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PREFACE

The relationship of the parts of this paper is like that of two brothers-in-law: the section on the social organization of the Fox is the wife and sister, that on the history and theory of the study of social organization the brother, and that on Fox history and ethnology the husband. The choice in organization was that of emphasizing either the consanguine or the marital tie; the former was chosen because of the wider interest in theory, and the ethnology of the Fox (except parts pertinent to the discussion), like so many husbands, is relegated to the appendices.

To his teachers a student owes what a President owes to his mother. While a mere enumeration is insufficient, it will have to do because it is impossible to evaluate the debt to each. Ralph Linton and Charlotte Gower first taught me anthropology at the University of Wisconsin; then, for a summer, Ruth Benedict of Columbia University directed field work in which we were engaged; but most of my student days in anthropology were spent at the University of Chicago under Fay-Cooper Cole, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, Robert Redfield, Manuel J. Andrade, and Harry Hoijer. To all of them, for their inspiration as well as their information, I owe thanks; and if this paper shows that occasionally I have not been following when I appeared to be listening, I hope it will also show that it was not lack of respect that was the cause.

Sol Tax

Chicago, Illinois
October 10, 1934.
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PART I
A SHORT HISTORY OF
THE STUDY OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

I. Forerunners

Reporting his experiences in eastern North America, John Lederer, an early English adventurer, wrote, in 1672, concerning the Tutelo, an eastern Siouan tribe, that:

From four women, viz., Pash, Sepoy, Askerin and Mareskarin, they derive the race of mankind; which they therefore divide into four Tribes, distinguished under those several names. They very religiously observe the degrees of Marriage, which they limit not to distance of Kindred, but difference of Tribes, which are continued in the issue of the females: now for two of the same tribe to match, is abhorred as Incest, and punished with great severity.¹

This, to my knowledge, is the first mention in modern ethnological history of those phenomena—clans, matriline, exogamy—peculiar to the study of what in anthropology is called "Social Organization." A fourth problem of social organization is that of kinship systems; but, even as speculation about the Malayan and Turanian types was destined to lag behind theories of marriage and descent, so the matter of kinship terminology remained unbroached until forty-two years later,² when Joseph Francoise Lafitau, a French Jesuit missionary, described the kinship system of the Iroquois—striking by chance at the archetype of the "Classificatory

¹The Discoveries of John Lederer (Cincinnati, 1879; republished from the original edition of 1672), pp. 10-11.

²Although Andrew Lang says that Nicolaus Damascus, who lived in the first century, A.D., described the Classificatory System of kinship terminology for the Galactophaei (Article, Family, Encyclopaedia Britannica, 12th edition, X, 150). I am dealing only with modern researches, however.
System" which was to become a catch phrase in the infant science a century and a half later:

Among the Iroquois and the Hurons, all the children of a cabin regard their mothers' sisters as their mothers, and their mothers' brothers as their uncles; in the same way they give the name of father to all their fathers' brothers and that of aunt to their fathers' sisters. All of the children on the side of the mother and her sisters and of the father and his brothers they regard as equal to brothers and sisters, but as regards the children of their uncles and aunts—that is to say, of their mothers' brothers and their fathers' sisters—they treat them only on the footing of cousins although they may be as closely related as those whom they regard as brothers and sisters. In the third generation the grand-uncles and grand-aunts become grandfathers and grandmothers of the children of those whom they call nephews and nieces. This continues always in the descending line according to the same rule. 3

Such interesting observations remained, however, unnoticed and unused. Early explorers brought back, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many more accounts of strange customs relating to marriage, the family, and such institutions as clans; oddly, kinship terminologies were rarely recorded, if, indeed, noticed. 4 Almost a century passed before Lafitau's observation

3Moeurs des Sauvages Ameriqains, Compare'es aux Moeurs des Premiers Temps, I, 532-53 (Paris, 1724). Liberties have been taken with the translation; the French is: "...parmi les Iroquois, & parmi les Hurons, tous les enfants d'une Cabane regardent comme leurs meres, toutes les soeurs de leurs meres, & comme leurs oncles, tous les freres de leurs meres: par la même raison, ils donnent le nom de Peres à tous les freres de leurs peres, & de tantes à toutes les soeurs de leurs peres. Tous les enfants du côté de la mere & de ses soeurs, du pere & de ses freres, se regardent entre eux également comme freres & soeurs; mais par rapport aux enfants de leurs oncles & de leurs tantes, c'est-à-dire des freres de leurs meres, & ses soeurs de leurs peres, ils ne les traitent que sur le pied de cousins, qu'qu'ils soient dans le même degre de parenté, que ceux qu'ils regardent comme leurs freres & leurs soeurs. Dans la troisième Generation cela change; les grands oncles & les grandes tantes redeviennent grands-peres & grandes-meres, des enfants de ceux qu'ils appelloient neveux, & nieces. Cela se continue toujours ainsi en descendant, selon la même regle."

4Lewis H. Morgan says: "It is a singular fact, but one which I have frequently verified, that those Americans who are most thoroughly versed in Indian languages, from a long residence in the Indian country, are unacquainted with their system of relationship except its general features. It does not appear to have attracted their attention sufficiently to have led to an investigation of its details, even as a matter of curiosity. Not one of
was repeated in print. In 1823, James Edwin, who led an expedition into the West, described the kinship system of the Omaha in these words:

The designations by which the Omawhaws distinguish their various degrees of consanguinity are somewhat different from ours; children universally address their father's brother by the title of father, and their mother's brother by that of uncle; their mother's sister is called mother and their father's sister aunt. The children of brothers and sisters address each other by the titles of brother and sister,... a man applies the title of We-hun-guh, or sister-in-law to his wife's sister.... he also calls his wife's brother's daughter Wahunguh, and may in like manner take her to wife.... A man distinguishes his wife's brother by the title of "Tahong," or brother-in-law, and his son also by the same designation. He calls the wife of his brother-in-law "cong-he" or mother-in-law. A woman calls her husband's brother "Wish-s-a," or brother-in-law, and speaks of his children as her own.... Men who marry sisters address each other by the title of brother. All women who marry the same individual, even if not previously related, apply to each other the title of sister.5

Edwin at the same time went further, and described some of the behavior patterns in the relationships, notably the parent-in-law avoidance. Yet, for all these preliminary observations, decades were again to pass before kinship systems were to obtrude themselves upon the scientific world.

But, meanwhile, such important concepts as that of the Totemic Clan were crystallizing. Albert Gallatin, the great American statesman, who in 1842 founded the American Ethnological Society of New York, and who may be called the first ethnologist in America (and, indeed, he was preceded by nobody in the world), redescribed Exogamy, as occurring in the Southeastern tribes, and gave the phenomenon currency. Moreover, he first adapted to use the number have I ever found who, from his own knowledge, was able to fill out even a small part of the schedule.... The same is also true of the returned missionaries from Asia, Africa, and the Islands of the Pacific...." (Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family, Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, XVII, 135).

5Account of An Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains (1823), p. 323.
the Ojibwe term "totem." This is especially noteworthy because there was no chance observation in his case, but rather a study of the literature, and, further, he suggested comparisons of a number of tribes. He writes, concerning the Chootaws, Cherokees, Creeks, Hatches, and others:

Every nation was divided into a number of clans, varying in the several nations from three to eight to ten, the members of which respectively were dispersed indiscriminately throughout the whole nation. It has been fully ascertained that the inviolable regulations, by which these clans were perpetuated amongst the southern nations, were, first, that no man could marry in his own clan; secondly, that every child belongs to his or her mother's clan. Among the Chootaws, there are two great divisions, each of which is subdivided into four clans; and no man can marry in any of the four clans belonging to his division. The restriction amongst the Cherokees, the Creeks, and the Hatches, does not extend beyond the clan to which the man belongs.

And again:

Whether the Totem, or family name of the Ojibways, descends in a regular manner, or is arbitrarily imposed by the father, has not been clearly examined.

Comparative ethnology in the subject of Social Organization had not entered the scene; this is further evidenced by the fact that Sir George Grey—a first explorer of northwestern Australia—after making independent observations of the tribes of that region, proceeded to compare his discoveries with those reported by Gallatin.

One of the most remarkable facts connected with the natives, is that they are divided into certain great families, all the members of which bear the same names, as a family, or second name: the principal branches of these families, so far as I have been able to ascertain, are the Bellerote, Tdonderup, Ngotek, Nagarnook, Nogonyuk, Mongelung, Narrangur. But in different districts the members of these families give a local name to the one to which they belong, which is understood in that district, to indicate some particular branch of the principal family....


7Ibid., p. 110. Gallatin obtained his Ojibwe information from Tanner's Narrative, p. 513.
These family names are common over a great portion of the continent.

These family names are perpetuated, and spread through the country, by the operation of two remarkable laws:

1st. That children of either sex, always take the family name of their mother.

2nd. That a man cannot marry a woman of his own family name.

But not the least singular circumstance connected with these institutions, is their coincidence with those of the North American Indians, which are thus stated in the Archaeologia Americana...8

Grey then quotes fully from Gallatin's statements above, and then remarks that animal and vegetable crests and family names are common to both. Grey wondered about the origin of the institutions, but did not try to speculate on it. Grey showed himself to be a worthy precursor of modern ethnologists, for, in addition to his general observations, he published genealogies, with data on clans and marriages.

Yet, as far as the study of social organization and kinship is concerned, one cannot say that the science was fairly launched. While it is true that Henry Schoolcraft brought together a large amount of information on the American Indians, including some on clans,9 yet one need merely catalogue the ethnological developments that took no account of such observations to see that the study of society in these respects was, prior to 1860, embryonic. To see what was being done in

---

8 *Journals of Two Expeditions in North-West and Western Australia* (London, 1841), II, 225-27.

9 In *Historical and Statistical Information Respecting the Indian Tribes of the United States*, he says: "That feature of the organization of tribes which consists of their being associated in clans, or what has been more appropriately denominated the totemic tie... is designed rather to produce fraternity and the means of at once recognizing it, than for any practical operations upon their simple theory of government." (Part I [Philadelphia, 1851], p. 193)
ethnology, one can examine two sets of evidence: the general books on that subject and the journals of the anthropological and ethnological societies.

The first general treatises were concerned with the natural history of mankind, but—in the confusion of physical, linguistic, and cultural phases of life—they included material on sociology. But while Pritchard, for instance, surveyed peoples all over the world, his interest in social organization—or his knowledge of it—was typified by such a statement as:

The Rejangs (Sumatra) live in villages under the government of magistrates subject to a king of the whole country. They are separated into clans, or tribes, or kindred.10

and, although Van Amringe the next year published considerable material on such topics as the position of women and the relations of the sexes in different parts of the world, there is nothing remotely selective or interpretive about it.11 In the next decade, the accumulating knowledge about clans, totemism, and kinship still failed to penetrate such works as, for example, Latham's Descriptive Ethnology (1859).12 Theodore Waitz, too, in his great work Anthropologie der Naturvölker, devotes a few pages to Social Organization, mostly to the matters of chastity and romantic love and the degradation of women-as-property among primitive peoples; on such things as kinship there is nothing, and on social structure only this:

In passing from sexual and family relations to the social condition of uncivilized nations, but little can be said that

10James Cowles Pritchard, Researches into the Physical History of Mankind (London, 1847), V. 72.

11William Frederick Van Amringe, An Investigation of the Theories of the Natural History of Mankind (New York, 1848).

12John Ferguson McLennan (Studies in Ancient History [London, 1876 and 1886]) attributes the discovery of clans and exogamy to him.
is generally characteristic. Families generally live near each other independently under their own chief, gradually forming little societies, without any form of government, until internal dissensions or external attacks compel them to unite and submit to the sway of one or more individuals who have proved their prowess or their wisdom. Such peoples may, however, remain for a long time without any organization, oscillating between a state of perfect independence and one of despotism. It is an erroneous view to consider this oscillation among rude nations as degrees of social development, instead of attributing it to its natural cause.  

Evidence for the view that the study of Social Organization was not crystallized before the middle sixties is even more conclusive (if equally negative) when the Journals are examined. From the beginning, the anthropological societies combined physical and social studies of man. From the beginning, too, there was no dearth of accounts of different native tribes. But never in this period was there even a general discussion on any topic relating to Social Organization. In fact, although the Journal of the Ethnological Society of London begun publication in 1848 and the Journal of the Anthropological Society of London in 1863, it was not until 1866 that there is any discussion on any of the general topics that later occupied the attention of anthropologists.


14 Compare this, for example, with E. B. Tylor's *Researches into the Early History of Mankind* (London, 1865), where information on clans, exogamy, and rules of descent (pp. 279-86); marriage by capture (pp. 286-88); parent-in-law taboos (pp. 288-91); couvade (pp. 291-302) is collected and dealt with in quite modern fashion.
scientists. Then there was a summary in the Anthropological Review of a paper on marriage and exogamy read by E. B. Tylor before the British Association. Before 1865 there was nothing of the sort. What happened in the middle sixties was a veritable revolution in the study of social organization when in the course of a few years a mushroom development occurred that saw the fruition of the first great stage of ethnological history.

The early Societies and their publications may be tabulated thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Society/Institute</th>
<th>Journal/Publication(s)</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1843-71</td>
<td>Ethnological Society of London</td>
<td>&quot;Journal&quot;</td>
<td>1848-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Transactions&quot;</td>
<td>1861-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-</td>
<td>Societe d'Anthropologie de Paris</td>
<td>&quot;Bulletins et Memoires&quot;</td>
<td>1860-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-71</td>
<td>Anthropological Society of London</td>
<td>&quot;Anthropological Review&quot;</td>
<td>1863-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Memoire&quot;</td>
<td>1863-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Transactions&quot;</td>
<td>1863-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Journal of Anthropology&quot;</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873-75</td>
<td>London Anthropological Society</td>
<td>&quot;Anthropologia&quot;</td>
<td>1873-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-</td>
<td>Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (Since, &quot;Royal&quot; prefixed)</td>
<td>&quot;Journal&quot;</td>
<td>1871-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first volume of the Journal of the Ethnological Society, there were four ethnographic articles, all of which included some data on marriage and the family. So with succeeding volumes. But there was nothing general in the early numbers. Typical is the contrast between two articles of William Ridley: the first appeared in the JES in 1856 (IV, 289-93) on the Kamilaroi tribe, and included the names of the Sections and the marriage and descent rules, as well as a vocabulary without kinship terms, and throughout, apparently no evidence of further interest. Another appeared in 1872 in the JAI (II, 257-91) on Australian Languages and Traditions, and this contains kinship terms, marriage rules, descent, classes, etc., plus comparisons, reference to Morgan's terminology, etc.

In Vol. II (1863) of the Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London, appears Bailey's article on the Wild Tribes of the Veddas of Ceylon which includes a good discussion of cross-cousin marriage; but this is hardly comparable to Lubbock's article in Vol. VI (1868) on The Origin of Civilization. So it is in all of the publications; theory appeared after 1865.
II. Historical Evolution

It appears that four relatively independent factors combined to give us what might be called the Historical Evolutionary School of anthropology. First, there was the intellectual temper of the century—the materialistic philosophy which saw Compte and Spencer seeking a positive science of society—together with the encouragement and analogy of the progress in biology that culminated with Darwin. Second were the researches into classical and protohistorical times by men like Baehofen and Maine, culminating in their evolutionary interpretation of ancient and contemporary society. Third, there were the accounts of curious customs brought back from other continents by the growing number of venturing travelers that became the stimulus and the subject matter of these historians to whom they suggested evolutionary sequences, the first of whom was J. F. McLennan. Fourth was the influence of the out and out ethnography of Morgan and the interest in kinship—which led to his evolutionary explanation of it—of which it was the beginning.

These four factors were not entirely independent; in a general way, the first was a condition of the other three, but to what extent, and in what way, it would be fruitless to inquire. If one is speaking of the theory of social evolution itself, it can be said that Spencer alone conceived the entire framework; but if one is thinking of the development of the theory in respect to Social Organization particularly, Spencer properly takes the place—merely part of the background—that has been assigned to him. Again, if one is thinking of the genesis of the science of Social Organization, Baehofen, Maine, and McLennan may be lumped together as having independently contributed much the same thing, while Morgan stands apart for his distinctive contribution.
Malne, Bachofen, McLennan. Sir Henry Maine published *Ancient Law* in 1861, the same year that Bachofen's *Das Mutterrecht* appeared, and there was a great deal else in common between them. Both were jurists; both drew their source material from Indo-European protohistory and history; both adopted a strictly historical point of view, purporting to show that there was a development of domestic rule and the family from earlier stages to the family as we know it. But there are striking differences as well, for while Maine was willing to limit his conclusions to the so-called Aryans, Bachofen felt that he was making a universal generalization; and whereas Maine's conclusions were that underlying the Indo-European family system there was a patriarchal family, Bachofen contended that mother-right preceded the patriarchate everywhere.

Maine (1822-88) was primarily a comparative jurist, an authority on Roman law. He was never an evolutionist in the sense that some of his contemporaries were, for he neither delineated a series of "stages" of human history, nor did he believe that there is evidence to warrant such procedure.

So far as I am aware, there is nothing in the recorded history of society to justify the belief that, during that vast chapter of its growth which is wholly unwritten, the same transformations of social constitution succeeded one another everywhere, uniformly if not simultaneously. Nevertheless, he believed that all societies whose histories are known were once organized on the model of the Hebrew patriarchate, hence his "Patriarchal Theory" which he attributed, however, to Plato (*Laws*, iii, 680) and Aristotle (*Politics*, 1, 2).

In 1852, Maine began a series of lectures in which he laid the foundation for his *Ancient Law*, the work which made him

---

immediately famous. His interest throughout was in jurisprudence, which he attacked from the historical point of view; and only incidentally did he in *Ancient Law* bring forth material bearing on the evolution of the family. Here he wrote that:

The rudiments of the social state, so far as they are known to us at all, are known through testimony of three sorts—accounts by contemporary observers of civilization less advanced than their own, the records which particular races have preserved concerning their primitive history, and ancient law.\(^{17}\)

and, although he made use of all three sources, his chief dependence was on the latter. But he did not study ancient law to discover the "rudiments of the social state" so much as to determine the meaning of law in general. McLennan especially set out to disprove the Patriarchal Theory, and in 1883, in refuting a posthumous work of his antagonist, Maine became, perhaps, more of an evolutionist than he had ever been, denying theories of original promiscuity and "the horde" and claiming that matrilineal descent must have come as a later phenomenon as a result of a disproportion of the sexes. In 1883, of course, the argument on such matters had passed its climax, and if settled at all, the decision went against Maine. In any event, one may be sure that in the history of ethnology Maine's influence was comparatively slight, due perhaps to his conservatism in a very extravagant era.

J. J. Bachofen, a Swiss, was a student chiefly of classical antiquity. The traditions and the mythology of the Greeks and Romans were the chief source of his theories, for he saw in them definite evidence of the importance of relationship through females. In the Orestes myth, for example, the mother-child relationship is sacred. Bachofen noted also that Herodotus had

\(^{17}\textit{Ancient Law} \ (\text{London, 1861}), \ p. \text{116}.\)
described the Lycians as having a sort of matriarchate; and it appeared to him also that the Spartans had traces of such an organization. Such were the sources for Bachofen's theory. Later (Antiquarische Briefe, 1880), he included a discussion of the Hairs of India as a living example of the matriarchate. He was convinced from such evidence that matriarchal preceded patriarchal organizations of society, and his theoretical endeavors were spent in explaining how and why the change came about. To do so, he set up an evolutionary scheme: first, there was no marriage, or some sort of communal marriage; then, the women, revolted by this state of affairs, established their own rule for moral reasons; but since motherhood is very material and serves as the basis of society only at a very early stage, in the course of history the spiritual creative influence of the father came to be recognized and mother-right was overthrown. Bachofen was really the first of the family-evolutionists, and, on the continent especially, his influence has been inestimable.

John Ferguson McLennan wrote that:

It was in the spring of 1866 that I first heard of Das Mutterrecht and then I found that I had been anticipated by Herr Bachofen in this discovery. No two routes, however, could be more widely apart than those by which Bachofen and I arrived at this conclusion. I was led to it by reasoning on the exigencies of my explanation of the origin of the form of capture. To Bachofen the fact seems to have revealed itself as everywhere underlying the traditions, and especially the mythologies, of antiquity which his prodigious learning comprehended in all their vast details.18

Indeed, that sums up the difference. Primitive Marriage was published in 1865, four years later than Das Mutterrecht. Both were concerned with the evolution of marriage and types of descent, and both considered that in human history there was line of development. But, except that he was anticipated by Bachofen, and

except that in the German-speaking world Bachofen probably had more influence (on Freud, for example), McLennan played a more important part in the history of the study of social organization than did his contemporary. McLennan not only set forth an evolutionary scheme of the development of society, but he used much ethnographic evidence and introduced a terminology ("exogamy," "endogamy," for example) that has survived. Besides the questions of descent, totemism, and clans, he drew attention to the importance of marriage regulations, marriage by capture, female infanticide, etc., and worked them into his theory of the evolution:

Whether the system of kinship through females only prevailed universally at first or not, it must have prevailed wherever exogamy prevailed—exogamy and the consequent practice of capturing wives. Certainty as to fathers is impossible where mothers are stolen from their first lords, and liable to be re-stolen before the birth of the children. And as exogamy and polyandry are referable to one and the same cause—a want of balance between the sexes—we are forced to regard all the exogamous races as having originally been polyandrous.19

At the outset of our argument we saw that if the system of kinship through females could only be shown to exist, or to have existed, it must be accounted a more archaic system of kinship than the system of relationship through males.... and that to prove its existence on such a scale as to entitle it to rank among the normal phenomena of human development would be to prove it the most ancient system of kinship. We now submit that we have amply established our proposition.... We have seen (further) that polyandry must be accepted as a stage in the progress towards marriage proper and the patriarchal system. The lower forms of polyandry we have found to be accompanied by the system of kinship through females only. We have seen polyandry change its form till it allowed of kinship through males, and then die away into an obligation on the younger brothers in turn to espouse the widow of the eldest brother....20

McLennan, like Bachofen, postulated an original state of promiscuity, for, he argued, the father would then have been unknown

---


20Ibid., p. 123.
and this fact would account for tracing descent through females, which he found to be prevalent. Following the state of promiscuity, or possibly substituted for it, came the family based on polyandry, which could also explain the origin of matrilineal descent. Polyandry, he argued, was connected with female infanticide, making women a scarcity. The very scarcity of women, again, led to the capture of girls from other tribes and finally to the rule that only women of other tribes were fit wives (exogamy). Originally, of course, the exogamic groups were matrilineal.

McLennan thought that he could see survivals of descent through females, of totemism, even of promiscuity, in classical and Indian lore; but his chief evidence was the survival of all of these and of marriage by capture in living tribes in all parts of the world. McLennan was the first student of social organization to use ethnographic materials as the basis of his argument.

Of all topics which are today lumped together as social organization, McLennan missed only one of importance—that of kinship systems. That was to await Morgan; and only after the American introduced the subject a few years later did McLennan include it in his discussions. Then he attacked Morgan; an attack that convinced English anthropology enough to keep the subject of kinship terminology from its proper sphere for many years.

Morgan. With Lewis H. Morgan, historical evolution reached its climax, while at the same time the subject matter of social organization was finally rounded out. Morgan's great contribution was his virtual discovery of the variety of kinship terminologies; his use of them to reconstruct the history of society, while at the time it seemed most important, must now be considered comparatively insignificant. Since Morgan's positive
influence has been greater than that of Bechofen, Maine, and McLennan together (in this field) his work deserves some detail.

While engaged in what was perhaps the first case of explicit ethnographic research in America, Lewis Morgan observed the peculiar kinship system that was employed by the Iroquois; believing that it was unique, he thought little about it. In 1858 he discovered that the Ojibwa (of quite different linguistic stock) had the same system; this curious fact led him to investigate further, and he soon came to believe that it was universal in America. Aided by the State Department, he sent out a questionnaire, requesting Government agents and missionaries all over the world to send him the kinship terms in use. In addition, Morgan collected a number of American Indian systems himself.

It is apparent that Morgan was at first interested in tracing racial history; he believed that the fact that the American Indians had, even though now linguistically and physically divergent, the same kinship system was proof that they are genetically related. He sent out the questionnaire-schedules to see if he could discover to whom the Indians as a whole were related and from whence they came. While languages change, he pointed out, ways of reckoning relationships remain constant. "We may.... be able to.... re-associate nations and races, whose original connection has passed from human knowledge." It is evident from such a statement that (1) Morgan was at this time thinking in terms of non-evolutionary historical reconstruction; (2) he was from the beginning convinced that systems of kinship

---

21 The League of the Iroquois was published in 1851.
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terminology are rather permanent and remain the same after other things (such as language) have changed; (3) he was already using a circular argument that was to stay with him: to wit, that kinship terms can be used to reconstruct history because they remain constant—and we know they remain constant because they are widespread among people who once were one and who have otherwise changed—and we know they were once one because the kinship systems are the same.

Morgan, when he set out to collect kinship terms, was not an evolutionist. He wrote that "the children are of the tribe (meaning "clan") of the mother, in a majority of the nations; but the rule, if anciently universal, is not so at the present day."23 By anciently universal he meant at some period after the tribes had diverged from the common ancestor; had he had the evolutionary notions he developed later, he would not have questioned the universality of such rules. Although it is easy to make much of a stray statement, the whole tenor of Morgan's writing at this time was non-evolutionary.

When the schedules were returned to him, he began to organize the material; and then it was that he worked out the theory that was to bring him fame.24 While waiting for the Government to publish his work, he became afraid that he would be anticipated and read a preview before the American Academy.25 Although the

23 Ibid., p. 13.
24 Some account of the friends who influenced Morgan in the working out of his theories is contained in his biography, Lewis Henry Morgan, Social Evolutionist, by Bernhard J. Stern (Chicago, 1931). There is excellent material in this book, but to a student of social organization possibly valuable interpretations are lacking.
preface to *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* was dated January, 1866, the work was not published until 1870. Systems completed the plateau of Historical Evolutionism, and at the same time it rounded out the subject matter of the science of social organization.

Systems is a contribution that ranks with any in ethnology, both because it bares a tremendous amount of factual material and because it draws inferences from it that, fallacious as the gross argument may be, contain a number of ideas that have found a permanent place in the science. If for nothing else than that Morgan began the system of getting terminologies systematically, he should be remembered, but even to the detail of getting the terms in relation to a speaker, and in the first person, he has been followed to this day.

The first great result of his schedules was that he saw an important distinction between two general types of systems: the one that he found in America, which he now called "classificatory," and the one that typifies the Semitic and Celtic languages—where all relatives are carefully distinguished by the term father, mother, sister, brother, son, daughter, grandfather, grandmother, grandson, granddaughter, and combinations of these terms, so that a type of cousin would be called "my mother's sister's daughter," for example, or "my father's sister's granddaughter"—which he called "descriptive." The terms "classificatory" and "descriptive" have caused confusion, but most of the confusion was in the minds of writers later than Morgan who was

---

26Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, Vol. XVII (Washington, 1870).

27Cf. Lafitau's description of Iroquois, p. 2 of this paper.
himself aware that English, for example, has non-descriptive features (such as the term "cousin," or "uncle") but who nevertheless appreciated the distinction that is, in fact, there. It may be that the distinction is overrated in importance, but that remains to be proved.

Within the classificatory systems, Morgan made a further distinction: he found that some systems (like that of Hawaii) made no distinctions whatsoever except on the basis of generation and sex, so that the siblings of both the father and mother are all called "father" and "mother," and their children all "brother" and "sister," and their children all "son" and "daughter," and so on; this he called the Malayan System; on the other hand, the systems in America and parts of Asia make a distinction between parallel and cross lines, i.e., between the father's brothers' and mother's sisters' lines as one group, and the father's sisters' and mother's brothers' lines as another. These systems he called the Turanian (in Asia) and the Ganovanian (in America).

Morgan's first problem was to explain the differences. He first noticed that, broadly, the classificatory system is of value to a small tribe, for it tends toward unity, while on the other hand such a system would be harmful to a society such as ours where the inheritance of property is so important. Such an observation, which in modern days would be termed "functional," was of minor importance; for he recognized that kinship systems cannot always be tied up functionally with the social structure, since—although Morgan's first assumption is that kinship systems cannot be made out of whole cloth but must always fit the societies in which they grow—he believed that kinship systems change very slowly and "it is rendered not improbable that they might survive changes of social condition sufficiently radical to
overthrow the primary ideas in which they originated.\textsuperscript{28} Kinship systems must always have originated in a social system of a type that would produce such a terminology, but the kinship terminology is apt to survive after the social system has passed; therefore, he thought that one can reconstruct social systems from the kinship terminologies and \textit{at the same time explain the variations in kinship terminology that we now find}. So he reconstructed history in the first place to explain the terminology, but more important, as an end in itself, with the terminology as the proof of the history.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Systems}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{29}Anyone who supposes that Morgan reached such conclusions without an argumentative tussle has not read \textit{Systems}. One must read his arguments with the knowledge that (1) he was, from the beginning, interested in reconstructing history, and that alone, and, further, that (2) he was convinced, without raising the question or trying to prove it, that kinship systems must arise in connection with social systems (and cannot be diffused as traits in themselves). The latter, and the point that kinship terminologies can survive the causes that gave them rise, are all that he assumed; and it may be said here that both of those assumptions have today a tremendous body of evidence in their support.

With that background, Morgan asks: Can the classificatory system (he does not try to account for descriptive systems because he considers them natural and logical in the societies in which they are now found) be accounted for (1) by causes and institutions now operative in different societies (and if the answer is "yes," the matter loses historical importance, for it might have then have grown up again and again), or (2) can it be accounted for by any supposed antecedent condition of society? If so, the classificatory system "must be treated as a transmitted system from the earliest epoch of its complete establishment, and its origin would be contemporaneous with the introduction of the customs, or the birth of the institutions from which it sprung" (\textit{Systems}, p. 474).

The first essential for Historian Morgan was to answer the first possibility in the negative, and he proceeded to do so in the following way: by analyzing the social conditions in societies today that might account for the growth of the classificatory system and showing that they are insufficient. First, he pointed out, there are two possible external causes that suggest themselves, (a) the use of the band of kin for mutual protection; this would tend to draw the relatives together, but since it would not account for the peculiar way they are drawn together as exemplified by the classificatory terminology that we find, it cannot
What sort of social organization must there have been back in the days when all the people who now have the classificatory system were one and when that system originated? That became account for the system; (b) clan (he calls it "tribal") organization will account for some parts of the system (such as, in a patrilineal society, the merging of the father and father's brother who are in the same clan, and of the father's brother's children and one's own siblings, since they are all in one's own clan), but it would not account for other parts of the system, such as the merging of one's brother's son with one's own son in a matrilineal society where they may be of different clans. Second, he went on, there might be internal causes that would originate the classificatory system again and again; such are polygyny, or polyandry and the levirate, which can explain parts of the system (the parallel lines) but not all of it; another reason why Morgan rejected these internal causes is that the number of people in any society affected by these customs is not great enough to account for the origin of the terminology. Such customs have, however, he pointed out, helped to perpetuate the kinship terminology that arose earlier and from other causes. So Morgan rejected the possibility that these kinship systems could have arisen over and over again from one cause or another. And, of course, if they could have arisen but once, they are useful in tracing history.

Although it is difficult to prove that Morgan's conclusion must be rejected, the tendency is to believe that classificatory systems have arisen independently (and, of course, a much greater complexity and lack of uniformity is now recognized). If Morgan was right, however, and the theory of several independent origins of the classificatory is discarded, the next question is, must one accept Morgan's alternative—are all the peoples with classificatory systems historically connected? Yes, but not necessarily genetically related, for (a) the peoples may have had a common ancestry with both the social organization and the kinship terminology that goes with it, and, diverging, have kept the terminology, or (b) the peoples may not have had a common source, but the kinship terminologies may have diffused independently with or without the concomitant social organization that gave it rise. Morgan accepted (a) without considering (b). Morgan believed in unilinear evolution in the sense that he thought that at one time all people were one, had a uniform culture, of course, and before or after diverging, gradually changed their cultures in somewhat the same direction. The Ganowanian family came to America "with the blood stream." (Morgan, no doubt, was confused about culture and biology, but, fortunately, it does not hamper his argument.) Morgan's next step was to postulate the kind of social organization that would give the Malayan type of kinship; then the kind that would give the Turanian and Ganowanian types. But he could not explain the latter in terms of their social organization alone, but on the basis of that plus the fact that it was a modification of the Malayan. That is the reason why he had to have an "evolution"; for, if he could explain each separately, they might have been independently developed without causal connection. This is the secret of his evolutionary scheme—this, rather than the fact that he tried to start from the opposite of Monogamy and work up, as some, cynically, have said.
Morgan's problem. But, first of all, which kinship system was older, the Malayan or Turanian? Morgan's answer was that the Malayan was older, for, as will be seen, the Turanian could be explained only as an outgrowth of the other. Specifically, then, what kind of social organization could possibly demand the Malayan type of nomenclature? Morgan's answer was "the communal family." If a group of brothers married a group of sisters, and they all lived together with their children, one would expect them to use the Malayan terminology. What kind of family life, next, could account for the Turanian and Ganowanian families? Morgan had rejected simply "clans" as an answer, but he now argued that given the Malayan kinship system, if clans are organized and the "consanguine family" described above is consequently broken up, the Malayan system will be modified to suit new conditions, and the Turanian system is the result.

For the later stages of the family—from the clan type to

---

20 Because, of course, all the men of the generation above would be either one's own father or step-father (mother's husband)—and in this case it would be impossible to tell which—and thus called "father"; all the women of the generation above either one's own mother or step-mother and thus called "mother"; reciprocally, and for the same reasons, all relatives of the generation below would be called "children"; all relatives of one's own generation would be full siblings, half-siblings, or step-siblings and would be called, thus, "brother" or "sister." A condition much like this was reported from Hawaii and served as Morgan's model and proof.

