi language, all the men bear one of these four names, —

Ippai. Murri. Kubbi. Kumbo.

All the women bear one of these, —

Ippata. Mata. Kapota. Buta.

There are certain rules of marriage and descent, which for convenience of reference I arrange as follows: —

A.		B.	
<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>	<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>
1. Ippai	marries Kapota.	Their children are: 1. Murri and Mata.	
2. Murri	" Buta.	" " "	2. Ippai " Ippata.
3. Kubbi	" Ippata.	" " "	3. Kumbo " Buta.
4. Kumbo	" Mata.	" " "	4. Kubbi " Kapota.

These rules of marriage do not forbid polygamy. Thus Kumbo may have as many Matas as he likes, but he may not have Ippata, Buta, or Kapota. So also with all the other names excepting Ippai, who has the privilege of cohabiting with Ippata as well as Kapota. This, however, Mr. Ridley considers to be "an infringement of rule, allowed in favor of some powerful Ippai, and so continued." It seems evident that this must be so; and it is worthy of remark that the children of Ippai and Ippata are Kumbo and Buta, as also are the children of Kubbi and Ippata.

Among tribes not speaking Kamilaroi, the following names are used: —

- | | | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Urgilla. | 2. Wunggo. | 3. Obūr. | 4. Maburri (male). |
| 1. Urgillagun. | 2. Wungooun. | 3. Oburgun. | 4. Maburrigun (female). |

These are in the Balomer language.

Among the Moreton Bay aborigines the names in use are for the males Derwain, Bandūr, Barang, Buudūr, with the additional syllable *gun* or *un* for the females.

At Wide Bay five names are in use, namely, —

Bundar. Derwain. Balkoin. Tandor. Barang.

But it is not clear from Mr. Ridley's paper whether these names are written in their proper order; nor are we informed whether any two of them are common to one class. If they be all distinct from one another, there must be a fifth class.

This is the substance of the information supplied to me by Mr. Ridley.

NOTE. — Reasoning from the analysis furnished by the systems prevailing among other savage races, which systems have been thoroughly examined and ascertained, we may fairly conclude that the various names given in Mr. Ridley's paper are classificatory, and that they represent certain degrees of kinship. Thus, that

Kubbi is in theory the brother of every Kubbi of the same generation.

Kapota “ “ sister “ “ Kubbi “ “ “

Taking this for granted, and ignoring for the present the privilege granted to Ippai of marrying Ippata as well as Kapota, — the variations caused thereby being kept for subsequent investigation, — the characteristic peculiarities of the Tamilian system, which is the Fijian also, are proved to exist among the Australian aborigines.

For the sake of convenience, I state these characteristics as seven different propositions.

I. *Tamilian Characteristic.**

I being male, the children of my brothers are my sons and daughters, while the children of my sisters are my nephews and nieces; but the grandchildren of my sisters, as well as those of my brothers, are my grandchildren.

This is so in the Australian system also.

For, take any male Kubbi.

(a) I, being male, am Kubbi. My brother is Kubbi.

His son is Kumbo (B. 2).

But Kumbo is my son (B. 3).

* For an exposition of the Tamilian system, see Proc. Am. Acad., Feb., 1868, p. 436.

Therefore my brother's son is my son.

So also it may be shown that his daughter is my daughter.

- (b) My sister is Kapata (B. 4). Her son is Murri (B. 1).

But Murri is not my son, for my son is Kumbo (B. 3).

Therefore my sister's son is my nephew, this being the only other relationship possible.

So also it may be shown that my sister's daughter is my niece.

- (c) My grandsons are Kubbi, son of my son Kumbo (B. 4).

and Ippai " " daughter Buta (B. 2).

My sister's (Kapota's) grandsons are Ippai, son of her son Murri (B. 2); and Kubbi, the son of her daughter Mata (B. 4).

But Ippai and Kubbi, as already shown, are my grandsons. In like manner it may be shown that her granddaughters are my granddaughters.

Therefore my sister's grandchildren are my grandchildren.

II. *Tamilian Characteristic.*

I, being female, the children of my sisters are my sons and daughters, while the children of my brothers are my nephews and nieces; but the grandchildren of my brothers, as well as those of my sisters, are my grandchildren.

