

to see that he is in a minority of one. The rattlesnakes stand by each other through thick and thin, and every member of the clan is bound by all that is holy to take vengeance for a wrong done to a brother or sister rattle-snake.

So among the North American Indians every nation was divided into a number of clans, and among most of the nations the rule is or was firstly, that no man could marry in his own clan, and, secondly, that every child belonged to the clan of its mother. (McLennan, *Primitive Marriage*, 96, Post, Grundriss, vol. I, p. 71). It would be easy to multiply instances of the same rule. What is the explanation of reckoning kindred by the mother only, and not considering that a child was related to its father or its father kin? The answer generally given is that it dates back to a time when even the wisest child did not know its own father. It is assumed that there was a time in the infancy of the race, when marriage had not been thought of. The wild men and women who wandered about the woods, picking up a precarious livelihood by killing game with the rudest weapons, formed according to this theory no permanent alliances with each other. Sir John Lubbock, with commendable gallantry, speaks of the women as "communal wives." But some degree of specific appropriation seems to be implied in the word "wife," and the term marriage is inappropriate to describe the casual and fleeting relations between the sexes which are assumed to have been universal in primitive society. As Mr. Herbert Spencer puts it, "among low savages the relations of the sexes are substantially like those common among inferior creatures." (*Principles of Sociology*, 3rd Ed., Vol. I, p. 600). Exclusive relationship by the mother is ascribed upon the theory to the uncertainty of paternity. The well-known saying "maternity is a