It should be noted that Morgan's position was not that a person would be ignorant of his mother's identity, as has been claimed; rather that a step-mother would be called mother due to the similarity of relationship, as indeed is the case among so many peoples.

31 The mother's brother comes to be distinguished from the father's brother because they are in different clans; and the mother's sister from the father's sister for the same reason. But in a matrilineal society, for example, a man still would call his brother's child "child" even though they may be in different clans because kinship systems are conservative and there was no strong reason for changing the Malayan in this respect.
our own simple bilateral type—some of Morgan's evidence was historical, but more was based only on logic and the presence of various social institutions (such as polyandry) in native tribes. But the assumptions that Morgan made, such as that of the dependence of kinship terms on social structure and the lag of terminology in social change, are historically more important than the exact sequence of evolution that he set up.  

Morgan's later works, *Ancient Society* and *Houses and House Life of the American Aborigines*, brought together considerably more material and clarified his point of view; the former added little to his argument, while the latter was concerned chiefly with the development of ideas of property. The influence of *Ancient Society* has been greater than that of *Systems*, chiefly because it is a smaller volume; but, while the theory in *Ancient Society* is largely outmoded, the raw material in *Systems* is of inestimable value. 

Morgan completed the foundations of Historical Evolutionism; and no great constructive additions were made after 1870. 

Argument on the subject, however, was just beginning, and for

---

32 As given in *Systems* (and changed only slightly in *Ancient Society*), Morgan's series is as follows:

1. Promiscuous intercourse
2. Intermarriage of brother-sister
3. The communal family
4. The Hawaiian custom
5. Malay form of classificatory system
6. The tribal organization (clans)
7. The Turanian and Ganoowanian systems of relationship
8. Marriage between single pairs
9. The barbarian family
10. Polygamy
11. The patriarchal family
12. Polyandria
13. The rise of property: lineal succession of estates
14. The civilized family
15. Overthrow of classificatory system of relationship and substitution of descriptive

33 New York, 1877.

twenty years it consumed the energy of the growing science as tag
does that of children—with by-products absolutely essential to
healthy development. Space does not warrant a detailed account
of what happened in those twenty years. Historically most impor-
tant was McLennan's answer to Morgan, for his claim that "the
classificatory system is a system of mutual salutations merely" seems to have been convincing enough to delay the study of kinship
for thirty years. Aside from McLennan, the most important
participants in the discussions were Sir John Lubbock,
C. S. ~eke

35 The Evolutionary arguments have consumed chiefly Eng-
lish energy, although both on the continent and in America there
have been and still are stray exponents. In England, it is fair
to say, at one time all anthropologists were believers in social
evolution of the unilinear type; in France it was never so strong;
in Germany it was, in many quarters, bitterly opposed; in America,
it was current until Boas, who had never been an evolutionist,
became the strongest influence.

p. 277, nevertheless, he tries to explain the Malayan type on
the basis of early marriage customs.

37 Until Rivers revived it.

38 Lubbock lectured in 1868 on the origin of civilization,
refuting Bachofen and McLennan on (as now considered) minor
points. His Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition
of Mankind appeared in 1870 (London); in it he presented his own
Scheme of promiscuity-individual marriage-exogamy-matriline-
patriline, differing slightly from that of his predecessors--mostly
on the causes of the changes. In 1871 he gave Morgan's work a
rousing welcome in the first article of the first Journal of the
Anthropological Institute, utilizing much of the data in Systems
for constructive hypotheses. As late as 1911 (Marriage, Totemism,
and Religion [London]), he maintained his evolutionary position.

39 In 1873, refuting McLennan, Lubbock, and Morgan, Wake
(Marriage by Capture, Anthropologie, I, 73-78) denied original
sexual communism. Later (Marriage among Primitive Peoples, ibid.,
pp. 197-207), he was one of the first to make use of Morgan's ta-
bles in Systems to counter Morgan's argument. He also used Ridley's
Australian material here, also on kinship terms. In 1878, after
reading Ancient Society, he supported the view that the father must
always have been recognized (The Origin of the Classificatory
System of Relationships Used among Primitive Peoples, JAI, VIII,
144-80). A year later he came out definitely for patrilinear
priority (The Primitive Human Family, JAI, IX, 3-19).
Robertson Smith, A. W. Howitt and Lorimer Fison, Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, and in America W. J. Powell, W. J. McGee, and others. Sir E. B. Tylor was somewhat aberrant; although none of his work looks like the typical Evolutionary discussion of logic and conjecture, he nevertheless contributed to the side of the argument which claimed priority for the matriarchate when he showed by statistical means that, on the assumption that there was a unilinear evolution, the distribution of traits such as in-law avoidance and the couvade are explicable only if considered survivals from a matriarchal condition.

40 A strong supporter of McLennan; Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia (Cambridge, 1885) is dedicated to the proposition that "male kinship has been preceded by kinship through women only."

41 Howitt began his Australian researches in 1865. In 1873 he began to collaborate with the Rev. Mr. Fison on the Classificatory system in Australia. A joint article appeared in the JAI in 1880 (Vol. X), Kamilaroi and Kurnai, in which they first pointed out that the classificatory system and exogamy are two sides of the same thing. In 1882, in another article (From Mother-Right to Father-Right, JAI, XII, 30-46), they showed how (but not on the basis of observed change) maternal descent could change to paternal in Australia. Both believed that promiscuity underlies group marriage in Australia, and Howitt's book in 1904 (The Native Tribes of South-East Australia (London) and his article in 1907 (Australian Group Relationships, JAI, XXXVII, 279-89) devote considerable time to discussions of group marriage, the latter in answer to Andrew Lang. Chiefly because of Howitt's and Fison's work, Australia became the stamping ground of the theorists.

42 In The Native Tribes of Central Australia (London, 1899), they support Morgan's as against McLennan's view of kinship terminology (p. 56). Their work on Australia was as important to later discussions as Howitt's was to earlier.

43 Powell wrote long theoretical discussions in the early BAE reports as well as in the AA. McGee is an example of a pre-Boas American; his The Beginning of Marriage (AA, o.s., IX, 371-82), while refuting the theory of original promiscuity, is evolutionary (1896). He was supported by H. Solotaroff in 1898 (A.A., o.s. XI, 223-42).

44 On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, etc., JAI, XVIII, 245-72 (1888). Tylor makes out his best case with the levirate.
nineties, however, interests of the evolutionists were shifting to psychological, rather than historical, problems.

Westermarck, in 1889 and 1891, rather smothered all arguments; while still not abandoning all evolutionary disposition, he gathered such a mass of facts to show the improbability of the schemes established that, practically speaking, nobody again cared or dared to enter the lists. Nevertheless, Frazer unblushingly supported Morgan's notion of origin as late as 1910, and, even in recent times, Hartland and Briffault, for example, have resuscitated the arguments, even if somewhat changed. One may write finis, however, to the attempts to set up "from promiscuity to monogamy" series on the basis of ethnographic data and date it 1890. In the span of thirty years, the Historical Evolutionary school had run its course, and whatever else one may say of it, it cannot be denied that in those same thirty years cultural anthropology had grown from nothing to maturity. Practically all of our elementary concepts about social organization—and its terminology—were developed by these evolutionists, and to try to evaluate their contributions would be as if a bullfrog were to try to evaluate a tadpole. Since we, at the present time, with all the concepts developed by the evolutionists, find it difficult, if not impossible, to synthesize the materials we have about social organization, who can say that it was unfortunate that the first ethnologists were beset by a false formula?

A preliminary paper on the Origin of Human Marriage appeared in 1889. His History of Human Marriage, in three volumes, was first published in London, in 1891.


III. Psychology

Attempts to explain the phenomena of social organization in terms of individual psychology have been connected historically with (a) the Evolutionists, (b) the Psychoanalysts, (c) the American-Historians, and (d) the Functionalists. Since psychology is but a phase of the latter two and since they are of great importance in contemporary anthropology, the Americans and the Functionalists will be treated separately in other sections.

Evolutionary Psychologists. To find the origin of a cultural institution, such as exogamy, for example, is, in the first place, a historical problem, but it is, at the same time, a "scientific" problem, for to establish a "law" as to how such an institution can ever start is to solve the historic problem also (except as to the exact time and place). All of the Evolutionists did both the history and science at the same time; but some of them used theoretical notions in order to establish their history (Morgan's implicit generalization that kinship systems must be growths in social organizations, for example) while others used evolutionary history (notions of "survivals" or "primitive peoples") as a means of establishing their generalizations. It is on the basis of this difference that a distinction can be made between "Historical" and "Scientific" Evolutionists.

From the very beginning, the English evolutionists were biased on the side of psychology as the basis of their scientific explanations of social institutions. On the other hand, the French evolutionists (notably Durkheim) opposed what they called "sociology" to psychology. The development of Scientific

---

48 Wundt, the German psychologist, contributed little to the study of social organization. Bastian might also be considered here, but his work was of such a general type that it has made no impression on the study of social institutions particularly.
Evolutionism and its branches would play a very essential role in any complete history of social anthropology; but it happens that the subject matter involved has been chiefly religion and mythology, so that its history in a paper on Social Organization is comparatively unimportant. In fact, it is only on borderline problems such as incest and totemism-and-exogamy and the esoteric phases of the transitions of birth, puberty, marriage and death that the Scientific Evolutionists enter this paper at all.

James Frazer, especially, and Ernest Crawley are the most renowned of the Evolutionary Psychologists. The latter's most important work, The Mystic Rose,\(^4^9\) denies the historical approach entirely and attempts to explain such customs as marriage-by-capture not as survivals from previous social states, but rather as answering a psychological need.\(^5^0\) Frazer's only work on social organization, Totemism and Exogamy,\(^5^1\) really deals with the religious phenomenon of Totemism, only incidentally with Exogamy. More historically minded than Crawley, he took up one by one the theories of the older evolutionists, discarding most of their historical hypotheses; as far as exogamy is concerned, he finally did approve of Morgan's idea, however—that exogamy was consciously originated by a few people who disapproved of brothersister marriage. Actually, Frazer's contribution to the study of  


\(^5^0\) Designed to obviate the dangers attendant on getting married. The idea is that all human relationships are fraught with great mystic danger, and especially when there is anything unusual about them—more especially when physiological functions are involved. The danger must be gotten around: hence, such weird customs as marriage by capture.

\(^5^1\) Four volumes (London, 1910).
social organization has been slight, and, in fact, the same may be said for the other English Psychologists: the study of religion is apparently better adapted to their type of theory. Those who have been here called evolutionary psychologists have been, however, the backbone of English anthropology. Excepting for the specialized groups of Rivers, of Kiliot Smith, and of Malinowski and Redcliffe-Brown, they still constitute English anthropology. They are the last outpost in anthropology of Social Philosophy—archaic speculators—but by their broad vision and power of analysis they remain today, old men that they now are, the most influential force in the science.\footnote{Prominent are R. R. Marett, Carveth Read, H. Ling Roth, and P. R. Somerset (Lord Raglan).}

\textbf{Psychoanalysis.} Psychoanalytic theory is related to the study of social organization at two important points: one, the origin of the family, incest, etc., and, indeed, of culture itself; and, two, the psychology of family relationships. Both of these have been dealt with by Freud and others, but the former especially in \textit{Totem and Taboo}.\footnote{Sigmund Freud, \textit{Totem and Taboo}. The theory of the origin of culture set up here is amply discussed in Malinowski, \textit{Sex and Repression in Savage Society} (London, 1927).} Freud is a specialized kind of Evolutionist, apparently holding that all of culture originated with a single act of patricide which resulted in changing a horde of ape-men into a human society with its complexes and its incest taboo. The psychology of familial relationships has been dealt with by the psychoanalysts for Western Europe, and, following the lead, for one matrilineal society by Malinowski. Roheim\footnote{Australian \textit{Totemism} (London, 1925).} has given to Australian social organization, meanwhile, a psychoanalytic interpretation which has had very little influence, however, in
anthropological circles. Although psychoanalysis is as old as any of the dominant schools of ethnology, its application to social organization generally is still a matter for the future.\footnote{Ernest Jones explains the famous paradox on incest psychoanalytically. The reason why there is a "universal horror of incest" and still there are strong laws against it is that there is an inclination toward incest actually present but repressed in the unconscious. (Psychoanalysis and Anthropology, JAI, LIV, 47-66 [1924].)}

**IV. Diffusionists**

Replacements in the ranks of the aging Evolutionists have been rendered virtually impossible by four developments which occurred at the turn of the century: (1) the diffusion to America of the German Geographical-psychological interest and the inauguration of scientific ethnography there which lost America to the Evolutionists, (2) the development of sociological-functionalism in France, which kept the French from feeling a keen interest in the sort of psychological-evolutionary theories that were current in England, (3) the rediscovery of kinship terminologies by Rivers which resulted in a stimulation of interest in the internal structures of tribes, and (4) the growth of the Kulturgeschichte which more definitely drew the Germans from Evolutionism and—more serious—which took Rivers and his followers in England farther from it.

This short section will be devoted to the fourth development, together with a further minor departure in England itself: the advent of the Heleolithic school.

**Kulturgeschichte.** The German speaking world had had its social evolutionists; Bachofen himself wrote in German, and Lipper, Kohler, and, of recent years, Muller-Iyer, were to be reckoned with. Nevertheless, there was contemporaneous with them...
another strain, quite different, which had its origin in the kind of "natural history of mankind" that was current in the fifties and sixties. World ethnography was its first keynote, world ethnography with its resultant interest in museums on the one hand and in geography on the other. From the description of the tribes of the world came (a) somewhat psychological analyses of what was in common among them and the relations of the various differences to environmental factors; from the museums was born an interest in cultural traits and their distribution—which, coupled with the old desire to trace history, led directly to (b) the Kulturkreise theory and the Kulturgeschichte school.

Considering social organization, at least, the German Historians have one thing in common with the Evolutionists: they seem prone to crystallize social complexes into unvarying forms. So, for example, the "matriarchate" has become for them something almost as definitive and unvarying as a milk bottle. Moieties and clans, "secret societies" and totemism are treated in much the same way. Treating phenomena of social organization so, the Graebnerites\textsuperscript{56} can handle them in tracing their histories quite as if they were boomerangs and spearthrowers. Since, in addition, these anthropologists have an iron-clad "methode" for tracing histories, they have been quite successful from their own point of view in dealing with the very treacherous subject of social organization. If there were any way of checking the historical reconstructions that they have established, outside that prescribed by the Methode itself, they might perhaps be useful to others;

\textsuperscript{56}Following Geographer Ratzel, Graebner and Foy founded the school; Graebner's great methodological work, the Bible was Methode der Ethnologie. Chief adherents to the school, which traces history through circles (kulturkreise) which correspond in space today to layers marking periods of the past, are Father Schmidt and Father Koppers.
unfortunately, however, the Kulturgeschichte people have dealt solely with peoples without recorded history so that neither the method nor the results can be adequately checked. Actually, these German-Historians have had practically no influence on the study of social organization outside their own circle—with one prominent exception: Rivers and his followers, who, however, were influenced not by the Methode but by the simple notion that clans and moieties, as well as kinship systems, can be diffused and confused.

**Neolithicists.** Quite independent of the German Historians, research in Egypt and Mesopotamia gave impetus to another group of diffusionists. The only thing in common between the two is the belief that independent invention is next to impossible, so that common cultural forms must be traceable to a common origin. G. Elliott Smith apparently was the first to postulate that there was a migration of the "Children of the Sun" from Egypt through southern Asia and Oceania to America, taking with them a number of important culture-traits. W. J. Perry, however, is more important in this history because he dealt at length with social organization. Perry bore out the evolutionist contention that mother-right preceded father-right, but to him there was nothing evolutionistic about it. An archaic culture with maternal clans was spread over the world until supplanted (in most places) by the migrating Children of the Sun from Egypt who brought with them, along with sun worship, dual organization and patriliny. In the matter of a scientific conclusion, a theory of some sort, one can

---

57 The conception of the matriarchate employed by the Grebnerites is severely criticized in J. H. Ronhaar, Woman in Primitive Motherright Societies (The Hague, 1931).

58 Children of the Sun (New York, 1923).
ask, "Is it useful?" and the promulgator must, to satisfy his critics, use it to help solve some problem. In the matter of history, however, the only question is, "Is it true?" because if it is not true, it certainly cannot be useful (as, say, a "case in point" of something or other). This section is not intended to be critical so much as interpretive, but one is bound to observe that highly questionable and wholly unverifiable "history" cannot have much influence outside the circle of those with faith.

V. Rivers

To most anthropologists today, Rivers is the founder of the modern study of social organization. Mrs. Seligman is his direct disciple; Radcliffe-Brown, his pupil, owes to him his interest in kinship and to some extent its direction; Lowie and Kroeber in America were completely changed by him; and the pupils of all of them in Britain and the colonies and in America are indirectly indebted to him. Only Malinowski in England (and not his pupils to date) can be said to be somewhat free in his point of view from that of Rivers, and he would be the last to deny that his own contributions, both in method and theory, have some foundation in the work of Rivers. In Germany, probably Rivers is considered an offshoot of their own dominant school, but he did not receive from Germany, nor did they take from him, those contributions for which most Anglo-Saxon anthropologists honor him. In France, apparently there is no specialization in the field of social organization; but were there such an interest it is conceivable that the followers of Durkheim should not be, to some extent, followers of Rivers.

Rivers' first great contribution was to ethnographic method; he it was who, almost single-handed, made research into
the social organization of tribes what it is today. When he accompanied the Torres Straits expedition from Cambridge, he was a psychologist, interested in making certain tests; as a psychologist, he needed to know how the subjects he was testing were related, so he obtained their genealogies. It was not long thereafter before he realized how much of the social organization of a tribe he could get by the genealogical expedient.\(^5^9\)

When the results of the Torres Straits expedition were published, the first somewhat scientific accounts of native societies ever written were found to be under the name of Rivers.\(^6^0\)

Meanwhile, he went to study the Todas of the Nilgiri hills of southern India; and here he brought to bear his genealogical method with results that gave to ethnology a report unparalleled for many years for completeness and accuracy.\(^6^1\)

Rivers' second great contribution was a direct result of his first. Having obtained kinship terms as well as social structures accurately by the genealogical records, and having done this, moreover, for a large number of different tribes (both in Torres Straits and on a later journey) it was not long before Rivers saw the connection between the system of terms and the clans, moieties, and marriage customs. He says that "the terminology of relationships has been rigorously determined by social conditions and.... systems of relationship furnish us with a most valuable instrument...


\(^{61}\) *The Todas* (London and New York, 1906).
in studying the history of social institutions." This sounds very much like Morgan, and Rivers, indeed, gave Morgan every credit for the initial discovery. To Rivers, it was a tragedy that anthropologists followed McLennan and not Morgan, for doing so caused them to miss even the facts of kinship:

Those who believe the classificatory system is merely an unimportant code of mutual salutations are not likely to attend to relatively minute differences in the customs they despise. Rivers himself gave full credit for "having been the first fully to recognize the social importance of these differences" to J. Kohler; perhaps it does rightly belong there, but it was certainly Rivers who did the major share of the research in linking kinship terms to social institutions and Rivers who popularized the knowledge and gained adherents.

Rivers started his career as an evolutionist. In 1907 he published an article in Evolutionary Tempo, arguing that the classificatory system originated with group marriage when dual division or clans were already in existence. In 1911, however,

---

62 W. H. R. Rivers, Kinship and Social Organization (London, 1914), p. 1. This is the thesis of the entire book. Note that Rivers made both of Morgan's points (1) that kinship systems originate to fit social institutions and (2) that (this is implicit) kinship systems survive the institutions and can, therefore, be used in reconstructing history. That the type of history was different will soon appear.

63 Ibid., p. 19.

64 Ibid.


66 Lowie and Kroeber and their followers, for example, were influenced by Rivers alone.

after having done his major research in Melanesia—and while attempting to work up the material—he came to the conclusion that migration and diffusion must be brought in to explain the distribution of types of social organization in Melanesia; he accepted, therefore, the main tenets of Graebner's method. The change in point of view was very conscious with him; in the introduction to his History of Melanesian Society he described how, after writing half the book, he changed his opinion but not the book, since he felt he could reconcile the two positions and make the book a valuable study in method. Rivers did neatly reconcile the evolutionary and Graebnerian approaches, for he theorized that the evolution had progressed to a certain point when it was disturbed by migrations and contacts, when it was not only confused, but stimulated.

But Rivers' contribution was not his History, but rather (1) his new ethnographic procedure which is followed today by most trained ethnologists, (2) his recognition of the importance of kinship terminology as a part of the social organization, and (3) his method of getting the history of a tribe by means of interpreting the kinship system. Whether the latter is a significant contribution is open to debate, but since it engages the attention of a prolific school of anthropology it must be included.

Brenda Seligman is Rivers' most ardent disciple; she has carried his methods from Melanesia to Africa, where, in small areas, she has tried to interpret both peculiar kinship systems and marriage customs together on the basis of inferences from

---


both. But if Mrs. Seligman will be remembered, it may very well be for her apparent grasp of the details of her subject which, however, seems to require as great astuteness to decipher as to write. 70

VI. American Historians

The history of the study of Social Organization in America can be divided into three phases: (1) the period of Evolutionism, from the time of Morgan to about 1900, indistinguishable from that in England; (2) the era of historical indeterminism, from about 1900 to 1915, when kinship terminology was considered a separately diffusible linguistic phenomenon; and (3) the Kinship phase, from 1915 to the present day, where the emphasis on the relation of kinship terminology to social institutions is dominant.

In 1895 Boas, who had been trained in Germany, published his famous broadside against the Evolutionists. On pages 29-31, the development of anthropology in Germany was outlined; Boas belonged to the group that had developed contemporaneously with the Evolutionists and was never itself evolutionistic. Boas had left this group and come to America before the Kulturkreise theories were developed from it, so that was still in the geographical, psychological, middle-of-the-road-historical state when his influence began to be felt in America; he had never been an evolutionist, and, indeed, considered those who were "a new school." Now, after considerable training in ethnography, he wrote the case against the "new school" which had its adherents in America

70See especially Marital Gerontocracy in Africa, JAI, LIV, 251-50 (1924); Bilateral Descent and the Formation of Marriage Classes, JAI, LVIII, 349-75 (1928); Asymmetry in Descent, JAI, LVIII, 533-58 (1928). Later, influenced by Malinowski, Mrs. Seligman became more "functional," less historical, and wrote a general theoretical study, Incest and Descent, JAI, LVIX, 231-72 (1929).
as well as abroad. Never, thereafter, did Evolutionism seriously raise its head in America.

The keynote in the study of social organization specifically, in the second phase, was sounded by John R. Swanton in 1905. He demolished the evolutionary theories by data from the American Indian tribes by showing that, as far as history can be safely reconstructed, maternal descent was spreading from the Tsimshian to the other (more patrilineal) tribes of the Northwest Coast when the white man came; he pointed out his refusal to believe, furthermore, that the matrilineal Iroquois and Cherokee and Hopi and Tsimshian, for example, are more primitive than the patrilineal tribes. Besides showing the importance of the possibility of diffusion, he warned that care should be taken that so-called "vestigial" characters are not in reality functional.

American anthropologists were not going to be hasty in accepting any conclusions; there were to be no rules of method except painstaking research in the minutiae of recorded and reasonably reconstructed history; every theory would have to stand the test of common sense.

With such a point of view, it is not surprising that ethnographic work, rather than theoretical, characterized this period; every American anthropologist had his turn in the field, and they all brought back better or worse accounts of the social organization and the kinship terminology with comparisons pointed toward historical relationships of the "traits" or of the tribes.

71 The Limitations of the Comparative Method in Anthropology, Science, n.s., IV, 901-908 (December 18, 1896).
Kinship systems were hardly noticed, although usually partly recorded as much for their linguistic value as their ethnologic.\(^73\)

The problem of kinship terminology was first dealt with by Kroeber, in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*.\(^74\) For Morgan's general distinction between "classificatory" and "descriptive" Kroeber substituted an analysis of eight "principles" underlying the classification of relatives, and suggested that kinship systems be described in terms of which principles are adopted. This suggestion has been to a large extent followed in America. Kroeber, at the same time, claimed that the principles made use of in any system become a matter of the psychology of the people, and two relatives may be called by the same term simply because they are conceived to have something in common according to one of the principles in use in the whole system. Since all language consists of classifications of phenomena that are conceived to belong together, Kroeber argued that kinship terms must be conceived as parts of the language, not of the social organization.

On the whole it is inherently very unlikely in any particular case that the use of identical terms for similar relationships can ever be connected with such special customs as the Levirate or group marriage. It is a much more conservative view to hold that such forms of linguistic expression and such conditions are both the outcome of the unalterable fact that certain relationships are more similar to one another than others. On the one hand this fact has led to certain sociological institutions; on the other hand to psychological recognitions and their expression in language.\(^75\)

Kroeber maintained this point of view for many years, even after his colleagues in America came to believe the contrary.

\(^73\)The best of the studies are Francis La Flesche and Alice Fletcher, *The Omaha Tribe*, AR-BAE 27, 1911 (and, long before, as good a study as there has been since: J. O. Dorsey, *Omaha Sociology*, AR-BAE 3, 1884); Swanton's work on the Northwest Coast and on the Southeastern tribes; Lowie's *Crow Studies*.

\(^74\)Classificatory Systems of Relationship, *JAI*, XXXIX, 77-84 (1909).

\(^75\)Ibid., p. 83.
Lowie especially was impressed by the work of Rivers; in 1915 he accepted the importance of the relations of kinship terms to social organization, with reservations to take care of diffusion. The next year, possibly afraid that he had been too hasty, he emphasized diffusion very much more. But when Gifford, Swanton, and Sapir and even Kroeber began to take the sociological view seriously, Lowie in 1917 became its strongest American adherent, and, since then, has been ever willing to theorize on the origin of kinship terminologies and social structures in terms of each other as well as external factors.

Year after year more evidence is amassed to prove to American anthropologists that kinship systems are related to social institutions such as moieties and clans, the levirate, cross-cousin marriage; and, today, the tendency is to link up particular

---

79. The Terms of Relationship of Pentecost Island. AA, n.s., XVIII, 455-63 (1915).
80. Terms of Relationship and the Levirate. AA, n.s. XVIII, 327-37 (1916).
82. See especially his last chapter in Culture and Ethnology (New York, 1917); his reviews in the American Anthropologist of Rivers' articles on kinship in Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics; Family and Sib. AA, n.s., XXI, 28-40 (1919); The Aryan Chinese in Patrilineal Tribes. AA, n.s., XXIV, 94-95 (1922); A Note on Relationship Terminologies. AA, XXX, 263-68 (1928); Hopi Kinship. AP-AMNH, Vol. XXX, Part VII (1929); and his recent article on Kinship in Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, VIII, 568-72 (1932).
features of terminology with particular institutions where they are found to exist. But, unlike Morgan, they never assume that, because a terminological feature is found without its concomitant institution, therefore, the institution must have been present once; and, unlike Rivers, they do not explain an anomalous system on the basis of the combination of two systems in contact when there is no evidence of such contact. Diffusion is never denied any more than asserted by rule; nor is internal development and the lag of one element of culture behind another. American anthropologists seem to realize that they are too unacquainted with the mechanisms of diffusion and of change to adopt any broad principles to serve as a basis of historical reconstruction.

VII. Functionalists

Apparently, Malinowski first employed the term "Functionalism" for a school of ethnology, and the term has gained currency chiefly as applied by himself and others to himself and his followers. Malinowski himself, however, when he lists the adherents to his doctrines and methods, often includes anthropologists who deny spiritual kindred with him. Sometimes, for example, he includes Lowie and Sapir among the Functionalists; yet they differ with him on important points; always he includes Radcliffe-Brown, and he differs on still more important (if different) points.

One can establish the following similarities and differences:

1. Malinowski, Lowie-Kroeber-Sapir-et al., and Radcliffe-Brown are at one in that, as opposed to the Evolutionists, Graebner, or Elliott Smith, they desire to study culture as it is lived rather than as cold traits useful for some purpose or other; they are all concerned with getting the inner workings of a culture and in theorizing on the relations of the parts.

2. Malinowski and Lowie-Kroeber-Sapir-et al. are at one in their interest in studying the relations of individuals to each other, in their desire to explain social phenomena psychologically; they are opposed in this to Radcliffe-Brown.
3. Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown are agreed that social institutions, indeed all parts of any culture, have functions in maintenance of something—and their prime interest is in figuring out the various functions. The Americans, though not denying the fact that some culture-traits have discernible functions, yet refuse to make a rule about it and certainly don't spend all of their time looking for functions.

4. Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown are agreed that to find functions, and to make universal generalizations history is not necessary, and doubtful-reconstructed-history is pernicious. The Americans deny the possibility of determining functions without history and insist on the danger of any generalization about culture that has not taken account of the historical nexus of the cultural elements involved; furthermore, they insist that probable-reconstructed-history is better than no history.

5. Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown are not agreed on what they mean by function or functionalism; and the Americans are not particularly interested in that argument. Malinowski considers anything a "function" if it "does something" for (a) another part of the culture, (b) the individual, or (c) the tribe. Radcliffe-Brown carefully distinguishes between "function for the individual" and "social function," and professes interest only in the latter. Also: while Malinowski is satisfied to find a series of unrelated or relatively unrelated functions for cultural phenomena, in one tribe or, generally, Radcliffe-Brown has an elaborate and highly systematized science worked out, so that there is a Grand Function, sub-functions, and innumerable minor functions that fill in the hierarchy.

6. As far as kinship particularly is concerned, there is little in common between any two of the three, as will be seen.

Since Malinowski is the most prone to use the term, it is fair to reserve the word Functionalist for him and his followers. Radcliffe-Brown prefers the term Comparative Sociology for his type of theory, and it may be shortened to simply Sociology if the term is understood in this context. The only adherents of Malinowski's functionalism who have published are Raymond Firth, E. E. Evans-Pritchard, and Reo Fortune. Lloyd Warner seems to be the only prominent disciple of Radcliffe-Brown. In both

83Raymond Firth, Marriage and the Classificatory System (for example), JAI, LX, 235-68 (1930).

84The Study of Kinship in Primitive Societies, Man, XXIX, 190-94 (1929).

cases there are dozens of students who do field work after the pattern of their respective teachers, but so far no additional young theoreticians have been produced.

Malinowski's most important statements on the subject of kinship and social organization appeared in 1930. Although Malinowski writes in general terms, he draws practically all of his data here from the Trobriand Islands; however, the type of theory which he proposes does not militate as much against such an extension as would that of Radcliffe-Brown, for example. Sociological parenthood and marriage, really the simple active family (no matter on what fictions it is based) such as there is in the Western World, the Trobriands or anywhere else, is to Malinowski the Initial Situation of Kinship; and, as extensions of this, all clans and other structures are derived. Viewing a tribe in its everyday life, Malinowski believes, peels off the camouflage of clans and moieties that has beset anthropologists; it is then seen by what psychological processes and for what social needs these extensions have come into being.

A. R. Radcliffe-Brown deals with kinship quite otherwise. Following Rivers in his adherence to the doctrine that kinship terminology is closely related to social institutions, he goes much farther in some respects: kinship terms are to him only parts of the kinship system, in the first place, for patterns of behavior accompany them, and both must be considered together. Furthermore, the kinship system is inextricably bound to the


87His most important publication on kinship is The Social Organization of Australian Tribes, Oceanic Monograph No. 1 (London, 1931). The material here is chiefly from unpublished lectures.
entire social structure—being, in fact, the subjective aspect of the structure itself. Since this is so, obviously, there cannot be any significant lags of one or the other, any more than the convex side of a lens can, when the lens is moved, lag behind the concave. The problem is never dependent upon history, therefore; for, at any point in time, the whole functions as of itself. The problem to Radcliffe-Brown is to determine the functions of the various parts of the whole in maintaining the social structure. This can be determined by analysis for any one tribe; but only by comparison of the results for each tribe can the general function of any institution (wherever it is found to exist) be found. By "function" is meant specifically what the institution does for the maintenance of the societal structure itself; culture is conceived of as acting through individuals but for society. That takes care of the functional aspect; the structural problems are related to the functional as anatomy is to physiology; but in kinship there are special problems of form. There are certain universal principles inherent in the nature of human society and in the way both the race and culture carry on that are always acting upon the structure. The principles which will be dominant are determined by still other factors in the culture; but the principles as they work themselves out in each society determine the kinship structure. In this scheme, there is no room for cause-and-effect hypotheses; a kinship system is neither the cause nor the result of a social institution or a marriage practice—rather, both must be considered results of functional needs and structural principles more basic than either.

---

68 Admittedly the influence of Emile Durkheim.
VIII. Recapitulation

Although, before 1860, many stray facts about the social organization of native peoples had reached the literature, they achieved no kind of order until the social evolutionists, chiefly in the following decade, used them to trace the history of human society. Discussions about that history have been largely abandoned since about 1890; but anthropologists with evolutionary tendencies have still, although in ever-lessening degree, been concerned with the psychological foundations of the various stages and their development. Since the end of the century there have been several coincident developments: from the geographic interest of non-Evolutionary Germany developed the Kulturgeschichte school in Germany and the emigrant American Historical school; from England emanated the influence of Rivers to affect the Americans, and, from Germany that of Graebner to affect Rivers and his followers in England. Meanwhile, somewhat independently rose the Neolithic adherents in England, to have little influence elsewhere. From France, "Sociology" spread to Radcliffe-Brown who, combining it with the Rivers kinship in interest, came to lead one branch of the Functionalists, the other being soon started under the guidance of Malinowski.

