Whilst jealousy is not unknown amongst these tribes, the point of importance in respect to the matter under discussion is that it is not strongly enough developed to prevent the occurrence of general intercourse on certain occasions, or the lending of wives at other times: it is, indeed, a factor which need not be taken into serious account in regard to the question of sexual relations amongst the Central Australian tribes. A man in these tribes may be put to death for wrongful intercourse, but at the same time this is no proof of the fact that sexual jealousy exists; it is a serious offence against tribal laws, and its punishment has no relation to the feelings of the individual.

We may now pass on to discuss briefly the customs relating to marriage which have already been enumerated, and in so doing, as we have often to refer to the lending of wives, it must be remembered that we use this term only as applying to the private lending of a woman to some other individual by the man to whom she has been allotted, and do not refer to the custom at corroborees which has just been dealt with, and which, as it is in reality obligatory and not optional, cannot be regarded as a lending in the same sense in which the term is used in connection with the former custom.

In his well-known work dealing with human marriage, Westermarck has brought together, from various sources, facts relating to similar customs, and, while discussing the hypothesis of promiscuity from an adverse point of view, has endeavoured to explain them as due to various causes. These we may conveniently discuss, examining each briefly in the endeavour to ascertain whether it will or will not serve to explain the marriage customs as we find them in Australian tribes, of which those quoted above may be taken as typical examples. It must be understood that we are here simply dealing with this question so far as the evidence derived from these Australian tribes is concerned.

The first explanation offered is that in certain instances the practice is evidently associated with phallic worship, as, for example, when in the valley of the Ganges, the virgins had offer themselves up in the temples of Juggernaut.

1 The History of Human Marriage, pp. 51-133.
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implies a state of social development very different from, and
much more advanced than, anything met with amongst the
Australian natives, and the two customs are evidently quite
distinct from one another. It is doubtful how far phallic
worship can be said to exist amongst the Australian natives.

In other cases where the bride is for a night considered the
common property of the guests at a wedding feast, Wester-
marck suggests that "It may have been a part of the nuptial
entertainment—a horrible kind of hospitality no doubt, but
quite in accordance with savage ideas, and analogous to another
custom which occurs much more frequently—I mean the
practice of lending wives." This presupposes, and in fact is
cog-existent with, what does not take place in Australian
tribes, and that is a more or less regular marriage ceremony
at which guests assemble, and such an organised proceeding
cannot be said to exist amongst the tribes with which we are
dealing; moreover, apart from this, which is not perhaps a
very serious objection, though it seems to imply a state of
development considerably in advance of that of the Australian
natives, there still remains what appears to us to be the in-
superable difficulty of accounting, on this hypothesis, for the
fact that this "hospitality" amongst Australian tribes is only
allowed to a limited number of individuals, all of whom must
stand in some particular relationship to the woman.

Westermarck further suggests that it is analogous to the
custom of lending wives. Now, amongst the Australian
natives wives are certainly lent, but only under strict rules:
in the Arunta tribe for example no man will lend his wife to
any one who does not belong to the particular group with
which it is lawful for her to have marital relations—she is
in fact, only lent to a man whom she calls Unawa, just as
she calls her own husband, and though this may undoubtedly
be spoken of as an act of hospitality, it may with equal justice
be regarded as evidence of the very clear recognition of group
relationship, and as evidence also in favour of the former
existence of group marriage.

It is quite true, on the other hand, that a native will some-
times offer his wife, as an act of hospitality, to a white man:
but this has nothing to do with the lending of wives which
has just been dealt with, and the difference between the two acts is of a radical nature. The white man stands outside the laws which govern the native tribe, and therefore to lend him a wife of any designation does not imply the infringement of any custom. This is purely and simply, as Westermarck points out, an act of hospitality, but the very fact that he will only lend his wife, if he does so at all, to another native of a particular designation, seems to at once imply that we are dealing with a custom at the root of which lies something much more than merely an idea of hospitality. The lending of women to men outside the tribe who are not amenable to its laws and customs is one thing, to lend them to men who are members of the tribe is quite another thing, and the respective origins of the customs in these two radically different cases are probably totally distinct—one is no doubt to be explained on the hypothesis of hospitality, the other is not. The hypothesis of hospitality does not, in short, appear to us to be capable of explaining the fact that both at marriage and at certain other times, it is only particular men who are allowed access to particular women.\footnote{1}

A third hypothesis suggested to account for certain customs such as the "jus primae noctis," accorded to chiefs and particular individuals, is that "it may be a right taken forcibly by the stronger, or it may be a privilege voluntarily given to the chief man as a mark of esteem; in either case it depends upon his authority."\footnote{2} It will be generally admitted that here again no such explanation will account for the customs as met with amongst Australian tribes. In the first place, while the elder men are undoubtedly accorded certain privileges, there is not in any Australian tribe any one in-

\footnote{1} It may perhaps be advisable to point out that in many cases in which apparently women are lent (in the sense in which we use the word, which is the sense in which it is generally used in this connection) indiscriminately, a knowledge of details would show that this was not so. In regard to Australian tribes it is very difficult, in most cases, to find out anything like exact details from accounts already published, and general statements such as that a party of men have the privilege of access to a woman are valueless unless we know the exact conditions or relative status of the individual men and the woman. In the nine tribes examined by us we have found that intercourse of this nature is strictly regulated by custom.

\footnote{2} Westermarck, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 78.
individual to whom the term chief can, with strict propriety, be applied, and in the second place the privilege with which we are dealing is by no means enjoyed wholly by the elder men. Unless the leading man in any group stands in a particular relationship to the woman, he has no more right of access to her than the most insignificant man in the group.

A fourth hypothesis is suggested in connection with the right of access granted to men who have assisted the bridegroom in the capture of the woman. "In such cases the 'jus primae noctis' is a reward for a good turn done, or perhaps, as Mr. McLennan suggests, a common war right, exercised by the captors of the woman." There is undoubtedly much to be said in favour of this, but there are objections applying to it as to the second hypothesis dealt with. In the first place, so far as Australia is concerned, it is founded upon such vague statements as that quoted by Brough Smyth upon the authority of Mr. J. M. Davis. Mr. Davis says, "when a young man is entitled to have a lubra, he organises a party of his friends, and they make a journey into the territories of some other tribe, and there lie in wait, generally in the evening, by a waterhole, where the lubras come for water. Such of the lubras as may be required are then pounced upon, and, if they attempt to make any resistance, are struck down insensible and dragged off. There is also this peculiarity, that in any instance where the abduction has taken place for the benefit of some one individual, each of the members of the party claims, as a right, a privilege which the intended husband has no power to refuse."

Before it is safe, or indeed possible, to draw any conclusion from this, we require to know exactly who the men were, that is in what relationship they stood to the man whom

1 The term chief or even king of a tribe is not seldom used in writings of a somewhat popular nature, which deal with Australia. Travellers will often find in up-country parts a native of appropriate age decorated with a brass plate whereon is inscribed some such legend as "King Billy, chief of the Gurraburra tribe." The individual in question may possibly have been, though it is just as likely that he was not, the head of a local group or even tribe, but the natives have no term which can be correctly rendered by the word "chief."

2 Westernmarck, op. cit., p. 76.

3 Aborigines of Victoria, vol. ii., p. 316.