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Introduction

Having discovered and bought from America a first edition of Briffault’s massive three-volume work, I began to realize how little known the detailed contents of his researches were. Worried that it might be completely lost, I produced this booklet to make some of it more generally available and maybe to whet your appetite for more.

Some readers might feel that what follows is little more than a long list of examples of matrilineal societies – a tedious read! Yet this is forgotten knowledge. It is surprising to realize that all these societies were known and recorded in 1927, when Briffault published this book. Here, he has gathered together every last reference, from Genesis to Herodotus and from China to the Torres Straits, to argue that nearly all the world’s indigenous peoples show evidence of being matriarchal in key respects. When he was writing, ‘matriarchy’ was an acceptable term – defined as including matrilocality, bride service and the inheritance of property through the maternal line.

It must be remembered that Briffault’s aim in listing all the matrilineal and matrilocal tribes he could find was to explode the fallacy that the nuclear family and life-long monogamy had always been the normal pattern of marriage. In the process of doing this, however, he began to build up his argument that the forms of patriarchy found so commonly in the world were always preceded by matriarchy and that women almost everywhere had much more solidarity and power than was generally acknowledged. This idea fell into disrepute following the widely accepted claim that societies underwent the transition from patriliny to matriliny just as easily and frequently as the other way around. Subsequent research has shown that in fact, as Briffault originally argued, there are vanishingly few examples of patriarchal societies turning into matriarchal ones over the passage of time.

When Briffault fell out of favour, it was during a period of reaction against all attempts to reconstruct general laws of human history or evolution. In place of evolutionism, anthropologists began advocating functionalism, arguing that the best way to understand a cultural practice was to work out how it benefitted the social organism as a
whole. To pick out, say, mother-in-law avoidances from a number of different cultures and compare them now seemed unacceptable; after all, a custom found in one culture might serve a quite different function from a superficially similar one in another. Anthropologists on that basis rejected the comparative method, turning instead to studying individual cultures in detail.

We might argue that Briffault did himself a disservice in claiming too much and sometimes making excessively sweeping generalizations. Yet his enquiring and radical mind shines a light in all sorts of odd anthropological corners. From a discussion on the origin of human clothing to the role of troubadours, weaving in material from Biblical texts, Jewish history and classical Greek and Roman sources, he rescues and makes available to us a rich treasure house of findings scarcely noticed by anyone else.

Reading this, it is natural to be reminded of recent texts that update his material. For one of the best descriptions of life in a present day Chinese matriarchy, I do recommend ‘A Society Without Fathers or Husbands’ by Cai Hua (translated by Asti Hustvedt; New York: 2001). I also urge you to read ‘Mothers and Others’, by the biological anthropologist Sarah Blaffer Hrdy (Harvard University Press 2009). Hrdy provides one of the most up to date vindications of the idea that early human society really did involve group motherhood. She documents how mothers opted for postmarital residence with their own mothers, relying on knowledgeable and hardworking grandmothers for help in provisioning and caring for their increasingly demanding offspring. So it turns out that early human kinship was indeed essentially matrilocal and matrilineal – just as Briffault argued so many years ago.

The extracts in this pamphlet are all from Robert Briffault, *The Mothers* (New York: Macmillan 1927) Vol. 1. Chapter VII, pp. 268-344. This is Briffault’s chapter on matrilocal marriage, in which he argues that this arrangement characterised the prehistory of all peoples. The author dwells at some length on the status and power of women in traditional societies; it is only through lack of space that I don’t reproduce these passages here. In chapter VIII of the same volume, not included in this pamphlet, he gives evidence for similar arrangements in the history of China, Japan and the Semites, Egypt, Greece and Rome; also the Cantabrians, the Celts and the Teutons!

Here is an archive of reporting which could be of use to future researchers and certainly should not be allowed to disappear.
Matrilocal Marriage

Matrilocal marriage, that is where a woman continues to live at her mother’s house after marriage and her husband takes up residence with her, has a very faint resonance with us as the bride still has her wedding breakfast at her parent’s home. But in fact the custom is of especial interest since it suggests the existence of a former female supremacy.

Matrilocal marriage is found among many varieties of Eskimo; among the Eskimo of Labrador “the young man goes to the home of the maiden and lives there with her parents, where, as man and wife they dwell together, the son-in-law helping to support the family. He does not become his own master till the death of his father-in-law.”

The same arrangement pertains among the Eskimo of Davis Strait and Cumberland Sound. The husband does not become the master in his wife’s house until both her parents have died. If he marries a woman belonging to a strange tribe, he must leave his own tribe and become a member of that of his wife. Of the Eskimo of Bering Strait, we are told that the husband who goes to live with his wife’s family “transfers filial duty of every kind” from his own people to those of his wife. Among the Aleuts of Kadiak Island “the husband always lives with the parents of the wife, though occasionally he may visit his own relations.” It is customary for the husband to discard his own name on entering the married state, and to assume that of his wife.

For women to remain in their own home after marriage was the general rule among all North American Indians. Among the Iroquois and Huron tribes “marriages are contracted in such a way that husband and wife never quit their own families and their own home to make one family and one home by themselves. Each remain in his or her home, and the

__________________________

children born to them belong to the women who bore them.”¹ “Their marriages,” says a Jesuit missionary, “do not establish anything in common between husband and wife except the bed, for each dwells during the day with his or her parents.”² Of the Algonkin in Canada, Father Charlevoix says, “the woman never leaves her home, of which she is regarded as the mistress and the heiress….the children belong to the mother, and acknowledge her only; the father is always as a stranger in regard to them.”³ Among the Canadian tribes of the Great Lakes a man “will remain with, and maintain his father-in-law as long as he lives, while another does the same to his own father.”⁴ When in the sixteenth century the Cayuga tribes were becoming almost extinct owing to constant warfare, they sent to the Mohawks, requesting them to supply a number of husbands for their women, so that the race, which counted its descent through the women only, might not be extinguished.⁵

The Senecas, the most important, and by far the most numerous of the confederated tribes known as Iroquois usually dwelt, before the advent of Europeans, in 'long-houses', or as they called them 'hodensote', which might be sixty or a hundred feet long, being divided at both sides into compartments, while the fireplace stood in the central passage. The interior economy of these clan dwellings was under the authority of a matron, who allotted to each one his place and controlled the

---

² Relations des Jesuits. 1657. p. 34.
distribution of the food. Twelve or twenty families lived together in a ‘long-house’, “the women taking husbands from other clans.” “Usually”, says a missionary who saw some surviving specimens of those communities, “the female portion ruled the house. The stores were in common; but woe to the luckless husband or lover who was too shiftless to do his share of the providing. No matter how many children or whatever goods he might have in the house, he might at any time be ordered to pick up his blanket and budge; and after such orders it would not be healthful for him to attempt to disobey; the house would be too hot for him; and, unless saved by the intercession of some aunt or grandmother he must retreat to his own clan, or as was often done, go and start a new matrimonial alliance in some other.”

Similar usages occurred obtained among the tribes of the plains. Thus among the Sioux, “a young man, as soon as he becomes a husband, forsakes his father’s tent, to which he seldom returns as an inmate, for women in general have a great ascendancy over their husbands and they always prefer living amongst those with whom they have been accustomed from childhood.” Among the Crees, “when a young man marries he resides with his wife’s parents, who, however, treat him as a stranger until the birth of his first child, he then attaches himself to them more than to his own parents.” Among the Pawnees also, a husband took up his residence with his wife’s people; if his contributions of produce were not satisfactory, or for any other reason his wife’s people got tired of him, he was dismissed. Among the Kansas, Osages, and other allied tribes, as soon as the eldest daughter married she became the mistress of the house, her parents becoming subordinate to her; her sisters as they grew up became the wives of the same husband, who took up his residence in the home of his wives. Similar customs were found among the Omahas, Kiowas, Mandans

6 James Edwin. Account of an Expedition from Pittsburgh to the Rocky Mountains, performed in the years 1819 and ’20 under the command of S. H. Long. 2 vols.
and other Dakotan tribes, and among the Sauk and Foxes of the Mississippi valley. Among the Natchez, a powerful chief was usually attended by one or two wives who looked after his establishment, but the majority of his spouses remained with their own relations, and the husband visited them when he pleased. In Florida among the Seminola Indians, “it is the man and not the woman who leaves father and mother and cleaves to his mate.” After a time the couple might set up a household of their own where they wished, “except among the husband’s relatives.”

