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This book describes the ways of life on a tiny West Indian island and seeks to define the principles that underlie and regulate society there. To pursue the analysis of social life in Carriacou, I shall try to combine an ethnographic and analytic account of local culture and society. With this end in view, I emphasise three dimensions of local society: community context and organisation, the individual life-cycle, and the system of kinship and mating. In the exposition, I try to show how these dimensions are interrelated; and so far as it is relevant to an understanding of the contemporary society, I discuss the history and economy of the island.

In writing of unfamiliar places, it is necessary to satisfy the reader's curiosity and interest by presenting a rounded account of local life, while exploring its coherence by simultaneous analysis. Since the society and culture of Carriacou are peculiar in several respects, its ethnography has the special importance of differentiat-
ing it from other Negro populations in the New World. As we shall see, in 1953 Carriacou contained a flourishing ancestor cult, an unusual system of plural mating, and a lineage organisation which may be unique in the British West Indies. The sex ratio among Carriacou adults is extremely unequal, and emigration has been a condition of local life for decades. The society has geared itself to this continuing to-and-fro movement of its members, especially of its adult males. In consequence, it exhibits institutions which serve to reintegrate those who return and regulate the movement of people. Without these adaptive institutions, or some others of equal efficacy, the little society would almost certainly undergo disorganisation and structural change.

In discussing these and other features of Carriacou life, it is not sufficient merely to describe them qualitatively, we must also determine as best we can their proportional and absolute incidence. In addition, we have to show how these different elements and conditions are related to one another and to such factors as the political organisation, the ecological context, or the local system of value and belief. In short an adequate account of the unfamiliar society and culture of Carriacou requires both quantitative and qualitative description, and its structural analysis must seek to show how statistical patterns and moral norms are interrelated.

Carriacou is a tiny island, lying between St. Vincent and Grenada, a place which tends to be ignored because of more urgent problems in the larger Caribbean territories nearby. Size, however, is no criterion of importance, and the study of Carriacou raises many issues which are significant to social science and West Indian development alike. In fact, the small size and compactness of the local society is an advantage in making a systematic study of these subjects among others.

Several friends have read and criticised earlier versions of this manuscript wholly or in part with considerable patience and insight. With all its various faults, the present text owes a great deal to these careful commentaries and suggestions in matters of style, clarity, presentation, layout, and analysis of the material. I am very grateful for such constructive criticism to Mrs. E. M. Chilver, Dr. Phyllis Kaberry, Professor Daryll Forde, Dr. David Lowen-
that, and Professor Sidney W. Mintz, the editor of this series. In addition, I wish to thank the editorial staff of the Yale University Press for the special care and patience with which they worked through the script, eliminating many repetitions and suggesting numerous changes to improve the presentation. Assistance from the Mather foundation, noted on the copyright page, and from the Ford Foundation in the publication of this volume is gratefully acknowledged. For help in typing the script, I am indebted to Mrs. Flora Miles of the Institute of Social and Economic Research, University College of the West Indies, and also to my wife. I owe my deepest debt for this study to the people of Carriacou for the friendliness and warmth with which they welcomed my enquiries. It would be invidious to single out individuals from among the islanders for special acknowledgment here, since everyone seemed to support my program of study. Perhaps it may be well to point out that the present tense used in the text refers to Carriacou in 1953. Several changes may have developed since then.

M.G.S.

University of California
Los Angeles
1961
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Caribbean Variations  Carriacou is an island almost completely unknown to the outside world, and even to its neighbours in the northern Caribbean. Its political and economic insignificance, coupled with its minute population and area, guarantee it a marginal position, even in the British West Indies to which it belongs. In no sense therefore is it representative of Caribbean societies; yet a knowledge of life in Carriacou is important for the light it sheds on the larger Creole units nearby.

