

possessed an equality, or even in some cases had a decided precedence, in the sphere of social and private law. While this precedence was not so great, or so coextensive with maternal lineage as some sociologists<sup>1</sup> have held, yet along with maternal lineage went in some cases an amelioration of the condition of women. Such an amelioration was apparent among the Sioux and the Wyandottes. In other cases the husband was the autocrat, and often the woman was only a medium through which rights were conveyed. (Dargun.) The conclusion at which Doctor Howard arrives is as follows: "In short, if among many peoples at some stage of progress research has clearly demonstrated the existence of mother-right, it has just as clearly shown that the notion of a gynocracy, of a period of female supremacy, is without historical foundation."<sup>2</sup>

Woman, from the very beginning of the history of mankind, seems to have been always more or less in a state of dependence, either to her father or to her husband. While allowance must be made for exceptions, this statement represents the prevailing condition of women in all ages. Professor Westermarck gives the results of extensive research work:

We must distinctly reject as erroneous the broad statement that the lower races in general hold their women in a state of almost complete subjection. Among many of

<sup>1</sup> Kantsky, Letourneau, Tylor, Grosse.

<sup>2</sup> "Matrimonial Institutions," Vol. I, p. 46.