Among the Haidas of Queen Charlotte Islands, a man is compelled to dwell in his wife’s home till his uncle dies. Among the Déné of Alaska the expression to denote that a man is ‘yeraesta’, ‘he stays with her.’ When a girl marries she erects a hut by the side of her mother’s. Among the Ahts of Nutkas of Vancouver, the great inducement for a man to marry is that he thereby acquires hunting and fishing rights over his wife’s property. If the partnership is dissolved, “the property reverts to the woman’s sole use and is a dowry for her next matrimonial experiment.” The children remain with the mother. Among the Chinooks a prosperous man often has a large number of wives, but the wives do not at all times remain together – indeed this would be utterly impossible – but at different camps where their relations are; so that the husband goes from camp to camp occasionally.

to visit them.”¹ Among the Yokut of California, “A man on marrying goes to live at his wife’s or father-in-law’s house”, and among the Patwin “a bride often remains in her father’s home, and her husband comes to live with her.”² Among the Kwakiutl of British Colombia, the husband likewise takes up his abode in the home of the bride, but on making a special payment may remove her after three months.³

Of the South Western tribes of New Mexico and Arizona, who are known as Pueblo Indians, we have many full and delightful accounts. I cite from that of Tylor: “My own personal knowledge of the maternal community belongs to one of the most picturesque experiences of my life, on a visit made in 1884, under the auspices of The American Bureau of Ethnology, to the Pueblo Indian district on the Californian border. A Pueblo such as that of the Zuñi rises, stage above stage, presenting a dreary aspect of mud terraces, and ladders leading up and down to give access to the half-lighted rooms inhabited by the families. In the living and cooking room, round the wood fire, the inmates might be seen sitting assembled in the evening – fathers, mothers and children – so that one might suppose oneself visiting a huge lodging house of the European sort, till one understood the relationships. Enquiry would show that while in a family dwelling the mothers are related together in the female line, and therefore, of course belong to the same clan, and their children after them, the fathers are not bound together by such ties, and need not be of the same clan, only they must not be of the same clan as the wives. Though the husband takes up his abode in the wife’s family dwelling during her life and his good behaviour, he belongs still to his own family, perhaps three terraces off, up two rude pole ladders and down a trap door. How much milder and kindlier the conditions of these people are than what we associate with the name of savages may well be judged from the idyllic record of life among them by Mr. Cushing. He describes how a Zuñi girl, when she takes a fancy for a young man conveys a present of the hewe-bread to him as a token and becomes affianced; how he sews clothes and moccasins for her and combs her hair out on the terrace in the sun.

With the woman rests the security of the marriage ties; and it must be said in her high honour that she rarely abuses the privilege; that is, never sends her husband ‘to the home of his fathers’ unless he richly deserves it.”

“The domestic life of the Zuñis,” says Mrs. Stevenson, “might well serve as an example to the civilized world. They do not have large families and the members are deeply attached to one another. The writer has found great enjoyment in her visits to the general living room in the early evening after the day’s labours were over and before the elders were called away to their fraternities or elsewhere. The young mothers would be seen caring for their infants or perhaps the fathers would be fondling them, for the Zuñi men are very devoted to their children, especially the babies. The grandmother would have one of the younger children in her lap, with perhaps the head of another resting against her shoulder while the rest would be sitting near or busying themselves about household matters.”

“The house,” says Dr. Kroeber, “belongs to the women born of the family. There they come into the world, pass their lives, and within the walls they die. As they grow up, their brothers leave them, each to abide in the house of his wife. Each woman too has her husband or succession of husbands, sharing her blankets. So generation succeeds generation, the slow stream of mothers and daughters forming a current that carried with it husbands, sons, and grandsons.”

The rule that the wife remains after her marriage in the parental home, and that the husband, if he cohabits with her, takes up his residence
there, or as we may call the arrangement ‘matrilocal marriage’, was as general in Central and South America as in the northern portion of the continent. Among the Caribbean races of the West Indian Islands reports an old observer, “the women never quit their father’s house after marriage.”¹ The men might have six or seven wives living with their families in various places, and they visited them in turn.² In ancient Mexico, among the tribes of Yucatan, the husband joined his wife in her parental home;³ and at the present day among the Kekchi Indians of Guatemala, marriage is usually matrilocal.⁴ So also among the Bribri of Costa Rica, “the husband went to live with his father-in-law.”⁵ An old account of the natives of the province of Caracas gives the following description of their marriages: “If an Indian takes a fancy to a girl, he tells her so and then goes to her house. And if she gives him a basin of water to wash himself and something to eat, he understands her meaning and they go to bed together without her parents objecting; and they are thus married. The marriage continues for a longer or shorter time, solely according to the wishes of the young woman. If she thinks that her husband is not a good worker, or for any other reason, she dismisses him and takes another, and he another wife.”⁶ Of the Mozcos of New Granada an old missionary notes that “a strange custom established amongst them is that the husband follows his wife wherever she desires to dwell.”⁷ Matrilocal marriage was customary in Peru under the Inca monarchy.⁸

Of the various tribes of the Orinoco Father Gilii says: “These savages have an extremely strange custom. The women do not follow their husbands, but it is the husbands who follow their wives. From the

² De la Borde, op. cit., p. 557.
moment a savage takes a wife he no longer organises his own home. He remains with his father-in-law, into whose hut he removes his hammock, his bow and arrows, and all his belongings. He hunts for his father-in-law and fishes for him and is in all things dependent on him. It is thus the fashion with all the savages that the sons go to other people’s homes and the daughters, on the other hand, remain in theirs.”

1 The usage is prevalent at the present day among all the tribes of the Upper Orinoco. “The husband frequently lives in his wife’s village; if she no longer cares for him, she turns him out of doors.”

2 Among the Arawaks of British Guiana the husband, on taking a wife, “immediately transports his possessions to the house of his father-in-law and there lives and works. The head of the family for whom he is bound to work and whom he obeys is not his own father, but his wife’s. When the family of the young people becomes too large to be conveniently housed underneath the roof of the father-in-law, the young husband builds a house for himself by the side of that of his wife’s father.”

The Tupi tribes of Brazil, who constituted the bulk of the native population of that country, had the same customs as the Caribs, who were probably identical to them in race. “A son-in-law passed over from his own family to that of his father-in-law and became a member of it, and he was under the obligation to accompany him in war.”

4 The traditional sentiment in that respect among the Tupis of Brazil is thus illustrated by an early missionary. A young Tupi maiden having married a Christian convert, the latter desired to remove to a mission further south in order to assist in the spread of the Gospel. But the young woman would not hear of it. “You know very well,” she remonstrated, “that my father’s garden requires cultivation and that he is short of victuals. Do you know that he has given me to you on condition that you should assist him and provide for his old age? If you wish to abandon him, I for my part will remain with him.”