In the Australian system, take any female Kapota.

- (a) I, being female, am Kapota. My sister is Kapota.

Her son is Murri (B. 1). But Murri is my son (B. 1).

Therefore my sister's son is my son. So also his daughter is my daughter.

- (b) My brother is Kubbi (B. 4). His son is Kumbo (B. 3).

But Kumbo is not my son, for my son is Murri (B. 1).

Therefore (as in B. 1) my brother's son is my nephew.

So also his daughter is my niece.

- (c) My brother Kubbi's grandsons are Kubbi and Ippai (see I. c).

But Ippai and Kubbi are my grandsons (see I. c).

Therefore my brother's grandsons are my grandsons.

So also his granddaughters are my granddaughters.

III. *Tamilian Characteristic.*

All my father's brothers are my fathers, but all my father's sisters are my aunts.

- (a) I being Kubbi or Kapota, i. e. male or female, my father's brother is Kumbo. But Kumbo is my father (A. 4).
Therefore my father's brother is my father.
- (b) My father's (Kumbo's) sister is Buta (B. 2). But Buta is not my mother, for my mother is Mata (A. 4).
Therefore, no other relationship being possible, my father's sister is my aunt.

IV. *Tamilian Characteristic.*

All my mother's sisters are my mothers, but all my mother's brothers are my uncles.

In the Australian system, I being Kubbi or Kapota (i. e. male or female), my mother's sister is Mata.

- (a) But Mata is my mother (A. 4).
Therefore my mother's sister is my mother.
- (b) My mother's brother is Murri (B. 1).
But Murri is not my father, for my father is Kumbo (A. 4).
Therefore my mother's brother is my uncle.

V. *Tamilian Characteristic.*

The children of my father's brothers, and those of my mother's sisters, are my brothers and sisters; but the children of my father's sisters, and those of my mother's brothers, are my cousins.

In the Australian system, I being Kubbi, a male.

- (a) My father's brother is Kumbo.
My father's brother's (Kumbo's) son is Kubbi (B. 4).
But every Kubbi is my brother, for I also am Kubbi.
Therefore, my father's brother's son is my brother.
So also it may be shown that my mother's sister's son is my brother, and that her daughter (as also my father's brother's daughter) is my sister.
- (b) My father's (Kumbo's) sister is Buta (B. 3).
Her son is Ippai (B. 2).
But Ippai is not my brother, for my brother is Kubbi.
Therefore my father's sister's son is my cousin.
So also it may be shown that my mother's brother's son is my cousin, and that her daughter (as also my father's sister's daughter) is my cousin.

VI. *Tamilian Characteristic.*

I, being male, the children of my male cousins are my nephews and nieces, but the children of my female cousins are my sons and daughters.

In the Australian system, I being Kubbi, a male.

(a) My male cousins are Ippai, son of my father's sister Buta (B. 2).

and Ippai, son of my mother's brother Murri (B. 2).

Ippai's children are Murri and Mata.

But Murri and Mata are my nephews and nieces (I. b).

Therefore the children of my male cousins are my nephews and nieces.

(b) My female cousin is Ippata, daughter of my father's sister Buta (B. 2).

and Ippata, daughter of my mother's brother Murri (B. 2).

Ippata's children are Kumbo and Buta.

But Kumbo and Buta are my children (B. 3).

Therefore the children of my female cousins are my sons and daughters.

VII. *Tamilian Characteristic.*

All the brothers of my grandfathers and those of my grandmothers are my grandfathers; all their sisters are my grandmothers.

In the Australian system, I being Kubbi or Kapota (i. e. male or female), my grandfathers are

Kubbi, the father of my father Kumbo (A. 3), and

Ippai " " " mother Mata (A. 1).

But all my grandfather's brothers are either Kubbi or Ippai.

Therefore they are my grandfathers.

My grandmothers are Ippata, mother of my father Kumbo (A. 3).

and Kapota, " " mother Mata (A. 1).

Ippata's brother is Ippai; Kapota's brother is Kubbi.

But Ippai and Kubbi are my grandfathers.

Therefore my grandfather's brothers are my grandfathers.