Interest in the United States is practically confined to the work of the American Historians and the two varieties of Functionalists. The discussions in this paper are not likely ever to extend beyond these bounds, since within them are found the only live, yet unsolved, problems of social organization. The latter, indeed, constitutes the subject matter of the next chapters.
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PART II
ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF
SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

I. Definitions

All of culture could be divided into "Form" and "Matter," if one wished to apply such terms. Specifically, one would consider the way individuals are interrelated as the "form" or the "structure" and the common substratum of behavior as the "matter" or, perhaps, the "common culture." In such a classification, such traditional categories as "religion," "politics," "economics" would be broken down, for, in each, only the organization of the priesthood, of the parliament, and of the corporation, respectively, would be considered under "structure." Thus, there can be made a cross-classification, and one can speak of the structural elements of religion, politics, economics and kinship; just this has been done occasionally, and the term "social structure" has been employed, notably by Professor Radcliffe-Brown. There does not seem to be a term for the non-structural aspect, probably because it has never been dealt with as a unit.

Now, the term "social organization" is very often used synonymously with what is above called "social structure." But the former phrase has been used in other ways as well, notably to designate aspects of culture which are not considered religious, political, or economic (or, of course, technological). It is significant that there are specific disciplines of Economics, Political Science, and Comparative Religion, and, yet, there is none for the remainder of culture. The other big category of
culture seems to revolve about kinship; and, occasionally, the term "social organization" is used to indicate this phase, thus setting it apart from political organization, economics, and religion. It is in this sense that the term "social organization" has been used in Part I of this paper, but it is admittedly a bad usage. It would have been much better to use the term "kinship organization," for only rarely was anything but the study of kinship mentioned. But the phrase "kinship organization" would be relatively new to anthropological literature, whereas, on the other hand, "social organization" used in this sense is fairly common. Whatever the words, however (and "social organization" will be used

---

1It is likely that some day, when a more dynamic view of culture shall have become the vogue, and when the science is advanced sufficiently for ethnologists to make a thorough-going analytic revision, a radical departure from conventional terminology, as well as classification, will become necessary.

Possibly, for example, it will be seen that the distinctions between religion, economics, politics, kinship, are not only more illusory than we now believe, but are indeed of much less use. By any definition, there are politics and economics involved in any religious cult, and religion equally involved in politics, and all involved in family relations. By political organization, we refer to such things as chiefs and councils and factions, but in the same sense it is apparent that a church is a political institution. So far, we have, nevertheless, gone along with this classification because the uses to which it is put have been (as might be expected) quite as gross as the classification itself. But when we reach the point where the prime motive is to discover the mechanisms of culture change and culture growth—for which it will certainly be necessary to determine the exact constitution of culture and the minutiae of the forces in which it is involved—we shall likely require a great refinement of concepts and terminology.

It is conceivable that our present classification of the phenomena of culture will someday be considered as inexact as we now know the division of the human body into "liquids" and "solids" to be. We may then have as our major distinction something like "dependent"—a belief or activity or institution in practice a part of a complex whole which must, therefore, be considered only in its connections—vs. "autonomous." This distinction would be cut across by innumerable others of like importance, and all would be refined to a point where everything could be compared to about everything else on some basis, yet the real differences could be appreciated and the "indeterminables" of the science pointed out. But to attempt the classification before the minutiae are worked out would be like preparing defenses now for war in the Buck Rogers era of 2500 A.D.
here synonymously with "kinship organization"), there can be no question of what part of culture is being treated: that part which is typically and distinctively somehow or other connected with the biological fact of human generation. This statement is not made in the spirit of a definition of kinship or of social organization in this sense; rather, it is an interpretation of the feeling that anthropologists seem to have that there is a body of phenomena besides those of economics, politics, religion, mythology, etc. that can be grouped together for study. To show that it is a fair interpretation of why these phenomena should be distinctively unified, it will be necessary to show how each of the social institutions generally considered together fits the proposition. At the same time, the descriptions of each of the institutions will embody their sufficient definition.

A preliminary statement to show what is meant by "the biological fact of human generation" is necessary. A mature man and a mature woman, mating, beget offspring; since it is human society as we know it, they remain mated long enough, typically, to get several offspring of both sexes. Furthermore, they live

2It may be immediately objected that the question is being begged; if so, it is because the meaning of the proposition advanced has yet to be made clear. It may as well be made clear now, however. There is no contention here that social organization is biological, for it is, no doubt, cultural. What is said is that, in contra-distinction to politics, religion, and economics, it is connected with biological generation. True, permanent mating is not unmixed biology; neither is the fact that children know their parents; neither are any of the other facts that are here called typical. But there is just as truly a biological element involved, not in the way that breathing is involved in praying, but in a way that distinctively shapes the social facts that follow.

If the statement should be worded "social organization is connected with both biological and cultural phenomena" there would, of course, be no objection, but the statement would have no significance, because it could be said about Economics or Religion equally well. All phases of culture are connected with biological phenomena, since man is, after all, a biological animal; but the point here is that only social organization of all cultural features is connected with biological generation particularly and
together long enough to know each other, parents, children, siblings. When the young ones grow to maturity, they also mate and have offspring; then there are involved grandparents, grandchildren, parents and children, siblings, uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces, and cousins, typically of all kinds. When the young ones again find mates and have children, additional relatives are, of course, brought into the picture. This is all that is meant by "the biological fact of human generation." In the following pages, the various phenomena of social organization will be considered in the light of this fact. It should be noted that not all possible variations of social institutions will be considered; only those that are found to exist in the world, and if some imaginary one should not fit the proposition, it should be remembered that anthropology is a science of only this earth.

The family has never been defined in a way that would suit all known cases of what ethnologists are willing to call families. The constitution of the family depends on the following biological circumstances: (1) the number of mutual mates involved—there may be one or more men, one or more women, only one of each, or more than one of each; and, furthermore, they may or may not be mated at the same time; (2) the relationship by blood of the mates—the husband and wife may be blood relatives of one of several degrees, and, likewise, the co-wives or co-husbands may be related respectively. It, likewise, depends on such sociological facts as (1) Rules of residence for the offspring—some or all may live with relatives other than parents—coupled with recognition of only some relatives as part of the family; (2) Adoption of offspring by persons other than their own parents; (3) Recognition of a greater or less range of relatives—of affinity as well as consanguinity—as members of the family. In addition, there are, of course, the cultural factors that determine the special biological circumstances listed above. Since there are almost any combinations and permutations of the above conditions, the range of phenomena included by the term family is large.

The impossibility of defining the family is understandable. Anthropologists really understand by the term any specialization directly. Why, then, not the statement that "social organization is connected with both biological generation and cultural phenomena"? Because all phases of culture are connected with cultural phenomena (of course) and social organization, not with any particular kind of cultural phenomenon to correspond to the "biological generation." Therefore, the first statement.
due to special biological and sociological circumstances that is not widespread enough to warrant a special term. This is hardly definitive in concept, hence the difficulty of defining the word. Some of the specializations common enough to warrant special terms are considered species of families: thus the "patriarchal family," the "joint family," etc.

At the same time, the recognition that biological heredity is the distinguishing feature of social organization is tacit in Malinowski's statement that parenthood is the "initial situation of kinship"—meaning socially recognized parenthood—and in Radcliffe-Brown's concept of the "elementary family" which is, of course, the parent-and-children smallest unit of generation.

The point is that from the fact of biological generation comes, in society, the family; but nowhere is there a typical "family"—rather a series of varieties, some of which are not specially named, and some of which are. Some again are so specialized and so widespread that they are no longer considered "families" at all. These may be called "lineages"—some of which may be the same as a type of "family," such as "patriarchal family"—or clans or moieties, or phratries.

Unilateral Kinship Groups. A "unilateral" organization is a specialization of the biologically generated group based entirely on cultural rules. In the most general sense it consists of recognition of certain members of the biological group as belonging to one division, others to another division, and so on. Determiners of these divisions are (1) rules providing to the group of which relatives the child will belong—resulting in "patriline," "matriline" or some special variety dependent on specialized, usually local, rules; (2) the number of divisions—if only two, they are "moieties," if more, they are "clans" (or "sibs"); (3) the marriage rules; if, as is usual, members of a unilateral group cannot mate with one another, it is "exogamous"; if members of a clan cannot intermarry with members of certain other clans as well, the clans so linked are "exogamous phratries"—which, if only two, may be called "moieties"; if members of a unilateral group must intermarry, they are "endogamous"; this usually applies to phratries; for the unilateral group necessarily loses its typical character if it is not exogamous; (4) the range of the group, which may be very large, in which case the group is only theoretically biologically related in the way provided, or small, when, if the relationships can be traced, the group is usually called a "lineage."

Marriage. Marriage is, of course, based on mating, which is the first necessity of biological generation. Mating is not synonymous with marriage, for as the term is used, marriage refers to (1) the culturally ruled act of creating a social bond which is to go together with the biological (normally), and (2) that part of the family which is a mutual group of mates—sometimes one man and one woman (monogamous marriage), or one man and more than one woman (polygynous marriage) or more than one man and one woman (polyandrous marriage) or more than one man and more than one woman (group marriage). Number (1) may be determined by a wide variety of customs of courtship and marriage ceremonial; (2) may be determined by the factors mentioned, and in addition rules of who should or should not intermarry (see unilateral above) such as "cross-cousin" marriage or any similar rule, "sororate" and "levirate," with its various varieties, and "incest."
Affinity refers to relatives by marriage as opposed to blood, although in the case of the intermarriage of blood relatives, they may be the same. It should be remembered that although in-laws are not of the same group in biological generation, yet their offspring are; if one should marry, then, that the case of relationship-by-marriage is a phenomenon of social organization not connected with biological generation, it can be answered that it is at least a sociological extension based on the biological facts. The fact that anthropologists include both systems of consanguinity and affinity under "kinship" indicates that the point is corroborated by common usage.

Behavior of Relatives. A large group of phenomena socially determined on the generational framework include such well-known phenomena as "avunculate" "mother-in-law taboo" "joking relationships" "brother-sister avoidance" and a host of others, all of which have in common one thing: that certain of the relatives by blood or affinity single each other out for special traditional beliefs and behavior towards each other. The sampling above indicates some of those which are most common in the world.

Kinship Terminology. All parts of culture may have linguistic expression; so the phenomena of social organization may have. All people apply kinship terms to their relatives as discussed above; in most cases they are the linguistic expression of the social organization, but they need not be in all cases. Only where they do express some phenomenon of social organization are they really a part of it. This is somewhat contrary to usage, but it is not inserted to make the facts fit the proposition that "social organization is connected with biological generation"; rather the contrary, for as will be seen later, the vexing confusion in the problem of what part of kinship terminologies is linguistic and what part sociological will be almost entirely clarified from this point of view. Students of social organization find themselves interested in kinship terminologies only when they are connected with biological generation and its cultural interpretations as given in the various cases above.

The Crises, sometimes called the transitions, and including birth, puberty, sometimes marriage, and death are often treated as phenomena of social organization. It is significant that birth, puberty and marriage are almost always considered with the social organization, while death is practically always treated as religion. This is significant because while birth is clearly a part of biological generation, and puberty or the advent of maturity is a necessary biological corollary (and marriage has been treated above) yet death is not. Except very indirectly and almost in a philosophical sense, the biological fact of death is not part of the process of reproduction or generation.

Local groups. Under social organization, ethnologists usually consider ecological conditions of the people; but it is again significant that they deal with them only in terms of marriage and residence-after-marriage and unilateral kinship groups--of matters connected with the essence of social organization. Other things they leave to the chapters on economics and politics, sometimes even religion.

Age groups. Where, among certain tribes, age grades and even age classes or groups are recognized, they are treated under
the heading social organization. Now it is apparent that, in the type of biologically generated group which is here considered one of the bases of social organization, a difference of generations is inherent, just as are differences of sex and ways of being related. But age groupings in a whole society require cultural arbitrariness to use this biological fact in their social organization, for in different families the generations will not coincide and if there are enough people there will be a complete grading from one to another. (Speaking generally, one cannot talk about "the next generation" without bringing in cultural factors.) What the societies do in these cases is to set off certain ages (0-7 years, 8-13 years, etc.) as constituting one age, and then the generations may be marked off, or age groups established. They are still as exclusively connected with biological generation, however, as in kinship.

Social classes and castes. There is perhaps no place in the world where some shading of the people according to their prestige does not occur; yet the only time it is taken into account under social organization is where it is in some way connected with families and heredity. Thus, such shading becomes especially important in the study of social organization when they are formed into castes, are at least partly endogamous, and thus remain close to family lines, connected again with biological generation.

If the foregoing is a fairly exhaustive survey of the group phenomena usually considered together as kinship, or social organization, then it would seem that the proposition that they are all distinguished by a connection with the biological fact of human generation is established. This is not a theory, but a discussion of definition; what is remarkable is that kinship should be found to be so consistent a subject matter, for its growth has certainly not been self-conscious.

II. The Problem

If the general problem of ethnology is to explain the presence and the distribution of cultural phenomena, the task of

3To "explain" seems to mean, in ethnology, to tell how something came to be what it is. This has two aspects, closely related: (1) historical, in terms of unique events, and (2) scientific in the sense that it involves a universal generalization. Thus, if one wished to explain the couvade, he would eventually want to be able to tell how it came to be in the places where it is. This sounds like a historical question, but if, in some way, he should be able to work out a general law covering the couvade, he would be able to answer the question without recourse to history by saying that in each of the places so-and-so must have occurred, and it would be sufficient. It seems impossible to do the latter
the student of social organization is to explain:

1. Why it is that every people in the world has made the fact of biological generation one of the important focal points of its culture; why do they all have the social ramifications that go under the names of marriage and the family, and why do so many of them always have lineages, clans, phratries, dual organizations?

2. Why it is that such institutions are so varied in form, if, indeed, they are variants of the same things and not in reality different.

3. Why institutions which seem most alike occur in far different parts of the world in some cases while contiguous peoples often have them quite different.

4. Why certain forms of institutions are found to occur together again and again and yet nothing near an absolute correlation is possible.

5. Why systems of kinship terminology especially seem so often to be connected with social institutions and practices; yet why the terminology is sometimes found without the institution in question, and vice versa.

6. Why some of the most peculiar forms of kinship systems, and peculiar social practices, are yet found to be distributed very widely.

Each of these questions has numerous specific ramifications in some of which conclusive answers have been given; in any general sense, for any phenomena of social organization; moreover, it is certainly impossible to explain them historically since native peoples do not have much history.

From necessity a species of half-explanation is undertaken: the "historian" says something like "The couvade has diffused from a point of origin throughout the old world, and from another place throughout the new world" and leaves unanswered the question of how it originated wherever it did, and how it was diffused and accepted by the borrowers. The "scientist" today sees that this is hardly an explanation, and offers a rival half-explanation something like "Every society must recognize the social importance of fatherhood, and the couvade is one means of so doing" or else, "At birth, as at any social transition, the close relatives are, together with the baby, in a dangerous marginal state and must be treated with great care; as far as the father is concerned, the couvade is an extreme manifestation of this," telling perhaps what the couvade does for society but still not answering the question of how it, worth while as it may be, came to be in the places where it is.

As far as kinship is concerned, bare quarter-explanations are current; a set of terms is called "the result of such and such marriage custom"—neither the marriage nor how the terms came to fit it being explained.
however, they are all problems by which students of social organization are still confronted.

The solutions to these puzzles have been translated first into the question of independent invention vs. diffusion, second, into the problem of psychological vs. sociological causation, and third, into the choice between any kind of natural law and a series of historic accidents. Combinations of these take care of all of the possibilities, and, indeed, ethnologists not too closely allied with any one theory realize that independent inventions and borrowing, psychological and social causes, and innumerable historic accidents have all, in one way or another, played their parts in the shaping of human social organization. The problem that remains is not to prove that any of these have or have not been instrumental in human history, but to show just what part each has played, and each will always play.

The matter of kinship terminology may be taken as a case in point. To make it more specific, but one feature—the classification of cross-cousins—in one small area, Central California, will form the nucleus of the discussion.\(^4\)

Three linguistic families—Hokan, Yukian, and Penutian—in Central California are each divided in their method of denoting cross-cousins.\(^5\) Of the tribes whose kinship terminology is known:

> A good example because (a) it illustrates the point with (b) a problem that will be the concern of this paper later in (c) an area well-known linguistically and fairly well-known ethnologically where (d) tribal and linguistic boundaries are relatively fixed and (e) where a specific study of kinship terminology has been made (note following footnote).

> All of the factual material here is taken from E. W. Gifford, *California Kinship Terminologies*, UCPAE, XVIII, 1-285 (1922). That kinship terminology is only an example to illustrate general points should be emphasized. The problem of matrilineal-patrilineral descent, or of clans and moieties would be equally
1. Yukian tribe out of 4 uses the **Omaha-Crow feature**.\(^6\)

2. Pomo tribes out of 7 Pomo and out of 36 Hokan tribes of which the Pomo are 7, use the Omaha-Crow feature.

3. Penutian tribes (4 out of 4 Wintun, 6 out of 6 Miwok, 3 out of 7 Yokuts) out of 27 use the Omaha-Crow feature.

Map I shows the distribution of the three linguistic stocks in California. Map II shows how the Omaha-Crow feature constitutes a continuous area cutting across linguistic boundaries.

---

Illustrative. The general points that will be brought out in the California example hold true for kinship systems over the whole world—and more generally for all aspects of social organization.

\(^6\) Where cross-cousins use terminology otherwise applied between relatives of consecutive generations. Specifically, the Omaha feature is the use of mother's brother—sister's son and daughter (male speaking) and mother-child terms between the mother's brother's son and reciprocally, and the mother's brother's daughter and reciprocally, respectively. The Crow feature is the use of father's sister and father for the father's sister's daughter and son, and the use of brother's son and daughter (female speaking) and son and daughter for their reciprocals. The following charts may make it clear. Triangles are males, circles females; horizontal lines connect siblings, and vertical lines parents—children.
MAP I
SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE YUKIAN, HOKAN, AND PENUTIAN LINGUISTIC FAMILIES IN CALIFORNIA
MAP II
SHOWING THE
PRESENCE IN CALIFORNIA OF THE
OMAHA-CROW FEATURE OF KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY
IN RELATION TO THE LINGUISTIC FAMILIES
The rest of the Hokan, Yukian, and Penutian tribes in the area employ for the cross-cousins either the same term applied to parallel cousins or else special terms entirely. Map III shows how these other usages surround geographically the Omaha-Crow feature.

Thus far, three conclusions are apparent:

1. That since the kinship classification overlaps linguistic boundaries, the problem of kinship systems (not of terms as such necessarily) is not entirely a linguistic problem.

2. That since the Omaha-Crow feature appears in contiguous tribes, it represents one problem, either of diffusion or of development due to like conditions; it would appear to be unlikely that in each tribe a different explanation would be forthcoming.

3. That since the Omaha-Crow feature seems to be more or less surrounded, where the surroundings are known, by the other two types, if one accepts the historical hypothesis, one must suppose it most likely that the Omaha-Crow feature has been spreading from some Penutians to other Penutians, Hokans, and Yukians; for to suppose the contrary (that more of the tribes had the Omaha-Crow feature and that the other features are pushing in from all sides) is to suppose that the Omaha-Crow feature was attacked on several fronts for different reasons.

Some languages do not classify these relatives at all; the Assyrian (Semitic) language, for example, classifies them only to the extent that it sets off all remote relatives, beyond certain degrees, and calls them *khazē*; it individualizes the rest just as an anthropologist does. Other languages make a thorough-going classification of all relatives into a few groups. Between the two extremes are all gradations. Kinship systems are, in the first place, a trait of language, for whether a language chooses to take account of relatives except as a matter of vocabulary is a matter within itself which may be related to social institutions in no stricter sense than the presence of polite forms of pronouns or distinctions of gender are related to the rest of the culture. But a language may choose to classify relatives, and in that case the classification is usually, but not necessarily, one in consonance with the social structure. On two counts, therefore, one cannot make the rule that kinship systems must be related to social structure; the matter of kinship terminology enters this study, however, only in cases where (1) the language classifies relatives, and (2) it does so in relation to social structure.
MAP III

ENCLOSED AREA SHOWS DISTRIBUTION OF CROSS-COUSIN TERMS OF HOKAN, YUKIAN, AND PENUTIAN TRIBES OF CENTRAL CALIFORNIA
One can reach more specific conclusions by studying the relations of these kinship systems in greater detail. Map IV is a detailed map of the region in Central California where the Omaha-Crow feature is found. Of the nineteen tribes that are known to designate cross-cousins by terms otherwise applied between members of consecutive generations, thirteen are Penutian speaking (3 Yokuts, 6 Miwok, and 4 Wintun), five are Hokan Pomo, and one is the Yukian Wappo. The Yokuts have the characteristic in typically Omaha form, as have all the Miwok with one slightly atypical exception; the Wintun and the Pomo have the Omaha form, too, but the most northern of the former have terminology of a very peculiar sort—intermediate between Omaha and Crow—and the most southern of the latter have a typical Crow type, as have finally, the neighboring Wappo.

What conclusions can be reached from a perusal of this map?

1. That not only in tribes of the same linguistic family, but in very closely related tribes, most of whose actual kinship terms are identical, both where the related tribes are contiguous and where they are not. Thus, for example, the Southwestern Pomo do not have the Omaha-Crow feature at all, the Southern Pomo have the Crow type, and the other Pomo, to the north and south, have Omaha type terms. On the other hand, all of the Yuki designate cross-cousins as siblings, while the Wappo, separated from their brethren but surrounded on all sides by peoples who have the Omaha-Crow feature, are like their neighbors rather than their linguistic relatives.

2. That there are some fine points about kinship terms that need investigation. What is the meaning of the difference between the Omaha-Crow types? They seem to be opposites in one sense, alike in another—capable of classifying relatives in entirely different ways, yet existing side by side in the same sort of cultural setting and even, on occasion, apparently becoming mixed.8

8Gifford and others often refer to kinship systems with the Omaha feature as "patrilineal" and to those with the Crow feature as "matrilineal," and, indeed, they not only fit these types of clans respectively but are usually found with them. This indicates a fundamental dissimilarity between the two types that is either disproved by or makes difficult to believe the condition here described (where, incidentally, clans do not exist, although moieties, in some tribes, do).
MAP IV
CENTRAL CALIFORNIA
SHOWING THE
DISTRIBUTION BY TRIBES
OF THE OMAHA-CROW KINSHIP
FEATURE IN CALIFORNIA
A tabular comparison of some of the vital kinship terms of the Central Porno (Omaha type), the Southern Porno (Crow type), and the Wappo (Crow type of different linguistic family) will serve to clarify both of the above statements:

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Father's Sister's Son</th>
<th>Father's Sister's Daughter</th>
<th>Mother's Brother's Son</th>
<th>Mother's Brother's Daughter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Porno</td>
<td>Kegu, applied by both men and women regardless of anybody's sex or age.</td>
<td>Kegu, same term as that applied to any nephew or niece.</td>
<td>Djuta, term for M B, applied by all Kegu</td>
<td>Oaki, term for My SS, applied by all Kegu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Porno</td>
<td>Adigin, term for F y B, applied by all M B ch. Related to Central Pomo term for F SS, muto</td>
<td>Amutain, term for F SS, applied by all M B ch. Related to Central Pomo term for F SS, muto</td>
<td>Apekin, term for o b s, applied by adigin</td>
<td>Apekin, term for o b d, applied by adigin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wappo</td>
<td>Olo, term for F y B, applied by all M B ch.</td>
<td>Etsa, term for F y SS (also c o s), applied by all M B ch.</td>
<td>Yau, term for o b s (also y b), applied by Etsa: Ek'a, term for o b s, applied by olo</td>
<td>Yapi, term for o b d, applied by olo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be noticed that, although the Pomo terms bear linguistic relations, their classification is quite different, and whereas the Southern Porno and Wappo terms are not at all related, yet their classification is almost the same. These three tribes are close neighbors. If one assumes that all of the Pomo once had the Omaha feature, can one say that the Southern Porno, for some reason or other, changed it around, and then influenced the Wappo to adopt their scheme? Or might one rather believe that the Wappo, moving from their neighbors into Porno and Miwok territory,
adopted the general idea of the Omaha-Crow type but bungled it, so to speak, and reversed what the Pomo and Miwok had, then influenced the Southern Pomo to go with them?

These are the sort of guesses that one expects at this stage of the investigation, and they are, indeed, just guesses. There is no certain way of knowing that the kinship classification of one people can influence that of another; we have even less of an idea of how that influence occurs, if it does, and what are the factors governing the results. This suggests the fundamental problem of kinship terminologies: how deeply are they seated in culture? If kinship systems are culture-traits that have not much to do with the rest of culture, then perhaps we could imagine them traveling from tribe to tribe like a new rifle. But this does not seem to be generally true. Not only are the kinship terms a people uses grounded as deeply in their everyday life as any part of their culture—and, indeed, an essential part of the transmission of culture itself since they usually reflect the native conception of the biologically generating group that in human society becomes the culture-maintaining group—but they are often the linguistic equivalent of the entire social structure. Yet, how, under these circumstances, have the changes that must have occurred in Central California (whether by diffusion or internal development) occurred? As a final presentation of evidence from this area, we may consider the Wintun situation.

All of the Wintun tribes have the Omaha feature with the exception of the most Northern tribe. On Map IV, it will be seen that this group is separated by a half-dozen tribes from the Wappo and the Southern Pomo who have the Crow feature. The Northern Wintun are surrounded by tribes that have (1) the Omaha
feature, (2) sibling terminology for cross-cousins, or (3) special terms for cross-cousins. Yet this tribe has in some way come to have a very strange kinship system—an almost perfect combination of Crow and Omaha types.

While the Omaha-Crow principle of classifying cross-cousins with relatives of the generations above and below is in force here, the choice between the Omaha and Crow methods is not made. The Omaha way is to group maternal cross-cousins with the generation above, and their reciprocals (the paternal cross-cousins) with that below; the Crow type is to group the paternal relatives with the generation above, and their reciprocals with the one below. Although this is the essential distinction, it goes much farther in the kinship system, for usually (but not always) the entire line through males is grouped together with the maternal uncle and his son—the females being called mother or mother's sister—in the Omaha type, and the entire line through females is grouped together with the paternal aunt and her daughter—the males being called father's brother or father—in the Crow type.

Among the Northern Wintun, however, neither of these alternatives is accepted. Instead, if the woman of the parental generation is younger than her brother, her children are mother's brother and mother to her brother's children and the entire line follows the Omaha pattern; while, if the woman is older than her brother, his children are fathers and fathers' sisters to hers and the line from then on follows the Omaha pattern.

In a very small area in California there are, then, three quite different varieties of the Omaha-Crow principle at work, as well as two non-Omaha-Crow methods of designating the relatives of cross-lines. The problem becomes one not of explaining the
type, or the Crow type, but, in the first place, to explain how it happens that such apparent diversity exists in cultures very much alike.³

It was said (p. 53) that the problems of social organization resolve themselves into combinations of three sets of alternatives: (1) independent invention vs. diffusion, (2) psychological vs. sociological causation, and (3) natural law vs. historic accident. The California illustration indicates that the solution of the general problem depends not on the acceptance of the

³The California situation is not, by any means, unique. In Melanesia, and again in Africa, the Crow and the Omaha types, with variations of each, exist side by side; and, of course, in several parts of America other than California (notably the Eastern Woodlands, the Southeast, the Southwest, the Plains, and, to some extent, the Northwest Coast), the same peculiarities of distribution recur. Wherever the Crow-Omaha feature is found, the facts of distribution usually take this form:

1. Either the Crow or the Omaha feature is dominant in the area, with the other also appearing.

2. Areas where either is dominant very often are contiguous to areas where the other is general.

3. Areas in which the Crow-Omaha feature is not found (i.e., where cross-cousins are called the same as parallel cousins or else have separate terms distinctive of terms applied to members of the generation above and below) are usually close to, if not actually scattered among, areas where it is prevalent.

Such repeated distributions suggest that, not only must the Crow and Omaha systems be explained together in some way, since they so often occur together and have, furthermore, so much in common, but the kind of explanation offered must, in some way, account for their usual proximity to non-Crow-Omaha systems. It is conceivable that the Crow and Omaha systems are much more alike than they appear in their surface manifestations, and that both are not so far, in their more fundamental nature, from the generation types as we have been given to believe. This is an illustration of a more general question. The nature of the difference between patrilineal clans and matrilineal might be taken as another example. Such analysis must necessarily accompany any studies of distribution if the major problems are to be solved: one cannot hope to determine whether the developments of the Omaha and Crow features have been distinct, or whether they are minor variations with one general history, unless the relation of the two is understood. The same can be said for other matters of kinship, marriage practices, clans, and the like.
alternatives—any one of a set or any combinations of several—but rather on the acceptance of all the possibilities given and the determination of what part each plays in the formation of different types of social organizations.

1. Both independent invention and diffusion must have played their parts in central California. No tribe has a system utterly distinct from its neighbors or from its linguistic affiliates; yet neither have two tribes exactly the same system. Distinctive developments of (a) common bases and (b) borrowed elements must have occurred in each tribe. There is no question of invention vs. diffusion, but rather of the relative influence of internal and external factors. In what ways have they, in the various tribes, combined?

2. By the problem of "sociological" vs. "psychological" causation is meant two different things in current anthropological discussion: (a) the determination of particular social institutions—such as kinship systems—by other social institutions—such as clans or moieties or marriage customs—is termed "sociological" as opposed to the determination of particular social institutions by such psychological factors (cultural though they may be) as notions of classification that crop out in language and social institutions as well. When applied to questions of kinship system, "psychological causation" is often translated "linguistic causation." That social structures are connected with kinship systems cannot be doubted in California, for in half of the tribes which have the Omaha feature, there are patrilinear moieties (which fit the feature) and some of them also have the marriage with the wife's brother's daughter, which also is in consonance with the terminology. But that psychological or linguistic determiners may also be present is just as undeniable, for such features as the notion of age distinctions in certain relationships occur differently in the different linguistic families. Again it seems that the problem becomes one of how each determinant enters the picture.

The problem of "sociological vs. psychological causation" has also the meaning (b) whether these elements of social organization are there to satisfy (1) the needs of the society as such, to help maintain it as a society, or (2) the needs of individuals, to help them in their adaptation to each other. The California example as given does not help towards a solution of this problem, since distributions can only show which peoples have what, and not what good is done by what they have. To the point of these paragraphs, however, it might be noted that no anthropologist with this "functional" perspective denies that culture satisfies both social and individual needs; the only argument might be as to which is the raison d'être.

3. The California example indicates that historical accidents must have occurred; except perhaps in a deep philosophical-fatalist sense, it must have been a series of pure accidents that induced the Wappo (with whatever kinship system they happened to have) to migrate Southward where they came into contact with Miwoks, Pemos, and Wintuns who, having different kinship systems, gradually
exerted influence on that of the Wappo. It must have been partly accidental—what the Wappo were, what they were exposed to, and what they took—but also it was certainly not entirely accidental; for what they could take, or would take, depended partly on what they already had (itself partly perhaps the result of natural causes) and partly on rules of borrowing which are (even if they cannot be stated) some of the laws governing culture. If there were no natural laws governing culture, how could the fact that kinship terms do go together with certain social structures in a number of these tribes and also in tribes three thousand miles away be explained? Somewhat by coincidence, somewhat by borrowing, but in the modern anthropologist's mind somewhat by the force of similar circumstances as well.

These days, extreme claims of diffusionists, parallelists, sociologists, psychologists, scientists, and historians, all in quotation marks, find themselves discounted but, nevertheless, accepted. Choices between these alternatives are no longer deemed necessary; rather, the difficulty becomes one of discovering to what extent, and in what way, each of the various determinants helps to explain the kinds of social organizations extant and their distribution.

This is the problem, but, although it has been put after a meager study of kinship distribution, it cannot be promoted by similar studies. The question of the relative importance of the influence of contacts, accidents, compulsives—psychological and sociological laws—cannot be answered empirically from the study of the distribution of institutions except insofar as it has been answered above; rather, the answer to this question depends upon (a) observations of the forces that are maintaining and changing cultures all over today, and (b) observation and analysis of the nature of the institutions in the various cultures. The first procedure is, of course, beyond the scope of any one paper; the second will be attempted for one culture—the Fox. From the material on Fox social organization, the nature of the relation between kinship systems and the other social institutions will be dealt with negatively; that is, it will be shown that the
prevalent theories do not seem to be supported by Fox data. The nature of the relations of the Omaha and Crow types will be adduced more positively; and some light will be thrown on the nature of kinship systems as such. But the Fox material will prove most useful in illustrating a general theory that will be presented in answer to the problems raised: a theory based in part on insight gained from experience among the Fox.
KEY TO CHARTS I - VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sibling</th>
<th>Ego</th>
<th>Descent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>neto-täm°</td>
<td>sibling of the same sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nete'gwäm°</td>
<td>sister, man speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>netawäm°</td>
<td>brother, woman speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>older sibling of the same sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>younger sibling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>older sibling of opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>negwi's°</td>
<td>son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>netane's°</td>
<td>daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>no-ci'sem°</td>
<td>grandchild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>nenegwa-ha</td>
<td>son of sibling of opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ne'cemi-ha</td>
<td>daughter of sibling of opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no-'s°</td>
<td>father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>negy°</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>negi-ha</td>
<td>mother's sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>nes'egwis°</td>
<td>father's sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ne'cili'g°</td>
<td>mother's brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ne'me'co</td>
<td>grandfather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>no-'game's°</td>
<td>grandmother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>nena-päm°</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ni-w°</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>nita-gw°</td>
<td>sibling-in-law of same sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ni-nem°</td>
<td>sibling-in-law of opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>neme'ca-m°</td>
<td>father-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>nogum°</td>
<td>mother-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>nenegwan°</td>
<td>daughter's husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ne'semy°</td>
<td>son's wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offsprings of all G's are G.
Parents of all I4's and I5's are I4 and I5 according to sex.
The descendents of siblings of great grandparents and of great-great-grandparents, etc. can be determined by following the rules of reciprocals and of descent apparent in the system given in Charts I and II.
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I. The Kinship System

Kinship Terminology

The Fox have an Omaha type of kinship system. The system, with the actual terms employed, is demonstrated in Charts I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, which are self-explanatory. The system without the terms, arranged with a view towards emphasizing the relationship pairs, is repeated in Charts VII and VIII. A brief summary of the system follows:

siblings.--Brothers refer to each other as nets'ém, and sisters use the same term for each other. Age distinctions are

1A central Algonkin tribe who officially (having once been allied with the Sac) are called "Sac and Fox of the Mississippi" and who live on their communal land in Tama County, Iowa. Their history appears in Appendix II and a discussion of their present condition in Appendix III. Appendix I describes the manner in which the material here given was gathered.