The same

customs are observed at the present day among the Carajas, a tribe of the same stock. The women own their houses and all their contents, and also the canoes; their husbands merely “stay with them.”\(^1\) Similarly among the tribes of the Bororo “after marriage the man stays in the house of his bride until he has a family of his own, when he builds a house for himself.”\(^2\) It appears that in the early days it was quite inconceivable to the Bororo that a woman should leave her tribe; rather than part with her, the members of her clan would all follow her if she was taken away. “This nation,” says an old Spanish writer, “have a very strange custom, which I do not think will be found in any other nation of the world and it is this; when the Portuguese take some woman, even if it be quite a young girl, of the Bororo nation, all her relatives come of their own free will to serve the Portuguese who has the girl in his home, and they continue to serve him all their lives as slaves.”\(^3\) Among the Chavantes “the bridegroom after betrothal, lives with his wife’s parents.”\(^4\)

The Guaycurus, the most important among the tribes of the interior, in the region of Gran Chaco, had similar customs. “The man goes to dwell in the house of the woman, leaving behind him in his village his home, family and possessions. If he be a chief or a man of wealth and consequence, he gives his wife his horses, soldiers, and prisoners. As his marriage is only of short duration, there is no community of goods, and after separating, the husband returns to his own family and tribe. In consequence of this mode of marriage, the men of these tribes seldom have any permanent abode, for many marriages are contracted with different tribes, the men of Albuquerque for instance, intermarrying with the people of Miranda or with the Cadindos, or in other villages near the country of the Spaniards; and the men from these places also marry with the women of the first named villages, which marriages are

very transient. As the husband always goes to live in the home of his wife, there results from this foolish practice a constant cycle of changes of abode, so that no man has a fixed and permanent place of residence. When the men passing through some remote village take a wife, the wife whom they have left behind also gets married again; if the husband returns and both are agreeable, they join again or he finds some other companion.”

The Guatos of the Araguay river have similarly various wives in different villages, whom they visit in turn. Matrilocal marriage was the general rule amongst the tribes of the Gran Chaco. Thus among the Mbayas, the husband “abandoned his parents and his belongings and went to reside with the family of his wife.” Among the Teranos, “the husband always resides with his wife’s family.” The same rule is generally observed by the Matacos. Among the Lenguas it is usual for the husband to take up his abode with his wife’s family. The custom was observed by the Abipones until a man had a family of his own. Matrilocal marriage is also reported of the T soroti, the Bakairi, and the Caingang of Southern Argentina. Among the Fuegians, the men “usually live for a long time with the parents of their wives”; and some times they continue with them permanently.

---

2 Schmidt Max. Indianenstudien in Zentralbrasilien, Berlin. 1905. p. 438
In Africa the rule that the women remain after marriage in their own family is found to be strictly observed among both the most primitive and backward people and among the most advanced races of that continent. The now almost extinct Bushmen of South Africa led a nomadic life in small groups or clans. With the consent of one of the older women, a man attached himself to a wandering group and became the partner of one or more of the women, providing the group into which he was adopted with the products of his chase. When he ceased to do so to their satisfaction, the association was dissolved and he joined some other band where he found new wives.\(^1\) Some remnants of the race survive at the present day on the Kalahari Plateau. Their usages in respect to social unions are the same as those of their ancestors. A man may on no account marry in the group to which he belongs. It is obligatory for him to join another group to find wives. On doing so, he becomes a member of the group to which his wives belong, and all connection, apart from friendly intercourse, is severed between him and the group in which he was born.\(^2\) With the somewhat more advanced and settled Hottentots the husband took up his residence, at least the first few years of married life, in the family of his wife.\(^3\) The same rule was observed among the Basutos,\(^4\) and among the Baralong and all other Bechuana tribes.\(^5\) The latter have a proverb: “Happy is she who has borne a daughter; a boy is the son of his mother-in-law.”\(^6\) Among the Zulus also the bridegroom goes to live in the house of his wife and may remain there for five years before he builds a house of his own, and sets up house-keeping for himself.\(^7\) Among the Overherero, a man, we are told, “has no home;” he sleeps by turn in the houses of his several wives.\(^8\) Livingstone thus describes the living arrangements of the Banyai of the Zambesi region: “When a young man marries he is obliged to come and live at their village. He has to perform certain services for the mother-in-law, such as keeping her well supplied with

\(^{3}\) Hahn Theophilus. Tsuni-Goam, the Supreme Being of the Koi-Koi, London. 1881. p. 18.
\(^{6}\) Brown Rev. J. Tom. The Bantu of Central-South Africa. (MS.)
firewood; and when he comes into her presence he is obliged to sit with
his knees in a bent position, as putting his feet towards the old lady
would give her great offence. If he becomes tired of living in this state of
vassalage and wishes to return to his own family, he is obliged to leave
all his children behind – they belong to his wife.”

The usage of matrilocal marriage is very general in eastern Africa. In
British Central Africa, “At marriage the man leaves his father and
mother, leaves his own home and country and goes to stay with his
wife.” With all the tribes of southern Nyasaland, “the husband
invariably goes away to live with the people of his wife.” The rule
obtains among the Marotse, the Yahos and Anyanga, the Tumbuka, the
Wakambo, the Mosuto. The marriage of the girls amongst those
people “brings an additional provider and unpaid worker into the
household. For this is the land of exogamy where the young wife does
not go to her husband’s home or ever his family, but, on the contrary, a
man leaves his father and mother and either moves directly into the
house of his wife’s parents, or builds his own close beside it.” Among
the Useguha, “unless a man has all his wives in one village, they live
with their parents and in any case after a few years of married life a
wife always insists in going to live with her parents, whither the
husband has to follow her”. Among the Bakumbi he must live from two
to five years with his parents-in-law, and the Mkonde “always builds his
first hut at the village of his wife’s parents.”

---

1 Livingstone David and Livingstone Charles. Narrative of an Expedition to the
i, p. 136.
412,413,415,471. Sir Harry Johnston mentions the Wakonde as an exception
though they also frequently revert to the traditional usage, he says. But that
matrilocal marriage is their immemorial and fundamental practice is very definitely
shown by Dr. Weule’s information.(Weule Karl. Native Life in East Africa. Transl.
4 Gibbons A. St. Hill. Africa from South to North through Marotseland, 2vols.
7 Hildebrandt J.M. “Ethnographische Notizen über Wakamba und ihre Nachbaren”,
9 Dundas Hon.Charles. “Native Laws of some Bantu Tribes of East Africa.” Journal of
the women do not leave their home after marriage, but are joined there by their husbands.1 Among the Wamegi, “When a man marries he does not remove his wife from her old home, but builds a house for her attached to that of her father, or a conical roofed hut near the flat roofed house and resides with her; when he marries another wife he leaves the first wife for a time and lives with the second wife in the village. It thus often happens, when a man has six or seven wives living in different parts of the country that he is absent for months from his first wife, as he makes his tour of visits to other wives and helps them to dig their fields and to sow and reap their crop.”2 Similarly among the Batuse of the Uganda Protectorate a man never has more than one wife in his own village; his other wives remain in their own villages and he visits them in turn in their homes.3

Among the primitive Pygmies of the Congo forests “the daughters continue even after they are married to live with their parents, and the son-in-law, passing over to the group of which their wives are members, place themselves under the order of their father-in-law.”4 The rule that the women never leave their native home is common among many tribes of the Congo.5 Thus among the Babwende of Stanley Pool a woman never leaves her native home; the husband visits her there and stays with her as long as he wishes. After a while, when he desires a change he goes to another village where the same arrangement is repeated.6 Similar customs are common in West Africa. Miss Kingsley mentions a Fan trader of her acquaintance “whose wives stretched over three hundred miles of country.”7 Among the Agni of the Ivory Coast a man who marries a woman of a different tribe establishes himself in the home of his wife and becomes part of her family, losing

2 Roscoe J. Twenty-five Years in East Africa. p. 21. (not in bibliography.)
3 Id., The Bagesu and other tribes of the Uganda Protectorate (The Third part of the Report of the Mackie Ethnological Expedition to Central Africa.) Cambridge. 1924. p. 197.
all rights of inheritance from his own family. Among the Ekoi of Southern Nigeria the husband takes up his residence in the home of his wife.