Again, my grandmother's sisters are either Ippata or Kapota.

But Ippata and Kapota are my grandmothers.

Therefore my grandmother's sisters are my grandmothers.

As for the complications caused by the intermarriage of Ippai and

Ippata, further information will doubtless make them easier of explanation.

From Tables A and B it will be seen : —

That Kubbi's cousins are Ippai and Ippata of the same generation.

Kumbo's	"	"	Murri	"	Mata	"	"	"
Ippai's	"	"	Kubbi	"	Kapota	"	"	"
Murri's	"	"	Kumbo	"	Buta	"	"	"

Hence (from Table A) a man must marry his female cousin.

Kubbi	may not have his male cousin	Ippai's	wife, for she is	Kapota,	his sister	(A 1).
Kumbo	"	"	"	Murri's	"	Buta, (A 2).
Ippai	"	"	"	Kubbi's	"	Ippata (A 3).
Murri	"	"	"	Kumbo's	"	Mata (A 4)

Hence a man is allowed his female cousins, but the wives of his male cousins were forbidden to him. Thus it is also with the Fijian system, and the Tamilian, as I pointed out in Memorandum No. 4; and this explains the difference between these systems and that of the Seneca-Iroquois as to the relationships between a man and the children of his cousins, male and female.

SYDNEY, May 1, 1871.

Memorandum B.

AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES.

T. E. Lance, Esq. (of Bungowalbyn, Lawrence, Clarence River, N. S. W.), has favored me with an extremely interesting letter, which fully confirms, not only the information given me by the Rev. W. Ridley, but the conclusions also which I drew from that information. (See Memo. A.)

Mr. Lance has had much intercourse with the natives, having lived among them for many years on frontier cattle stations on the Darling River, and in the Trans-Darling country.

1. He says: "All Kubbis are brothers, and all Kapotas are their sisters: and so also with the Ippais and Ippatas." (See Table B. Memo. A.)

2. "If a Kubbi meets a Kapota whom he has never seen or heard of before, they address each other as brother and sister. If he meets a strange Ippata, they address each other as *goleer* = spouse."

Hence we may infer that these nations salute by the title of kinship as do the Fijians also.

3. He informs me "that a Kubbi thus meeting an Ippata, even though she were of another tribe, would treat her as his wife, and that his right to do so would be recognized by her tribe."

Inference : The word *goleer* = wife, as the Fijian *wate* = wife, does not imply the conjugal relation as understood by us, but is simply "one of those with whom I may cohabit."

4. Mr. Lance, after telling me about the class-names and their various relations, goes on to say : "The way I have stated as between the different names is the normal and usual regulation ; but it is crossed and complicated occasionally by other arrangements which I do not understand."

Probably these complications are caused by the privilege granted to Ippai of taking Ippata as well as Kapota, which Mr. Lance seems not to have noticed.

5. He says : "Every black fellow, besides the names I have mentioned (i. e. the class-names), is called after some animal, which he calls his *Mudgee*, implying some incomprehensible relationship. The usual rule is that every Kumbo is an Emu, every Ippai a Blacksnake, every Kubbi an Iguana, etc. They have also a third individualizing name. But sometimes I have come across a man and wife whose names were not suitable for the connection ; and on inquiring how this could be, they would reply, 'This Ippai is not a Blacksnake, as are most Ippais, but an Opossum. That explains it.'"

This appears to me to be important. The "names not suitable for the connection" must be the class-names borne by the couple whom Mr. Lance questioned ; and as the man was an Ippai, the woman was probably an Ippata, for had she been a Kapota there would have been nothing strange in the connection (see Table A, Memo. A). Here we have a clew to Ippai's privilege. It seems probable that the Ippais are divided into two classes, the Blacksnakes and the Opossums.

Ippai the Blacksnake being the husband of Kapota ; and

Ippai the Opossum being the husband of Ippata.

But I have no information as to whether the Blacksnake may be the husband of Ippata, and the Opossum the husband of Kapota. If the Blacksnake be restricted to Kapotas, and the Opossums to Ippatas, we have in effect a fifth class of males. Now the Rev. W. Ridley informs me that among the Wide Bay natives, five class-names for males are used (see Memo. A). Further inquiries as to the Wide Bay names will probably throw further light on this point.