The Caribbean Sea and its mainland borders contain two distinct cultural provinces. The tropical Latin American states, with the possible except of Cuba, belong to the Spanish American mestizo cultural province. Haiti and the British, Dutch, and French Antilles and Guianas, together with Louisiana and certain other areas of the southern United States, constitute the Creole cultural province. Mestizo and Creole cultures differ profoundly.

Mestizo culture emerged from the Spanish conquest of large
Amerindian communities. The mestizo elements in these societies are biologically and culturally hybrid. Under peonage and the *encomienda* system, the Spaniards administered their Indian subjects, converting them to Catholicism. Spanish administrative organisation, itself patterned on the Muslim (Moorish) government of Cordoba, controlled the Indian communities indirectly through institutions of peonage, religion, clientage, and kinship.

The constitution and development of Creole culture differ sharply. When Columbus discovered the West Indies, they were sparsely populated. The Carib and Arawak Indians who lived there were easily conquered by the Europeans and soon disappeared. To replace this labour force, Negro slaves were imported from West Africa and put to work on plantations which specialised in the cultivation and processing of sugar-cane for export. Throughout the eighteenth century slave production of sugar enjoyed a boom under mercantilist protection. High returns from plantation investments merely accelerated the rate of investment in plantations, which in turn led to a steady growth in the transatlantic slave trade. All the societies which emerged under these conditions, whether their rulers were British, French, or Dutch, had one essential feature in common: a handful of white masters ruling a much larger population of Negro slaves. In this Creole area, as in the Spanish territories, the association of different racial and cultural stocks produced a sizeable interstitial population of racial and cultural hybrids. Of these, some were slave, others free.

In most of the Creole area, the white planters took great care to prevent Christianity from disturbing their slaves. Their political administration rested on three institutional pillars: local parliaments, in which the planters and rich merchants were dominant; judicial systems, which tried issues involving free persons (slaves were regulated under codes which their masters enforced independently); and colonial militias, designed to repel invasions and suppress slave rebellions.

In 1808 Britain prohibited further importation of African slaves to its West Indian colonies. In 1834 the British Parliament followed this up by an act emancipating the slave population of all British colonies. In 1838, this emancipation took final effect. In the next decades the French and Dutch followed suit.
For some years previous to 1834, the sugar industry on which the Creole economies were based had been in difficulty. Then, with the triumph of free trade policies in Europe around 1850, Imperial protection, under which these units had flourished, was withdrawn. Several islands found themselves unable to compete with Brazilian sugar, and suffered an acute depression. In St. Vincent arrow-root gradually replaced sugar; in Jamaica, bananas; in Grenada, first cocoa, then nutmegs. Accompanying these crop changes was a major shift of emphasis from plantation to peasant production. The ex-slaves had begun to emerge as a Creole peasantry.

In the larger colonies the white and coloured elite continued to pursue prosperity with the political power at its disposal. Carriacou, however, was already so marginal that the elite withdrew entirely from the island, taking with it the plantation form and economy and abandoning the ex-slaves to their own devices. The Creole culture of the islanders persisted and developed in this new situation. Many old elements which have elsewhere disappeared still flourish in Carriacou; and several new forms, such as the lineage system, gradually emerged.

While the natives of Carriacou were developing their society and culture in splendid isolation, new racial and cultural elements were being introduced to the larger possessions nearby, which were too important to be abandoned. Instead they were continuously subject to economic and political stimuli designed to promote their viability. During the present century these external stimuli have increased in range and intensity. Autonomy, federation, industrialisation, university development, and communications are only the principal foci of current programmes. Carriacou, abandoned in the last century, remains quite outside this stream of activity.

In certain ways Carriacou belongs to the French section of the Creole culture province. With its dominant neighbour, Grenada, the island was initially colonised by the French, and only came into British hands during the American War of Independence. By then, French cultural forms had been firmly established in Carriacou. Since then, the islanders have absorbed many important elements of the British Creole complex as mediated by Grenada;
yet even to-day they speak the French *patois* as well as the English dialect, Catholicism is deeply rooted among them, and many items of folk culture—such as diet, *cantiques*, or witchcraft beliefs—show unmistakable French influence.