Through out the vast region which extends south of the Sahara desert from the Atlantic to the Nile and includes the countries now known as Nigeria and the French Sudan, the social constitution of the various native races appears to have been characteristically matriarchal, descent being traced through the women and property being transmitted by a man to the children of his sister. The usage of matrilocal marriage also is present in every part of that region, though at the present day the usual breaking down of old customs in favour of patriarchal usages is taking place. In Northern Nigeria among the Kona, the women continue to live in their own homes but instead of being visited by their husbands it is they who visit the men at night. Among the Kilba of the same region, the wife returns home after the birth of her first child, and remains there for at least three years; the child lives with his mother’s people until it grows up. Similarly among the Fulani, “the husband goes to live with his wife not the wife with her husband. The first born son of a Fulani always lives with his mother’s kinsfolk until his father dies.” With the Kulangas the women never leave their home; and similarly among the Madi the man is obliged to remove on marriage to his wife’s home. In the Nioru district of the French Sudan, well-to-do families generally refuse to allow their daughters to leave their home, the husbands come and reside with them. Among the Buduma of Lake Chad, if a man marries into another tribe, the wife

5 Ibid. p. 234.
“never follows him but remains with her own people.”¹ Among the Baele of the same region the women also never leave their home: a house is built for a married daughter adjoining that of her parents.² Among the Nuer of the Upper Nile, a woman never goes to live with her husband in his home until at least two years after they have been married.³ Among the Barabra of Nubia, after the marriage negotiations are concluded a house is built for the couple in the courtyard of the bride’s home.⁴ Among the natives of the large region of Darfur, in the Egyptian Sudan, the immemorial custom is for the women to continue in their maternal home after marriage. The husband comes and lives with his wife’s people, and during the first year of marriage is regarded as their guest, the wife’s father defraying all the expenses of the couple. The husband may, after a time, set up a household of his own but never until he has a family of two or three children; should he suggest doing so before that time, his indiscretion is regarded as a justifiable ground for divorce. Indeed the women are extremely reluctant to leave their natal home at any time. It is regarded as highly improper for the marriage to be consummated anywhere but in the wife’s home.⁵

The Berbers of Algeria and Tunisia have to a large extent adopted Muslim customs and are now thoroughly patriarchal in their social organization; ⁶ but those tribes which withdrew into the interior, rather than yield to foreign invasion and which are known as Tuareg, have preserved both their ancient language and their social constitution. “Berber society”, says Renan, “is nought but an example that has survived until our own time of an ancient type of society which formerly covered the whole of the world before the administrative

---

ruler, as in Egypt, or the mighty conqueror as in Assyria, Persia or Rome, had arisen.”

Among the Tuareg, “the woman does not leave her dwelling place to follow her husband but he must come to her in her own village.” “The relations of man and wife in Aheer, one of the chief centres of the Targi population of the Sahara, are curious if not extraordinary,” says Mr. J. Richardson. “A woman never leaves the home of her father. When a man marries a woman he remains with her a few weeks, and then if he will not take up residence in the town or village of his wife, he must return to his own place without her. When the husbands visit them they give them something to eat, and they remain a few days or weeks and again depart to their native town, leaving the wife with her property and any chance lover. But the men marry two or three wives and so area constantly in motion, first going to visit one wife and then another.” Descent among the Tuareg is reckoned in the female line and the child takes the condition of his mother; a man’s property and titles are handed down, not to his children, but to his sister’s children. They regard themselves as we do as descended from the first woman Eve, but in their case there is no Adam. Their ancestors in Roman times, the Numidians, had the same customs. They were named after their mothers; ‘mas’ means ‘son of’ and the son of Gula was called Masinissa, that is ‘son of Issa’. His sons were Misagenas, Micipsa, Masgaba. Icurtha, was the son of a slave woman and therefore bore his father’s name, but his sons were called after their mothers. The women retain complete control of their property after marriage, and are not obliged to contribute towards the husband’s household expenses, nor do they consent to do so. Each is thus quite economically independent. Most of the property is accumulated in the hands of the women. An old German poet who accompanied some crusading expedition mentions that in Tunis “it is the women and not the men who inherit property.”

5 Duveyrier Henri. op. cit., p. 397.
The matriarchal character of Targi society was noticed by the first traveller who described them in modern times, the Arab Ibn Batuta. “The women”, he says, “are exceedingly beautiful, and they are of more consequence than the men. The character of these people is indeed strange as they are quite impervious to jealousy. None is named after his father, but each derives his descent from his uncle on his mother’s side. Only a man’s sister’s children inherit from him to the exclusion of his own children….As regards the women, they are not timid in the presence of men, nor do they cover their faces with a veil, although they are zealous at their prayers. Whoso wishes to marry any of them may do so, but the women do not follow their husbands, and should any of them wish to do so her relatives would prevent it.”

The position which women occupy among the Berber races of the Sahara has been commented on by every traveller. Among the Berber tribes of Morocco, “the independence of the women is a cause for scandal.” The girls marry who they please without consulting anyone and the alliance is officially promulgated by the announcement that, “So-and-so, daughter of So-and-so, has taken Such-a-one as her husband.” In the Tibbu country in the Eastern Sahara, “it is man and his mistress not woman and her master.” The Tibbu ladies do not even allow their spouses to enter the house without previously sending word to announce their visit. The Tibbu women transact all the trade and manage all the affairs. “The Tibbu women are indeed everything and their men nothing – idling and lounging their time, and kicked about by their wives as so many drones of society. The women maintain the men as a race of stallions and not from love of them, but to preserve the Tibbu race from extinction.” Among the Northern Tuareg, what strikes one most, says Duveyrier, is “the preponderant part played by the women.” “In all matters their word is law.” The culture of the Tuareg is almost exclusively confined to the women; the men are entirely illiterate but the women have artistic and literary tastes, and it is in their hands alone that is preserved the knowledge of the ancient Libyan tongue and of the script which is identical with that of the most ancient inscriptions of North Africa and presents a striking affinity to

4 Duveyrier H. op. cit. p. 334.
that of Minoan Krete and of yet undeciphered inscriptions of the Aegean.1 "In all their historical traditions the women invariably play the principle part."2 Among the southern Targi tribes, says M. de Zeltner, "the women are consulted in the important affairs of life and their influence is very great, as has been observed of the Berbers. In short it is no exaggeration to describe Targi society as a gynaecocracy."3

The Malay race, which has spread over the whole Indonesian region and has sent off-shoots westwards as far as Madagascar, northwards to Formosa and China, and in early days to Polynesia, has for centuries come under the influence of Hindu and Islamic religions. The Malays nevertheless always distinguish between the laws and customs of their adopted religion and their own ancient traditional law known as ‘adat’ and they cling with considerable persistence to the latter. The old form of marriage known as ‘ambil anak’, is among most Malay populations preferred to the patrilocal marriage by purchase, or ‘jujul’, which has been introduced by Islam. “Immediately after marriage a Malay husband settles down to live in his father-in-law’s house.” Where there is but one daughter in the family, or in the case of a younger daughter, her parents commonly give up the house to her and go and live in an annex.4 “The married man becomes entirely separate from his original family and gives up his right of inheritance.”5 Chinese travellers at the time of the Ming dynasty (1368-1643) had noted that among the Malays of Sumatra “in marrying, the husband goes to the house of the wife and afterwards belongs to her family; therefore they prefer getting