2For the spelling of most of the terms, Dr. Truman Michelson is responsible. These are the ordinary ego type chart, the relationships being read from the marked ego. Triangles are males, circles females; horizontal lines connect siblings, vertical lines, parent-offspring; equal signs connecting a pair indicate their marriage.

3A type of ego-less chart in which three generations are indicated. Each term is represented by a color (see the key) and all possible kinds of relationships are indicated by connecting the triangles and circles with lines of the proper color. The advantages of studying the system from this kind of chart is made apparent in the text. Being unorthodox, these charts may be more difficult to read, but when one is accustomed to them they are actually more simple. It is noticed, of course, that the necessity of having separate "male speaking" and "female speaking" charts is abolished.
usually made, however, so that a man calls his older brother nesesa, a woman calls her older sister nomise, and both call a younger sibling nesime. A brother calls his sister neta'gwem, and she responds with netawema. These terms are applied in the same manner to the children of anybody called no'sa or negi'ha (father or mother's sister), including among others the parallel cousins.

Parents-Children.—Father is called no'sa and the term is applied not only to him, but to everybody he calls neta'tam (brother); mother is negy, and the term is restricted to one's own mother. The mother's sister, and everybody whom she calls neta'tam, as well as the daughter of a ne'cisa, is called negi'sa (mother's brother). The reciprocals of all of these in all of their uses are negwi'sa (son) and netane'sa (daughter). These terms thus take care of all parallel uncles, aunts, nephews, and nieces, among others.

Uncle.Aunt—Nephew, Niece.—The mother's brother is called ne'c'is'a, and this term is applied also to his son, his son's son, and so on indefinitely, besides to every man to whom the mother applies the term netawema. The father's sister is called nes'egwi'sa, and this term is applied to all whom the father calls neta'gwem. The reciprocals of both of these terms are nenegwe'ha (cross-nephew) and ne'cemi'ha (cross-niece), and they are applied to the children of any netawema or neta'gwem.

Grandparent-Grandchild.—Any grandfather is called mene'co, and any grandmother no'gome'sa; and the reciprocal for both is no'c'is'ema. These terms are also applied respectively to the great-grandparents and great-grandchildren, and to more distant generations. Consistent with the terminology employed in the cross-lines, the parents' mothers' brothers' son is also called grandfather, and his son also, and so on indefinitely, the sisters of these
grandfathers always being grandmothers. The reciprocals of all
grandparents are grandchildren.

System of Affinity.--The most common term for wife is
ni'wə, and for husband nane'pamə, and these terms are not other-
wise used. Father-in-law is nene'co'mə, and mother-in-law nogumə,
and these terms are applied to their siblings as well. The reci-
procal terms in all cases are nenegwanə (son-in-law) and ne'semə'ə
(daughter-in-law). The father's brother's wife is negi'ha
(mother's sister) and this is applied to the wife of any no'sə
except one's own father; the mother's sister's husband is no'sə
and this is applied to the husband of any negi'ha. The recipro-
cals of these terms in all their applications are, of course,
ne'lwa'sə (son) and ne'lwa'sə (daughter). The wife of any
ne'ci'wa'sə is nes'egwi'sə, but the prefix nes'egwi'sə
(niece) with the same prefix usually added. The father's sister's
husband is a brother-in-law. Brothers-in-law apply the term
nata'gwa to each other, and sisters-in-law the same term for each
other; but brother- and sister-in-law apply the term ninemwa
to each other. Thus, the husband of any nes'egwi'sə (father's sis-
ter) by blood is nata'gwa to a man, ninemwa to a woman, and the
reciprocals are the same.

Rules.--The Fox terminology is completely systematic, and
can be reduced to three principles:

1. The principle of basic structure: that one's own sib-
lings, parents and parents' siblings, grandparents, parallel and
cross-cousins and their reciprocals are as given above.

2. The principle of succession: that the offspring of
anybody called "father" or "mother's sister" are always siblings;
that the offspring of a sibling of the same sex are always "son"
and "daughter" and of a sibling of opposite sex always "nephew"
and "niece"; that the offspring of a "son," "daughter," "niece,"

or "nephew" is always "grandchild." That the offspring of a "mother's brother" are always "mother's brother" and "mother's sister"; that the offspring of a "father's sister" are always "nephew" and "niece." (Note that there is no rule of succession from grandparents.)

3. **The principle of constant reciprocals:** that the reciprocals as given above never vary--each term has its set reciprocal no matter where in the system it is found. It is by application of this principle only that the offspring of persons called "grandfather" and "grandmother" can be determined.

It is by the application of these three principles that doubts in the minds of the natives themselves are resolved. The first two are, of course, grounded into the minds of the natives from long experience, as are closer relatives without the necessity of applying any logic. In cases where the grandparents' siblings' children must be determined conceptually, however, the third is the guiding principle. The native conception of relationships is that they exist in pairs: mother's brother's son is not a relationship separate from father's sister's son; rather ne'oi'sa'ha and nenegwa'ha are two sides to one relationship.4

**Behavior Patterns**

The range of the kinship system is limited only by knowledge and memory, and this differs with different people. Every person, of course, knows his immediate family, and, in addition, also his parents' siblings and their descendants; grandparents' siblings are usually known if they live to maturity, and then most of their descendants are known as well. Beyond that, a scattered name only is remembered, although there are exceptional individuals who can trace their genealogies through most of the great-grandparent

---

4Although anthropologists usually realize that relationships must be defined by the two relatives, as "father-son," they very often do not, in their theoretical discussions, utilize the notion. Thus, the mother's brother's son is often discussed in one paragraph and the father's sister's son in another, when they are the two sides of one relationship.
The range is not unilateral; while some people remember more of their fathers' or grandfathers' families, others are equally more facile on the other side. Which relatives are best known depends on many circumstances and is not reducible to a rule.

The kinship terminology is applied to all known relatives, so that the whole group is cut into a small number of types of relationship pairs. Each of these types carries with it a more or less distinct traditional pattern of behavior. Generally speaking, the behavior of close relatives follows the patterns in their greatest intensity; but there are numerous cases where, for some reason, a pair of close relatives "don't behave towards each other at all as they should."

Underlying all family patterns of behavior is a general feeling that there should be good will toward all relatives, by blood and marriage, a feeling of affection and willingness to help. In addition, there is a certain amount of restraint, between all relatives by blood, that becomes greater when the relatives are of different sexes. In any pair of relatives these mutual feelings are essential in the behavior of both persons, and might be called equivalent factors. In addition, there are between the two persons of a relationship pair other differential factors, as will be seen in the following summary of the behavior patterns.

Brothers. Besides the equivalent factors, which here emerge in a spirit of comradeship, coupled with what the natives translate as "respect" (a reluctance to discuss any matters of sex or even to joke freely together), there is a differential factor based on actual age. The younger brother should follow

---

5 Even to some to whom relationship cannot be traced; a man might know that another is his no-sah only because he remembers that his father used to call him "brother."
his elder brother's advice and to some extent obey him; on the other hand, the elder brother should look after his younger brother's welfare especially. The difference is very informal, however, and hardly more standardized than the same difference in the culture of Chicago.

Sisters. What has been said above may be repeated here. Sisters are apparently a bit more ready to tease each other lightly about the boys than are brothers, but there are wide individual differences.

Brother and Sister. Between a man and his sister the equivalent factor of restraint becomes very important. Even today sister and brother are never seen alone together, never would think of going to a theater or dance together; and if by chance they are left alone in the house at night, the man seeks his bed outside. Yet there is no "avoidance" in any stricter sense. They may see each other, talk together, and work together; there is supposed to be real affection between them and there usually is. Differentially, all brothers respect their sisters in the sense that they respect their elder brothers; but they are more deferential towards elder sisters than towards younger. A sister is expected to make things (clothes, etc.) for her brother; and the brother tries to find out (usually through their mother) what she would like so that he can bring it to her.

Father and Son. The father-son relationship is much like that between two brothers, except that the differential factor is very much stressed. A son is supposed to obey his father, and if he does wrong, the father is supposed to make him fast "for his own good"—which is the closest thing to corporal punishment that properly occurs.

Father and Daughter. As far as equivalent factors are concerned, this relationship is much like that of brother-sister; but the differential factor is somewhat reversed, for the daughter is supposed to obey her father and respect him even as her brother does her.

Mother and Son. The relationship here also is much like that between sister and brother, but since the mother does not have to respect the wishes of the father in the way that the daughter does, she can help her son when the father is intent on punishing him. Thus, if he is sent to bed without supper she may (after making him promise to do right in the future) bring him food. Obviously there are wide variations in matters such as this.

Mother and Daughter. The relationship between a mother and her daughter is much like that between a father and his son.

6In addition to bashfulness about sex matters, there is also restraint between brother and sister on religious matters. It might be added that the restraint pattern between blood relatives, especially of opposite sex, is sometimes carried beyond the family; thus, a very close male friend of a man would not feel free to take his friend's sister out.
It is up to the mother, or other close female relatives, to teach her daughter what she should know, both about household duties and more personal matters. While the father may give the girl good advice about how to behave, his wishes are generally transmitted through the mother, upon whom is also chiefly entrusted the duty of discipline.

In the case of all these parent-child relationships, the pattern extends to all pairs of relatives who apply parent-child terms to each other, and in the case of the mother-child relationship the term "mother's sister" is just as much equivalent to "mother" in behavior as the terms for "father" are to each other, even though linguistically the latter are all no-sah while the former are different terms. But in these relationships more than any other in Fox, the intensity of the pattern depends on the closeness of the actual relationship.

Grandparents and Grandchildren. The equivalent factor of restraint is somewhat lessened between grandparents and grandchildren; there is considerably more intimacy between them than between parents and children, for example. The advice and help of grandparents are sought, and a father's father will, for example, help his grandson in an argument with his son, the boy's father. The restraint is not relaxed to the extent of allowing obscenity, however, such a thing would hardly be considered. But it is at the same time highly proper to talk over love affairs with a grandparent even of the opposite sex. The differential factor of seeking advice from, not giving it to, a grandparent is present. The grandson will haul water for his grandfather, fill his pipe, and so on as a sign both of his affection and his respect.

Uncle, Aunt, Nephew, and Niece. Although the previous relationships described are to some extent indefinite, and not so different from those found in our own society, the nepotic relationships are highly formalized and distinctive. Coupled with the other normal equivalent factors is one best described as the "joking relationship." The mother's brother and his sister's children, and the father's sister and her brother's children, characteristically play light practical jokes on each other, tease each other in public, and, in general, have what the natives would term a "non-respect" relationship. At any gathering, the raillery is usually occasioned by the presence of several of the various joking relatives. Since these relatives are restrained in their behavior by the same modesty that characterizes other blood relatives, the joking is always of an innocent sort, with never any bodily contact and with never an obscene reference. As might be expected, the restraint is more noticeable between people of opposite sexes.

There is one differential factor in these relationships: when the nephew or niece are young children, their parents

---

7 Also on the closeness of the social bond. A child brought up with its mother's sister would treat her as its mother.
threaten them when they are naughty, with the name of their uncle, saying that he will come and eat them up, or something of the sort. This use of the uncle as a "bogey man" is very effective, for the children grow to fear the man who sometimes actually does pour a pail of water over them as they sleep. Yet when the nephew or niece grows up, he is supposed to forget all this and love his mother's brother.

**Siblings-in-law.** Between all siblings-in-law there is also a pronounced joking relationship, but since they are not blood relatives, the restraint is absent, and the joking takes on a very ribald character, the keynote of which is, in the case of brothers-in-law, horseplay and obscenity with one jokingly acting as if the other is a woman, and, in the case of a man and a woman, mock love of a verbal nature only, and some degree of suggestive obscenity.

Mother's brother's wife and husband's sister's children, these are the relatives who apply terms of consanguinity with the prefix "joking." All aunts and their nephews and nieces joke in the innocent manner, but these "joking" aunts and nephews and nieces joke in the same manner that siblings-in-law do. In addition, there is, in this case, the differential factor that exists between uncle and nephew and niece; but when a child is threatened with his mother's brother's wife, he is afraid of her love, for he is told she will come and kiss him and make love to him, and this seems to be an effective threat.

**Parents- and Children-in-Law.** No joking is indulged in by these relatives, but neither is there anything like avoidance. The relationship is like that of parents-children in that children-in-law have duties toward and respect for their parents-in-law; but especially when these relatives are of opposite sex, there seems to be a feeling of uncomfortable restraint that keeps them from speaking to each other except on business matters. They would never just sit down and gossip or indulge in small talk.

There are, of course, personal variations in all these relationships. Some people who should joke, for example, do not do it—perhaps because they are far away relatives, or sometimes because one who is a poor teaser is afraid to start anything because he knows the other will get the better of him. Needless to say, there are a few individuals who cannot take a joke as they should. Nevertheless, the pattern of joking is carried more uniformly to all relatives who use the same kinship terms than any of the other behavior patterns, possibly because it is the most positive pattern.

Some particular points about the kinship system will be discussed later, together with whatever interpretations seem feasible. It should be noted here that the kinship terminology and the kinship behavior patterns are the linguistic and social facets of one coherent system, and they cannot be considered separately.
II. Social Structures

Besides being the center of the group of relatives already described—which the Fox themselves would call the Family—each Indian is a member of one or more religious societies; one of the two tribal divisions; probably, if he or she is mature, one of the two political factions; and possibly—if a man—the baseball team, the band, or some of the various clubs. It may seem as if the oft recorded fact that the Fox have totemic gentes is being omitted, but—although they have special characteristics to distinguish them from the other religious societies—they will be better understood as types of cult groups.

The Family.—Bodies of kindred are of course overlapping groups; yet to any Fox Indian his group of relatives is, by far, the most important social unit to which he is attached. In a population of close to four hundred, the size of this group is normally from fifty to a hundred persons, scattered over the reservation in perhaps a dozen households besides his own. The blood tie is considerably stronger than the marriage tie, but this statement should be taken with reservations, for when a marriage has lasted for a long time the affinal ties—whether through habit or the influence of the children—become stronger indeed, on the one hand, and the bond between husband, wife, and children becomes stronger than that which ties either the father or the mother to his or her family.

The difficulty in establishing any generalization about the relative strength of consanguineous and affinal bonds by any objective means rises from the instability of marriage itself. A great many marriages are of short duration, too short for them to bear effect in the social structure. In 1932, a record of 273 marriages that had occurred in the tribe was taken; of that 273,
67 of the couples were still living together. Of the 205 marriages that had terminated, no less than 105 had ended by means of separation—63 when there were not even any children to show for the marriage. Some people never settle down long enough to have families, and, in any interpretative study, these and transitory marriages in general must be treated separately.

What is to one person a group of relatives by marriage is, of course, a group of blood relatives to his children. It is this group, relatives through the father and through the mother equally, that is, without doubt, the most important social unit. Genealogies of all the members of the tribe were taken, and, while in some cases, due to circumstances not to the point, more of the mother's family were remembered, in other cases the reverse was true. While in the kinship system cross-lines are distinguished from parallel lines, the difference is not in social proximity, and in all cases the family group most meaningful in daily life is absolutely bilateral.

In addition to relatives brought into the family in the normal course of biological generation, there are additional adopted ones. It must be understood that there are two kinds of adoption among the Fox: in many cases, for various reasons, children may go to live with relatives other than their own parents (for a shorter or longer time) and for purposes of receiving the child's annuities, the foster parents may adopt the child legally. Whether they do or not, this is often called "adoption." In this case, the child is already a relative of the foster parents, and they keep up the old connections, so that the question of changed incest groups, for example, does not enter. What is more often called "adoption" by the Fox might better be termed "replacement," and it will be described later. Suffice it to say that whenever a person has died, no matter what his or her age, some person of approximately the same age, and the same sex, is taken into the family in his place and assumes the kinship relations that the original had. Behavior patterns are extended to people thus adopted, and a person will joke with an adopted mother's brother, for example, just as he had with his predecessor. Records of

It must not be supposed that this condition is necessarily a result of recent disintegration. As far back as genealogies can be carried now—sixty or seventy years ago, when the social organization probably was as integrated as it ever was—the same situation seems to hold. "Easy divorce" is, more probably than not, an old pattern.
adoptions of all living Indians show that they are never adopted to replace their own blood relatives.

Relatives feel an affinity for each other that is not found in any other social structure than the family, including the so-called gentes. They visit each other, stay as long as they please, and, although there are personal likes and dislikes, of course, there is a strong feeling that these should be submerged. Political factionalism rarely cuts across family lines; when a woman and man of different factions marry, the woman usually changes to the man's faction, although cases of the reverse are known, but the personal bitterness that sometimes accompanies burning issues is in such cases allayed, and the children rarely take sides.

Members of the family group are not supposed to intermarry, and it is extremely rarely that they do. Eleven cases of intermarriage of blood relatives appear in the genealogies, and in all but three of them nobody knew of the relationship until it was discovered in the genealogy. The three cases have caused much disapproval, even though the degrees of relationship would not be considered too close in our culture. The most disapproved case is of a man who married a woman who had previously been adopted to take the place of his daughter.

When the clan groups are discussed, it will be seen that marriage within the clan is not only universally practiced but thought little of; that, together with such facts as that in adoption, the adoptee takes the dead person's place in the family but not in the clan, is an indication that the bilateral family is the important social unit.

The Household.—Since there are no formal rules of residence, and only very slight preferences in favor of matrilocal residence in practice, the household might be considered a group only by virtue of the fact that people have to live together
somewhere. In daily life, the household group is extremely im-
portant, of course, for it is a group usually of the closest rela-
tives, and it is the economic unit. Conceptually, it is not that
important, however; people come home when they want to or stay
with relatives when they want to—and, in practice, its economic
unity is very tenuous, since, if a member of the family has money,
he does not necessarily contribute to the larder, and if he has
not money, he may seek sustenance anywhere he happens to be. The
household achieves what importance it has because for most of the
members it is the most important part of the family.

There were in 1932 seventy-one households. Of this num-
ber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of them consist of a married couple and some or all of the
children of both, or of one or the other by a previous marriage;
but, in a large number, an unmarried (at the time) brother or
sister of the man or wife, with perhaps a grandchild or some mis-
cellaneous relative, complete the household. In only one case do
two elementary families live together; in this case a man with
children by a previous wife married a woman with a married son
and family, and all live together. The most frequent cause for
any doubling up (residence of a young couple with the parents of
one, for example) is the scarcity of land and houses.

Religious Societies.--It is not intended here to discuss
the religious groups except in so far as they are pertinent to
the description of the Social Organization. There are two types
of religious societies. The most important consists of a group
of members of a sacred pack, of which there are many, who in the
ceremonies are the hosts and, among other distinguishing activi-
ties, do not eat. In this type the membership is to some extent
hereditary but not fixed as to the number, and there are no par-
ticular fixed positions that are always to be filled. Of this
type, the sacred packs are all more or less linked to a few Major
packs, the members of which constitute what are usually con-
sidered the gentes.

In the second type, there are no sacred packs as such.
The membership (except in the Peyote Cult, which, being foreign,
follows a different pattern) is relatively fixed, and there are
positions to fill. The first type is far more important and will
be considered first.

The Gentes.—How many sacred packs there are in existence
among the Fox today no one individual knows, but there are cer-
tainly at least forty. These packs are classified into (today)
eleven groups, and within each of these eleven there are a num-
ber of "major packs" and a number of minor packs. Those persons
who are connected with a major pack are connected with all the
major packs of its group. And only those connected with the major
packs of a particular group can be connected with its minor packs.
It thus appears that these groups of packs are the basis of a
classification of the people, and how one becomes attached to
them is the vital point.

The rule is that if the father belongs to the Bear group
or the Wolf group, or one of the others, all his children auto-
matically belong there. Thus there is patrilineal descent. But
each of these what may be called totemic groups has a stock of
personal names, and if a child is named from the Thunder, for ex-
ample, he is a member of the Thunder packs no matter what his
father was, in addition to his patrilineal group. This is con-
sidered "borrowing," however, and his children in turn will always
belong to his father's group. In addition, people can be taken into the totemic groups for other reasons, so that conceivably a man can belong to all of them. It would seem as if these totemic groups should be called gentes, since they are patrilinear in ultimate succession no matter how much adoption occurs. But, in daily life, clan groupings are conceived of as units no matter how membership came about, for they function as ceremonial societies rather than as hereditary social institutions.

If an Indian is asked to what gens another belongs (and he understands what is meant) he will think of one of three criteria on which to judge. If he remembers that at the War Chief festivals this person does not eat, he will say he belongs to the War Chief; if he remembers to which gens the father was allied, he will answer with the name of that gens; on the other hand, he may simply think of the meaning of the person's name, and if it refers to the Wolf he will answer that the person belongs to the Wolf gens. Sometimes the answer is that he belongs to two or more. The conclusion is that, in the native mind today, at least, membership in a group of packs is membership there, no matter what the father was.

The basis on which personal names are given is this: if there is no particular reason for giving the child a name from another gens, its father's gens bestows the name; if there is any reason for wishing to (1) name it from some other gens than that of the father or (2) name it into a particular gens, like that of the mother, it is done without any difficulty. Of 366 recorded cases of living Fox Indians (1932), seventy-one were named from a clan other than that of the father. Of this number ten were illegitimate, so that, the father being unknown, the name could not come from his gens; in two cases the father was a white man or half-breed without a gens, so that the children were named for the mother. In sixteen cases there had been previous deaths in the family, and for a change in luck they decided to name the children from another clan.9 In two cases, the mother's sister or the

9W. J. McGee quotes the last Chief, Push-i-tani-ke, as saying: "When a couple are married and the first child is born,
mother's mother adopted the child before it was named and had the right to name it. In one case the child was posthumous and the stepfather named her. Three children were named by their father's mother out of respect for her old age. The circumstances for the rest of the cases are unknown except for the statement that "the father gave his permission."

The chief reason for a person's becoming a member of a group of sacred packs other than by inheritance or naming, is that he is a good singer and knows the songs. He may then be asked to participate as a host in their ceremonies and he is considered a member thereafter. As far as the records are complete there are only three persons, however, who are hosts in more than three gentes.

There is a tradition that the gentes are supposed to be exogamous, and the rule is that a man should not marry anyone who belongs for any reason to any of the gentes to which he, for any reason, belongs. This rule is not at all followed today, and as far back as one can judge from the genealogies, it was never followed. Certain it is that there is no sentiment in its favor and that there is no statistical preponderance of usage in its favor.

To show the latter, records of all marriages were collected, with records also of the clan names, the clans of the parents, and so on. In order to give every benefit to the notion that there is clan exogamy today, one can consider the marriages only of those whose gens name and whose father's affiliation mark him as definitely belonging to a certain clan.

For convenience, the largest gens (judged by names) is taken. There were in 1932 one hundred twenty-one persons with Bear names (as opposed to 100 Thunder, 55 War [and Peace] Chief, 33 Wolf, 39 in three Water clans, 12 Eagle, only one old Pheasant woman, and no Elks). Of these 121, there were 89 whose fathers were also Bears. Of these 89, only 42 had been married—but a total number of 79 marriages had been contracted by these 42 Bears.

Of these 79, 23 were with War Chiefs, 21 with Thunders, 10 with Wolves, the father has the right to name it, but if it dies the mother takes the right" (A Muskwaki Bowl, AA, o. s., XI [1898], 89). The rule is not as hard and fast, however.
while 6 with Water peoples,
1 with an Eagle,
7 with foreigners, and
4 were intermarriages among the 42 Bears,
7 were marriages with then deceased Bears.

There were, thus, about one-seventh of all marriages contracted by Bears that contradicted gens exogamy. Since the Bears constitute one-fourth of the tribe, however, it might be argued that there is a tendency to marry out; but when it is remembered that a large proportion of a Bear's family are Bears and these are all within the prohibited degree, the difference between one-seventh and one-fourth is about taken up.

It would appear, therefore, that the Gentes are not in fact exogamous, and from genealogies it appears that they were hardly more so in the past. It is significant that some of the clan intramarriages have occurred among the oldest and most conservative people that are living today. To what extent are they, then, social institutions? They do not regulate marriage, they have no juridical functions discoverable; today, at least, they are social institutions only in the sense that any cult groups are. It is for this reason that the term "gens," usually applied to a unilateral kinship group with some function in regulating marriage, should be applied only with reservations to the Fox groups that surround the sacred packs.

There is one group, organized about a sacred pack called mo-wi-ti-a-ki (the "little spotted buffalo" group or, as Michelson translates the word, "The Dirty Little Ani"). It is connected with the packs of the Wolf gens, but one does not have to belong to the major wolf packs to belong to it, and, indeed, most of the members are not of the Wolf Gens, but rather of all the others. Yet the pattern involved in this group and its ceremonies is exactly like that of the others, the members of which are considered to be in a particular gens. It seems to bear out the conclusion that the genses vary less from purely religious cult societies among the Fox than they do from the social institutions that ordinarily bear the name.10

10 Even more significant, perhaps, is the matter of the Buffalo sacred-pack organizations. The buffalo (or buffalo skin) is one of the minor packs of the Bear gens and a major pack of the War Chief, Thunder, and Wolf genses. The War Chief and Thunder groups hold Buffalo ceremonies twice a year, and the War
Other Cults.—The "Singing Around Society" (Kiwagamo'ag'ki) has a membership which cuts across all family and gens lines, and yet has a membership largely determined, today, by heredity. Generally speaking, membership descends from father to son, but since a father has only one membership, he can pass it on to only one son. He usually chooses his successor in his lifetime, and then they are both members occupying one membership. In one case today, Young Bear is a member, having received the office from his father; although he is still living, he has appointed his son Dan (neither the youngest nor the eldest) to his place, and in 1954 he in turn made his son (seven years old) a member in his place; now all three are members of the society. Yet none of Young Bear's other sons can ever become members through succession, for the "seat" is taken.

Another way that membership is determined is this: if a member dies without having appointed his successor, the person who is adopted to take his place will assume his membership in the society as well. The third method by which people have become members of the society is by having become cured through its offices; in the one case where this has occurred recently, the man is still often called by the name of the society (although the cure was effected some forty years ago).

Of the forty-seven people who are recognized as members today, there are 26 men and 21 women, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 men and 7 women received membership from the father</th>
<th>2 men and 4 women received membership by replacement of a member (ceremonial adoption)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot; &quot; 4 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; mother</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; because he was a good singer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 man . . . . 4 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; received</td>
<td>1 man and 4 women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; M F B</td>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; her M Sis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; M M B</td>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 woman . . . . &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; M B</td>
<td>1 man . . . . &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; M Sis</td>
<td>1 man . . . . &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief and Bear gentes, at least, have names in their stocks that refer to the Buffalo. There are "different buffalo" for each of the gentes, and yet, forty or fifty years ago, when there were gens-houses in the Fox village, there was one which was a "Buffalo" house in which, presumably, all Buffalo ceremonies were held.
1 man became a member because he was cured by the society
3 men and 4 women are members for unknown reasons.

Since there are several ways in which membership can be
achieved, two or more members of the same family (such as sib-
lings) can hold membership and pass it on; but, generally speak-
ing, most of the families are represented by only one, if any,
person.

This society "sings around" at the homes of the members
of the tribe during an epidemic, and functioned in the Spring of
1934 when a serious drought threatened. Regular meetings are not
held, and the society has lost most of the social importance it
once may have had—lost it chiefly to the Peyote cult.

The "Religion Society," "Drum Society," or "Dream Dance,"
as it variously called, is a comparatively recent importation
(probably from the Pottawotamie of Wisconsin) since the Fox have
been in Iowa. All the positions in the society surround four
drums, each of which has a leader and various functionaries. Mem-
bership, however, is not strictly limited, and positions are
available to any who are interested and show the proper religious
spirit. Actually, the membership is chiefly concentrated in a
few families that are politically close.

The Peyote Cult, which is growing steadily in importance
among the Fox, has not been in the tribe for more than about
twenty-five years. Membership is open to everybody, for the cult
is mildly evangelistic. Since, however, part of the belief of
the cult is that the old religions of the Fox are false, people
strongly involved in the other societies are not apt to become
Peyote. Nevertheless, two Peyote members are in the Drum Society,
for example, and more of them take part in the gens festivals.
The chief actual motive for joining Peyote seems to be its cura-
tive function; the peyote is supposed to be somewhat of a cure-
all, and when other treatment fails, the patient may take up
peyote and, thereafter, remain a member.

The Dual Division.—All Fox Indians, male and female
alike, are in either one of two divisions, *kic'ko* and *to'kan*. The rule of membership is this: if the father is a *kic'ko*, his eldest child is a *to'kan*, his next child a *kic'ko*, the next a *to'kan*, and so on. If he is a *to'kan*, his first child is a *kic'ko*, and so on alternately. In this way the tribe is divided as nearly as possible (by any such methods) into two divisions. The divisions used to function in war, but now chiefly in games and in the ceremonies. Whenever a La Crosse game is played, instead of "choosing up" sides, the *kic'kos* line up against the *to'kans*, and so with all the games, including partnership gambling games (except when members of another tribe are present, when the split may be on tribal lines). In the ceremonies, the *kic'kos* and the *to'kans* have dancing or eating contests. In all cases, *kic'kos* are placed to the South, *to'kans* to the North; the former are connected with the color white, the latter, black.

The rule of membership is determined automatically, not by any naming or initiation, and among the first things that a child learns is to what division he belongs. Yet today, at least, people do not know the divisions of other members of the tribe, unless they happen to remember the side they were once on, or remember what his next father or sibling is.

One interesting point is that although the rule given above holds for practically every member of the tribe, it does not hold for one particular group of clans, those related to water. In these clans, all people are *kic'ko*. There is no rationalization given for this circumstance, but it is affirmed by all; there are not enough cases from these clans to be sure if it is the name that determines the clan for this purpose or the clan of the father.

**The Factions.**—What is to some extent a dual division of the tribe that functions throughout the culture much more than does the above, is the division into two political factions. The history of the factions is given in Appendix II, and it is probably largely correct, although there is a possibility that the supposed origin there given may have been another manifestation.
of disagreement in the tribe that was already manifest. The fact supporting the history is that the leaders of the factions, the focal points about whom most disagreements turn, are both members of the Bear clan, but two disconnected families of the Bear clan. It will be seen after a study of the genealogies that there are really three important families in the Bear clan. It appears that the chieftainship was in one of these families (it is supposed to be in the Bear clan and inherited in the male line) and when it was switched to the other line, the trouble started. It is still a matter of Old Bear (and Tetapache) against Young Bear. Poweshiek, who is on the Old Bear branch of the family (too distantly for the genealogies to catch and attested to only by tradition) lends support to the Young Bear faction.

Each family of the tribe generally is a unit in political matters, but clans have nothing to do with the matter. In ceremonial matters (where the clans are important) factional differences do not enter, and neither of the factions seems to be more progressive in religious matters than the other. But the members of the Drum Society are nearly all leaders in the Young Bear faction, and there are more members of the Old Bear faction than of the other in Peyote (although the leaders of both factions disapprove of Peyote).

Marriages between members of the two factions are not uncommon; but in every case one of the parties to the marriage changes his or her allegiance to suit the other. Women more often switch than men, and there are cases where a woman has changed sides with each of three or four marriages. In 1933 an old woman who, with her family, belonged to one of the factions, married the leader of the other faction; now she votes with her husband. In cases of intermarriage, the children, as far as records are available, belong to neither faction, since the father's family has one allegiance and the mother's another and both sides are felt to be equally close. It is apparent that on such a basis this dual division cannot become a permanent social institution; yet now it is extremely important, and a great many political and even personal issues are decided along factional lines.

To summarize: the bilateral family, cutting across the ceremonial non-exogamous and only partly patrilineal gentes and other cult societies, is the unit in social life to which all.
allegiances are eventually referred. To consider the traditional dual division, or the factions, or the gentes as of any social significance apart from their connections with the families is to render a false picture of Fox social organization.

The family it is that is connected with the kinship system: for the terms, for example, or the behavior patterns that go with them, are never extended beyond the traceable blood and affinal relatives—never to all members of the clan or (of course) to the kic'ko or to'kan division to which the person belongs.

III. Social Customs

Marriage

Courtship.—Ideally, Fox young people are completely chaste before marriage. The parents shower them with good advice, watch carefully the company they keep, and—should an affair look as if it were becoming serious—speak with them about the faults and virtues of the prospective mates and their families. Of course, in these days of automobiles and schools, parental influence is, of necessity, weakened; nevertheless, even now marriage is considered a matter in which parents should have, if possible, a hand.

In the very recent past there was a definite procedure of courtship. Becoming acquainted with a girl during the course of daily life, a young man took a liking to her. Presumably he received some encouragement; having played his flute outside her house in the evening, perhaps she came out—managing to evade her mother's watchful eye—and had a tryst with him. But formally the courtship consisted of nocturnal visits to the girl's bedside. In the summer houses, the sleeping benches are about three or four feet from the ground; the young man entered the house, held
a lighted match to his face to display his identity (and also to be sure of the identity of the girl) to her and the family, and stood beside the girl's bed to talk to her. This he continued to do every few nights, and finally—having acquainted his parents with his actions, and received their approval—he proposed marriage, and, if the girl accepted him, she set an approximate date for marriage ("harvest time," for example). Then, the young man visited her no more in this way, although he might speak to her in the daytime. They might give each other small gifts to seal their betrothal, which was not, however, made public.