Nonetheless, the culture of Carriacou is no more like that of the French Antilles, whether Haiti, Guadeloupe, or Martinique, than it is like the British Creole culture as represented by Jamaica or Barbados. Carriacou was spared the political upheavals for which Haiti is justly famous. It lacks the elite and the continuing association with metropolitan France of which Martinique and Guadeloupe are proud. It lacks the Barbadian white plantocracy, the Barbadian educational and political institutions, or the Jamaican ecological and social complexity. Carriacou and other nearby islands with similar constitution and history are simple societies of Creole Negro folk, presenting the simplest units in the Creole societal continuum. From these areas are excluded those alien influences which overlie, circumscribe, and disorganise folk institutions in more complex Creole units. Societies such as Carriacou lack the internal divisions which are basic to the larger Creole populations.

Compared with other British West Indian populations, Carriacou is peculiar in several respects. Though not racially homogeneous, it contains no native-born Chinese or East Indians; almost all the land is now held by the islanders as peasants; there is no local elite, class stratification, or cultural plurality. Since its colonisation, the island has remained a dependency with very little say in its own government. Even under slavery, it was peculiar in operating a single system of task-work established by a dominant proprietor, who controlled two-thirds of its slave population. Since then, it has developed extreme demographic peculiarities which permit or require equally peculiar modes of mating and family organisation. It differs from better-known West Indian societies in its well-developed lineage system, its continuing dependence on emigration, its almost complete lack of local wage employment or trade unions, and its full-fledged ancestor cult, from which spirit possession is totally absent. The high incidence of marriage among local males may also be unique among British Caribbean populations. Many other Carriacou conditions
such as the infrequency of “keeping unions” and lack of house
rent may also be peculiar.

In these respects, Carriacou provides an instructive comparison
with other Creole societies. The islanders have been left to them-
selves for the better part of a hundred years and have constructed
their culture out of materials locally available; but the differences
between this culture and that of other nearby West Indian popu-
lations cannot be explained by lack of contact alone. The is-
landers depend on migration, and are quite familiar with the cus-
toms of nearby Creole populations; the primary difference be-
tween their society on the one hand and Trinidad, Grenada, or
Martinique on the other is the cultural and social homogeneity of
Carriacou. In the larger territories nearby, elite and folk live side
by side in cultural and political competition, the former dominat-
ing the latter by various means. Carriacou has long been free from
direct elite influence, and the islanders have therefore had ex-
cellent conditions in which to develop and systematise their own
culture within the educational, economic and other limits imposed
by their context.

In another sense, also, Carriacou society is instructive. The
population is descended from slaves, just as in other British Carib-
bean territories; but among the Carriacou folk a well-regulated
kinship system exists, with clearly defined rules of mating, paren-
thood and family organisation. The Carriacou “bloods,” or lineages,
are simply the most elaborate instance of this. Given the prevail-
ing emphasis on marriage and fulfilment of paternal roles, the
family organisation must be regarded as clear and determinate.
It permits little ambiguity or evasion of roles and responsibilities.
This example is quite sufficient to show how mistaken it is to at-
tribute the weakly organised family and kinship systems of other
British West Indian populations to the continuing influence of
slavery. Indeed, the demographic conditions of Carriacou rep-
resent the severest strain on a family system of any in the British
West Indies. Yet it is precisely under these conditions that we find
the most clearly organised family structure in this culture area.

The Field Situation I first visited Carriacou in December 1952,
during a reconnaissance survey of Grenada Colony, which had been
selected for detailed sociological study by the Institute of Social and Economic Research of the University College of the West Indies. The Institute's object was to provide a thorough account of culture and society in Grenada for comparison with similar studies of other Caribbean territories. This initial visit to Carriacou lasted only a week, but was quite sufficient to show that Grenada and Carriacou were distinct societies, with differing cultures, economies, and political organisations. During this week I also observed that the culture of Carriacou lacked the heterogeneity of Grenada. Since the social implications of cultural heterogeneity formed the basic problem of my Grenada study, for comparative purposes I decided to devote as much time as I could to Carriacou.