SYDNEY, May 5, 1871.

Memorandum C.

AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINES.

N. B. Duli = Iguana. Murriira = Paddymelon, a sort of Kan-
 Dinoun = Emu. Nurai = Blacksnake. [garoo.
 Bilba = Bandicoot. Mute = Opossum.

The Rev. W. Ridley, M. A., who has recently returned from a visit to the interior, during which he kindly made further inquiries for me as to the class-names, now informs me that the divisions indicated by these class-names are further subdivided as follows:—

CLASS-NAMES.	SUBDIVISIONS.		
1. Murri and Mata.	1. Duli.	2. Murriira.	[3. Mute.]*
2. Kumbo and Buta.	1. Dinoun.	2. Nurai.	[3. Bilba.]*
3. Ippai and Ippata.	1. Dinoun.	2. Nurai.	3. Bilba.
4. Kubbi and Kapota.	1. Mute.	2. Murriira.	3. Duli.

That is, the Murris are subdivided into two classes, Murri-Duli and Murri-Murriira. So also with the other names.

LAWS OF MARRIAGE.

1. Murri-Iguana † marries any Buta; also Mata-Kangaroo.‡
2. " -Kangaroo " " " " " -Iguana.
3. Kumbo-Emu " " Mata; " Buta-Blacksnake.
4. " -Blacksnake " " " " " -Emu.
5. Ippai-Emu " " Kapota-Kangaroo and Iguana; also Ippata-Blacksnake
6. " -Blacksnake " " -Opossum " " -Emu.
7. " -Bandicoot " " " -Kangaroo " " -Blacksnake.
8. Kubbi-Opossum " " Ippata-Emu; also Kapoto-Iguana.
9. " -Kangaroo " " " -Blacksnake; " "
10. " -Iguana " " " -Bandicoot " -Kangaroo.

* I have added these tribes because Murri and Mata are necessarily found in the one and Kumbo and Buta in the other. Mr. Fison does the same elsewhere. — L. H. M.

† I have substituted the English for the native name of the tribes. — L. H. M.

‡ It is important to remember that the children take the mother's second or "animal" name. Also that they take the class-name which is given to the children of their mother by her *proper* husband, — that is, by her husband according to the laws given in Memo. A. Thus, the children of Ippai and Ippata are Kumbo and Buta, as also are the children of Ippata by her proper husband, Kubbi.

There seems to be some little uncertainty about the pronunciation of the class

Hence I deduce the following

LAWS OF DESCENT.

	The Children of	Are Male.	Female.	Memo. A.
1	Murri-Iguana and Buta-Emu	Ippai-Emu	Ippata-Emu	2
2	" " " -Blacksnake	Ippai-Blacksnake	Ippata-Blacksnake	2
3	" " " Mata-Kangaroo	Kubbi-Kangaroo	Kapota-Kangaroo	4
4	Murri-Kangaroo and Buta-Emu	Ippai-Emu	Ippata-Emu	2
5	" " " -Blacksnake	Ippai-Blacksnake	Ippata-Blacksnake	2
6	" " " Mata-Iguana	Kubbi-Iguana	Kapota-Iguana	4
7	Kumbo-Emu " " -Iguana	Kubbi-Iguana	Kapota-Iguana	4
8	" " " -Kangaroo	Kubbi-Kangaroo	Kapota-Kangaroo	4
9	" " " Buta-Blacksnake	Ippai-Blacksnake	Ippata-Blacksnake	2
10	Kumbo-Blacksnake and Mata-Iguana	Kubbi-Iguana	Kapota-Iguana	4
11	" " " " -Kangaroo	Kubbi-Kangaroo	Kapota-Kangaroo	4
12	" " " Buta-Emu	Ippai-Emu	Ippata-Emu	2
13	Ippai-Emu and Kapota-Iguana	Murri-Iguana	Mata-Iguana	1
14	" " " " -Blacksnake	Murri-Blacksnake	Mata-Blacksnake	1
15	" " " Ippata-Blacksnake	Kumbo-Blacksnake	Buta-Blacksnake	3
16	Ippai-Blacksnake and Kapota-Opossum	Murri-Opossum	Mata-Opossum	1
17	" " " Ippata-Emu	Kumbo-Emu	Buta-Emu	3
18	" " Bandicoot and Kapota-Kangaroo	Murri-Kangaroo	Mata-Kangaroo	1
19	" " " Ippata-Blacksnake	Kumbo-Blacksnake	Buta-Blacksnake	3
20	Kubbi-Opossum and Ippata-Emu	Kumbo-Emu	Buta-Emu	3
21	" " " Kapota-Iguana	Murri-Iguana	Mata-Iguana	1
22	" " Kangaroo and Ippata-Blacksnake	Kumbo-Blacksnake	Buta-Blacksnake	3
23	" " " Kapota-Iguana	Murri-Iguana	Mata-Iguana	1
24	" " -Iguana and Ippata-Bandicoot	Kumbo-Bandicoot	Buta-Bandicoot	3
25	" " " Kapota-Kangaroo	Murri-Kangaroo	Mata-Kangaroo	1