Marriage.—When the time came, the young man went to his fiancee's home again, at night in the same way. If she was still agreeable, he spent the night at her side, remaining chaste, however. In the morning he would stay until the family had seen him, and then he would leave before breakfast. The next night he came again; in the meantime, the girl and her parents had had a last chance to consider; if all was favorable, the young man lay with the girl and consummated the marriage. In the morning he stayed for breakfast and became part of the household. In a few days he took his bride to his own home, and his relatives dressed her in new clothes, and gave her a lot of dry goods and some horses. The horses the bride gave to her brothers, or, if she had none, to her mother's brothers or to her brothers' children (own or classificatory). Some time later, her family sent to his a number of gifts consisting of foodstuffs. Then the marriage ceremonies were over. The couple stayed with the wife's folks or the husband's until they had a place of their own.

Divorce.—Nowadays, legal marriages are often contracted, but, since the cost of a legal divorce is considerable, they are
not usually so dissolved. Instead, the couple simply separate, and the man and woman find new mates (second marriages were, in the past, seldom solemnized with gifts, and now few, if any, are,)--not legally, of course. The chief cause for divorce is simply incompatibility: if the couple begin to quarrel, they do not bother to try to make a success of the marriage. Ideally, husband and wife should overlook small faults—even minor excursions into unfaithfulness; in practice, they overlook very little, and marriages often break up because of minor misunderstandings. Actual adultery is occasionally condoned, but not if it becomes public. There are women who have bad reputations, of course, and it is noteworthy that they find husbands now only in other tribes. In cases of divorce, the woman usually takes the children with her.

**TABLE II**

**MARRIAGES TERMINATED; SHOWING DISPOSITION MADE OF CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition of Children</th>
<th>MARRIAGES TERMINATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases.............</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children.............</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife kept..............</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband kept...........</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's family kept....</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's family kept.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous and unknown..........</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this table, information relative to the disposition of the children on the death of one of the parents is also included; it is seen that the wife and her family take care of the children.
in most cases.

**Preferential Marriage.**—Although in times past cases of polygyny were more common, in all the genealogies collected only one case came to light. The preference in polygamous marriages was always that the wives should be sisters. The sororate itself is still a common enough knowledge; it is felt to be proper now, but in the old days, apparently, it was almost compulsory. In seventeen cases of persons now living, the first and second mates have been related so:

**TABLE III**

**RELATIONSHIP OF FIRST AND SECOND MATES (IN PREFERENTIAL MARRIAGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARRIAGE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL RELATIONSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman married two brothers ..................</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man married two sisters ..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man married mother and daughter ...............</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman married both a mother's brother and a sister's son (m. sp.)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent that the levirate is now much more common than the sororate.

A most interesting form of sororate was the marriage of a man and his wife's brother's daughter. Although no cases of such a marriage are on record, and nobody remembers the last one, a few of the old people describe the custom in such detail that there can be no doubt of its presence in the old days. In the
old-time wickiup there were definite sleeping places on the
benches that lined the building, and a married daughter and her
husband had their place. Occasionally, if the wife's family liked
the young man and wanted to be sure that he would remain in the
family (so the informants stated), they took one of their son's
daughters, a girl of perhaps eight years, and "put her on the
bench"; that is, they had her sleep across the head of their
daughter's and son-in-law's bed. Thereafter, no matter where the
daughter and her husband lived, this little girl—the wife's
brother's daughter—lived with them. When she grew up she would
become the man's second wife, and if the first wife died before
the child grew up, the husband was expected to await her maturity.

The Life Cycle

Birth.—When a woman is pregnant, she tells her close
female relatives, who tell her what to do; during pregnancy a
woman must be very careful of her health and that of the baby.
Since there are beliefs that to eat scabby fruit will give the
child scabs, or to eat bologna will injure the child since it,
like the child, is wrapped in skin, or to behead a chicken will
cause the baby to be born with a broken neck, and so on, there
are many things a young woman must learn.

Furthermore she must be careful to stay away from public
places where sorcerers might easily get at the child. Both the
father and the mother must be very wary of engaging in quarrels—
for the baby's sake always—and the father, too, is careful of
what he eats and does (for example, he should not touch lightning-
struck trees, snakes, corpses, etc.—innumerable things).

A woman makes preparations for childbirth outside the
house, in a specially built wickiup. When the labor pains begin,
she goes into the house, and the husband notifies women relatives,
who usually know what is best to do. They cut and bury the
umbilical cord and bathe the baby; the mother bathes herself.

Away from her husband, the wife in the old days stayed in her wickiup for forty days after the birth of the child; nowadays they stay only about ten days. It used to be considered very harmful to conceive a child while still nursing another, so husband and wife did not live together for at least a year—at least regularly—but beliefs such as this have relaxed very much in recent years.

**Puberty.**—Even today the puberty wickiup is general. At a girl's first menstruation, she is thrown into the water, head covered, and then she must be segregated for ten days from everybody but old female relatives. After the ten days she is a woman "and should consider herself as such," but for ten days more she cooks for herself, and at every menstruation period, she does the same.

There is no sort of puberty-marking for boys. A boy in the old days was taught to fast, both for the general good of his soul, so to speak, and in the hopes of getting a blessing from some spirit. Fasting is still thought much of, but with children going off to school, it is practically a lost art.

**Death.**—When a person dies, runners are sent to notify the people, and the same evening there is a ceremony—much like the feasting at the gens festivals—conducted by the clan to which the dead man belonged. It is here that the gens plays its most important part in a person's life. Attendants from other clans are appointed to sleep that night in the house and to dig the grave the next day. The body is washed and dressed and carried up to one of the three cemeteries, in these days on a truck with a motorcade funeral procession. (The choice of cemeteries follows family lines in general.) A clan-marker is later put on the grave.

Meanwhile visitors have been bringing gifts to the dead man's family, even while the body is still in the house. The spirit of the day is much like that of a comparable one in our own society.

**Adoption.**—Ordinary adoption is informal and irregular; but ceremonial replacement follows a definite pattern. Some time
close to a year after a person has died, his relatives choose some person to take his place. They usually find somebody who is close to the age and of the same sex as the deceased, and presumably it is somebody of whom they are fond. There is one case in which a boy was adopted to replace a girl, and one case in which an old man replaced a child a few months old. The adoption feast, at which a general feast and a religious dance are held and at which the adoptee receives new clothes and many gifts of dry goods, is usually given by the closest relatives, who furnish the wherewithal, at the home of the closest. Occasionally, two adoptions are made for one death, when different members of the family, probably disagreeing, each adopts a person. The case of one old man who died some fifty years ago is still remembered because, for some reason or other, at his adoption feast a Wolf gens festival was held at night, an altogether unheard of thing.

In eighty-nine cases of adoptions recorded, the feasts were made by the dead person's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Relationship</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew or niece</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt or uncle</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather and uncle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A non-relative at whose house the deceased had been living</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the adoption, the "ward" takes his place in the family of the deceased although, as far as the records show, never

11 Later, the adoptee returns to the family that gave the feast a large amount of foodstuffs as gifts. In collecting the gifts, the host calls on the whole family for help; and, in the same way, the family of the adopted person helps collect the food with which to reciprocate.
actually in the household. Kin of the dead person now apply to
the adoptee the proper kinship terms, as well as the behavior
that goes with them.

IV. Analysis

In the present-day social organization of the Fox, the
kinship system is an integral part of the culture; it represents
the classification of all who are considered to be related, and
the group of relatives is the most important in social life. The
strong family feeling is reflected in the traditional behavior
patterns that go with the kinship terms, and just the group
throughout which the kinship terms are applied is the group which
functions in daily life. In some other tribe the kinship terms
might be extended throughout the clans, but not so here; among the
Fox, the clans are not social units in this sense, and the members
of a clan do not feel themselves to be a social unity because of
that fact. Likewise, one could not possibly interpret the use of
the terms "son" and "daughter" for a woman's father's sister's
children as meaning "children of women of my clan" and hope to
make oneself understood in the language of the Fox. Gentes--
dclouded in descent and not at all exogamous--exist among the Fox;
yet if that is supposed to infer a condition like that of the
Omaha Tribe, for example, where the gentes are units in the camp
circle, they certainly are absent here. In this meaningful sense,
one must insist that the Fox do not have a unilateral social or-
ganization, that such a thing is foreign to them actually and
conceptually.

This fact comes out in many ways. The range of the kin-
ship system itself is a clue, for just as kinship terms are not
extended throughout clans, they are not curtailed in certain
lineages. The bilaterality of Fox social organization comes out also in the makeup of the household groups, in the bilocality of residence, in the equal exchange of gifts at marriage, and especially in the adoption of a person to take the place of any relative in the family, but never in the clan. The type of dual organization—an alternation of the children of each family—is indicative in a negative way of the lack of feeling for social groups involving unilateral descent.

About the only social function that clans seem to have had in the old days was the location of chieftainship in the Bear Clan. But there is strong evidence that this actually meant descent in a Fox family that happened to be of the Bear clan. It is conceivable that, before the recent interruption by white contact, the clans were becoming stronger social units: the fact that all the members of a water clan were members of one of the dual divisions is an indication of a unity of clans that may have been spreading in the culture. On the other hand, the contrary may be true, and it is conceivable that this case was the last survivor of an old system of strong clans that had broken down. But both historical interpretations are dangerous because (a) the data today are hardly conclusive, and (b) a functional interpretation of the anomaly might be, if all the facts were known, possible.

It appears that in the last fifty years, at any rate, clans have not been socially prominent and, in general, that Fox society has been based on the bilateral group of relatives by blood and marriage. One is entitled to wonder, then, how the peculiar kinship system can be explained. It is the same kind of kinship system that, in other places, accompanies strong clans or moieties; yet, in the case of California, and now again among the Fox, it cannot be explained in terms of clans, unless one adopts the
auxiliary hypothesis that clans must have previously existed wherever the system is found. An alternative explanation that has been offered is on the basis of the marriage of a man and his wife's brother's daughter. It might be well to discuss both of these possibilities in terms of the Fox material presented.

That the "classificatory system," in general, fits clans to some extent was pointed out by Morgan himself; but the hypothesis that it is explicable on that basis was at the same time rejected by him. That a distinction between parallel and cross lines is reminiscent of the division into clans cannot be doubted, since in a patrilineal society, the father, his brothers and sisters, the children of the former, and so on, are all in one's own clan while the father's sister's descendants and the mother's siblings' descendants are not necessarily so. Likewise, in a matrilineal society, the mother's sister's female line is in one's own clan, while all others are not necessarily so. Of course, in each case, one of the first questions asked is why both parallel lines are merged with one's own line. The systems could be explained on the basis of exogamous moieties better than on that of clans, for then certain relatives in both parallel lines would be in one's own moiety. As a universal explanation of the classificatory system with the distinction of parallel and cross lines this has never been seriously accepted, however, since the distribution of moieties is comparatively limited.

The Omaha type, of which the Fox system is an example, seems to fit patrilineal clans particularly, just as the Crow type fits matrilineal clans. In these cases, the lines that are merged happen to consist of relatives who are in the mother's clan (in the Omaha type) and those of the father's clan (in the Crow type)
respectively. Now among the Fox, the term for mother's brother
and his son and his son, etc. might be considered to mean "male
relative of my mother's clan." Indeed, the only male relatives
of one's mother's clan besides these are called "grandfathers,"
and this usage may perhaps be explained away on the basis of the
extraordinary closeness of the mother's father. There is a
strong temptation, therefore, to believe that the formation of
patrilineal clans preceded and caused the Omaha type. But among
the Fox, at least, present-day clans could never have exerted
such influence, because the clans are not important enough to
affect kinship terminology; and, besides, no Fox Indian ever
thinks of his mother's brother as "a male of my mother's clan."
Generally, such an explanation of the Omaha type is faulty, be-
cause there are regions of tribes where the Omaha type, but no
clan at all, exist, and there is no independent reason to be-
lieve that they ever did. On the other hand, the Ojibwa, closely
related to the Fox, and with clans very much stronger, do not
have the Omaha type of kinship system. Finally, militating
against the theory, is the question of what, if the clans brought
on the kinship system, caused the clans? Any one of these argu-
ments is answerable with auxiliary hypotheses, but to construct
supposition on supposition is to build on quicksands.

The answer that has been given is that clans have brought
on the Omaha type where both exist; but the marriage with the
wife's brother's daughter has caused the system wherever it, in
turn, exists. This theory holds that if for some reason (unstated)
a sororate practice of taking the wife's brother's daughter as a
second wife arises, then the natural consequences of that marriage
are anticipated in the terminology and the Omaha type arises.
Thus, one's child by a first wife will call the second wife "mother" (or "stepmother") and her brother "mother's brother"; but since the second wife is also this child's mother's brother's daughter—and her brother the mother's brother's son—these relatives are precipitantly called "mother" and "mother's brother." Meanwhile, of course, the wife's brother's daughter would be a "sister-in-law." Now these are the terms of the Fox system (with "mother's sister" substituted for "mother"), and since the Fox also have the designated form of marriage, it would appear that they are an example which corroborates this theory.

On general grounds, this explanation suffers as does the other, but specifically among the Fox it can be shown to be untenable. In the first place, the marriage is barely remembered today, but all evidence points to the fact that it was never very common, and that, therefore, it could hardly have so affected the kinship system. It appears that the ordinary sororate was fairly common, and that the marriage with the wife's brother's daughter was a substitute for it when (perhaps) the wife had no eligible sister. If one looks at the kinship system today, this is understandable, since both the wife's sister and her brother's daughter are called sister-in-law, and if one is marriageable, so is the other. The question becomes, first of all, that of why the wife's brother's daughter is called sister-in-law (and, reciprocally, of course, why the father's sister's husband is called brother-in-law by both a man and a woman). Such terminology fits the marriage, and would seem to be a sine qua non of it. In order to sustain the theory under discussion, it would have to be shown that this part of the terminology goes together with the other distinctive part of the Omaha type. In fact, the two
features have somewhat independent distributions, even though they often appear in the same tribe. In considering the terminology applied to the father's sister's husband, and to the mother's brother's wife, it is noteworthy that among the Fox there is a strong tendency today to think of the mother's brother's wife as sister-in-law. Now Crow-type kinship systems have been explained on the basis of marriage with the mother's brother's wife or widow—an explanation comparable to that of the Omaha type on the basis of marriage to the father's sister's husband (or, as it is usually stated, to the wife's brother's daughter). The marriage with the mother's brother's wife, of course, goes together with calling her sister-in-law. The condition among the Fox becomes interesting, therefore; with the Omaha type, the mother's brother's wife is yet treated like a sister-in-law, and often referred to as one. Whether this is very recent (and the terminology would indicate that it is) or whether marriages have ever been contracted within this relationship one cannot tell (there are no records of such a marriage, but there are no records of the marriage with the father's sister's husband, either); but it is fair to say that the two relatives have become conceptually equivalent among the Fox. This means (1) that the terminology applied to spouses of uncles and aunts is not completely bound up with the Omaha-Crow types—which rather destroys the explanations on the basis of the peculiar marriages, and (2) that the Fox seem to have been developing a system as completely bilateral as possible, notwithstanding its supposedly unilateral Omaha feature.

The question of how unilateral the Fox kinship system is, is essential to an understanding of the entire question. One has
a strong feeling that even though this type of kinship system often is accompanied by patrilineal groupings, yet the Fox system in practice is as bilateral as any. The mother's brother and sister's son relationship is equivalent, and there is practical equivalence in the other cross-cousin relationships in spite of the fact that the mother's brother's daughter is mother to her father's sister's children, and a mother-child relationship is normally one of super- and subordination. This is accomplished because actually it is the relative age of the two that is significant. A "mother" (or "mother's sister") normally demands respect of her "children." But if they are the same age, they behave rather as siblings, and if the "child" is considerably older than the "mother," the respect is in the opposite direction. The same is true with grandparents and grandchildren. A good case of this that is easily affirmed is that of the uncle and his nephew or niece. This is a relationship of equivalence except in the bogey-man aspect that has been described; normally, the "uncle" is the bogey-man to the "nephew," but if the "uncle" is a child and the "nephew" a mature man, the "nephew" is actually the bogey-man. In Fox, at least, all relationships are conceptually equivalent, the non-equivalent behavior dependent upon relative age alone. It is useless to think of the mother's brother's line as somehow elevated, therefore. The differentiation must still be explained, but not fundamentally on the basis of a unilateral conception. It is for this reason, also, that one cannot think of the Omaha and Crow types as opposite poles of a conceptual scheme. Actually, there may be very little difference between them.

In combination with actual clans or moieties, the Omaha
and Crow types assume new and different meanings, and they fit
so nicely that one is tempted to explain one in terms of the other.
Fox material gives some strong indications that this is an erro-
neous approach. An analysis of Fox social organization shows at
the same time that the Omaha and Crow types cannot be explained
glibly on the basis of the marriages that often accompany them.
To attack the problem generally, and to indicate what may be the
ture relationship of kinship systems and social institutions, as
well as to attempt an explanation of the Crow and Omaha types as
an example of general method, is the object of Part IV.
Robert Lowie, America's premier student of social organization, recently wrote:

Among the Omaha of Nebraska the generation lines are overridden—a mother's brother's son is called by the same term as a maternal uncle. This feature is not shared by such fellow Siouans as the Crow or Dakota, but occurs among several Central Algonquian tribes. Since, however, these tribes are neighbors, the peculiarity might be explained through diffusion without recourse to social phenomena. But when the same terminological feature crops up two thousand miles to the west among the Miwok of California as well as in Africa and Asia, one must... look for a common determinant. The latter is found in the common stressing of the paternal line, for all the tribes in question have paternal clans and by paternal descent a maternal uncle and his son will always be in the same clan. For the Miwok and Omaha parallels a perfect answer can be given; both permit a man to marry his wife's brother's daughter—the niece is thus elevated in status, becoming a mother to the offspring of her husband's first marriage, whence her brother becomes a mother's brother. Yet the theory is not adequate; there are tribes like the Ojibwa which are also patrilineal but fail to disregard generation lines.

The reverse occurs in Melanesia, in Southern Alaska, among the Crow of Montana, the Pawnee of Nebraska, the Hopi of Arizona and in the Southeastern United States where the paternal aunt's son is reckoned a father and her daughter a paternal aunt. All these tribes are matrilineal, so that the father's sister and her children are always in the same group as herself and her brother. But here too a supplementary hypothesis is required, for there are matrilineal tribes such as the Iroquois, that do not override generation. For the Melanesian and Tlingit tribes, at least, nepotic inheritance of widows provides the key: a man inherits his mother's brother's widow, hence her children by the first husband call their cousin father. In Dobu, Melanesia, as Fortune has shown, the father's sister's son is verbally identified with the father only after the latter's death; Malinowski found that in the nearby Trobriands the classification obtains from birth. The steps of the development are therefore clear in this area.1

1Article on Kinship, Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, VIII, 568-72 (1932).
This statement is worth reading several times because in it is contained a condensed version of the entire theory—with its presuppositions, its proofs, and its conclusions—now held by almost every interested anthropologist in England and America.² Lowie himself is not responsible for any of the explanations of kinship offered in these paragraphs. It will be remembered that it was Rivers who first proposed to explain kinship systems in terms of social institutions. Rivers credits the above explanation of the Omaha type to Kohler, and the same explanation was later offered by Mrs. Seligman. Gifford, who studied the Miwok, proposed the identical explanation of the kinship system there. Kohler and Rivers are also responsible for the explanation of the Crow kinship type on the basis of marriage with the mother's brother's widow. Of course, the general observation that these kinship terminologies are suited to patrilineal and matrilineal clans respectively is as old as the notion that terminology is explicable on the basis of social organization.³

It is this paragraph, reflecting as it does current theory of social organization, that will be the text for discussion in this section. Historically, it was seen that the second great advance in the study of social organization was the rediscovery of kinship terminology by Rivers, and his connecting it with social organization. The Rivers period is now at its height, at the stage where argument over the method is hushed and where the presuppositions are unchallenged; indeed, the study of kinship today is very comparable in this respect to the science of social organization in 1875 or 1880 when the methods and assumptions of the

²Radcliffe-Brown and a few disciples are the exceptions which come to mind.

³Morgan noticed the peculiar variations in cross-cousin terminology but he did not try to explain them.
Evolutionists were dominant in England and nobody questioned their premises.

The type of explanation that is in vogue today bears one other resemblance to that of the evolutionists: it is enticingly simple. There are the matrilineal clans and the Crow type: they fit nicely and occur often enough together to make their causal relationship obvious; there are the patrilineal clans and the Omaha type: they correspond in exactly the same way that the members of the other pair do. Each is convincing evidence for the other. But some tribes have the kinship system without the clans? Yes, but see how the marriage with the wife's brother's daughter fits the Omaha type, and how the marriage with the mother's brother's widow suits the Crow type! Where there are no clans, these are the institutions which have brought on the kinship terminology! Indeed, the marriage is found with these kinship systems, and, if not, only one of two things can have happened: the institution that caused the kinship terms has disappeared, or else the kinship terminology has diffused from some place that once had had, if it now has not, the proper institution.

It was pointed out that, as far as the Fox are concerned, these specific explanations of the Omaha type are faulty. Specific objections may, however, be argued away: the Fox are, perhaps, not typical, and the explanations might still be valid for the Omaha tribe, or the Miwok. It is patent that the refutation must be more general: the explanations of the Omaha and Crow type on the basis of clans and marriage practices are only examples of a type, and it would be well to destroy the power, not only of the example, but of the underlying methodology.

To refute the entire notion, one could apply logic—point out that (a) it savors of trying to find any sort of explanation
that seems reasonable, different for different cases of the same thing if necessary, (b) there is still no explanation of the institutions that are given as "causes" of the kinship terms—or data of distribution; but the most effective rebuttal would be a counter explanation that takes into account all of the points in favor of the current theory as well as all of the data which does not fit it.

The general thesis of the counter explanation is that all elements of social organization are the result of a complex of psychological forces or principles acting in particular social situations and tending to create forms of social behavior which, in a small society, may crystallize into institutions. The same forces, tend, on the one hand, to crystallize kinship systems and, on the other, to form such social institutions as clans and forms of marriage; that kinship systems fit the social structure is thus to be expected. Diffusion is never denied, for where psychological tensions in common social situations are present, the crystallization may come in only one of several societies and be borrowed by others; on the other hand, for like reasons, the same internal developments may occur in different societies independently. It is also not denied that institutions such as clans can secondarily influence kinship terminology, and vice versa; but the argument remains that the fundamental consideration is the causation of both.

The type of explanation presented is similar to that of Professor Redcliffe-Brown in certain respects; but, in other, equally important, respects, its whole tenor is contrary. Redcliffe-Brown also contradicts Lowie and the type of thought he represents; he also claims that various elements of social organization are related because they result from the same causes—not because one comes from the other. The "causes" presented here, and those
postulated by Radcliffe-Brown are, however, quite different. Radcliffe-Brown believes that the necessity for social integration is the fundamental cause for all social institutions—that they have a "function" in keeping integrated the society. He will always admit that individual human nature is active in the formation of all institutions, but for him that is beside the point; what is important is to determine how specific institutions, in particular societies, or in all, function in the integration of society. Here, on the other hand, the attempt is to see by what psychological and social processes the institutions are originated and maintained; it is understood that one of the processes is that of "accommodation of individuals to each other" which may be translated into Radcliffe-Brown's "integration"; but that is only one of many, and, besides, the interest is in seeing on what principles such accommodation occurs rather than in determining the value of institutions for that end.

Specifically, there are a number of small points of agreement with Radcliffe-Brown; one of his recognized contributions, for example, is his "generation principle"—that there is a tendency to respect members of the generation above, but not so much those of the second generation above. It will be seen that this is perfectly agreeable to the argument to be presented; there is a large body of evidence in its favor. But the difference in conception and point of view is apparent when one understands that, while Radcliffe-Brown believes that the raison d'etre for this fact is the social necessity of passing on culture from one generation to the next, this thesis argues that the reason is the very commonplace fact that children are small when their parents are old and caring for them—a social situation based on a biological fact—and they obey their parents, and respect them, for about the same reason.
that a dog obeys its master. There is agreement on facts of the matter—such as the generation principle, the sex principle (that brothers tend to respect their sisters) and so on; but there the similarity ends. Radcliffe-Brown would be the first to deny that he is responsible for the argument that will follow, and, since he comes by far the closest to being their godfather, this thesis cannot ask anyone but its author to take any responsibility. At the same time, without the theories of Radcliffe-Brown as a beginning, there is little doubt that this argument would never have been born.

The following exposition gives a selective outline of the kinds of forces and tendencies always involved in the introduction and maintenance of social institutions. Following the example previously given, the selection will be in favor of kinship systems, and of the Omaha-Crow types. It is impossible (a) in a short paper and (b) with the writer's meager experience, to carry through the development of social forms in all of their ramifications; nevertheless, this is not intended to be as narrow in its scope as the material presented is. This may appear to be a development of the Fox kinship system deductively; what is claimed for it is that it (a) is as empirical as anything in social science, even if its propositions are based on observation and common sense rather than on statistics, and (b) represents an exposition of (1) the causes underlying classificatory systems in general and the Omaha-Crow types in particular and (2) a point of view and a method for solving the propounded problems of social organization.

1. The rule of uniform descent: If somebody whom ego calls A has children whom ego calls B, then the children of everybody whom ego calls A are called B.

This rule, generally followed (in our own society, as well as in others), is submerged among the Fox, for example, in the case
of people called "grandfather" and "grandmother." It is inoperative because the grandparents, due to other causes, are conceived of as being the end of the system and all members of their generation are called "grandparents"; if, under these circumstances, the rule of uniform descent would apply, it would conflict with the rule of uniform reciprocals.

2. The rule of uniform reciprocals: If A and B are terms used between a pair of relatives, then the reciprocal of every A must be B.

This rule, followed in our own society, as well as in Fox, has rare exceptions. In Merlav (Banks Islands) the term for "child" has the normal reciprocals "father" and "mother"; yet, cross-cousins apply the term "child" to each other. It is possible that, until recently (as in neighboring groups), the father's sister's children were "father" and "father's children" which have the normal reciprocal of "child" and other forces have worked to make the relationships equivalent but have not yet affected the terms. It is possible, however, that the rule of reciprocals is submerged there by other rules and a thorough study would make the historical explanation futile.

3. The rule of uniform siblings: If the male of a pair of siblings is called A, and the female is B, then whenever a man is called A, his sister must be called B.

Rarely broken, this rule has an exception in Fox, for example, where the sister of a "mother's brother" is always "mother's sister" except when she happens to be ego's own mother. Further, this rule must be modified to include differences of age.

4. The rule of uniform mates: If a husband is called A and his wife is called B, then the wife of any A must be B.

Besides minor exceptions like that in Fox, where one's own mother is called by a different term than the wife of any other "father," there are some important subjugations of this rule. Very often, the mother's brother is called, say, "uncle," and his
wife, say, "aunt," while the husband of the father's sister (who is also "aunt") is "brother-in-law." Variations of this kind occur chiefly in the mates of maternal uncles and paternal aunts. The reasons will be discussed later.

5. The rule of uniform ascent: If somebody whom ego calls A has parents whom ego calls B, then the parents of all who are called A are B.

This rule is almost as often submerged as followed. Very often, for example, the parents of people called "siblings" are alternatively "parents" and "uncles and aunts"; and in Fox, as in other tribes, the parents of grandchildren are either son and daughter or else nephew and niece. Yet the rule crops out in practice when nothing seriously interferes.

The rules are as purely psychological as anything in culture can be; they seem to be a striving towards logic. There is another group of what Kroeber called "principles" determining kinship systems; but they are rather to be considered as choices that a people make in their classifications of relatives and they are much more cultural in determination. Thus, people may or may not make distinctions on the basis of sex, or of age, or of generation; or they may or may not distinguish relatives before and after the connecting relative has died. These are descriptive principles, and, although they have been used to classify kinship systems, their usefulness in analysis is limited.

The whole matter of kinship systems is a problem of choices that people must make—choices somewhat limited by the rules listed and also by the biological facts by which they are confronted. There is a wide range of choices, and which are taken depends partly on a series of accidents, but partly also by somewhat general problems of adjustment of members of the biologically generated group to each other. These problems of
adjustment constantly recur, and account in large part for the
distributions of a few solutions. The necessity of accommod-
ation of individuals to each other is peculiarly social and
effectively keeps anthropology from being nothing more than psy-
chology. But the manner in which adjustments are made depends on
individual human nature, too. Finally, and as important in de-
termining means of accommodation as any, is the purely accidental
fact of the size of the group. The customs peculiar to primitive
peoples could never have originated if it were not for the fact
that, due to its nature, a small group of people is peculiarly
sensitive to the forces that will be described. Thus, in the for-
mation of kinship systems, accidents, psychological and social
influences, and a purely physical factor are all involved.

The kinds of forces that are involved in the making of
kinship systems cannot be understood unless it is remembered that
in a small society there is close and constant contact between
the members of a biologically generated group. In a society such
as ours, there are undoubted complications in the family of
parents and children; but in other smaller societies there are
tensions and conflicts with the uncles and aunts, too, and with
cousins. There is a chance in a primitive group that all people
who even know that they are related will sometime or other have
to settle the kind of relationship. All that is necessary to the
argument here, however, is that the family consisting of parents
and children, uncles and aunts, and grandparents and cousins
should have enough contact to make some accommodation necessary--
ot at some point in the dark historic past, but all the time,
with each new generation.

Given friction among people, some of them will solve the
problem, perhaps in various ways, and some solution will, in the
course of time, spread to other people in like circumstances, and will crystallize as a custom. In a small group, with the passage of time, an innovation in one generation can easily become the tradition of the next; that is what is meant, partly, by the "sensitivity" of a small group. Obviously, the innovation depends partly on the cultural forms already present, and nothing in this argument should be construed as a denial of that; but there are certain tendencies always cropping up, in any society at any time, that reinforce some of the customs and work to undermine and change others. These are the forces that will be considered now.4

For some reason, probably partly psychological in that there is something in common between offspring of the same parents, probably sociological in that siblings are little children in the same house to start with, have one economic life, and so on, a group of siblings tends to be considered a unit. But for like reasons, brothers, on the one hand, and sisters, on the other, are considered to be a closer unity than brothers and sisters together.5 This comes out in our own society, for example, in the fact that, while we have a term "brother" and a term "sister," we have none for "brother-and-sister," and in Fox society, for example, in that siblings of the same sex have one term and siblings of the opposite sex another term for each other.

When children grow up, therefore, they are taught to consider their mother and her sister as one, and their father and his brother as one.6 This is very apt to result in their considering

4It is not denied that, in some societies, any of these forces are submerged by cultural forms already present. That will be dealt with in the course of the argument.

5Redcliffe-Brown commonly uses the phrase "equivalence of brothers."

6And the mother's siblings different from the father's. Where these are not distinguished, differentiation on sex lines is week.
the father's brother as "father" and the mother's sister as "mother." Then, by the rule of uniform descent, there is a very strong tendency to consider their children as siblings. This tendency is not overpowering, however, because children are not apt to consider themselves siblings because they are children of people they call parents—they are siblings in their own right, so to speak. Therefore:

1. Due to the notion of equivalence of siblings of the same sex, there is a tendency to equate parents with their siblings of the same sex, and

2. if that is done, there is a further tendency to consider parallel cousins as brothers and sisters, but

3. if (1) is done, (2) need not follow, but it often does. Furthermore, it is unlikely that (2) will come without (1), but this may happen due to other reasons.

If parallel cousins are equated with siblings, the rule of uniform descent will be so enforced that it is almost certain that their offspring will be equated with one's sibling's offspring. Thus, the entire parallel lines are apt to be the same as one's own line. Meanwhile, due to the same forces carried to the next generation, the father's parallel cousins will be the same as the father's siblings (made almost certain by the reinforcing application of the rules of uniform siblings and of uniform reciprocals). By the same tokens, all collateral lines through siblings of the same sex will be the same as far as relationships are extended.

This merging of relatives has effects both linguistic and sociological. In effect, about half of one's biological group is set apart as parents, siblings, and children. Now there are many reasons why, in some places, the importance of the distinction of the sexes should become emphasized (usually economic); and the same causes may in some of these places give a conception of differential importance of the two sexes. Where this occurs, the importance of descent from the father or from the mother may be emphasized. When this conception comes in conjunction with the merging of relatives in the way described, two things seem to happen:
1. Everybody in the merged group except one of the parents and his or her siblings of the same sex (and reciprocally the same exceptions) is considered as forming one division. If the mother and her sisters are left out, the group is "patrilineal"; if the father and his brothers are left out, it is "matrilineal." Then all other relatives are in a second group. The two groups are called "moieties." These moieties must be exogamous if they are to keep this character. Since the conception of dominance of one line of descent is independent of the rules of kinship here given, it extends beyond any one family, and, no matter whether the dual division starts in one family by a conjunction with the kinship system, or whether it comes in separately, by intermarriage of the families it must, in any case, be tribe-wide. The kinship system does not bring on the moieties, nor vice-versa; they fit because both are partly determined by the same fundamental conceptions (equivalence and distinction of siblings and the sexes) and rules (uniformity of reciprocals, siblings, descent, mates, etc.).

2. Everybody in the merged group except one of the parents and his or her siblings of the same sex and their entire lines is considered as forming one division, but the other relatives need not be all in the same other division; instead, there are a number of groups, called "clans," matrilineal or patrilineal that extend through the tribe for the same reasons that moieties do.

This is not a theory of the origin of clans and moieties; how they originated is a matter left for other research. The important point here is that neither clans nor kinship systems are the cause of each other, even though they may reinforce each other and one of them in a specific case (who knows?) may go far toward determining the other. The theory that moieties in some way "cause" the classificatory kinship system described above is the notion that is being countered here by an alternative.