I returned to Carriacou in June 1953 to study the island society with this aim in mind. I could spend only two months then, but during this period I collected the bulk of the information presented below. On this visit, I also arranged for a study of land tenure and inheritance on a government-established settlement, which I carried out on a third visit in November 1953, with the assistance of F. A. Phillips, then District Officer, Carriacou.¹

To compare Carriacou and Grenada, I needed equally comprehensive accounts. Since the two months I was able to spend in Carriacou is obviously a very short time indeed in which to collect comprehensive data on a people and their culture, I determined to combine as many differing forms of enquiry and observation as I could manage. I began by renting an empty house at L'Esterre, a place from which I was able to see and hear a good deal. I visited my neighbours and received visits in turn; I also visited other communities on the island on several occasions. I made a detailed study of the L'Esterre community, mapping the layout of land holdings, houses, shops, family cemeteries, etc. and discussing the history of their transmission, together with the genealogies of the present and past owners. In this way I made a genealogical census of the community, which I was able to combine with a census of its households and a census of the mating histories of its adult members. To supplement the community study at L'Esterre I carried out an islandwide survey of 224 households (includ-

ing the 75 at L’Esterre). In this survey I was helped by three schoolteachers whom Mr. Phillips very kindly directed to assist me. Having trained these schoolteachers in the study of household composition, I directed them to make field surveys of 50 contiguous households in their communities, at Windward, Belmont, and Mount Pleasant. Each community lay in a different quarter of the island, and together the total sample represented more than one-seventh of all the households in Carriacou.

In preparation for the study of land transmission and tenure at Harvey Vale, I listed all original allottees and subsequent purchasers of plots in that settlement and arranged for full genealogies of these individuals and their descendants to be collected. During the field study of land tenure, Mr. Phillips and I also collected genealogies from the interviewees independently, and we were therefore able to check three bodies of information on the descent lines. Their correspondence was impressive. So was the accuracy and completeness of the household surveys conducted by my teacher assistants. By means of the three surveys, I have been able to develop a detailed and reliable picture of mating, household and family organisation, occupational distribution, land tenure, migrancy, population composition, bilingualism, and other conditions in Carriacou. I have also been able to assess the representativeness of my L’Esterre data by comparison with similar bodies of information from other communities. In consequence, I am able to make certain generalisations about Carriacou that would not have been possible if my study had been confined to L’Esterre. These survey materials also enabled me to study the frequency distributions of particular conditions and so to determine their interrelations. This type of analysis is particularly important in a society which contains alternative forms of institutions such as family or mating.

However, by themselves quantitative data neither provide a rounded account of social life, nor define a normative order of social organisation. To supplement the quantitative studies, I therefore organised a series of structured interviews during which I discussed ethnographic problems with four informants, all males above the age of forty-five. Occasionally I would record the interviews on tape, but more often I made verbatim notes. By
discussing the same topics with each man separately, I was able
to build up fairly thorough accounts of local customs, individual
histories, and the like. This information was further checked by
discursive enquiries with other individuals during the surveys I
conducted. Such knowledgeable persons as Mr. Phillips, Clifford
Palmer, then Education Officer, Grenada, and Andrew Pearse
were also helpful in suggesting lines of enquiry.