2 Duveyrier H. op. cit. p. 400.
girls to boys.”¹ Malay tradition as well as historical indications, represent the highlands of middle Sumatra as the cradle of the nation and their inhabitants the Menangkabau, as the original and pure Malays....In the secluded highlands of Padang they preserve unmodified to this day the original social contributions and customs of the race. Tylor thus paraphrases from the account of them given by the Dutch Controller, Verkerk Pistorius “The traveller, following the narrow paths between dense tropical vegetation comes upon villages of long timber houses almost hidden among the foliage. Built on posts, adorned with coloured and carved woodwork and heavily thatched, these houses duplicate themselves into barrack-like rows of dwellings occupied, it may be, by over a hundred people, forming a ‘Sa-mandei’, or ‘Motherhood’, consisting of the old house-mother and her descendents in the female line, sons and daughters, daughter’s children and so on. If the visitor, mounting the ladder steps, looks in at one of the doors of the separate dwellings he may see seated beyond the family hearth the mother and her children eating the midday meal and very likely the father, who may be doing a turn of work in his wife’s rice plot. If he is a kindly husband he is much there as a friendly visitor, though his real home remains the house where he was born. To the European the social situation wears a comic aspect, as when the Dutch Controller describes the ‘chassez-croisez’, which takes place at dusk when the husbands walk across the village from their homes to join their wives.”² There is nothing to prevent a man from having several wives; in which case he visits them in turn in their various homes.³ “The Malay family, properly so-called, ‘the Motherhood’,” writes Pistorius, “consists of the mother and her children. The father does not form part of it. The bonds of kinship which unite the latter to his brothers and sisters are much closer than those between his wife and children. Both the man and the woman continue after their marriage to live in the family of their brothers and sisters. The husband is not charged with either the feeding or the maintenance of his wife or children; that obligation falls on the maternal family to whom the wife and children belong. The head of the family is usually the brother of the mother,

called ‘mamak’; he has the administration of goods, but according to custom, it is his sister who keeps the family valuables and money in her room. The family property is inalienable within the motherhood. The belongings of a Malay, pass at his death to his maternal family – first to his brothers and sisters, after to the children of his sisters, but never to his wife and the children that are born of her.”

In various branches of the Malay race and often in the same district every conceivable transition between ‘Motherhood’ and the Islamic patriarchal form of marriage of Islam may be observed.

In the almost inaccessible forests of Eastern Sumatra, among the Sakai, tribal organization is strictly matriarchal. The men have no possessions and men take up their abode for a longer or a shorter time in the house of a woman. “The woman can simply send away her husbands; house, property and furniture remain in every case the property of the woman.” The man too, can go away when he chooses but he is obliged to refund the expenses incurred for his maintenance by his wife’s family. Similar customs are observed by the Malays of Rantau-Binuwang. Among the Atjehs, who occupy the western part of Sumatra, the women never leave their paternal home after marriage.

The customs of the Malay race have passed with it over to the mainland. “In Negri Sembilan, land tenure, contract and succession to property are still governed mainly by the Matriarchal law of Menangkabau”. “A man marrying into another tribe becomes a member of it; the children also belong to the tribe of the woman”. In the Binua tribes of Johore

also the man joins the family of his wife, and she never leaves it to follow him.¹

Matrilocal marriage is the rule among the primitive races of Timor,² of the neighbouring islands of the southern Moluccas,³ and in Celebes.⁴ In the northern Moluccas, as in Java, Islamic marriage customs have now become universal, but in the islands of Sangir and Talau, between Celebes and the Philippines, “the man always goes to the house of his wife and becomes a member of her family.”⁵

In Borneo amongst both Land and Sea-Dayaks, it is the rule that the husband takes up his residence with the family of his wife; often he is merely a visitor there. To this rule there are but few exceptions, as when, owing to the large number of brothers and sisters, the wife’s home is too crowded to accommodate the husband, or when he is the only support of aged relatives.⁶ Thus in British North Borneo, “after

---

marriage the bridegroom becomes the liege-man of his wife’s family, dwelling in his father-in-law’s house for at least six months; but in districts such as Tuara and Pape, where the common village home has been abolished, he is allowed to move after the period and build a house of his own.”¹ In the Kenyan and Kayan tribes the husband takes up his residence in the room of his wife’s people; he does not take his wife to his own home until his father dies or a new home is built. If the woman be of noble birth she never in any circumstances leaves her home for that of her husband.²

In the Philippines likewise it was the general native custom for the women to continue in their own home after marriage, their husbands joining them there.³ Among the wild Igorots of Bontoc, when a girl marries, a hut is built for her and her husband adjoining that of her parents.⁴ Similarly among the Bila-an and the Mandaya of Mindanao, the husband takes up his quarters with his wife’s people either until he has a family of his own or for an indefinite number of years.⁵ It was noted by the early Spanish conquerors that among the wildest tribes they called ‘Pintados’, on account of the tattooing with which their bodies were covered, the men ‘love their wives so dearly that in case of a quarrel they take sides with their wives’ relations even against their own fathers and mothers.’⁶

The natives of the Micronesian region, the Carolines with the exception of Yap, the Marshall, Mortlock, Pelew and Gilbert Islands, are matriarchal in their social organization. Thus in the Pelew Islands, “the meaning of the family is different from our conception, and has

⁵ Cole Fay Cooper. Traditions of the Tinguian, a Study in Philippine Folklore (Field Museum of Natural History, Anthropological Series vol. xii. No.2.) Chicago. 1913. The Wild Tribes of Davao District, Mindanao pp. 144,192.
reference to female descent.” The head of the family is the oldest female, ‘adhalal a blay’, the ‘Mother of the family’ and the head of each district is ‘adhalal a pelu’, the ‘Mother of the land.’ All landed property is in the hands of women, and a man’s property goes not to his sons, but to his sister’s children.\(^1\) Marriage is throughout the region essentially matrilocal, although the rule in some islands may not be strictly adhered to when inconvenient. In the Pelew Islands a man is under the obligation to reside at least for a time in his wife’s home and she may not be confined anywhere else.\(^2\) In Ponapé matrilocal marriage is the rule.\(^3\) In Yap a man visits his wives in their various homes.\(^4\) In the Gilbert Islands, “on marriage a man always removes to the house of his wife. If he marries the eldest daughter, her parents give up the home to her and build themselves a new house in the neighbourhood.”\(^5\) In the Mortlock Islands the husband has his field in one part of the reef and passes backwards and forwards across the lagoon, to and from his wife’s home in another part, lending a hand to the cultivation of her patch.\(^6\)

Similarly in the western islands of Torres Straits, where matrilocal marriage is the rule, it is common for men to marry in another island and to divide their time between their own plantation and that of their wife, crossing backwards and forwards at different seasons of the year between the two islands. If the husband, in later life, settles down in a more permanent manner, it is usually in the home of his wife.\(^7\)

A very similar thing is found amongst the natives of Dutch New Guinea….in the south eastern extremity of the large island; a man has a number of wives who he visits in turn in the various villages where they dwell. That arrangement which has already been noted in several

\(^2\) Ibid. p. 55.
\(^7\) Haddon A. C. in Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits, Magic and Fetichism. vol. v. London. 1906. pp. 225, 229.
parts of the world and which may be called a polyaecious form of marriage is very clearly described, as practised by his countrymen by a semi civilized native of the Dobu region of New Guinea. “Suppose you reside at a village called A, one of your wives will be a woman belonging to village B, another to C, the third to D, the fourth to E, and the fifth to F. No one of them can be of your town, A; the A women are forbidden to you. And each of these five wives of yours stays in her own town; she does not come to yours. Her house is built in her town, and you dwell in your house in A. But it is your business to go and visit them at B, C, D, and F, and plant food in each of these places. And as for the children of these women they belong to the town and tribe of their mother, so that you have no children at all in A, and your line is extinct in your own town. But if you have a sister and a man marries her, he does not take her away to his own town. Her house is built near yours in A, and her children are not counted to her husband’s tribe or clan; they are counted to yours. Thus your own children go to other tribes, but your sister’s children come to yours.”