To go back now to the matter of kinship, the rules can be followed to some other relationships. By the rule of uniform mates, as well as that of uniform ascendants, the father's brother's wife is called mother, and the mother's sister's husband is considered a father in the general type of system described. In the same way, the mate of any sibling is sibling-in-law, and the mates of all called children are considered sons- and daughters-in-law. In the matter of what the sibling of a sibling-in-law should be considered, there is a conflict of rules:
By the rule of uniform siblings, they should be siblings-in-law; by the rule of mates, if this should be done, the kinship system would go on indefinitely from the mates of siblings of siblings-in-law to their siblings, and so on, so there is a tendency to drop the relationship altogether there; finally, there seems to be another minor rule heretofore unmentioned: that two people who call a third person the same thing should be siblings to each other. While this rule is usually submerged in the others, in this case it often becomes operative. In other words, the choice is so fine here that even in closely related tribes, one may call the siblings of siblings-in-law (and reciprocally) nothing at all, another may call them siblings-in-law, and still another may call them siblings—depending on equally fine circumstances in the rest of the system and the culture.

Meanwhile, for the same reasons that brothers are equated, and sisters are equated, brothers may share each other's wives, and/or sisters each other's husbands. For other reasons, this may or may not occur while the brothers or sisters are all living. If they are living, there comes "sororal polygyny" or "fraternal polyandry." If not, then there is the more widespread sororate and levirate. Now these institutions do not bring on the kinship terms, or vice versa. Conceptions and rules are again common to both of them. The father's brother is already "father" and the mother's sister is already "mother" when the marriage occurs. It would not be at all surprising if the levirate had some influence in shaping the fine point of sibling-in-law's sibling's terminology, however; for, if the levirate were very common, it would tend to turn the tide in favor of calling him or her "sibling-in-law" which he or she is after the levirate-sororate marriage. But, also, it would not be surprising if, where these relatives are called "siblings" the sororate and levirate would not be approved, since a relationship would have to be changed from "sibling" to "sibling-in-law"—a real revolution in many cases (as among the Fox where, however, the siblings of siblings-in-law are not considered relatives and the sororate-levirate is allowed).

It may be argued that the matter is being simplified here in that with the sororate-levirate practices, parents' siblings-of-same-sex are called not "father" and "mother" often, but, rather, "stepfather" and "stepmother" (and the reciprocals correspondingly), apparently for no purpose other than to anticipate the coming marriage. But the translation of the native terms into "stepfather" and "stepmother" is unjustified; all that can be said is that the lineal relatives are set off from the collateral by
perhaps, a prefix. Fox thus sets off the mother's sister from the mother by a sort of diminutive, yet it does not mean "stepmother," although among other uses, the term is applied to a stepmother.

The difficult cross-lines may now be considered. A corollary to the equation of siblings of the same sex is the separation of siblings of opposite sex. When one is considering a group of siblings who are very young, the distinction is not so often made; thus, grandchildren are very often thought of as equivalent, regardless of sex; where they are closer to one's own age (in other words, where they and ego are both normally adults at some time) the distinction is more apt to be made, as, for example, between son and daughter; where they are normally older, of generations above, the distinction between the sexes is almost always made. Thus, the father and his sister are clearly distinguished, as are the mother and her brother. It is with the father's sister and the mother's brother and their lines under these circumstances that the following paragraphs are concerned.

There is a very strong tendency to equate the cross-lines. The reason for this is not difficult to see, provided one thinks of the cross-lines as reciprocal. The common type of kinship chart in use—the "ego" chart—sets the cross-lines on different sides of the paper; and people who work with the charts generally think in the same manner. There is no such thing as a father's sister's son on the one hand and a mother's brother's son on the other; rather, if A is father's sister's son to B, then B is mother's brother's son to A, just as parallel cousins are siblings to each other. So viewed, the merging of the cross-lines is simply the adoption of reciprocal terminology and behavior. The reason why the relationship should be reciprocal (i.e., they call each other the same thing and have no differential factors in their mutual behavior) is that there is another rule that applies
not only to kinship but probably to all human relationships: when there is no reason for the contrary, people treat each other mutually the same. Now, where nothing interferes, the cross-cousins treat each other the same (excepting differences in sex).

There is another important tendency in kinship systems; that people who behave toward each other the same will call each other the same term. In some tribes, this is done rather thoroughly; but in others, for example the Fox, there may be a uniform pattern of behavior between people who call each other different things, but this is because another notion interferes—and that is that normal age difference (amounting to generation difference) should be noted by different terms even if not in behavior. But since cross-cousins are of the same generation and usually about the same age, no interference is caused in their case. The Fox, of course, do not use reciprocal terms between cross-cousins; it will be seen, however, that cross-cousins are in effect equated anyway.

Now, by the rule of uniform ascent, coupled with that of uniform mates, if the cross-cousins are equated, so must be their parents. Actually, in cases where the cross-cousins are merged so are their parents, so that the father's sister's husband is considered a mother's brother, and the mother's brother's wife is considered a father's sister. The pairs of cross-aunts and cross-uncles and their mates become the same, their descendants are the same, and the cross-lines are equated.

It happens that in many systems the cross-lines are merged with the parallel lines; where this occurs there is often no distinction of parent's siblings except as to age; then, of course, the rules of uniform descent are followed. Sometimes the cross-lines are merged with parallel lines except in the case of cross-aunts and cross-uncles. The rules of descent and/or ascent are here submerged by two tendencies which are always at work when there is only a weak differentiation of male and female lines (which may be enough, however, to help in the formation of clans): one is to equate all members of the same generation, and the other is to differentiate according to sex. Usually, one of the tendencies becomes dominant, but anomalies occur. It is to be noticed that in all cases where this occurs generation lines are strictly kept, on the one hand, and sex differentiation (between mother's brother and father's sister) is always made, on the other.

Certain peculiar variations in the cross-cousin lines (all of them cannot be dealt with here)—such as the Crow and Omaha types—require that the rules and general tendencies in kinship be
augmented by observation of social relations generally if they are to be explained. It is for this reason that kinship terminology cannot be studied without the patterns of behavior of which they are a part. Kinship systems are built out of the fabric of culture as a whole, and, while there are such psychological rules that have been mentioned, yet these rules are always conditioned by other factors—not necessarily by social institutions such as clans or marriage forms, but by fundamental social conditions that influence both kinship relations and social institutions.

One of the important facts of social life (to be explained by psychologists, sociologists or who can?) is that in the immediate family of parents and children there is a shame relationship; all over the world, it seems, there are inhibitions of certain activities and conversation (notably sexual) among the members of the group, and especially between persons of opposite sex. Now this "bashful" relationship usually extends to other relatives as well, although to which ones is a matter connected with the kinship system and social institutions. Among the Fox, it extends to all blood relatives, and has been described in Part II. In other places it may extend throughout a clan, and in still others to parallel but not cross lines. Now, even though in a few places this shame relationship (often called "respect" by the Fox Indians) is not extended to the mother's brother and the father's sister (judging by the fact that these are sometimes marriageable relatives), there is some reason to believe that fundamentally it extends always to the parents' siblings at least. The exceptional cases, it will be seen, are secondary developments based on rules already mentioned.

Probably connected with this general shame relationship is a special respect of a brother for his sister (as well as mother);
this may be independent, psychologically, of the shame relationship, but it is, nevertheless, a fact that a man in most societies has a wholesome respect for his sister that amounts in some cases almost to subservience. This may, in fact, be one of the elements that enters into the formation of matrilineal institutions (although men are not actually subservient to women—say, their wives). At the same time, due to the natural condition engendered by biological generation, a child respects its parents and obeys them (they are mature when he is young and helpless). There may be a secondary substitution of the mother's brother for the father in the matter of obedience, but this must be considered almost like adoption and is beside the point here.

The mother's brother and sister's son have a unique relationship: the child respects his father and his father's brother, as well as his mother and mother's sister; but for the reasons already given, the mother's brother cannot be conceptualized in a great many societies as equivalent to the father. There is a problem as to what kind of relationship to establish. If there is the female dominance that helps to make matrilineal clans, he, as the mother's brother, will be raised in respect, which fits well with the notion of "clan father" that often appears in such societies. If there is no female dominance, something else must be done. Looking at the relationship from the mother's brother's point of view: out of respect for his sister he will want to respect her child. From the child's point of view: the mother's brother is an older man and should be respected, especially since he is closely connected with the mother.

But what happens when each of two people respect each other? Such relationships are apt to be formal and uneasy. And, in the case of such uneasy relationships, they sometimes turn
into avoidance. And avoidance may be actual or it may be accomplished simply by avoiding issues—establishing a joking relationship. Sometimes these things happen, and the tension is universal enough in the group to crystallize such joking relationships into customs. Even if nothing does crystallize, the relationship is apt to remain a peculiar one, and that is the important point.

The father's sister is also in a peculiar position. To the woman, her brother's child is somebody very close, yet, due to the strain between her and her brother, far apart. It is difficult to be intimate in her brother's household. In practice, the relationship becomes like that of a sister. This is aided by the rule propounded above that two people who both consider a third person A tend to consider each other as siblings. In some places this woman is even called a sister by her brother's children. But other things can happen as well. The child respects its father, who respects this woman, and it is particularly difficult to establish an intimate relationship. Thus, avoidance is often the result, and it, too (as among the Fox), may take the form of a joking relationship. But, again, the fact that this is, in any case, a peculiar relationship is the important point, for none of these other results must come. The society for other reasons may not be susceptible to these particular accidents, or else these relatives may simply "muddle along." But where there is tension accidents are apt to occur and to be taken up and the results made permanent.

What sort of relationship can be established between cross-cousins, each of whom has the peculiar relationship to the other's parent? Possibly nothing special, as has been said: they may consider each other as siblings or as cousins. But cross-cousins may find themselves taking cognizance of the
peculiarity of their relationship. For example, if people joke freely with their mother's brother, how can they, at the same time, carry on a serious relationship with his son? Some peoples manage, but others do not. The rule, however, seems to be this: if there is a strong crystallization of the behavior between uncles-aunts and their nephews-nieces, the tendency is to do something about the cross-cousins. The next rule seems to be this: if the relationship of ego to the mother's brother and the father's sister follows the same pattern, then the children will have a mutual relationship to each other, most likely of the same kind as in the nepotic relationships, but not necessarily. (Thus, in Fox, where there is joking between children and their mother's brother and father's sister both, the cross-cousins have a reciprocally balanced relationship between each other—and it, too, is a joking relationship.)

If the relationship to the mother's brother and the father's sister is different, however, then the relationship of the cross-cousins will be an unbalanced one (as, for example, where the mother's brother's children respect and obey the father's sister's children among the Hopi), along the pattern of the nepotic.

Now there is the rule that if you behave towards A and B in the same way, there is a tendency to consider them the same in all respects and apply the same term to both. But, if this rule should be carried out, and the mother's brother's son should be called mother's brother, and the father's sister's son should be called mother's brother as well (the male equivalent of father's sister), then the important rule of the uniformity of reciprocals is broken. Two people cannot consider each other mother's brother when the normal reciprocal of mother's brother is "sister's son" (male speaking). So this compromise is most often
the result: that the one that has the strongest, most important
and definite relationship (between mother's brother and father's
sister) is carried down a generation, and the reciprocal is nor-
mal. That is the reason why (1) Crow types and Omaha types are
found side by side, (2) why they are found with matriliney and pa-
triliney respectively, and (3) why there are such peculiar varia-
tions as that of the Northern Wintun of California.

1. Because the same general conditions produce both, but
especially where there are no crystallized clans (as in California),
the mother's brother's relationship or the father's sister's rela-
tionship may be stronger in one tribe than in a neighboring tribe
(since it is a fine point) resulting in the seemingly far different
systems.

2. The Crow type is usually found with matriliney partly
because the father's sister is a more equivocal relationship (thus
stronger in the sense of more peculiar) than the mother's brother
who is a sort of substitute father; the Omaha type, on the other
hand, is usually found with patriliney partly because here the
father's sister has a less equivocal relationship (she is especial-
ly highly respected as the closest older women of the clan) than
the mother's brother.

3. Since a choice is necessary between carrying down the
mother's brother's or the father's sister's line, it may be de-
cided by some alternative method such as the Northern Wintun have:
on the criterion of the age of the man and his sister.

By the rule of uniform siblings, where the mother's
brother's son is "mother's brother," the mother's brother's daugh-
ter must be the same as "mother's sister," usually "mother." The
reciprocals must be, likewise, "sister's children" (male speaking)
and "children" (female speaking). By the rule of uniform
descent, the lines must be continued this way as far as relationships are carried. Thus, there is the typical Omaha system. On the other hand, in the same way, where the father's sister's daughter is "father's sister," her son must be "father" and the reciprocals must be "brother's children" (female speaking) and "children" (male speaking). Likewise, the system is carried on indefinitely and the typical Crow type is formed.

Now it may very well be argued that for no reason the F Sis D and the M B S are here taken as the basic terms instead of the F Sis S (called F) and the M B D (called M). Most theories have been made on the other basis. But it is obvious that the distinguishing character of the Omaha type is the grouping in the male line, and of the Crow type in the female line. To use the M B D and the F Sis S as vital elements in the theory requires a roundabout explanation of the distinguishing characters. The reason the M B D and the F Sis S have been important is because they have fit the peculiar marriages that are often found. But, as will be seen, the marriages are secondary.

Yet the F Sis S and the M B D terminology must be consistent with other important elements in the social organization, or the rule of uniform siblings would be abrogated or the whole system would not be consistent. These usages are indeed consistent with matrilineal clans and patrilineal clans, however. In a matrilineal society all of the relatives of the father's clan are called "father" and "father's sister" and this works in with the clan forms; correspondingly, the Omaha type fits patrilineal clans. But the kinship usages are not the result of the clans (or of the marriage forms either) simply because they work with them; both, as has been said so often before, are equally results of a group of rules and social and psychological tendencies.

It has been said that where the cross-lines are merged, the mother's brother's wife and the father's sister's husband are considered as "father's sister" and "mother's brother" respectively. Now, very often in those cases, and oftener in cases where the Omaha-Crow feature is involved, the mates of these uncles and aunts are sister-in-law or brother-in-law or something like it. Why is that?

With the mother's brother and the father's sister peculiar relatives, and their children also peculiar, what about the mother of the children? She becomes a peculiar relative, too, but with this difference: she is not a blood relative (where there is a cross-cousin marriage and these spouses of aunts and uncles are
actually one's mother's brother and father's sister, no problem of special terminology arises). Not being a blood relative, none of the inhibitions are necessary, and, if there is any sort of question of how they should be treated, it will very likely be settled by recourse to very free behavior. Thus, if there is joking with the mother's brother, joking with his wife would be extreme; if there is joking with the father's sister, joking with her husband would be extreme. But, joking or no joking, there would be a strong tendency to treat the spouses differently from the uncle and aunt. Immediately there is a violation of one of the rules (that people treated differently should be called different terms) if there is a force demanding that they be called father's sister and mother's brother. With this conflict, one of the tendencies usually wins, depending on circumstances. In the Omaha type the father's sister's husband usually is considered a brother-in-law, since there is here a reinforcing reason for the change: the father's sister's children are called the same as one's own sister's children, so their father (by the rule of uniform ascent) should be called the same as the father of any sister's child, i.e., brother-in-law. In the same way, in the Crow type, where the mother's brother's children are called the same as one's own children, the mother's brother's wife is often called sister-in-law.

There are many variations of this, however. In the Omaha type the logic may extend from the mother's brother's children by the rule of uniform ascent to the mother's brother's children's mother (the M B W) and she may be called, therefore, grandmother. This happens occasionally. Among the Fox there is a strong tendency to call the M B W sister-in-law, partly because the relationship between cross-cousins is balanced, and, therefore, there is a feeling for symmetry of each other's nepotic spouses; partly because the peculiar relation to the mother's brother is carried to his wife for the same reasons but without the restraint reserved for a relative and so she is teased after the fashion of a sister-in-law. Today, although the term is formally "father's
sister," the prefix "joking" is usually attached, and in conversa-
tion she is often referred to as "sister-in-law."

Since, in the Omaha type, the F S H is so often called
brother-in-law, and, since in most cases a woman can marry any-
body whom she calls brother-in-law (in fact, this is a preferred
marriage), and, since this is the closest brother-in-law besides
her husband's brothers and sister's husbands, it is not surprising
that marriage with the F S H (usually stated as marriage with the
wife's brother's daughter) often goes along with it. Likewise,
since, in the Crow type, for reasons stated, the mother's
brother's wife is called sister-in-law, it is not uncommon or sur-
prising to find that marriage with her is not only permitted but
highly approved in some cases (she is called "wife" in some parts
of Melanesia instead of "sister-in-law"). But, in neither case
is it possible to explain the entire kinship systems on the basis
of such marriages; it has rather been shown how the marriage and
the kinship system both have a complex series of common causes.

It is possible that any of the particular rules and ten-
dencies and the features of social organization in which they
have here been purported to result are unsound. The necessity for
further research along these lines is obvious; only a few rules
and minor forces among thousands have been pointed out. But the
research will have to be field research, for the literature
gathered for other purposes often fails to reveal what it is
necessary to know. If the ethnologist is fortunate enough to find
crucial instances in the culture in which he is working, he can
go a long way toward solving many problems.

Meanwhile, the general method of explanation of primitive
social organization that has been propounded here--using the
example of kinship, chiefly, and of the Omaha and Crow types, spe-
cifically--can be useful in interpreting the data of Fox social
organization that has been presented. No history, as such, for the pox is available; but one can see, even today, the psychological and social forces—as well as the condition that allows for the crystallization of accidental changes—that might well have developed the kinship system as it is found today.

The way is pointed out for the solution of the general problems posed—how it happens that the phenomena of social organization are where they are; not, again, by means of history (which is impossible) but by determining the general forces involved in the formation of social phenomena and piecing them together into a workable and consistent pattern. It will never be possible to say that "just this and that" happened in California; but California can rather furnish data for discovering the general pattern and for testing the rules set up, and, after all, science is, in some respects, more important than California.
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APPENDIX I

THE FIELD TRIP TO THE FOX INDIANS

Sponsored by the Department of Anthropology of the University of Chicago, the writer spent ten weeks among the Fox Indians near Tama, Iowa, during the summer of 1932, and another month during the summer of 1934. In the intervening summer, also under the sponsorship of the University, kinship systems were collected from the Ojibwa of Manitoulin Island, Baraga (Michigan), Odenah, Court d'Oreilles, and Lao du Flambeau (Wisconsin), from the Potawottamie near Wabeno and Soperton (Wisconsin), and from the Menomini in their Reservation near Shawano, Wisconsin. More than a month was spent with the Menomini.

It was impossible to do ideal ethnography among the Fox because it was impracticable to try to learn the language or to "live the life." Since, however, the problem was to get social organization chiefly, and since, moreover, there is a small concentrated population, it was found that an elaboration of the genealogical and the schedule methods would be the next best thing.

The attempt was made to determine all pertinent facts about all the Indians living on the reservation, to draw conclusions directly from these facts and to supplement them with statements of informants. Genealogies of practically every Indian were taken; these were checked against each other and combined. They were, furthermore, checked against a few genealogies that William Jones took about thirty years before and which were kindly
furnished to the writer by Mrs.Welpley, who worked them out from Jones' notes. In addition a check was made against a family census enumeration made in 1905 by Duren Ward. While there are without doubt a few inaccuracies still remaining, the genealogies are on the whole worked out well enough to be used.

The clan to which each name in the genealogies belongs was noted, so that not only can the inherited clan be determined, but also in each case the clan into which the individual was named. For all living people, the translation of the Indian names was obtained also, and in cases where they were named from other than the father's clan, the circumstances, if known, were recorded.

A map of the reservation was made, with each household marked; then a separate record of each household was kept, with all the members listed and note made of how they are related to each other; on the household sheets was kept the record of the dual-division membership. Each of the households bears a number, and these appear on the genealogies over the symbol for each living person (those living are heavily scored). In this way, it was determined what relationship the family connections bear to the household groupings.

On the genealogies, of course, a great number of marriages are recorded. To check these, and also to obtain additional information concerning them, a record of as many marriages as were remembered was taken, with information as to the clan of each of the parties and their parents, the tribe of each (tribal intermarriage has occurred on and off), the relationship of the two parties to each other, if any; the relationship of the several mates of each person to each other, if any; the number of children
born to the couple while married, the number that were living when the marriage was dissolved and what became of them; how the marriage was dissolved (death of husband, or of wife, or by divorce). All the marriages (even those that lasted for a few months and amounted to "just living together") that have been participated in by living Indians, and that are considered marriages by the natives, were recorded, as well as many marriages the parties to which are now both dead. The object was to get as many cases as possible.

Records were taken of membership, active and nominal both, in the various societies revolving about the sacred packs, thus determining the exact membership of the so-called clans; in addition membership in other societies, and in secular clubs such as the band and the baseball team. On the genealogies were recorded the leading adherents to the two factions, so that it is possible to determine just how they follow family and clan lines. The attempt was made, in short, to determine the make-up of every social group in the tribe, on the one hand, and the group activities of every individual on the other.

This was all done by means of filling out schedules which were made up after at least several weeks in the field, after some knowledge of the culture was obtained. In some cases it was found to be possible to get the questions answered by half a dozen individuals who knew facts about everybody else. In other cases a thorough canvassing was necessary. In all cases there were ample checks, facilitated by thorough cross-indexing of every member of the tribe (and all the deceased ones that appeared in the records) in all their activities and connections.

Meanwhile, the kinship terminology was obtained from some
twenty different informants. In some cases there was disagree-
ment, and the persons who disagreed were in several cases brought
together to settle the difference. In the end, when the theory
of the system's logic was worked out, mistakes could be corrected
easily and the reason for the error easily seen. Errors occurred
chiefly in the descendants of the second ascendant generation when
the rule of reciprocals was neglected. There is no doubt from
the genealogies that the kinship system as finally recorded is
the one in use; in every case where a man was not certain of what
to call a relative it was because he had no such relative. A few
people had the theory of the system, but not many; yet the theory
is clear, and it invariably works out in practice.

Conventional patterns of behavior could be obtained only
by the informant method. Once the patterns were known, there was
ample opportunity for seeing how they work out in practice. A
practice was made of noting what happened when any two people met,
or when joking occurred at community gatherings; then the rela-
tionship of the people involved was traced through the genealogies.
In this way the few observations that could be made without know-
ledge of the language were made to serve in substantiating the
statements of informants (which, however, were in general agree-
ment anyway).

A number of gens festivals were witnessed, and, of course,
what was seen was made meaningful chiefly by Michelson's descrip-
tions of them. An adoption ceremony was also witnessed, and
since the death had occurred since the last field trip, the de-
ceased, his family, and the adopted person were all well known to
the writer. Only one funeral was witnessed. In all, dependence
was chiefly on factual data gathered from all members of the tribe.
rather than on participation in the culture; but there is no feel-
ing of doubt about anything worked out from the schedules them-
selves or from the statements of a great many informants.

It seems possible that the Fox Indians may some day fur-
nish a classic study of acculturation. They have been observed
by Dr. Michelson over a period of twenty years, and he has in-
formed the writer that he intends to publish some of his observa-
tions of the changes that have occurred. Now a large body of
factual material has been collected bearing on marriage, family,
and social life. Ten years from now conditions will have changed;
and if another investigator, armed with the material now at hand--
specific material dealing with names and dates--will return to the
scene to see what has happened in the interim, and the apparent
reasons for it, conclusions of great general value might be drawn.
For this reason, the genealogies, schedules, and notes of the
writer's field trips will be kept in the files of the Department
of Anthropology at the University of Chicago.
APPENDIX II

THE RECENT HISTORY OF THE FOX INDIANS

The early history of the Fox is closely linked with that of the Sac to whom they are closely related in language and culture. Although often allied, the earliest historical records show that they were distinct nations, and although in the government records they are always considered together as the "Sac and Fox," they have always considered themselves as separate tribes.

In the middle of the seventeenth century, when the historical records open, they were both in the vicinity of Green Bay, and both were hostile to the French missionaries and traders, exacting tribute where they could and, in general, causing the white settlers considerable trouble. The French succeeded in pacifying the Ojibwa of the region, but the Sac and Fox were stubborn in their opposition. The history of these tribes for the next century was one of continual fighting with the French and their Indian allies. The Sac for a time made their peace with the French, and the Fox traded furs through them; but when, about 1665, the Fox engaged in a war with the French a number of Sac aided them clandestinely, and the French finally found that there was nothing to do but exterminate them. According to the reports of the French officers, they succeeded in doing so; yet a century later both tribes were found to be flourishing in southern Wisconsin--the Sac in what is now Sauk County, and the Fox on the other side of the Wisconsin River in what is now Iowa.
County.  

In the meantime, there was no dearth of Indian wars. The Sau and the Fox, in alliance with some Ottawa, Pottawottamie, and Hurons, fought the Sioux in 1671; a century later, allied with the Sioux, they were almost annihilated by the Chippewa. After that they warred consistently (reports of their annihilation to the contrary notwithstanding) against the Illinois, the Osage, the Pawnee, and began a serious war against the Sioux in 1822 which was interrupted by the General Council at Prairie du Chien in 1825 and only completed after the Blackhawk War.  

By this time, of course, the French had been supplanted by the British, and the British by the Americans. But the Fox were hardly more kindly disposed towards one group of whites than towards another. They were always trouble makers, and in the War of 1812, for example, they sided with the British against the United States. They had meanwhile been pushed to the Mississippi and beyond, and at the turn of the century they apparently had their villages on the Iowa River.  

In 1804 they moved eastward.

1See J. N. B. Hewitt's article on Sauk (in Handbook of the American Indians, BAE Bulletin 30, pp. 471-80); also Thomas' article on Fox, ibid.; also V. S. Pease, The Indians of Sauk County, Wisconsin Historical Society (Madison).

2This council is still remembered by Indians whose grandparents attended.

3The War Chief gens still has a British flag as one of its sacred packs. McKenney and Hall say that one group of Fox helped the Americans and later went up the Missouri to La Platte, not joining the main group again (History of the Indian Tribes of North America [Philadelphia, 1837], I, 135). The group they refer to is called "The Sau and Fox of the Missouri" in government records as opposed to the Sau and Fox of the Mississippi, but, in recent times, all the members of this group seem to have been Sau, not Fox. McKenney and Hall were probably in error.

4Interesting because this is the present site of the Fox; today they consider it their "ancient home."
again and built their villages at the junction of the Mississippi and the Rock rivers. During the following three decades, when their recent history really begins, the Sac and Fox had their permanent villages in this vicinity, and went into Illinois and Wisconsin, as well as westward as far as the Missouri chiefly during the winter hunting season. The tribes were generally distinct, but the Government treated them as Sac and Fox and had one representative for both.

Much has been written of the Blackhawk War of 1832. Although the fates of both the Sac and the Fox were dependent upon its outcome, the chief actors in the war were Sac and not Foxes. This is not the place to recount the history of the war or to discuss the causes, except to say that fundamentally the war was caused by the disinclination of the Indians to "give up Illinois" and the insistence of the United States that they move permanently across the Mississippi. The result of the war was a treaty by which the Sac and Fox agreed to cede all rights to land east of the River in exchange for a sum that would yield perpetual annuities. In the next few years, the Sac and Fox settled their score with the Sioux, and since then the hatchet has been effectively buried.

A fair picture of Fox culture during this early period can be gleaned from the literature. Father Allouez, writing in the middle of the seventeenth century, gives what must be an accurate general picture of Fox life:

[The Fox are] a populous tribe, of about a thousand men bearing arms, and given to hunting and warfare. They have fields of Indian corn, and live in a country offering excellent facilities for the hunting of the wildcat, stag, wild ox, and beaver. Canoes they do not use, but commonly make their journeys by land, bearing their packages and their
game on their shoulders.  

They live by hunting during the winter, returning to their cabins toward its close, and living there on Indian corn that they had laid away the previous autumn; they season it with fish. In the midst of their clearings they have a fort, where their cabins of heavy bark are situated, for resisting all sorts of attacks. On their journeys they make themselves cabins with mats.  

At the time Father Allouez visited them, the Indians' civil and economic life was quite free of foreign influence; but by the time Major Marston wrote, a hundred and fifty years later, this was hardly the case. At this time they still led their dual life of farming in the summer time and hunting in winter, but the winter hunt had far different economic value. Although some changes must have accompanied the advent of money and the goods of civilization, there do not seem to have been any deep incursions into the social life. Marston described the summer life especially, telling how, when the Indians returned to their villages in April, they put their lodges in order and prepared the soil with hoes. The women did the agriculture, and when, in June, most of the men left to hunt, they spent their time making mats and bags with the rushes and bark that the remainder of the men helped to collect. Marston wrote that the Sae and Fox cultivated three hundred acres and raised, in one year, seven to eight thousand bushels of corn, as well as beans, pumpkins, melons, etc. After the harvest, each family took five bushels for use during the winter and buried the remainder for use during the following spring and summer. 

5 Jesuit Relations, LI, 43.  
6 Ibid., LIV, 223-24.  
7 Letter of Major Marston to Rev. Dr. Morse (in E.H.Blair, Indian Tribes of the Upper Mississippi and Great Lakes Region [Cleveland, 1918]).
Several years later, Thomas Forsythe observed that in the middle of September all the Indians began to move from their villages for the annual winter hunt. Some with horses went to the headwaters of the Iowa and Des Moines rivers overland; others, without, by canoe down the Mississippi to the mouths of these rivers and then up to the same places. Some Indians with enough horses to transport their families went beyond the Missouri into Kansas. When winter set in, they stopped their deer hunting and formed into "grand encampments to pass the remainder of the winter or severe weather. On opening of the spring those that have traps go to hunting beaver, others to hunt bear, and they generally finish their hunt about the 10th of April." 8

During these years the new economic order was apparently profiting the Indians; Marston gives the proceeds of one winter's hunt as

- 980 packs, including
- 2760 beaver skins
- 922 otter
- 13440 raccoon
- 12900 muskrat
- 500 mink
- 200 wildcat
- 680 bear
- 26680 deer skins, a total of 60,082 pelts with a value at that time of $58,800. Besides, they collected
- 286,800 pounds of deer tallow
- 3,000 pounds of feathers, and
- 1,000 pounds of beeswax.

Considering that the population of the Sac and the Fox together was probably no more than about four thousand, and, to judge from later figures, more likely much less, this indicates a considerable industry.

8 Thomas Forsythe, An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Sauk and Fox Nations of Indian Tradition (in Blair, op.cit.)
Describing the houses, Forsythe says:

The Indians have only one way of building their bark huts or summer residences, they are built in the form of an oblong, a bench on each side of the long sides about three feet high and four feet wide, parallel to each other, a door at each end, and a passage through the center of about six feet wide, some of these huts, are fifty or sixty feet long and capable of lodging fifty or sixty persons.

He describes the winter lodge as being made by driving long poles in the ground in two rows, bending the tops so they overlap, then covering with mats or rushes and suspending a bear skin over the door.

It appears that in those days the division of labor was rather strict. The man hunted, bought kettles, axes, and hoes, made canoes, paddles, hoes, and saddles, and helped in the canoeing, in hunting, and in saddling and driving the horses. The woman skinned the animals, prepared the skins, cooked, made camp, cut and carried wood, made the fires, made moccasins and leggings, planted, hoed, and gathered the corn and other crops, and did "all the drudgery."

It is a maxim among the Indians that everything belongs to the woman or women except the Indian's hunting or war implements, even the game, the Indian brings home on his back.... the husband is master, the wife the slave, but it is in most cases voluntary slavery....

The Indians "felt always at a loss without corn, even in the midst of meat." There were few animals that an Indian would not eat, but he preferred venison and bear meat, and these were the most common. Besides garden crops, wild potatoes, swan-root,

---

9 Ibid., p. 227. A very few such houses still remain among the Indians; the very large ones described were probably used in gens festivals. The winter houses, round rather than long, and often covered with bark instead of reeds, are more common today.

10 Ibid., p. 218.

11 Ibid., p. 229. Agriculture cannot be considered a mere side line.
and wild rice were common. Fish was eaten only when necessary. Food was always boiled, and a kettle was kept on the fire so that members of the family could eat at any time of the day.

Marston describes an Indian family as consisting of from five to ten persons, his wife, children, children-in-law, and grandchildren, all of whom look to its head for their supplies; and the whole of the proceeds of the hunt goes into one common stock, which is disposed of by him for the benefit of the whole. 12

The Sauk and Fox were apparently always friendly toward each other, but except when there was a temporary alliance of some sort, each was inimical to every other tribe. War was, therefore, very important. There were apparently two kinds of wars; one type, in which the entire group of warriors engaged after a formal council meeting, may be called "national war." It must be about this kind of war that Forsythe remarked that he never had heard of peace being made between two warring tribes unless the Government forced it, "for when war commenced, it always led to the final extermination of one or the other of the parties." 13 The other type of war consisted of small skirmishes by small war parties, for revenge or honor.

The revenge motive is illustrated by Allouez' story. A few days before he had arrived at a Fox village, some Iroquois had descended upon the village when only a few men were about and had killed and captured some women and children. The Fox "captain"

12Letter to Rev. Dr. Morse, ibid., p. 176. If he had mentioned which children-in-law were included, a number of problems would be simplified. From knowledge of the present culture, one must assume that most probably he meant both sons-in-law and daughters-in-law, in some cases one and in other cases the other, or both. The Fox were certainly not strictly matri- or patrilocal; most probably there was alternation during the first years of married life.

13Forsythe, ibid., p. 205. In the next breath, Forsythe tells how he induced the Sauk and Fox to make peace with the Oto and Maha.
asked the missionary to stay near them and console them, as well as teach them so that they could get their wives back and have peace. But,

in the evening four Savages, of the Nation of the Oumamis (Fox), arrived from a place two days journey hence, bringing three Iroquois scalps and a half-smashed arm, to console the relatives of those whom the Iroquois had killed a short time before.\textsuperscript{14}

The glory motive is exemplified in McKenney and Hall's description of the origin of a Buffalo head-dress that a Fox brave wore on a trip to Washington:

It seems that on a certain occasion, when some skirmishing was going on between these hostile tribes, Kishekosh (the Fox brave), with a single companion, charged suddenly upon the Sioux, rushed into their ranks, killed several of their warriors, and retreated in safety, bringing off as a trophy this buffalo head, which Kishekosh tore from the person of one of the slain.\textsuperscript{15}

The dual division played an important part in wartime; the ki'ko painted themselves white, the to'ken black, each had a war chief and when the party returned, each division compared the number of trophies that had been taken. Competition was apparently keen.\textsuperscript{16} Preparation for war was, nevertheless, by no means hurried.