Perhaps a third of my time was spent attending various cere­
monies, rituals, prayer-meetings, schools, markets, law courts,
wakes, or going out to sea, and on these occasions I was continu­
ally collecting information. From the local Administration I received
information on Carriacou political organisation, birth rates, cotton
yields, etc. I arranged special performances of folk dances to re­
cord on tape and held interviews with specialists of the Big
Drum cult. After leaving Carriacou, I made an exhaustive study
of all the available historical documents dealing with Grenada
and Carriacou; these included newspaper files in Grenada from
1815 to the present, Blue Books and other official documents,
handbooks, etc. In addition, my friend Douglas Hall scoured the
files of the Public Record Office in London, and the British Mu­
seum Library, the collections of West Indian documents at Bristol
and Oxford Universities, and other important collections of source
material in the United Kingdom. The Institute of Social and
Economic Research also enquired of American collections and
at the West Indian Reference Library in Jamaica, for certain un­
 traced documents. Despite the incompleteness of my historical
and field studies, I have taken special pains to gather and to
check all material relevant to my purpose. Such subjects as fishing
technology or material culture, being marginal to my theme, have
been treated only briefly. As to the adequacy of the sociological
materials, I leave the reader to judge.

Grenada and Carriacou Carriacou lies twenty-three miles to
the northeast of Grenada, of which it is a dependency. However,
the ecology and society of Carriacou and Grenada differ remark­
ably. Carriacou society and culture are homogeneous, whereas
Grenada's are not. Grenadians express this difference in social
structure by saying, "Carriacou is a classless society; everybody is the same in Carriacou." Without fully accepting this statement, no one could doubt that the type of class system which pervades Grenadian society is altogether absent from Carriacou. In Grenada there are folk and elite; in Carriacou there are no elite. In Grenada there are violent tensions between social classes; not so in Carriacou. In Grenada half the land in cultivation is held in estates of one hundred acres or more, and these estates as a group are the largest employer of labour. In Carriacou there were no estates operating in 1953, when the Government purchased the last large holding on the island for rehabilitation and allocation to settlers. To the people of Carriacou, Grenada is "the mainland," an alien society which has for centuries dominated them politically and commercially, a place where they remain strangers. In Grenada we find the central institutions of the Colony, government, the Civil Service, the churches, the banks, and education. In Carriacou in 1953 there were only two churches, three primary schools, a hospital, a skeleton administration, minimal postal, telegraph and other government services, and no banks. In Grenada scores of people yearly pass the Cambridge Local School Certificate examination and thereby qualify as a primary schoolteacher or for admission to the Civil Service. However, it was only in 1952–53 that one of the native elementary schoolteachers of Carriacou, after several years of unsuccessful effort, finally managed to pass the examination. The uniqueness of this event in Carriacou history was demonstrated by the island-wide, three-day fête which followed its announcement.

At the cultural level there are also important differences between Grenada and Carriacou. Among the folk of these islands, kinship and community organisation differ sharply, as does the form of the individual life-cycle. Among the Grenadian lower class or folk, Friendly Societies, Masonic Orders and lodges, and savings institutions such as susu are common; in Carriacou they are almost completely absent. In Grenada the typical folk cults are Shango and Shakerism; neither exists in Carriacou, where the

Big Drum or Nation Dance, formerly current among the Grenadian folk, is still the representative ritual form. Grenadian Shango is of Yoruban and Dahomean provenience; Grenadian Shakerism is derived from the cult of the American Spiritual Baptists, or Shouters; both cults emphasise spirit-possession and include other practices which are unknown in Carriacou. In the Carriacou Big Drum, songs and dances attributed to the African “nations,” or tribes, from which the slave population of Carriacou was drawn, are combined with secular songs and a cult of ancestor-worship. Big Drum songs are differentiated by their tribal origin such as Ibo, Moko, Congo, Temne, Mandinka, Chamba, Kromanti (Akan), and it is probable that these were the principal groups from which the Carriacou slaves came. Few Yarraba (Yoruba) or Arada (Dahomeans) seem to have come to Carriacou. The secular dances of the Big Drum in Carriacou—Kalenda, Juba, Belair, Granbelair, Banda, etc.—are differentiated by rhythm and dance form.