The natives of Motu in British Papua have similar arrangements; they visit their wives in neighbouring villages in the same manner as those of Doreh and Dobu. In the Wagawaga district husbands take up their abode permanently in the homes of their wives. Matrilocal marriage would thus appear to be the typical native usage in most parts of New Guinea, although there are great gaps in our information concerning the various parts of that vast island. There are instances in several regions of a state of transition from matrilocal to patrilocal usages. Thus in some parts of Dutch New Guinea a man may take his wife to his home for a year, after which she returns to hers where he visits her. The fundamental matrilocal character of their customs is significantly indicated by the fact that no boy can go through the puberty ceremonies until he has resided for a time with his mother’s family. Among the Massim tribes of Eastern New Guinea all degrees of transition and, as it were, hesitations between matrilocal and patrilocal marriage customs occur; it is incumbent upon the men to spend some time in the wife’s family and to make a garden there, but

---

they also cultivate a patch round their own homes, and they spend the first years of their married life in a semi-migratory existence between the two homes.¹ In New Zealand a young man on marriage, “continued to live with his father-in-law, being looked upon as one of the tribe, or ‘hapu’ to which his wife belonged, and in the case of war the son-in-law was often obliged to fight against his own relations. So common is the custom of the bridgroom going to live with his wife’s family that it frequently occurs, when he refuses to do so, that his wife will leave him and go back to her relatives. “Several instances came under my notice,” says Mr. Taylor, “where young men have tried to break through this custom and have lost their wives in consequence.”² Often both the men and the women continued to live with their own relatives, the husbands visiting their wives from time to time.³ In Samoa likewise, it was usual for the husband to take up his abode in the home of his wife.⁴ He became an absolute bond-slave to his mother-in-law.⁵ In the Ellice Islands the husband lived with his wife’s mother until the combined families grew too large for the hut.⁶ In Raratonga, if a woman married a man belonging to the same island, she went to live with him; but if she married a man from another island he had to come and live with her.⁷ In the Hervey or Cook Islands, if the wife were a chief’s daughter, it was compulsory that her husband should take up his domicile in her home; his children belonged to her clan, and both they and their father were under an obligation to fight with the mother’s clan, even against that of

---

the husband’s father. Similar matrilocal usages have been noted in the Marquesas, in Bowditch Island, and in Rotuma.

In the Nicobar Islands “until he marries a man considers himself a member of his father’s household, but after that event he calls himself the son of his father-in-law, and he becomes a member of his wife’s family, leaving the house of his parents, or even the village, if the woman dwells elsewhere.”

Among the Ainu of Japan, one of the most primitive races of Asia, the native usage is for the women to remain in their own home, and for their husbands to join them there, although at the present day where contact with the Japanese is closest, a woman may sometimes join her husband in his home after some years, but never before the birth of a child. According to the older usage “the bridegroom is removed from his family to take up his abode close to the hut of his father-in-law; he is in fact adopted.” The Ainu, we are informed, “do not like to give their daughters into another family, but prefer to adopt the son-in-law.” Where a man has several wives they remain each in her own home. In the Kuril Islands which are inhabited by a branch of the same race which has not come under Japanese influence, the primitive customs are regularly maintained; a man does not live with his wives but merely visits them in their homes.

Among all the peoples of northern and central Asia no custom is more persistently and strictly observed than that which requires the

5 Kloss Boden C. In the Andamans and Nicobars. London. 1903. p. 236.
6 Siebold H. von. Ethnologischen Studien über die Aino auf der Insel Yesso. p. 31. (not in bibliography)
8 Czaplicka M.A. Aboriginal Siberia. Oxford. 1914. p. 102n; from a personal communication from Mr. Pilaudski.
9 Batchelor John. op. cit., p. 231
bridegroom to reside for a more or less prolonged period in his wife’s family, or that the bride after a short residence with her husband, shall return for a prolonged period to her own home.

Among all the peoples of northern and central Asia no custom is more persistently and strictly observed than that which requires the bridegroom to reside for a more or less prolonged period in his wife’s family, or that the bride, after a short residence with her husband, shall return for a prolonged period to her own home. These customs which are similar to the practices now observed in some parts of New Guinea and Africa which, to our knowledge, are in a state of transition from recent matrilocal to patrilocal usages, suggest that they are survivals of a time when marriage throughout these parts of Asia was also permanently matrilocal. And that inference is confirmed when it is found that amongst several of them, this is the case. At the present day the Yakut, the most numerous and widespread of these Siberian races, visit their wives for several years in their homes, and many children are usually born before a separate home is set up.¹ Travelling in their country in the eighteenth century, the French consular agent Lesseps, thus described their practise: “Polygamy is a social institution amongst them. Being obliged to make frequent journeys from place to place, they have a wife in each of the places where they stay, and they never gather them together in one home.”² “Each wife of a polygynous Yakut,” says Troshchanski, “lived separately with her children, and relations and cattle; during the frequent absences of her husband, she was actually the head of the family.”³ Among the Chukchi of the extreme north east of Asia, every man, no matter how rich he may be, is obliged to take up his residence for a considerable time, often for several years, during which he begets a considerable family, with his wife’s people; at times he becomes a permanent member of it.⁴ In the neighbouring Aleutian Islands, wives remained for at least one or two years after marriage in their own home, and never in any circumstances left it until they had a

³ Czaplicka M.A. op. cit., p. 197n.
child. It has been noted as a ‘singular custom’ of the natives of Kamchatka that a man is there obliged to take up his residence in his wife’s home and to serve her family in the capacity of a slave for from one to ten years; after that period of probation the husband “lives with his father-in-law as if he were his own son.” It was usual to marry all the sisters of the family or several cousins. Among the Koryak likewise, a young man was obliged to take up his residence in the home of his wife, where he might remain five or ten years. The same customs obtain among the Yukaghir; the bridegroom is accepted by the bride’s father only on condition the latter solemnly declares that “he will stay with me to the end of my life, till death.” The husband frequently succeeds his father-in-law as head of the house. Among the Tungus the newly married couple were wont to remain for at least two years after their marriage with the bride’s father; after that time the latter presented them with a ‘yurta’ of their own. There is little doubt that marriage was with them entirely matrilocal, for their social constitution was matriarchal, all relationship being counted on the female side only. “They are a very ferocious people,” writes an old Chinese historian; “in a fit of rage they would kill a father or an elder brother, but never hurt their mother, because the mother was considered the fountain of kinship.” Among the Buryat, a Mongolian tribe of southern Siberia, the bride after marriage returns home for six months or more and these visits are several times repeated until the family settles down in her husband’s home. We are definitely informed by Buryat tradition that it was formerly the usage for the husband to take up his abode

---

2 Dobell Peter. Travels in Kamchatka and Siberia. 2 vols. London. 1830. vol. i. p. 82.
permanently in the home of his wife. Among the Samoyeds the women return home after marriage, but only for a few weeks. The custom that the bride should return to her home for a longer or shorter period, after a brief honeymoon is common among all the Tartar populations of Central Asia. She remains with her parents, sometimes for as long as two years and during that period her husband only pays clandestine visits to her during the night. Similar customs are observed in the Caucasus. Among the Chevsurs, the bride never spends more than three days with her husband, after which she returns home and is secretly visited by him. Among the Ossetes the wife returns to her home after a few months, and the husband must come and formally claim her once more. The same usage is observed by the Votyak, and the transfer of the bride, after she has given birth to a child in her own home, is attended with the same ceremonial as the original wedding. Among the tribes of Aghanistan it is usual for the husband to join the family of his wife, at least for a certain period.