One or more Indians of the same nation and village may at the same time fast, pray, consult their Manitou or Supernatural Agents about going to war. The dreams they have during their fasting, praying, etc. determine everything, as they always relate in public the purport of their lucky dreams to encourage the young Indians to join them. Those Indians who prepare for war, etc., may be any common Indian in the nation, and if the warriors believe in his dream, etc., he is never at a loss for followers, that is to say, after a partisan is done fasting, and praying to the great spirit, and that he continues to have lucky dreams, he makes himself a lodge detached from

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14}Jesuit Relations, LIV, 227.
\item \textsuperscript{15}The History of the Indian Tribes of North America, II, 49.
\item \textsuperscript{16}Ibid., II, 68-69; Marston, op. cit., p. 156.
\end{itemize}
the village, where he has tobacco prepared, and in this lodge a belt of blue wampum painted red with vermillion, or a strip of scarlet cloth hanging up in his lodge, and each warrior who enters the lodge smokes of the partisan's tobacco and draws the wampum or scarlet cloth through his hands, as much as to say, he is enlisted in his service. If a nation of Indians or a village are likely to be attacked, everyone turns out for the general defense.17

An Indian intending to go to war will commence by blacking his face, permitting his hair to grow long, and neglecting his personal appearance, and also, by frequent fastings, sometimes for two or three days together, and refraining from all intercourse with the other sex; if his dreams are favorable he thinks the Great Spirit will give him success; he then makes a feast, generally of dog's meat (it being the greatest sacrifice that he can make to part with a dog); when all those who feel inclined will attend the feast; after this is concluded they immediately set off on their expedition.18

Sometimes, if there were unfavorable omens, the party returned without meeting the enemy. But if they were successful, they sent messengers ahead to inform the village of the time of their return so that preparations for them could be made. The women dressed up and, carrying trinkets and blankets, went to meet the warriors.

The whole party then paint themselves and approach the village with the scalps stretched on small hoops and suspended to long poles or sticks, dancing, singing, and beating the drum, in this manner they enter the village. The chiefs in council then determine whether they shall dance the scalps (as they term it) or not; if this is permitted, the time is fixed by them, when the ceremony shall commence, and when it shall end. In these dances the women join the successful warriors. I have seen myself more than a hundred of them dancing at once, all painted and clad in their most gaudy attire.19

Prisoners of war were kept in the village (except that elderly ones were killed on the way home) according to Forsythe.

Young persons taken in war are generally adopted into the family of one of the slain. Other prisoners are bought and sold as such; but if, after having gained the confidence of their masters, they choose to go to war, and kill an enemy of

17 Forsythe, op. cit.
19 Ibid.
the nation, they become free, and are entitled to all the rights of a native. The women taken in war are received into the families of those who capture them, either as wives or servants, and their offspring become members of the tribe.20

Although Forsythe and McKenney and Hall agree on the general point, the whole matter of prisoners was probably misunderstood. It is doubtful if the Fox ever had an institution of slavery; and, for that matter, of such wholesale adoption into the tribe.21

The tribal chieftainship was hereditary in a division of the Bear gens; the chief might often have had great influence, but the office itself carried little power. It was the tribal council which had the real authority. If the old people of the two families involved in a dispute could not settle it, the chief stepped in; but social control generally was exercised largely by public opinion and "fear of punishment from evil spirits." Even the prestige of the chief's office does not seem to have been great.

The Sauk Indians pay great respect to their chiefs when assembled in council, but the Fox Indians are quite the contrary, they pay no respect to their chiefs at any time, except necessity compels them, but as there is so much equality among all Indians, the chiefs seldom dare insult a private individual.22

The gentes as listed by Marston and Forsythe were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gentes</th>
<th>Marston</th>
<th>Forsythe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>Bear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20McKenney and Hall, The History of the Indian Tribes of North America, p. 70.

21The Indians today say that in the old days there was a definite belief that to have sexual relations with a member of another tribe (beside the Sauk) would bring death within a year. Although this belief would not necessarily have deterred the formation of marital alliances, it would appear that they were at least frowned upon.

22Forsythe, op. cit., p. 226.

23Marston, op. cit., p. 163.

24Forsythe, op. cit.
Besides these lists of clans, inaccurate pictures of the dual division, and some discussion of married life and adultery, there is little that one can learn about the social organization of a century ago. One point of interest is, however, that apparently the Sauk or the Fox, or both, had the Medicine Society then, although it has disappeared among the Fox today and for as far back as anybody can remember. Forsythe wrote that:

There is a particular society....the particulars of which I understand is never divulged by any of the society. They hold their meetings in secret, and whatever passes among them at their meetings, is never spoken of by any of them elsewhere, this society is composed of some of the best and most sensible men of the two nations....The Indians of this society are called Great Medicine men, and when a young Indian wishes to become one of the society, he applies to one of the members to intercede for him, saying 'You can vouch for me as being a good Indian, etc.;' the friend of the applicant mentions the circumstance to the head man of the society, who gives an answer in a few days after consulting others of the society, if the applicant is admitted, his friend is directed to prepare him accordingly....but no Indian can be admitted until the expiration of one year, after application is made. This society consists of 4 roads (degrees)....and it requires something to gain the first, second, 3rd, 4th......degrees. It costs....40 to 50 dollars....and few.....gain the end of the 4th road.

Possibly it was the Sac, not the Fox, who had this society; or possibly the society was lost in the period of wandering that characterized the decades after Forsythe wrote.

The history of the first forty years of the nineteenth century is, for the Fox, a story of ever-narrowing boundaries. At the turn of the century they felt free to roam any of the woodlands
and prairies of the Mississippi and Missouri valleys. The first restricting treaty with the United States Government was signed in St. Louis on November 5, 1804; the Sac and Fox presumably ceded all lands in northern Illinois and southern Wisconsin, retaining only hunting privileges in the area. In 1824 they ceded all their lands in the state of Missouri "reserving for the half-breeds of their nations 'the small tract of land lying between the rivers Desmoin and the Mississippi and the section of the above (Missouri) line.'" In 1825 the Indians signed a treaty which determined a line through the middle of Iowa south of which the Indians would not live. In 1830 they ceded still another strip of land.

In settlement of the Black Hawk War the so-called "Black Hawk purchase" including most of Iowa except four hundred sections of land on the Iowa River was given up; in 1836 these four hundred sections, too, were ceded. In 1837 another 1,250,000 acres was given up by the Indians, and, finally, on October 11, 1842, the Sacs and Foxes ceded all rights to any land in return for the payment of all their debts, a reservation on the Missouri River, and subsistence while migrating to it, and interest on a capital sum of $800,000.

During the period when this last treaty was signed, presumably banishing them from Iowa forever, the Sacs and Foxes were living in a number of villages scattered through central Iowa chiefly on the Des Moines and Skunk Rivers. The government agency was about eighteen miles southwest of Fairfield, Iowa. About half of the Sacs and one band of Foxes built their villages within sight of the Agency, and the rest of the Sacs had theirs within eight miles; but the great majority of the Foxes--consisting of
those who had resided on the Iowa and Skunk Rivers—refused to come nearer than fifteen miles away, on the Skunk River. It was estimated in 1842 that there were some 2300 Sacs and Foxes living in six villages.

The Indians still carried on their form of life, dispersing in the fall after the annuities were paid, to hunt and fish, and returning to their villages in spring for the planting season and the summer months. Their winter habitats were temporary lodges made of mats and erected under the protection of some densely wooded bottom-land. They moved from place to place as circumstances required; in the winter of 1845, for example, the Foxes visited their old haunts upon the Iowa, drawn there by their attachment to the old section, while their next move was to the sugar camps, whither they went as soon as the sap began to run to make sugar and molasses, after which they returned to their permanent villages.

The Indians of the neighborhood were apparently at peace with one another during this time, and it is recorded that a number of Pottawatomie in Iowa partook of the hospitality of the Sac and Fox villages. The round of life was apparently disturbed chiefly by the pressure of the government on the Indians to move to their new reservation across the Missouri.

The emigration was quite irregular in manner, especially that of the Foxes. In the fall of 1846 all the Sacs and about one-fifth of the Foxes had already crossed the river, but the rest of the Foxes under Chief Poweshiek remained in the Pottawatomie country on the north side of the Missouri. The government had offered the Indians a choice of two tracts of land in Kansas, and the Sauks were impatiently awaiting the arrival of the Foxes to
-159-

help make their decision. When the planting season was upon them, however, and Poweshiek's followers had not yet arrived, the Indians already in Kansas made their choice without them.

For twenty years the Sæ and Fox of the Mississippi officially were living on their reservation in Kansas. They had their skirmishes with other tribes (what amounted to a little war with the Comanche); they had their annual buffalo hunts—somewhat of a new experience for the Sæ and Fox—and they had their internal dissensions. They refused all overtures for the establishment of schools or missions; they continued stubbornly to be "blanket Indians." But they had the respect of their Agents, who, no matter how exasperated they became at their stubbornness, could not help but admire their intelligence and independence. The old way of life was still enforced, even to the burying of corn after the harvest for use during the next summer. In the early seventies the Kansas reservation was exchanged for one in Oklahoma, and most of the Indians moved south to the land which they occupy today.

But in the meantime, the Fox had finally and definitely cut themselves off from the Sæ. In about 1850, a Pottawottamie named Johnny Green led a small group including some Fox, and they finally settled in their wandering near the Iowa River in Iowa. It may even be that some Foxes had never arrived in Kansas and had always remained here; but at any rate, a nucleus of Foxes established themselves in their old camping grounds.

In 1856 the Government began to allot the lands of the Sæ and Fox Indians in Kansas to the Indians separately. The Foxes, led by their chief Ma-mi-nwa-ni-ka, objected strenuously, refused to accept allotments, and finally decided to leave
Kansas entirely and go back to Iowa to join the few Foxes that were already there. It must be understood that in general the Fox did not get along with the Sac—even before they moved to Kansas—and that considerable bad luck followed them to Kansas, including a smallpox epidemic that carried off a great number (more Fox than Sac because the former refused to be vaccinated). There was, therefore, strong sentiment against staying in their new home, sentiment bolstered by their attachment to the country where their dead were buried.

In the Fall of 1856, Ma-mi-mwa-mi-ka and his group raised some $735.00 between them (partly from the sale of ponies, it appears) and left for Iowa. During the following winter some eighty Indians were back in their old country. The Legislature of Iowa passed a bill giving them permission to remain in Iowa as long as they were peaceful, and in the spring they purchased eighty acres of land on the Iowa River where they live today. For the first time since the Black Hawk War, they could feel free of Government intervention. But they were not recognized in their new home, and they received no annuities from their share of the treaty money that they considered their due.

For years they struggled along on what crops they could grow, on what game they could shoot in a settled area, and on what they could beg from the white farmers in the country. Winters were especially hard, but they steadfastly refused to return to Kansas where money was awaiting them.

The Government finally recognized them in 1866, "since the State of Iowa has practically invited them to live there," and gave them some blankets and clothing and sent one Leander

Clark to be their Agent. The next year, cash payment of annuities began again. Meanwhile, many more Fox had come from Kansas to join the group, so that in 1867 there were 264. From that day to this, the population has increased erratically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>264 (including 16 Pottawottamie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>252 (without the )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>262 (besides 10 from Kansas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>295 (probably including the new arrivals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>335 (5 Kansas Indians included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>380 (had smallpox epidemic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the government resumed annuity payments, some of the money was used to buy more land. By 1900 they held some three thousand acres of land, and since then little more has been added.

Some idea of their condition is contained in the Agent's report for 1868. There were 252 Indians then, and their possessions and income for the previous year were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261 ponies at $45.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 bushels corn at $.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 pounds sugar at $.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 days' work in harvest at $2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of furs sold</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,497.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,782.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The people, although they might accept new economic conditions, were conservative as ever about their religious and social life and even their wearing apparel and houses. In 1870, Agent Garretty reported:

They are very comfortably situated, their houses or 'nicky-ups,' as they call them, being put up large enough to accommodate from four to eight families. The interior is kept nice and clean, and any day you go there you will find the women either baking cakes or roasting coffee—a sure sign of doing well. There has been an increase of 28 since my taking charge, one of the women having twins, both living and doing well.....In relation to the getting up of schools, I must say it was a failure. I have tried and done my utmost to get them to start one, but after all my talk on the subject to the chiefs and headmen assembled in council....they one and all shrug their shoulders and say: 'Misquakie no like school'....
These Indians are very proud, and still tenacious of their old habits and customs, and think it beneath them to teach their children or send them to school.

A year later,

Many of the young persons of the tribe have learned or are learning to speak English; some of them speak it quite well. Some of them are adopting citizens' clothes, but the larger part still adhere to the blanket as an article of dress.

The tribe was at this time receiving $51,000 a year in annuities. The farmer the next year built the first frame house to appear on the Indian lands. Some progress toward adopting new modes of living was becoming apparent. In 1873 Agent Howbert wrote:

After many efforts...I succeeded in getting about fifteen families to locate on lots of land embracing 3 to 10 acres each, the families agreeing to cultivate that amount of land for their own benefit....About 100 acres were put under cultivation....All seemed to be progressing satisfactorily until one warm day in the latter part of July they announced to me in the most solemn manner that they just received a revelation from the Great Spirit, telling them 'that the men must not work any more, but they must hunt, trap, and fish, and the squaws must do the work, as in the days of their fathers,,' and in spite of all I could say or do, the greater part of them removed their wigwams over the river into their village, and soon started on a deer-hunt into the northwestern part of Iowa and into Nebraska. I have learned that the medicine men are in the habit of pretending to receive revelations from the Great Spirit, that they may more successfully carry on their nefarious purposes....The agent has issued an order prohibiting the proclamation of revelations that....interfere with the industry....of the Indians....

and the next year:

These Indians cling with great tenacity to their old ideas. They follow their natural instincts, and regard these instincts as the voice of the 'Great Spirit' to them. They are an intensely religious people in their way; they observe the ceremonies of their system of religion with the greatest punctuality and fervor. Only a few have or seem to have a disposition to adopt the 'white man's way of living.'

In 1875 there was no mission yet, and the first school building had just been built. But

They are, as a majority, opposed to going to school, especially
the old men.....Their prejudices have been strengthened by some disagreeing whites.....When once assured that all is well, there can be no trouble, for they are apt and intelligent. Their nomadic habits stand decidedly in the way of education.

For years the Agents had to report practically no success in the matter of schools. A few people learned to read and write English in irregular fashion, and most of them could read and write in their own syllabary; this was apparently taught children by their parents even while they opposed any education in English.

Some picture of Fox life about this time is contained in the reports. Agent Free in 1877 wrote that:

Their lands being held in common under tribal relations, works to their decided disadvantage in the way of agriculture, as but small tracts are allowed to each head of family.

Agent George L. Davenport, who, having lived with an Indian woman, has a large number of descendants still on the reservation, reported in 1879 that:

Their village consists of about 31 houses, mainly built of bark and partly of boards. Their houses and grounds are kept very clean and neat.....The women of the tribe are very well behaved, modest, and chaste.

There was some talk of moving the Indians to Oklahoma; they objected, of course, and partly for fear that there was a catch to it, refused to sign the new form of the Rolls. There was an argument about the amount of the annuity at the same time; the Indians claimed that they should get annuities from the capital sum represented by the value of half of the land of the Sawk and Fox in Oklahoma, since half belonged to the Fox. In 1876 there was a new form of Roll presented them, and they refused to sign it. The Commissioner reported in 1880 that:

Formerly only the heads of families were entered on the payrolls and the number of children was given without specifying names, ages, etc. The new form requires each family to be
entered separately, commencing with the head of the same and followed by the names and a brief description of all the persons for whom he or she is entitled to draw the per capita payment. Thus far no inducement or argument has prevailed to change the determination of the Sac and Fox not to sign these rolls, as they believe a compliance with the requirement conflicts with their religious opinions.

This matter of annuity payments and the rolls is given by the Indians today as one of the causes of the origin of the political factions of the tribe. It seems that for somewhat superstitious reasons, the members of the tribe refused to sign the rolls. As a result, they did not obtain annuities. The taxes came due and were left unpaid for several years. Finally, apparently, somebody threatened to take their lands away, and to save the land, a number of Indians, less conservative, signed the rolls, received their annuities, and paid the taxes. For years thereafter this group continued to do so; and as, one after another, the old conservatives (which may be called now "the other faction") capitulated and signed, they did not contribute to the back taxes, and hard feelings were caused. This view is supported to some extent by Davenport's 1882 report:

In January last I enrolled them (a few Indians still refusing to give their names) and paid them $20,000, and in May last I made another effort to get them all to enroll, but did not succeed until the end of August when I paid them $20,000.... The most of the Indians contributed a share of their money to the chiefs for public debts and to pay their taxes.....

But about the same time the matter of succession to the chieftainship arose, and this no doubt contributed to the origin, if the origin occurred at this time, of the factional difference. Early in July of 1881, Man-wa-wah-ne-kah, the principal chief, died. His eldest son died in a few weeks. His younger son was young and timid, and the strong man of the tribe, an old war chief called Ma-tau-e-qua, called the council together and had
Push-e-to-neke-qua proclaimed the chief. It appears that

Push-e-to-neke-qua was not of the same family of the Bear clan as the old chief, and according to some contention today was not of the division of the Bear clan that had the right of chieftainship. There is no record in the literature of any disagreement over the matter then; but by fifteen years later, when still another question of annuities came up, dissension rose strongly and the issue of chieftainship was paramount. In 1898 Agent Rebok wrote:

By request of the Indians their annuity was last year divided into semi-annual instead of annual payments... When the change was made many of the Indians objected, and about one-fourth of the tribe, headed by Old Bear, who aspires to leadership and who has never drawn his annuity (sic!), refused to accept the payment, and continues to hold out at this time. The division of the annuity was only the occasion for this concerted manifestation of hostility. This band represents the most unprogressive members of the tribe, who do not farm and who bitterly oppose all such innovations as the opening up of their country by a highway, the establishment of a school, the appointment of policemen... They denied to the Government the right to change the manner of their payment from annual to semi-annual periods.

In 1899 the issues crystallized:

Old Bear, now 34 years old and the youngest son of Ma-min-waine-ka, a former chief of the tribe, has for more than a year past aspired to the chieftainship of the tribe and is creating considerable division and contention in the tribe. He finds the present an advantageous occasion for pushing his claim. He is uncompromisingly opposed to the advancement of the tribe and the many innovations that have occurred in recent years. They are used by him in rallying to his support many of the old men and women who are as much opposed to advancement as he. They realize that the present chief, Push-e-to-neke-qua... looks approvingly on the progress made... and has no personal inclination to oppose the school.

The first purchase of land for the tribe in Tama County was made when Old Bear's father was chief and the deed was erroneously made to five members of the council and their heirs. (He thinks he and another are the sole owners of the 80 acres and opposes the reformation of the deed in the courts.)

The points of contention raised by Old Bear and his followers, which are at this time creating considerable disturbance and unrest in the tribe, are (1) the claim of Old Bear to the chieftainship; (2) the denial of the right of the State to
establish a highway through the Indian land; (4) the denial of the right of the Government to divide their annuity into semi-annual payments; (5) opposition to the school and refusal to send their children; (6) objection to policemen; (7) objection to any Indians owning cattle on the Indian land and general opposition to industry and frugality.

Old Bear was destined to lose on all counts. Push-e-to-neke-qua was ratified as Chief by the government in Washington and granted $500 a year for life. He was the last chief. The Lincoln Highway was built through the reservation. The annuities have practically disappeared. The Indians are all for modern schools these days and they are getting them. Policemen came and stayed. Even in the fall of 1934, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration sent fifty cattle to the Indians from drought-stricken areas to form the nucleus of a herd.

Yet the factions persisted. Almost every year some new issue arises, and it is usually Old Bear vs. Young Bear (the last chief's son). But the history of the tribe has been one of material progress, advancement in education, but—peculiarly—continued paganism. The mission that was established (a church built in 1891) has made very little progress; and it appears that religion will be the last of the Indian ways that will be changed by the white man.
APPENDIX III

PRESENT CONDITIONS AMONG THE FOX

The reservation is located about two miles west of Tama, in central Iowa, and five or six miles east of Montour. The boundaries of the territory, which is now inhabited by some four hundred Fox and a few Winnebago, are quite irregular, the whole stretch being about five miles at its greatest length and three miles in width. The missionary's home, the church, the government farmer's home and barn, and the little school and the teacher's home are all located close to the highway and the railroads. Then there is a parting of the ways and on all sides are scattered the dwellings of the Indians.

The grounds of each household are shut off from the road by a barbed-wire gate which serves to keep the horses at home. The house, a small frame building of one or two rooms and generally in great need of paint, stands a few yards back from the gate. Somewhere near, there will likely be a wickiup, a round house with a frame of poles and a covering of mats, and very often there will be near the house proper, a square or rectangular construction consisting of a sort of raised platform, a roof of twigs and branches supported by four poles, and having open sides. In the summer the family eats here, all sitting on the platform, while the food is brought from the open fire nearby. Frequently, members of the family sleep on the platform, too. This part of the living quarters is mentioned nowhere in Fox literature; it is probably a substitute for the old "summer house" which, with
perhaps one or two exceptions, has disappeared from the settle-
ment. There may also be a barn, and, of course, a pump, and al-
most every place will have some fields of corn, fruit trees, and
a little vegetable garden planted for the most part with various
kinds of beans, pumpkins, and squashes. In all, there are some
seventy such "camps," and in each one lives a family, consisting
of parents and children, sometimes an aged grandparent, and often
the young family of one of the children.

There are three cemeteries scattered over the reservation,
at the summits of hills; the burials are along family lines, for
a man will usually be buried where his fathers lie. The cemetery
on the hill in back of the government farmer's is fenced off with
a "no trespass" sign to keep out curious visitors; the other two
are unmarked, and, for that matter, uneven and unkempt.

On a hill, which is said to be the highest spot on the
reservation, there is a small clearing, neatly fenced around with
a bench running around the inside, and forming a circular dance
place where the Drum Society (as it is usually called) holds its
ceremonies. In winter, of course, the society must meet in a
house. This is the only obvious evidence of the rich ceremonial
life in the camps; the important gens festivals are held in barn-
like houses near the homes of the respective clan leaders. In
the lower country, near the highway, are the Pow-wow grounds, a
large cleared space with a ticket-seller's booth, and bleachers
for spectators, where the annual Pow-Wow is held for the benefit
of white visitors and the Indian pocketbook.

The land of the Fox Indians is not allotted in the sense
that Indian lands elsewhere are; it all belongs to the entire
tribe, and the whole community pays the taxes to the State of
Iowa. Of course, no land can be sold by an individual; yet certain Indians have definite rights to the farm land that they and their families have been working. As an old Indian tells about it:

When they (the Indian forefathers) were still buying land, many acres accumulated. The chief and council decided to portion out the land to those who wanted to farm it. Some conservatives advised against this white-man's business; and we therefore could take as much as we could handle. I took about twenty-five acres and others took the same. Later, people in general realized that farming was profitable, and others got in gradually. The council allotted the different fields. Since then these fields have been inherited.

(It may be mentioned in passing, that many of the Indians now favor a re-allotment of the land—opposed, needless to say, by those who have much.) Money and real estate are inherited according to state laws, and in these days even wills are made. Personal property, viz., tools, clothing, horses, dogs, and other chattels are not inherited but are divided among the funeral attendants who wash and bury the body; horses are kept by the family, and dogs belonging to the deceased are taken over by his ceremonially-adopted substitute. If a man dies of communicable diseases, his things are burned. Women own their own property and money, and their husbands have absolutely no voice in the management of it. As one old woman puts it:

A wife (in the old days) owned her cooking utensils; she had no other property. With the help of other women she made the wickiup; if she wanted a divorce, she would put her husband's property outside and tell him to go. Any money the wife has is hers; she doesn't have to give her husband anything.

As regards law and punishment, the old chiefs are gone, and with them the ancient tribal council with its ceremonial functions. The courts of law have jurisdiction in cases of murder, rape, and other major crimes, but for small offenses the only deterrent is public opinion besides, of course, the
displeasure of the Great Spirit, and it is difficult to ascertain just what part the latter plays. The best idea of what the Indians think about offenses of various natures may be illustrated by a quotation from one of them:

If a man is known to have taken something, the owner could go to him and demand or take the stolen goods. If a man steals, they say, 'maybe he needs it.' They always know what kind of a man he is. Children are reasoned with and taught, when they steal; the fasting is to make them better.

Lying is not punished, but is followed by loss of luck and reputation.

Personal broils are entirely private, individual affairs. A person might hit a man going after his wife, but not for something like stealing. Fighters should be ashamed: only dogs fight. It is best to keep the peace and do nothing.

The activities and interests of the Fox today are many and varied, and there is something to do and to look forward to every day. They walk or drive to Tama, there to shop or to gossip with their white friends. On Wednesday night there is the Tama band concert, and bargain night at the movies, and on Saturday the Indians join the throngs of townspeople on the street.

At home there is usually work to do in the fields or in the garden. There are chickens to feed, and usually a car to be repaired. One often sees the women sitting in the sun with their bead work, while their husbands sit near them on the grass fashioning bracelets of silver or bows and arrows for souvenir sale. When the work is done there is always some friend or relative to visit, and, of course, there may be a ceremony of some kind, with sacred singing and dancing and eating, and the Indian, if he happens to be one of the hosts this time, may be preparing the food or delivering the invitations, or dressing himself in his finery for the party.

In the winter, when snow binds them to their reservation,
and work in the fields is over, there are more ceremonies and feasts to take up the time. Some of the youths are off at school, or if they are in the local schools, their evenings are occupied with their studies. Meanwhile there is band practice for those young men who compose the Indian band, and there are clubs which claim as members a number of the younger men and women of the tribe. In the summer there is baseball and other sports, as well as social activity in the evening at the Pow Wow grounds. Also there is the mission church with its various activities, or, for those less pious, a Sunday afternoon rodeo, started by a young man who had been out West, and who can lasso and ride a bucking horse.

The Fox Indians are proud of their group. Their position is unique, not like other Indians', for theirs really is not a reservation. They and their fathers bought the land, and even now they pay taxes; yet they are not under the jurisdiction of the state, as are their white neighbors, and only Congress itself enacts the laws which govern them. The neighboring whites are proud of "their" Indians, too. The only Indians in Iowa, the chambers of commerce advertise their presence widely, and await the Pow Wow, which in normal times at least attracted about seven thousand people. The merchants know them all, and welcome them, speak a few words of Fox, and think that they understand them (admitting at the same time that there is more to them than appears on the surface).

The old Indian pattern of perfectly inclusive hospitality still prevails. If one goes through the camps to see how the Indians live, he is more than welcome, and if he wishes to take photographs, there is no demand for payment, and few refuse to
pose. If a young Indian is engaged as a guide, or if queries are put to one of the older Indians, no bargaining is necessary beforehand, and a gift of any nature apparently satisfies the recipient. There is constant gift-giving, and generosity, in this small community whose good will every person needs, is a prime virtue.

There are among the people certain modes of behavior between relatives, and toward strangers, and the culture is live enough to enforce them. Even political enmities and rivalries seldom interfere with normal social intercourse, and rarely does bitterness and personal feeling rise between members of opposite factions. As for economic rivalry, there is little opportunity. The land is not allotted, so there is no ownership as such, no fortunes, little difference in economic status. Where one finds a family living in a wickiup only, it is due not so much to poverty as to a natural feeling of conservatism, and the conservative old man or woman who prefers the old to the new is naturally not envious of those who live differently.

There are those in the younger generation, who are anxious to move forward according to white standards: to improve their homes, to till more soil, to acquire more chickens and even some cattle, to own better automobiles. Likewise, there seems to be a growing tendency towards the acquisition of individual possessions. With the passing of the years this new tendency may do much to break down the attitudes formulated by the old culture. It is evident in the recent feeling against the extended visits of Indians from other reservations. These others, it is said, are less industrious and leave their own work to come and "sponge" on their more worthy brothers. This is not entirely due, however,
to a breakdown of easy hospitality; there is in it a sense of outraged justice—for if some of their own people should be shiftless, and live off the bounty of their friends, social pressure could be brought to bear, while nothing can be done about these strangers who seem to have no feelings of proper morality themselves, who descend upon Fox families for half a year or more, and give nothing in return. This attitude of the Fox is further accentuated by the behavior of the visitors toward girls of the tribe.

The Meskwakis are comparatively clean in their habits; their homes are as clean as the average and are airy, although the furniture is sparse, and usually not of the best. The Indian washes himself frequently, and his clothes, even if patched, are clean. Drunkenness is the exception and not the rule. Although from a missionary's point of view sexual behavior is at low ebb—for marriages, especially after "divorces," are not always by benefit of clergy—actually there is little wantonness; chastity and faithfulness are virtues to be learned by the young, and the morals of the Indian youth are on a par with those of the average youth in any Iowa town.

All this seems to indicate that the culture is not broken, and that its social integration is reflected in the psychological stability of the individual. The natives are happy because their conflicts are not extraordinary, and because their lives are filled with varied interests. Actually, the native culture has become adjusted to the relatively slight encroachment of white civilization. If the medicine society is gone, there remain many ceremonies (and at least two new ones—the Drum Society and the Peyote Cult—have arisen); if the occupation of the men—hunting—
is gone, farming has taken its place, and the Fox has no aversion to work; if war is gone, there is a rich outside life to relieve the ennui. So the Indian still has his social life intact; he still has his stories and his ceremonies, his dances and his songs; he has his work and his play. In addition, there are many new activities as, for example, schools, and the white man's newspapers and magazines, music, and competitive sports within the tribe as well as with outsiders; there are movies and trips to big cities, also political life and interests (extending even to national elections). The annual Pow Wow which takes much effort both from the business and program point of view is conducted entirely by the tribe. There are new holidays in addition to their own ceremonial days: Wednesday and Saturday nights, Sundays, Christmas, Fourth of July, and the other national holidays. There is much to look forward to in the Fox life of today, and no sooner has one occasion gone by and been forgotten than another looms ahead. So the total of social institutions keeps the individuals living and society in motion. The Fox today are definitely a going concern.
I was born on July 18, 1912, at my mother's place on the reservation near Tama. During my early childhood my father worked in Tama, at the Toledo corn factory, and later in Marshalltown where we made our home for about a year. When I was six years old we moved to the place on the reservation where my mother lives now. I was sent to the Fox Day School and went there for five years, until I was about twelve years old. At that time my parents separated because they couldn't get along; my mother stayed in her house, and my father went to live with his sister. This happened when I was twelve years old, and very soon one of my sisters and I went to Genoa, Nebraska, to attend the government school there. I started in the second grade. Two of my sisters were being treated at the tuberculosis sanitarium at Toledo.

The five years I spent at the Fox Day School were not pleasant. The teacher, a crippled man of 65 years, was very mean to the children. Some of us were blamed for the things that others did, and for punishment I was often made to stand in front of the class with books on my head, or holding a dustpan piled up with books. If I couldn't pronounce a word right, the teacher would hit me; at these times I used to faint. In Genoa things were different; the teachers were kind and it was a good place to live. The school had about five hundred pupils. The boys and girls

---

1This account is paraphrased from the autobiography dictated by a young married woman to Mrs. Tax.
lived in separate dormitories, but the classes were held together. Two years after I came to Genoa, when I was fourteen, the minister at Fullerton baptized me and ten others. I didn't know much about what was happening; I had sometimes attended the Presbyterian Church in Tama, and, since nobody back home knew about it, anyway, there was no objection to my baptism.

At Genoa we were closely supervised and chaperoned. We mingled with the boys only at the school dances, and I only attended those my last year at school. Of course, we talked to the boys at socials and at the gymnasium, and sometimes we walked back to the buildings from school together. Two Sioux boys were good friends of mine, just friends—no love-making. It sometimes happened that girls would sneak out of the dormitory to meet boys. During the time I was at Genoa, a couple of the girls got into trouble. One Tama girl was sent home one spring because she was pregnant; she had been pregnant when she had entered school in the fall. Once during the sixth year I was there, eighteen girls sneaked out to meet boys. They were caught, and all the girls were expelled. The boys were not let out, but they were made to work very hard. The following year I, too, ran away from the school with four other girls, not because I was dissatisfied or wanted to go away, but because the other girls had had trouble with the matron and they dared me to go along with them. All of us together had only one dollar to spend; we got as far as Silver Creek, Nebraska—twelve miles away—and there we were caught by the station master at the depot (we had taken off our overalls and left them in the washroom at the depot), and he reported us to the school. They came to get us, and we were locked up all
day, given only bread and water, and in the evening (it was Sunday) we all had to go to church.

I spent most of my summer vacations in Tama at my mother's place. In 1926 when I came home from school my father was very sick, but my mother wouldn't let me go to see him. Two of my sisters sneaked off to see him, but he was not able to talk to them any more. The third day I was home I spent the whole day with my father; in the evening he died. The men sang sacred songs all night; I stayed up all night, too. The next day, in the afternoon, they buried him, and the funeral was just like my grandmother's who had died about four years before. Ten days later my father's sister (the one with whom he had lived since my parents' separation) held the adoption ceremony, and she adopted a man to take the place of my father. Usually the adoption feast is not held for some months after the death, but my father's sister was very sick at that time, and she wanted to have it done quickly (she died the following November).