In Grenada after a death the folk hold prayer-meetings on the third and the fortieth nights; in Carriacou, on the third and the ninth nights. In Grenada the co-operative group work known as the Maroon is only used nowadays for heavy farm work or for moving or setting up a house. In Carriacou house-moving is rather rare, and the Maroon is a turn-out of the young men of a community to work on the roads or to clear the ponds. In Grenada the folk hold dances as private commercial ventures; in Carriacou the old-time “bouquet” or “company” dances are still the most general form of secular dance, and the lancers, reels and nineteenth-century dance patterns are current. In Grenada folk music is now the steel band; in Carriacou the bass and tambourine are the secular parallel of the Big Drum. Even the celebration of Carnival (Mardi Gras) differs widely. So do ritual beliefs and concepts regarding dream-messages; “dealers” who sell human souls to the Devil; “door-openers” whose spells allow them to enter where they will, or La Jablesse (diablesse), the cloven-footed woman of the Grenadian wilderness and of the empty rocks and islands off Carriacou.

INTRODUCTION

These differences between Grenada and Carriacou co-exist with certain similar or common customs. However, it is important to recognise the nature and extent of the cultural differences between the folk of Grenada and Carriacou, both of whom have similar institutions of land tenure, are bilingual in English and a French patois, and share common cycles of Zien (Anancy) stories and common wakes, prayer-meetings, and beliefs in witchcraft (lougarou), etc. The presence of common and similar cultural forms in these two neighbouring societies reflects their historical association. Differences seem to be due to differing historical and economic conditions which have promoted change in Grenada and discouraged it in Carriacou. Some evidence to support this is provided by Grenadian accounts of folk life and customs at the turn of this century. These accounts show that the marriage ceremony among the Grenadian folk then was very similar to that still current in Carriacou; that the Big Drum or Nation Dance was then the characteristic cult of the Grenada folk, and that among them at that time the “bouquet” or “company dance” was a popular form of entertainment.\(^4\)

\(^4\) M. G. Smith, “Dark Puritan: The Life and Work of Norman Paul,” Caribbean Quarterly, 5, no. 1 (1957); 5, no. 2 (1958); 5, no. 4 (1959); 6, no. 1 (1960).
PART I
THE SETTING
A First View

Carriacou is the largest of the Grenadines, and the most northerly district of Grenada Colony. It lies about a hundred miles northeast of Trinidad and about forty miles south of St. Vincent. Directly opposite the lee of Carriacou lies the island of Union, the southernmost outpost of the St. Vincent Grenadines. The channel between Union and Carriacou is about three miles wide, and there is some coming and going between the two islands.

Besides being the largest of the Grenadines, Carriacou contains more people than the rest of them put together. A dependency of Grenada, Carriacou also has its own dependencies, which lie to the windward. Of these, the tiny island of Petit Martinique is the most important. Its population, which is partly French in origin, is rather isolated. Opposite Petit Martinique, on the northern coast of Carriacou, lies the village of Windward, whose popula-
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tion is markedly fair and traces descent from Scottish settlers. Like Petit Martinique, Windward is a closed community, and together they contain about one-sixth of the Carriacou population. In view of their social and cultural peculiarities and numerical insignificance, I did not attempt to study either community in detail; and except for the survey of domestic groupings, which included fifty households at Orange Vale and Windward, my account does not refer to these villages except where they are specially mentioned.

The “French” of Petit Martinique are recognisably French by their family names, language, and religion, less so by phenotype; but the “Scots” of Windward are almost all light-skinned, and include many blondes. Both groups are great seafarers and excel at building schooners and sloops. With these two exceptions, the rest of the Carriacou population is Negro, although many are of mixed descent. At Windward and Petit Martinique the people are almost entirely Roman Catholic, but 57 per cent of the total Carriacou population, which includes these villages, is Anglican.