The rule, that the children take the mother's second name, gives us two instances of names not recorded in Mr. Ridley's list of the subdivisions, namely, sixteen Murri and Mata-Opossum, and twenty-four Kumbo and Buta-Bandicoot. There must be something wanting here, as we find no provision for the "privileged" marriage of these names.

I think we may take it for granted that there is a third subdivision of all the classes, as follows :—

1. Murri and Mata subdivide into 1. Iguana. 2. Kangaroo. 3. Opossum.
2. Kumbo and Buta " " 1. Emu. 2. Blacksnake. 3. Bandicoot.

For, since there are Ippai-Bandicoot and Ippata-Bandicoot, the mother of the two, that is, Buta, must also be Bandicoot, because the children take the mother's second, or tribal name. And, there being a Buta-Bandicoot, there must also be a Kumbo-Bandicoot, because each of all these pairs takes the same second name for both male and female. So also with Murri and Mata-Opossum.

Hence we get six classes, each containing *four names*, consisting of two pairs of brothers and sisters.

names. Mr. Ridley tells me that some of the natives whom he questioned pronounced Kapota, Kubbotha; Mata, Matha, etc. I retain Kapota for uniformity's sake.

1. Emu (Dinoun)	Ippai and Ippata:	Kumbo and Buta.
2. Iguana (Duli)	Murri " Mata:	Kubbi " Kapota.
3. Kangaroo (Murriira)	Murri " Mata:	Kubbi " Kapota.
4. Blacksnake (Nuari)	Ippai " Ippata:	Kumbo " Buta.
5. Opossum (Muta)	Murri " Mata:	Kubbi " Kapota.
6. Bandicoot (Bilba)	Ippai " Ippata:	Kumbo " Buta.

INFERENCES.

1. From these tables it is evident that a man may cohabit with his half-sister by the father's side, though not with his full sister, or with the half-sister by the mother's side. That this is an innovation on the system explained in Memo. A may perhaps be inferred from the fact that the children of such a connection take the class-names which they would have had, had their father's been of the usual class.

2. Persons having the same animal name may not intermarry.

3. In the six classes arranged under the animal names, it is worthy of note that the names of one pair are those of the children of the woman of the other pair. Thus the Emus are Ippai and Ippata, Kumbo and Buta. Now Ippata is the mother of Kumbo and Buta; and Buta is the mother of Ippai and Ippata (see Laws of Descent, Memo. C).

Mr. Ridley informs me that *Murri* has a third distinguishing name, which is that of his father's grave (see Memo. B).

He also gives me another most important fact, namely, that there are separate terms for brother or sister according to seniority. Thus:—

Daiadi, Elder Brother.	Boadi, Elder Sister.
Gullami, Younger Brother.	Burri, Younger Sister.

These are the words used by a male.

SYDNEY, August 7, 1871.

NOTE. — If the divisions caused by the animal names be tribal, then is it evident that the child is of the mother's tribe, as among the North American Indians and the tribes of Central Africa, because the child always takes the mother's animal name.

Six hundred and forty-third Meeting.

April 9, 1872. — MONTHLY MEETING.

The PRESIDENT in the chair.

The President announced the death of Professor Trendelen-