In several parts of China are various aboriginal populations of non-Chinese race. One of these tribes, the Nue’Kun, is said to be permanently ruled by a woman, the supreme authority being confined to the female descendents of the ruling family. Among the more secluded of those tribes, in the mountains of Kwei-Chow, marriage is matrilocal; after ten years of married life a man sometimes removes from his wife’s family to a household of his own. In the population of

2 Ibid. p. 124.
the lowlands such as the Lunk-Tsung-Ye-Yan,¹ and the Miao² which have come in closer contact with the Chinese, the wife remains in her home until the birth of her first child. In south-western China amongst the Lolo, the claims of a husband to remove his wife to his home are emphatically asserted but are associated with a significant indication of other customs. The bride is brought to the house of her father-in-law but “the remarkable particularity among the Lolo is that invariably, some days after marriage, the bride escapes and runs home to her father’s house.” The husband must use entreaties and offer her presents to win her back; if she proves obdurate he has the recognised right to use a stick.³

Through out the eastern peninsula of southern Asia – that is amongst the peoples of Siam, Burma, Indo-China and Tonkin – marriage customs are characteristically matrilocal. Thus in Burma, “after marriage the couple almost always live for two or three years in the house of the bride’s parents the son-in-law becoming one of the family and contributing to its support. Setting up a separate establishment, even in Rangoon, where the young husband is a clerk in an English office is looked upon with disfavour as a piece of pride and ostentation.⁴ If the girl is an only daughter she and her husband stay on till the old people die.”

In Siam, after the marriage negotiations are completed it is the first duty of the bride’s father to provide a home for the couple. “It is customary to erect the building near the home of the bride’s father; thus a newly married young man is scarcely ever to be found with his own father, but with his father-in-law.” Until after the birth of the first child all the expenses of the young couple fall to the charge of the bride’s father.⁵ The rule of matrilocal marriage is the primitive usage of all the peoples of Cochin China. It is falling into disuse amongst the more advanced populations of Annam and Cambodia, where in the more conservative families the bridegroom is merely required to reside

¹ Ibid. p. 304.
⁴ Shway Yoe. (i.e. Sir James George Scott) The Burman; his Life and Notions. 2 vols. London. 1882. vol. i. p. 70.
with his wife's family for about a year. But among the more sophisticated tribes of northern Tonkin, whence the Annamites and Cambodians derive, the usage is general and strictly observed. Thus among the Moi, the most important and numerous of those tribes, "a girl who marries does not leave her parents; it is, on the contrary, the husband who comes to dwell with his wife, unless he is rich enough to provide a slave as compensation in her stead." The bride is taken on a visit of five or ten days to the home of her father-in-law, but the marriage may not be consummated there. After the visit the couple return in state to the bride's home and settle there permanently. If, as is usual there are several wives, they are commonly sisters; but if another wife is taken in another family, she also remains and the husband divides his time between the homes of his various wives. An arrangement may however be made if the second wife is not in good circumstances and has not a comfortable home, for the first wife to invite her to come to share her house with her husband and her sisters. Such customs are observed by the other primitive populations of northern Tonkin, such as the Thaï, the Man, the Muong, the Pateng. The rule is strictly observed among the inland populations of southern Indo-China.

In India in the Hills of Assam are various tribes who, undisturbed by the tramps and drums of three conquests, have retained to this day a primitive social organization, and still erect large standing stones like the menhirs of Brittany over their dead. In a Syntang household you

---

will find an old crone who is the grandmother or even perhaps the great-grandmother of the family, together with her grandchildren and great-grandchildren; but the husbands of the daughters are not there. They only visit their wives at night, and are known as ‘u shong kha,’ that is, ‘begetters’. Among the Khasis “the husband does not take his bride to his own home, but enters her household or visits it occasionally. He seems merely entertained to continue the family to which his wife belongs.” In some Khasi tribes the husbands take up their abode with their wives, who remain under the same roof as their mothers and grandmothers. The grandmother is called ‘the young grandmother’ to distinguish her from the grandmother who is the ancestress of the family and its protecting goddess. All a man earns before he is married goes to his mother, after his marriage his earnings go to his wife’s family. Property is transmitted from mother to daughter, but curiously, it is the youngest, not the eldest daughter, who gets the lion’s share, and in the tribe, the whole of the landed property. The maternal clan, which thus constitutes the social units of these peoples is called ‘Mahari’, that is ‘Motherhood’. “Their social organisation”, says Sir Charles Lyall, “presents one of the most perfect examples still surviving of matriarchal institutions carried out in a logical and thorough manner which to those accustomed to regard the status and authority of the father as the foundation of society are extremely remarkable. Not only is the mother the head and source and only bond of union of the family; in the most primitive parts of the hills, the Synteg country she is the only owner of real property and through her alone is inheritance transmitted. The father has no kinship with his children, who belong to their mother’s clan. The flat memorial stones which they set up to perpetuate the memory of the dead are called after the woman who represents the clan and the standing stones ranged behind them are dedicated to male kinsmen on the mother’s side.”

The same organization is found among other tribes of the region. Thus among the Garos “it is agreed that the woman occupies the superior position. The husband enters her mother’s family and the children belong to her clan, and not to that of the father. All property goes through the woman, and males are incapable of inheriting in their own

---

right.” The husband takes up his abode with his wife in the house of her parents.¹ Among the Lalungs, another tribe of the Khasi and Jaintia Hills, “the usual custom in regard to marriage is for the parents of the girl to find a husband for her and take him to their house as a member of their family. The offspring of such marriages enter the clan of the mother.”² Among the Kochs “the men are so gallant as to have made over all property to the women, who in return are most industrious, weaving, spinning, brewing, planting, in a word, doing all the work not above their strength. When a woman dies, the family property goes to her daughters, and when a man marries he lives with his wife’s mother, obeying her and his wife.”³

The usage of matrilocal marriage is found among several of the most typical aboriginal races of India, especially where Brahmanical Hindu customs have not to any great extent influenced the original customs of the people, and among many other local tribes the survival of matrilocal customs indicates that they were formally general. Among the Kehal, a nomadic tribe of boatmen on the Indus, who are now Muhammadans, the husband “goes to live permanently with his father-in-law and subsequently becomes his heir.”⁴ Among the Gonds the son-in-law resides for a period of seven to eight months to three years in the home of his wife.⁵ Among the Santals and the Mundas, permanent matrilocal marriage is common, and the son-in-law becoming a member of the family succeeds to a portion of his father-in-law’s inheritance.⁶ Among the Ragjhar, a mixed caste of farm servants in the northern districts of the Central Provinces, the bride, after spending three months with her husband, returns to her home for a year.⁷ Among the Bhongi, when the bride is wealthy it is obligatory for the husband to take up his residence

² Ibid. p. 707.  
in her home.\textsuperscript{1} Among the Kaikadis, a wild tribe dwelling in the hills of Khandsh and Bijapur, the husband is bound to dwell with his wife’s family until he has a family of his own of at least three children.\textsuperscript{2} So again among the Lamans of Ahmadgar, the husband is expected to reside for several years in his wife’s home before he sets up one of his own.\textsuperscript{3}

In southern India on the Malabar coast, the famous Nayars constituted the aristocratic caste of the native Tamil population. The marriage customs have attracted much attention, and will have to be discussed elsewhere in some detail. All that we have to note here is that among them no woman ever left her home to take up her residence with her husband. The family group or clan, or, as it was called, the ‘tarwad’, or ‘Motherhood’, consisted “of all the descendents in the female line of a common female ancestor.”\textsuperscript{4} The household was constituted by the mother and her children, sisters and brothers; no husband formed part of it. The husbands were in the strictest sense visitors only, and so scrupulously was that position recognised that a Nayar husband would not even partake of food in the home of his wife, not being a member of it, but made a point of paying his visits after supper.\textsuperscript{5} At the present day much of the social organisation of ‘Nayar’ motherhoods has suffered the disintegrating influences of modern conditions, but the essential rule of matrilocal marriage continues to be adhered to, and “ancient and aristocratic families still refuse to send their ladies out of the home.”\textsuperscript{6} Throughout South Malabar and North Travancore it is exceptional for a woman to remove after marriage to her husband’s home.\textsuperscript{7}