As shown by the map, Carriacou is a long, narrow island curving like an arc along the oceanic ridge between Grenada and St. Vincent. Along its centre runs the usual Caribbean island spine, and at either end is a peak of just under 1,000 feet. Hardly any of the original vegetation remains, and apart from the cultivated patches, the island is given over to bush, scrub and other semi-desert vegetation. In the middle of the ridge, Government many years ago established a forest of Honduran mahogany, which is now used in building schooners.

On the eastern or windward side of the island there is a continuous rough surf except for reefed inlets; on the leeward side the water is usually calm, the beaches slope gently, and there are good harbours for local vessels. Apart from the settlement at Windward, which lies directly opposite a break in the reef, no other village on the eastern side is engaged in seafaring; but at the southern tip the Great Careenage or Tyrell Bay provides an excellent harbour on one arm of the L’Esterre peninsula, while another fine harbour lies to leeward. Apart from L’Esterre, on the leeward side there are seafaring communities at Bleges and Hillsborough. Hillsborough is the only officially gazetted port and
town on the island; it is also the capital and administrative centre, and a weekly market is held there on Mondays. However, in 1946 Hillsborough contained only 276 people, many fewer than L'Esterre.

Carriacou has no springs or rivers and the average annual rainfall is only about 50 inches, less than half that of Grenada. The local rainy season extends from late May to early October, and cultivation is limited to this period. The difference in rainfall between Grenada and Carriacou results in different crops, and explains the different economies and histories of the two islands. When late or unevenly distributed rainfall causes crop failure in Carriacou, as it often does, the nearby islands of St. Vincent and Grenada are called on for food until the following harvest. Lacking rivers or streams, the islanders seek to conserve their rainwater supply in community ponds and in household tanks or cisterns, and they also receive help from the Government, which maintains large catchments.

Carriacou agriculture emphasises production of grain and ground provisions for use in the home. Indian corn, pigeon peas, sweet potato, cassava, and okra are the principal crops grown for local consumption. Sea-island cotton and groundnuts are grown for sale. On the larger holdings limes and coconuts are now the only cash crops. Much of the land is pasture, and cattle are reared as an insurance against crop failure and drought. Grenadian tree crops such as cocoa, nutmegs, cloves, cinnamon, vanilla, avocados, breadfruit, and bluggo (a variety of plantain), and Grenadian roots, such as yams, dasheen, tannia, and eddoes, are either completely absent or very rare in Carriacou.

Fishing, sailing, and the care of cattle are the principal sources of work for males on the island. To supplement these, they emigrate in search of work. Since the islanders build and man their own vessels, travel abroad is cheap and easy.¹ Emigrant males continually send money home from overseas. Most of the routine cultivation and farm work on the island, then, is carried out by women. In short, the islanders have adjusted themselves to a

difficult habitat, and this adjustment allocates subsistence production to women and exchange production to men.

Besides agriculture, seafaring, and cattle-rearing, there are a few occupations, such as joinery, shopkeeping, mechanical work, teaching, and clerical work in the administration, which support a few individuals. The building and repair of boats also provide occasional employment. But together these activities do not offer enough opportunity for local wage labour. As the men say, “There is no pay-day in Carriacou.” Hence male emigration in search of pay-days abroad. Hence also the stress on own-account production: “You have to make your own pay-day in Carriacou.” The hired hands on schooners are perhaps the largest single category of wage workers in Carriacou, but their employment is irregular, since the work is often rotated among the large number of local sailors. In crop-time the two lime-oil factories employ some women and the cotton gin factory needs some men, but these seasonal demands merely underline the local unemployment.

In this context, it is worthy of note that until 1946 approximately a quarter of Carriacou was held by about seven landowners, but none of these larger holdings used a regular labour force; apart from a few acres of limes and coconuts they were either rented out, cultivated on a share-cropping basis, used as pasture, or simply abandoned. Bad farming practice for several generations has destroyed much of the topsoil on the island slopes, and erosion is now severe. After the cotton harvest the goats are allowed to graze where they will, and by May there is hardly any vegetation left. Then the first heavy showers deepen old gullies and dig new ones. Advice on this matter from agricultural officers is largely unheeded. The economic situation and high population density do not allow Carriacouans to change their farm practice easily.