I just mentioned my grandmother, i.e. my mother's mother. When I was a child I was always taken care of by this woman; she was my guardian. When I was a baby my mother gave me to my grandmother, and papers to show it were filled out in the agent's office. I always called my grandmother "mother," even after I was told that she was not my mother. My grandmother died of old age when I was ten years old. I felt very bad and cried. Before this some of my little brothers and sisters had died, but I had just thought that I wouldn't see them for a while, and then I forgot about them. My grandmother died on Sunday morning at about ten o'clock; they dressed her in Indian clothes—black cloth skirt, silk waist, ribbons, moccasins, leggings with ribbons on
them. They braided her hair, and tied ribbons and beads into it, and painted her face with red and blue paint at the temples. The men made a box of wood, and placed the body in it with new blankets, a bucket of food—meat and sweets—money and tobacco. They covered her up with the blankets; the tobacco was put in this way: at the cemetery the box was open beside the grave; the members of the family passed around the box, and each one put a little tobacco on a handkerchief spread open on the dead body; then the guests at the funeral followed and did the same. Tobacco was also placed in the hands of the dead person. After the lid was put on, the box was buried, and covered first with dirt, then with logs placed over the grave to look like a little house. After the burial, my mother "took a walk" and didn't come home for four days. She fasted all that time, and mourned for her mother. During these four days, any wrong done to my grandmother before her death would be revealed to my mother as she walked about. The adoption feast was held almost a year later. The evening before the feast my mother went after the adoptee, a woman of the same age as my grandmother, and brought her to her home, and fed her. The next day she was called for again, and after feeding her again, they dressed her up in new clothes, and she came out where all the people were assembled. Then the guests ate, and there was dancing, and the adoptee received the presents from my mother—clothes to wear that day, jewelry, moccasins, and new blankets. The adoptee, in turn, shortly after the adoption feast brought gifts of clothes and groceries—four sacks of flour, coffee, sugar, tea, and lard.

There was no special ceremony at my first menstruation period, because I was away at school in Genoa. I was fourteen at the time. Among the Fox when a girl has her first menstruation,
she is shut up for ten days. She is taken down to the river, with her head covered, and she is thrown in four times. Then the women take a razor and cut the skin in spots, first down one side, then down the other. This is to make sure that the girl's menstruation periods will not be long or painful. During these ten days, the girl cooks for herself in a wickiup; some older women usually stays there with her. After the ten days, for ten days more the girl cooks for herself outside; she does not eat with the rest of the family. Thereafter each month at this period the girl cooks for herself outside.

Twice during summer vacations I traveled with the rodeo through Illinois and Wisconsin. One year I earned $14 and the other $39.75. Several other Tama Indians were along. After the second trip with the rodeo, I came back to Tama too late to go back to school, so I stayed home, at my mother's. She had been married since 1925; my stepfather is always very kind to us, like a father.

Behavior to Relatives

Father. I always obeyed him. He was good to us; we were not afraid of him. After my grandmother died he gave me money, and he was the only one who ever sent me money and clothes when I was at school.

Mother. I obeyed my mother, too. She was mean to me; after my grandmother died, she beat me. She would never let me go with boys; she always said she would pick out a boy for me to marry.

Older brother (half). I am afraid of him; he gets after me and tells me what is right and wrong.
Older sister. I tell her all my confidences. She advises me well; she tells me to be good, to stay at home.

Older sister (half). She is a bad influence; she tells me to go with boys. I always listen to my full sister who tells me to be good. Still, my mother favors my other sister, who is not good.

I joke most with my full sister, with her husband, with my uncles, and with my cousins. When I stay at my sister's house, my sister's husband jokes with me and says that now he had two wives instead of one.

I was twenty years old when I came back from Genoa to stay. Up to this time I didn't have much to do with boys. My first real friend was sickly; he died last year at the sanatorium. Another man used to bother me a lot, but I never liked him, and I didn't want to marry him (Indian fashion); my mother encouraged me to, but I said, "No, he has two children, and he's not divorced from his other wife." I was staying at my mother's house now for a while. In February, 1933, I went to stay at my half brother's house; his wife was going to have a baby, and I had to help around the house. I was there for ten days before the baby was born. When the baby came, I didn't help; I was afraid and stayed out of the room. My brother did all the work; the next morning the government nurse came and told me how to do everything. I stayed for fifteen days more helping, then I got mad at my brother because he wanted me to stick to the house all the time. So I left and went to my full sister's house; she was going to have a baby in a month. I helped with all the work,
and I stayed there until May, when I came to live here. I was always on good terms with my brother-in-law; we joked together, and my sister, my brother-in-law, and boy I was going with, and I often went places together. Then we come to my marriage.

When I first started to go with my husband, he was living with his uncle. He had been married several times (once legally, and he was divorced from that wife), but they never worked out, and Tommy wanted to get settled down. One of his marriages had been with my half-sister (older). He knew that I was a good girl, and that my mother hadn't let me "step out" with boys. When I was at school, he wrote me friendly letters, and I answered him twice. Then, when I came home and lived first at my mother's, then at my brother's, and later at my sister's, I started to go with Tommy. He was also going with another Indian girl, but he used to tell me that she wouldn't make him a good wife, that he would quit her if I would stop going round with other boys. There was one in particular that I was going with; we went together on church-nights and when there were mission movies. Tommy said that the other girl's folks just wanted the land, which he would probably receive when his uncle died. He said he had picked me because I didn't have a home and was always going from one place to another to live. So in May I moved over here. That summer I worked at the sanatorium and earned $51 a month. On October 16th we were married at the Presbyterian mission. We got the license in Toledo for $2.50, went to the Mission by ourselves, and got married. The next day we drove to Pella with my mother and her

2With the man who may be called Tommy. The uncle referred to later was Tom's mother's brother. He was at this time sick and being cared for at his sister's (Tom's mother's) place.
husband, just for a pleasure trip.

In January I became pregnant. For three months I didn't know what it was. Everything went along all right until the 4th of July when we went to Marshalltown with my sister and her husband. We were bumped around a lot in the car, and when we came home I was sick. Tommy went for the doctor; he said everything was OK, and he gave me pills to stop the pain. After supper I helped my mother-in-law, who was at our house, but in the night and the next morning I was worse. The doctor came, and so did my mother, but the baby had already been born, dead, and had been buried by my mother-in-law. After that Tommy stayed in for four days; he had to take a sweat bath each night so that his fields, gardens, etc. would not be ruined. I was locked up for ten days. I couldn't look out of the window at anything, because anything I looked at would burn up. During those ten days we used separate blankets, but slept on the same bed. Then my mother-in-law washed the blankets, and we both used the same ones together. The old Indians say that when you know you are going to have a baby, you shouldn't go near your husband for the full time.

When my father was living he objected to peyote. The year after he died, when I came home for vacation, my mother took us children to the peyote meetings. I started eating peyote when I was fifteen. I didn't eat much, though; just a few pieces and that only when I was sick. After our marriage, we went to the meetings regularly, and still do. I used to get sick from eating peyote. Last January my cousin told me that it was because I had not been baptized by the peyote people, and that after my

3In answer to a question, the narrator said that she had never heard of any kind of contraceptive.
baptism, I would be able to eat peyote. He told me to "put up a meeting," and so I did that. I had to prepare a lot of food; I ground meat and fixed it with sugar, and I prepared parched corn in sweetened water, besides furnishing ducks, chicken, meat, candy, cookies, fruit, and more things. It all cost me about twenty-one dollars. The meeting for me was held at my cousin's house (the one who had advised me to put up the meeting). At nine o'clock everybody followed the leader in; he told what the meeting was for, and all the people started to pray for me. I ate sixteen pieces of peyote that night. In the morning food was passed around to everybody, and they all stayed around and had dinner later. Then we went down to the Iowa River; they made a hole in the ice and my cousin went in with me. They said prayers, and so I was baptized. Then I put on all new clothes, and the meeting went on again until the evening.

Almost every year I dance in the Pow Wow and earn some money that way. In 1926 I earned $24.24, in 1927, $2.50, in 1933 I was only in the pageant, "ci-bo-ne" (I was working at the sanatorium all week), and I earned only $.25, and in this year's Pow Wow I made $9.28.
APPENDIX V

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PEYOTE CULT

AMONG THE FOX INDIANS

In 1903-1904, Joe Tesson was the first Fox to receive peyote; he and his son were the first to use it here, having obtained it from the Oto and the Iowa in Oklahoma. Tesson had a good name with the government as the most progressive of the Indians, and he was a prominent man. In 1912, Percy Bear began to use it; he is the present leader, and he was one of the few to use it at that time. Percy is related to Joe's wife, and he lived there for a while after he began to take peyote, living there until old Joe died.

Peyote meetings are held:

1. When somebody is sick and asks for a meeting.

2. After someone dies, there may be a peyote funeral. A few months later a relative may call a meeting for the dead person. The members of peyote don't believe in adoption ceremonies, but if somebody wishes to have the adoption feast for a deceased relative, he can call a peyote meeting.

3. Christmas, New Year, Easter, Thanksgiving Day.

4. If a visitor from another tribe comes and is peyote, his peyote friends have a meeting in his honor or for his safe journey.

At general meetings we pray for everybody, but at special meetings, when somebody is sick, we pray for him. At these times we have only picked members, so the meeting isn't too full, thus:

---

1 As obtained from one member.
5. For the birthday of a child of a member; child comes to meeting. We pray for the child's health and spiritual good.

If I want to "put up a meeting," I see if I can get up the food, peyotes, etc. because I have to buy all this for all those who will be at the meeting. When I figure that I can make it, I go around and tell all the people to come on such and such a day. Also, I tell anybody who is sick that he can come, and anybody else who is interested.

In the morning of the day for the meeting I call on any of the members, three or more, to help build the tepee. The tepee always faces east (see diagram). To get the East you sit in a spot in the morning, and put a stick in line with the sun. First we put up three poles and let a rope hang from the top to get the center. Then we put up eight more poles, making eleven in all so far; to the twelfth pole the canvas is fastened, and when that pole is put up, the canvas is put around to form the tepee. The twelve poles on the tepee mean the twelve apostles, or they might be considered as different peoples or languages, all bound together. There is a flap over the opening of the tepee. In the center of the tepee the fire is built; a raised half-moon (of earth) is behind it, and in the center of the moon is placed for the night the "peyote chief," the best piece of peyote. The whole tepee represents the world.

At about nine or ten o'clock in the evening the people come together. The leader, i.e., the man who has called the meeting, has already appointed the officials; this was done when he invited the guests. The leader has his drum and paraphernalia. The drummer fixes the drum, putting in water, four pieces of
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peyote, seven rocks (the seven days of the week) in the knots, and the stringing of the drum is done counter-clockwise with the rope-ends beneath tied together to form a star.

When the time comes, the leader says they'll start now, and everybody gets in line, the leader carrying his outfit. The leader goes in first, then the drummer, the cedar man, and then all the others, and the last one in is the fire chief, who has held the door open to the north while all the others have passed in. Before entering, the leader prays to the Great Spirit; they will stay all night and he prays that they will all be all right in the morning. Then everybody turns to the left, and they file in to their places. Only the officials have definite places to sit; the others can sit anywhere. The leader sits in back of the half-moon, immediately in front of which is the fire. At the leader's right sits the drummer, and at his left the cedar man. The fire chief sits opposite the leader, between the entrance and the fire. When everyone has entered, the fire chief walks all around to his place, and then he notifies the leader that all are ready. Meanwhile, the wood has been laid thus to represent the ribs of Christ, and the fire has been started with flint spark, and logs are put in and pushed up as they burn. The ashes are pushed back toward the half-moon (the ashes of the fire represent the people who have passed away). It is on these ashes that the cedar is burned as an offering. The leader now tells the purpose of the meeting, and he asks the people to sit up all night and pray for that purpose. He says they will eat the peyote, and no one should go out before midnight. From the beginning to midnight signifies the Old Testament; from then on is the New Testament. Then the leader tells about smoking, how it was given
to the Indians before the white man came, and those who wish to smoke may. He passes corn husks and tobacco around, so that the people can make cigarettes. He gives it to the drummer first, and then it is passed around clockwise. After all have rolled cigarettes, the fire chief gets a hot stick and passes it around to all to light their cigarettes. The stick comes back to him, he puts it back at the fire, and then all start praying together, aloud, each as he wishes. This takes from five to ten minutes. Then all lay their cigarette stubs in front of them; the fire chief goes around to his left, picking up all the stubs. When he gets to the leader, he places them all on the south side of the half-moon, with the burnt parts toward the fire. Then he goes around to his right to collect the other half of the stubs and he places them on the north side of the moon in the same manner.

There is sage leaf or grass all around the circle, representing the palm leaves for Christ to walk on. The leader tells the people to pick up some leaves and smell them; the leader takes some cedar from the spot where his paraphernalia lie, and throws it on the fire; this represents a burnt offering. He has peyote in a bag, and he puts the peyote bag over the cedar smoke, “smoking the peyote.” It was the leader who had placed the peyote chief in the half-moon, taking it from his peyote bag when he first came into the tepee. The leader now makes four motions over the smoke with the peyote (everything is done four times). Then he puts the peyote down, and tells the people that they will eat peyote. He gives his drummer six, and he takes six for himself; the others get four apiece. They all eat up the peyote; then anybody can ask for more, or for more tobacco if they wish it. After this the leader sings four songs. The first is a
starting song which is used in all meetings—the others can be any peyote songs. The songs tell what the peyote meeting means, etc. As he sings, the leader holds the staff (representing the staff of Christ with which He performed miracles) and sage leaves. When he has finished singing he passes this on to the drummer—always outside of the drum—and the drum goes to the leader while the drummer sings. The staff goes to the left after this, and the drum follows the staff around so that the drummer is always to the left of the singer, except when the leader drums for the drummer. By the time the circle is completed, it is midnight and the singing stops. The leader ends the singing, unless it is late, and midnight interrupts the circle. In this case, the singing stops wherever it is, and the drum and staff go back to the right, the way they came. The leader sings a midnight song, and three others, but before this he has told the fire chief to go out for a bucket of water, and he sings while the fire chief is gone. After two songs, the leader picks up the flute, and blows it four times, to represent the coming of Christ. The flute which he uses is made of the wing of an eagle, because it is the eagle that reaches the highest skies. At this time the fire chief comes in, and sits in front of the entrance with the bucket of water in front of him. The leader now passes corn husks and tobacco to the left and it comes to the fire chief, who lights a cigarette. He passes the tobacco to the left and it goes back to the leader. The fire chief starts to smoke, and the leader prays for the purpose of the meeting. The drummer gets the cigarette from the fire chief when he has smoked half, and he gives it to the leader, who finishes it while praying. When he has finished, he puts it on the end of the moon. The fire chief gets up, and pours a little water on the
ground before the others can drink—this is for the fertility of
the soil. He gives the pail of water to the first person sitting
on the south side of the door, with a drinking cup; then he pro-
ceeds all around the circle clockwise to his place. The water is
passed around; this drinking of the water at midnight represents
the birth of Christ. The drummer puts some water on the drum to
keep it moist. All drink, and the fire chief drinks last. He
tells the leader they are finished drinking; the water remains
inside close to the door in case anyone gets thirsty.

The leader, after having blown the flute and sung the last
two songs, puts his staff down. Before singing he had put some
cedar in the fire; the people with feathers smoke them in the
cedar smoke, and then they may use the feathers to fan themselves,
or anything. The feathers are ten in a bunch, for the ten Com-
mandments. Some have a little tuft of white; that is for Christ,
and others have a second tuft of white; that is for John the
Baptist. The feathers used will be handy at Judgment Day, for
the angels have wings.

Now the singing starts and goes on as before, and while
it is passing around, the leader gets up and goes outside, always
clockwise, and he stays out while all the others sing. He can
come in between four-song intervals. After the leader comes in
and sits down, others who want air can go out in turns, four or
five at a time, following the same rule as the leader. When the
singing gets back to the leader, he lays down the staff and stops
for a short prayer, burning cedar, and all pray individually, say-
ing that life is the most precious thing God can give, and they
pray for their loved ones, the sick, and those who have passed
away. Then they burn cedar again; cedar is evergreen, so they are
praying for everlasting life. Then there is more singing around; if one doesn't feel like singing he can pass his turn. Prayers can go on even while the singing does. Both men and women can ask for tobacco at any time, but there is no chewing. This goes on all night, and every time the leader's turn comes, he stops to burn cedar, and all can stretch a moment, or go out at any time. If a person is eating peyote on the north side of the tepee, you can't pass him until he has finished; if he is praying, you can't pass him, either. Then you must go out the other way.

Visitors who belong to peyote get the best places, on the south side of the tepee. If the visitor doesn't understand the language, the purpose of the meeting is translated to him. Utter strangers to peyote may sit with their friends; they pass on the drums and the staff, and follow the etiquette generally. This goes on until the morning star comes out. The fire chief keeps a look-out for it; if it is cloudy, he uses a watch to see when it is daybreak. Near dawn, they prepare to close the meeting. The fire chief fixes the fire, sweeps up, and all clean their places. Then the fire chief starts sweeping around from the left, clockwise; when he comes to the middle, he burns the cigarette stubs from the south of the moon, and then he continues to do the same on the other side. Each cigarette carries its prayer with it, and in the morning when they are all burned, they go up to God in smoke.

Now the water woman goes out for water. The leader prays, picks up his flute, and blows it four times, to attract lost souls. The woman is still out for water. The leader sings four songs, and the woman comes back and sits where the drummer sat at midnight. The leader lays down his staff and feathers, and the
drummer puts his drum near the moon. Now again the leader passes around corn husks and tobacco, and the fire chief rolls a cigarette for the water woman, and lights it for her, and she starts praying. When she finishes, the drummer takes her cigarette, gives it to the leader, who finishes it while praying, and then throws it into the fire. He also throws more cedar on the fire, and the cedar man with feathers wafts smoke toward the water. The woman pours water on the ground, drinks some herself, and then passes it around. The bucket comes back to her, but she walks clockwise around the tepee before picking it up and carrying it out. This bringing in of the water by the woman signifies the second coming of Christ. The water is Christ, and the food coming in is the end of the world and Christ is there in front. With the help of two or three other women, breakfast is now brought in; there is water, parched corn in sweet water, sweet meat--ground and prepared with sugar--peaches. Before eating, all join in prayer, and if anyone wishes to be baptized, it is also done before eating. The one who is going to be baptized chooses any one of the members to perform the baptism. If the person wants a river baptism, he waits until after dinner, and then he and others go down to the river.

After breakfast, which is served clockwise, and to the visiting peyote members first, the floor is open to anyone who wishes to give a lecture that may be helpful--about the "good things in life." Then the ones who put up the meeting invite the company to stay for dinner, and someone is appointed to pray before dinner. They leave the tepee; the fire chief goes first, then those who sat on his side of the tepee, then the leader in the middle, and the rest of the people. Everybody sits around
and visits until about 11:30, when dinner is ready. There is a prayer again before dinner, then dinner is served, the visitors eating first. After the dishes are washed, if somebody wishes to be baptized, all those who wish go down to the river. The person about to be baptized has been instructed before as to the life he is supposed to lead. If he has any confessions, he makes them at the river before he is ducked. He tells the kind of life he has been leading, and of the sins he has committed; he says that he is going to lead a new life from now on. He appoints somebody to duck him, and he goes completely under. The person who ducks him gets wet, too, but the others remain on shore. If it is winter, a hole is made in the ice. After the baptism, it is up to the person to live a good life. Some do, and some don't.

If the peyote people are in earnest in believing in God and Christ, that is, in the Great Spirit and his Son, they will not get sick.
APPENDIX VI

AN ACCOUNT OF THE CEREMONIAL RUNNERS
OF THE FOX INDIANS

(A Summary)

A long time ago, when the Fox Indians were numerous, they observed how wretched they were and they desired to do better so that their life would be right. One old man told the people what to do, and they immediately began to move camp and to go in different directions, some to Green Bay, some to Lake Michigan. The men hunted and walked around, desiring that their life be proper, and in the fall they began to fast a number of days at a time. As a consequence they knew what they should do.

When they gathered together, one "name" (gens) was to be on the east side, one on the south, one on the west, and one on the north. The boys and women and children were instructed in the rules the Foxes were to have, and how their future life was to be lived if they followed them. The Bear gens was told (by the spirits) first; its members were the first to be made mortal, and it is a prominent gens. At the end of three years, the War Chief

---

1As obtained by Harry Lincoln; recorded and translated by Truman Michelson, BAE Bulletin 85 (1927).

2Included as an appendix because (1) it gives some notion of the mythology and the religious notions of the people; (2) it describes an institution social as well as ceremonial; and (3) of all of Michelson's work, this one seems to have excited the most interest. Yet it is difficult to read as a translation from text. The portions deleted are either repetitions or else side comments on "what evil days we have fallen into!"; the order has, in some cases, been changed, and I have not hesitated to change the wording to make the story more readable, or points more understandable.
gens was blessed into existence, followed in three years by the Feathered gens, and in another three years by the Eagle gens. Other gentes came in at this time, but these were the four leaders—those who knew about the ceremonial runners and ceremonial attendants. It was the Bear gens people who told what the ceremonial attendants and runners were to do.

The ceremonial runners were three in number, one of whom was the leader and the one spoken to when the runners were hired and who employed the other two. The leader belonged to the Bear gens, the others to the War Chief and the Eagle. They excelled in running because the leader was blessed by the wind, the next in succession by a deer, and the next by a humming bird. These three ceremonial runners were given power by the Manitou to be the workers. They oversaw everything: they saw to it that the village site was proper and not evil. They understood mystic power and had to be present on the battle field. They were fast and willing runners and were sent on errands with news or to summon people who dwelt far off, and they would go any distance, even if there were rivers to cross in order to get there.

When the ceremonial attendants were sent on an errand, they did not eat and they drank only water. If they wanted a wooden cane, they could make it out of red cedar only. They became ceremonial runners after fasting and they fasted earnestly; they retained the position all their lives. When a dance was held, it was thought proper for them to dance with the others. They were not supposed to see menstruating women nor come near a woman in childbirth.

In the spring and fall, the ceremonial runners entered the wickiups of the people, looking for news, and, if they were employed by anyone for some purpose, they would go around telling
people what they were supposed to. Whenever gens festivals were held, they sat down facing the hosts so that they could see if they had errands to run. They attended the tribal council and were called upon to decide the question if the counselors could not reach a decision and what they decided was final. When anybody died, they were the ones who went about to tell the news and to inform those who were to lay the body to rest. And these runners themselves walked in front of the body as it was led away.

The ceremonial runners had full control over the weather. To conjure for rain, they splashed water in a river, threw tobacco as an offering, and bellowed into the water. In winter, if the people complained of the cold, the runners went to the snow, took off their clothing and rolled about, and early in the morning would bellow like Manitous. Then they sang a song before they put on their clothes--a certain song.

The long wickiup in which gens festivals were celebrated was placed to the north and west, and the house in which the ceremonial runners lived was to the south and east. At gens festivals, the ceremonial runners burned tobacco as an offering to the eider ducks, who, as fast fliers, had blessed them. Also, they made an offering of deer brain, never anything else. When they beat the drum, they used not sticks but buffalo horns, and they always carried dried buffalo hearts to watch over them. They wore buffalo hide moccasins rather than buckskin, since they wore better. Ceremonial runners usually remained unmarried so that they would not be bothered by wives.

Ceremonial runners have long since died out. The last was sent on an errand sixty-two years ago from Green Bay to the edge of the Missouri to tell the Sauks of a coming fight. There he was
fed bounteously and stayed four days resting. He died the follow-
ing winter after he came back, adjuring the people to keep up the
religious customs in the face of obstacles put by the coming of
the white man. He was fifty-six years old when he died; he had
been blessed at Shallow Water (St. Louis) as will be described in
a moment; since that time there have been no ceremonial runners
and it is difficult to get news around. Ceremonial attendants
there still are, but they can be any boys, and they are indolent,
unwilling to work, and have not been blessed with the spirit of
the ceremonial runners.

This is the story of how the last ceremonial runner, men-
tioned above, was first blessed:

As a boy, he fasted for ten days, and then ate and had a
sweat bath; in the winter he began to fast in earnest, and after
a twelve-day fast, he slept and was addressed in his sleep thus:
"Now I bless you. You have made your body suffer the pangs of
hunger and nobody has blessed you. Now I bless you, and I shall
give you instructions. Tomorrow at noon, you must travel south;
there is a river there, and you must cross it. You must sit
there steadfastly until I come; you will see how fast I can go,
or perhaps you will not see me." Then the boy awoke. The next
day he told his father what had occurred, and his father said,
"You must do exactly what you have been told, my son."

So the boy went to the river and remained seated on the
south side at noon. Soon he heard a whizzing sound about him,
and he wondered what it was, thinking, "He must be a very fast
runner!" Presently, the whizzing stopped and a humming bird
alighted before him, tiny and beautiful, and addressed him: "Did
you see how fast I am? I keep running around and around, flying
about hither and yon. Well, I bless you, although I am not good
at anything except that there is no one who can overtake me; I am so fast, someday I might run over this whole island. Well, today I bless you, and you will be very fast, and you will call yourself 'Ceremonial Runner Man.' That is what intelligent people—those who know anything—will call you, too, and they will be fond of you as long as you live.

"Now I shall tell you what you are to do. You will help your people in anything; they will send you on difficult errands, and even if anyone lives far off, you will be sent on an errand to tell him something. You must not be unwilling, so I shall give you willingness and a quality of tranquil braveness. When you first came here you did not see me until I showed you myself; you will be exactly as I am. The people will not see you if you are sent on an errand; you may meet your enemies somewhere, but they will not see you. I have not given you the gifts with which I bless you, but I shall give them to you when I have thoroughly informed you."

As the humming bird spoke, the boy was unable to speak. He began to be different, began to think differently, and his thoughts wandered, even to the great sea, flitting around where the sun rises and sets.

"Well, you must live morally in the future; you must not think of what is evil but must follow only what is good," the humming bird went on. "When you are sent on an errand, you must go willingly, thinking only of me and what I have told you. You should cut off a strip of hide and tie a little on your right leg so that, if you forget something when you are on an errand, it will come back to you. If you do not do this, you will forget what you were sent for, so think firmly of it. Furthermore, you should wear moccasins made of buffalo hide."
"I will give you great strength. If your enemies see you and shoot at you, they will not hit you. Nobody who has shot at me has hit me, and, if you believe me, you will be the same as I am in this respect.

"Do not bother the persons called women. They are not handsome, and, if you bother them, they will spoil the blessing I have bestowed upon you, because they are mostly employed by the Evil Manitou, and are bad. If a menstruating woman lives near you, she will ruin you and kill you. It is against my religion for a menstruating woman to dwell near wherever I live, and you, too, will be this way.

"If you are going on an errand, you must always start on the south side. The only kind of meat you will then eat will be that of a turtledove or a quail, because they are very fast. If you are not going on an errand, however, you may eat what others eat. Do not carry anything red with you when you are on an errand, especially when somebody has died, because the blood of the dead has stopped flowing. Do not jest when you are on an errand; merely tell people what the news is. When the people hold a council, you must go quietly to the east door and sit down there; if they are not able to reach a decision, you will be called upon to decide the question. Then you should rise to your feet to tell them how you fasted earnestly and were blessed, and then you will tell them whatever you know is the truth.

"Another thing, if you are fed do not fail to eat everything on your plate. I also forbid you to use bad words, to mock your fellow people or to steal any of their possessions. Do not make fun of women, for they are your sisters. You must treat children well, and also domestic animals (if you see them in the future). Moreover, when you are sent on an errand, you must first cast
some tobacco wherever a brook in the forest flows by; this is for me. You will also sing this song:

I shall use a Manitou song,
I shall use a Manitou song,
Oh, it might happen
That I shall be scalped.
I shall use a Manitou song.
A Manitou song.

Then, you may go on the errand. That is as much as I shall tell you today," concluded the humming bird. "but you must come here again tomorrow at noon when I shall tell you more." With that, the bird became invisible and whizzed away.

The boy thought to himself that someday he would be very fast like that, too, and went home and told his father and mother what had occurred. "Surely, my son, you have done well," they said to him, and his father continued, "You have heard about your future life. That was because you fasted. Sometimes, with fasting, people are blessed by the evil spirit, and that is why, when they fast, they should tell their parents what is happening. Your blessing is good, and, if you do what you have learned, it will be well. The Manitou who has blessed you—Who-dwells-in-the-smoke-hole—is good and there is nothing wrong with what he does.

The next day, at noon, the young man went again to the place where he had been blessed, and soon, even as on the day before, the same Manitou came to him and assumed human form. "Well, I shall instruct you again today," he said. "You remember I told you that, when you are on an errand, you should eat the meat of only turtledoves and quails. But you should not be wasteful of them; you should not slay birds with downy feathers, and you should always watch over the young ones. And you should not get your firewood from the water's edge, for that is where I live.

"You must always bathe, for your body must never be filthy. You should make offerings of tobacco—food I do not want—in the
early spring, in the middle of summer, in the fall, and in the middle of winter. I have not yet given you power, for I am still giving you instructions, but, later, you will easily be able to kill game, except that which flies. You must feed game to your parents, for they are the source of your being and who have cared for you, deserve that you help them a little; and, when they forbid you something, you must listen to them. And, whenever any people worship, you should be there with them.

"Later on, people may say something against you, but do not listen to them. The Evil Manitou is always at work, and he thinks he is convincing whenever he says something, trying to rival the Manitou who confer blessings. That is why people get into trouble, but I tell you that you should not believe an evil speech, for, if you do, it will be the Evil Manitou that you will be believing.

"You must make a wooden bowl and spoon, which you will keep all your life, placing it at the dwelling of the principle chief, who will take care of it. This is the bowl that the ceremonial runners will always have. As long as you live, you will sleep on the south side of the lodge, and you must kill a spotted deer and use its skin—and it only—for your rug and mat, although, occasionally, you may use ordinary matting. In summer, when you sleep outside, you must sleep on the south side of the wickiup, because the Evil Manitou lingers on the north." So saying, the spirit became again an invisible humming bird and whizzed away.

The young man went home and told his parents what had happened, and they commended it again. The next day, at noon, he went again to the same place, and the humming bird came, straightway changed into human form, and said, "I'm the ceremonial
runner of as many fowls that fly about, and I am sent on far-off errands, as you will be, too. Nobody will be able to kill you, either; I shall live for a long time, but the time will come when I shall perish. But I shall not instruct you more today; tomorrow I shall tell you how your life will be." Then he departed. The next day, the young man came again, and now not one, but two—as like as possible—came to him, and he was told: "Now you see how we look; I presume we look alike, for we are surely both the same. This person is a ceremonial runner, who goes on errands.... Well, today is the last time I shall see you, so I shall tell you what you must do today, for now I shall bestow on you my blessing, and you will be fit to begin to work for your fellow people. You will now take off your clothing, and, when you have done so, you will stand here in the water with your head exposed and we shall fly about where you stand."

The youth undressed, waded into the water, and stood with his head exposed, while the others flew about him. The two began to graze his head repeatedly, muttering strange sounds the while. It seemed to the young man, presently, that he was beginning to fly about violently himself, and he had a bad headache, but he stayed where he was, doing nothing. "Now, very likely, you have a headache," he was told, "but do not offer any resistance." The boy obeyed, and soon became dizzy, and the earth fell fast and whirled about him. The two ceased flying, and he stopped being dizzy, and the two sat down. "You may open your mouth," they said, and when he did so, they blew into it four times—so strong that he could not speak.

"Well," said the humming birds when they had finished, "we have now given you something on which you may always rely. As long as you live, you shall have it with you. As yet, the
blessing has not entered you, but, in four days, if you are healthy, you will know that you have it. You see how healthy I am; well, in four days you will be made healthy, too. Right away, you must begin to live cleanly, and, on the third night, you must take a sweat bath. You must remember all of my instructions, for we shall not see each other again."

The young man went back to his father, who congratulated him and admonished him to follow instructions. He took a sweat bath with his father, sang him the songs, prayed, and told how he was blessed. Then, he took an ordinary bath, and, when he came back, he told his parents again how he had been blessed, and he was much praised by his mother.

"Now I must go to try to find what I was ordered," said the boy. "I have been ordered to search for a spotted deer for a rug," and he departed. He went far to see how fast he was, and by noon he had gone very far and he was not at all tired. "Maybe, I shall be very fast," he thought. He walked along, enjoying it and not getting tired. Finally, he ran back to his parents and told them how fast he was, and how tireless. The next day he went off toward the south, and soon he came to the Missouri River; there he heard some humming birds whiz by, and they were so fast that he could not see them. "Well, I had better depart," he said, and started to walk back home, soon breaking into a run, and in a short time arriving back home. "I have been at the river yonder," he told his parents. "Why," said his father, "You have been very far off!"

The next day he went hunting, and soon killed a spotted deer, which he carried back. The old woman skinned it for him, and stretched the hide so that it would dry. Then the young man went to hunt for buffalo for his moccasins. He saw a herd, soon
killed a buffalo, skinned it, cut the flesh in pieces, and went home, where the old woman termed the hide and made him his moccasins. He told his father where he had left the meat, and the old man fetched some to be cooked.

The young man himself walked around, sacrificing tobacco to trees and rocks and all the strange creatures he saw. Then he came back home and saw that his moccasins and rug were finished, so he put them where he usually sat. "We had better go to the village now," said his father. They went there, and the people rejoiced to see them.

He stayed in the village, and soon, when the people decided to hold a council, they remembered him and asked him to go about telling the news of it. He started to walk south, and from there went around telling everybody to come for the meeting. In a very short time he was back, and just seemed to be loitering around. "Why," said the people among themselves, "the one we sent on an errand is not even ready!" One of them asked him if he had gone about, and, to their amazement, he replied in the affirmative. Sure enough, soon the important people began to arrive, one by one. Now he was proved to be very fast. He was asked to come to the council meeting, and, when they were finished talking, they said to him, "Today you are young and active, and we shall send you on errands on all occasions. Now the people have a ceremonial runner that they can rely on."

The people began to call him Ceremonial Runner; he put on his moccasins, and used the hide of the spotted deer for a rug, and remembered everything that was told him, and so, from then on, he was a ceremonial runner.

He was the last of the ceremonial runners....
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