In several of the instances above considered, marriage is not permanently matrilocal, but the continued residence of the woman in her own home after marriage and the residence of her husband with her family are limited to varying periods of months or years. Sometimes

\textsuperscript{1} Crooke W. Ibid. vol. i. p. 281.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid. vol. xvii. p. 162.
\textsuperscript{4} Thurston E. Ethnographic Notes in Southern India. Madras. 1906. p. 120, n.
\textsuperscript{5} Buchanan F. A Journey from Madras Through the Countries of Mysore, Canara and Malabar. 3vols. London. 1807. vol. ii. p. 412.
such attenuated matrilocalse usages have dwindled down to a mere ceremonial. Thus in the Patani States of the Malay Peninsula it is obligatory for the young couple to spend the first fortnight of their married life in the wife’s home.¹ Since permanent residence of the wife in her mother’s family was the original rule with the Malays, the obligation to remain there a fortnight after marriage can only be regarded as a ceremonial relic of the older usage. When the same custom is found elsewhere, as for instance among the Kaduppattan of Cochin,² the inference is probable that it derives from a similar original practise. Again among the Baila of Rhodesia, a region where matrilocalse marriage was once general, the wedding night is now spent by the newly married couple at the bridegroom’s house, but they proceed the next day to the wife’s home, and after a ceremony in which the bridegroom casts a spear in the ground before his wife, they remain there two nights.³ Among the Kagoro of Nigeria, the bride and bridegroom spend their wedding night only at the house of the bride’s parents.⁴ The same custom is observed by some tribes of Dardistan; but amongst others the prescriptive residence of the young couple in the bride’s home extends for several months.⁵ Perhaps the most attenuated form of matrilocalse customs is found among the tribes of Southern India. Among the Mappellas of Malabar, the bride and bridegroom, after the wedding ceremony, are locked up together in a room of the bride’s home “for a few moments.” The marriage is supposed to be consummated; but as a matter of fact, the custom is merely ritual.⁶ Among the Wends, the bridegroom spends the night at the bride’s house; before doing so he bids an unnecessarily solemn farewell to his family.⁷ As with most other primal institutions of society an attenuated relic of matrilocalse marriage survives in our own usages as the custom of

---

¹ Annandale N. and Robinson H.C. Fasciculi Malayenses. 2Parts. London. 1903-4. vol. ii. p. 75.
partaking of the wedding breakfast at the bride’s house; the bridegroom thus begins his married life as a guest of his wife’s family.

In those instances the vestigial matrilocal usages are but empty ceremonial practices which cannot serve any practical object, and have merely a sentimental value. In other instances, the practice of transferring the wife to the husband’s home is qualified either by alternating residences in the home of the husband and wife respectively or by a return of the bride to her own home, and by frequent prolonged visits to her own family. In many parts of Africa, even where the wife is brought to her husband’s home, the connection with her own family remains much closer than is the rule in advanced patriarchal societies. Of the Bakerewe, a missionary remarks: “A custom which is very injurious to good understanding and to stability in marriage is the habit which women have of going back to their family on the least occasion. If she is indisposed, the woman says: ‘I am going home.’ And those residences, often very prolonged, demoralise the poor husband who is left alone. But he is powerless to alter things; it is the fashion.”

In many other instances, partial matrilocal marriage is scarcely distinguishable from ‘marriage by service’, in which the bridegroom gives his services for a stipulated period in consideration of being afterwards permitted to remove his wife from her parents to one of his own. Only on a very superficial view of the facts could the usage be interpreted as having had its origin in the commutation of payment. The practice of making a payment to the wife’s family, which is a comparatively late social usage and is unknown in societies where the notion of traffic has not yet developed, appears to be a commutation of the services which the wife’s family expect from the son-in-law. All matrilocal marriage is in a sense, ‘marriage by service’, for the association of the husband with the wife’s family is generally conditional on his contributing his labour towards their maintenance, and also on his fighting on their behalf. Where ‘marriage by service’ is associated with ‘marriage by purchase’ and where services for a given period are tendered in place of such payment, it is clearly an adaptation from more ancient usages to conditions and transactions which are foreign to the constitution of primitive society. It is not found anywhere except where permanent matrilocal marriage is customary or has been

---

in the past. Thus, among the tribes of Assam, where there is a matriarchal social organization, as among the Khasis, the Garos, the Kochs we are told that among the Bodo and Dhimal, who now pay a bride price on marriage, “a youth who has no means of discharging this sum must go to the house of his father-in-law elect and there literally earn his wife by the sweat of his brow, labouring ‘more judaico’, upon mere diet labouring for a term of years varying from two to five or even seven as the extreme period. This custom is named gaboi by the Bodo, gharjya by the Dhimals.”¹ It would be difficult to suppose that the custom of these tribes is independent in origin from the universal and permanent matrilocal customs of their neighbours and kinsmen. Similarly, when we find the same custom of ‘marriage by service’ reported from parts of Indo-China, Malaya or Africa and the bridegroom is described as earning his wife by service, the practice cannot be seen as unconnected with the wider society’s matrilocal usages. This service is very commonly, not an optional alternative to the payment of a bride-price, but is compulsory, no matter how well able he may be to make that payment. Nay, in some instances, instead of the ‘service’ being regarded as a form of payment, the husband himself is paid by the wife’s parents to forgo any claim to remove her and her children from their home.² Matrilocal marriage has been erroneously described even when quite unmodified by some older observers as ‘serving for a bride.’ Thus the Jesuit missionaries in North America, with the Biblical precedent of the marriage of Jacob in their minds, frequently represented the marriage customs of the Indians as marriage by service. Jacob’s marriage itself is not an example of the commutation by services of a payment entitling the husband to remove his wives, for the Biblical narrative expressly tells us that Jacob’s father-in-law utterly denied that he had any such right, even after twenty years.³ It seems to be a social fact to which there are no exceptions that whenever a man removes his wife from her home and brings her to his own the procedure invariably involves a compact or transaction whereby such a transfer is sanctioned by the woman’s family. Where a man is given the right to remove her it is as the result of the

³ Genesis, xxxi, 26, 43.
development of juridic and commercial transactions and of the purchasing power of the man. This rule is most frequently associated with the reckoning of descent through the female line. The classic example of this and the one that drew our attention to it, is the one given by Herodutus of the practise if the Lycheans in Asia Minor. “They have,” he says, “a singular custom which no other people have; for they take their names after their mother and not their father; and if a Lykian be asked who he is, he will recite his genealogy on his mother’s side, reckoning up his ancestry from mother to mother.”¹ That which Herodutus thought ‘singular’ is known to be the rule with about half the people of the world; and with most of those peoples who reckon descent in the paternal line, clear evidence exists showing that the opposite rule formerly obtained amongst them also. However it does not necessarily imply the dominant position of women for in the Australian tribes, for example, although descent is reckoned through the women they are not dominant. However in matrilocal marriage it is evident that the woman occupies a position of vantage entirely different from that which she holds in patriarchal societies, however civilized and refined, and that in those circumstances her status cannot be one of complete subjection. Heer Adriani remarks that among the Toradjas of Middle Celebes, owing to the woman remaining in her own home and in the midst of her own relatives, the husband’s position is always one of subordination.² The whole organization of Zuni society remarks Dr. Kroeber, is founded on the continued residence of the woman in her home. “Attached to her ownership of it is the Zuni woman’s position in her world. Upon her permanent occupancy of her house rests the matrilinear custom of her tribe.”³

Of the various features of the matriarchal order of society, matrilocal marriage is the most distinctive and important and wherever it has been found that this was the practise in the past we can conclude that at one time it had a matriarchal order.

¹ Herodutus, i. 173.