Population At the time of the 1946 census Carriacou contained 2,558 males and 4,211 females. The age distribution of the population indicates the pattern of emigration quite clearly. In 1946 there were 2.3 women aged 15 to 44 for every man on the island. Of the 6,769 people in Carriacou, 3,025 or 44.7% were less than
The report of the census of 1881 shows that this striking demographic imbalance is not a new feature of the Carriacou population. In 1881 Carriacou contained 5,154 people—3,007 females and 2,147 males. Of this total, 2,612 or 50.7% were 15 years or less, and of these, 1,302 were boys. Of the remaining 2,542 adults, 845 or 33.1% were males. There were at that time 77 young men and 222 young women aged 20 to 25 living in Carriacou. There were also on the island 76 young men and 226 young women between 25 and 30. At that time the island contained 538 males aged 16 to 45, compared with 1,191 females, giving a
sex ratio of one male to 2.22 females. It is obvious that a society with such permanent sexual imbalance in the reproductive age groups will have unusual features. Such demographic abnormality may promote disorganisation or population decline unless there in an institutional accommodation.

In 1835 Carriacou contained 3,127 persons of whom 432 were free, the remaining 2,695 being "apprentices"—that is, slaves whose freedom was due in 1838. Of the apprentices, 1,284 were males and 1,411 were females. On the eve of Emancipation, therefore, the island population was almost evenly balanced. Table 2 summarises the data I have been able to trace on the growth of the island's population from 1851, when the second census was taken, until 1946. Although a heavy emigration continued throughout this period, the rate of natural increase within the island population was sufficient for it to grow steadily from 1861 to 1921. To understand more about this population history, we shall have to review the social and economic development of Carriacou.

**Table 2. Population of Carriacou, 1851 to 1946.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Increase or decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>NK *</td>
<td>NK *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>-762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>2,535</td>
<td>+785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>2,147</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>+568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>+833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>6,497</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>+466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>+389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>+218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6,771</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>-333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NK not known.

**Social Foundations** Until 1763 Carriacou was a French possession. It came under British rule by the terms of the Peace of Paris. The French recaptured it during the American War of Independence, but in 1784 it returned to British hands. Since then Carriacou has been administered as a part of the British Colony of Grenada.

The eighteenth century was the hey-day of Caribbean sugar

and the Atlantic slave trade, and British interests were dominant in both. After the British had recovered Grenada and Carriacou, they pushed ahead the sugar cultivation as rapidly as they could. There was an influx of capital and adventurers from Britain and neighbouring British West Indian territories, such as Barbados and St. Vincent. In addition, the islands already contained some French planters. To augment the local labour force there was a heavy importation of slaves. With the abolition of the British slave trade in 1808, the maintenance of the slave population by natural increase became a concern of the Caribbean planters. Movement of slaves from one colony to another was forbidden, and various inducements were offered to slaves to bear and rear children successfully. Nonetheless, the slave population of Grenada declined steadily from 28,029 slaves in 1817 to 25,586 in 1822 and to 23,471 in 1832. Only in Carriacou did the slave population increase.

The *Bristol Mirror* of June 15, 1833, contains an interesting account by an English visitor of Carriacou on the eve of Emancipation:

> The model of all slave islands seemed to me to be Carriacou. ... Mr. Maclean [is] the principal proprietor there. ... [The] total population is about 4,000 of whom 3,200 are slaves. Mr. Maclean has either of his own, or under his management, about 2,200 slaves. The principal production by which the Negroes make money is poultry, which they breed and send down by small vessels, which are constantly running up and down between that [island] and Grenada. They cultivate provision grounds for themselves, but as the island suffers much from dry weather, they have a weekly issue of Grenada corn—six quarts to each—continued from six to ten months of the year, according to the produce of their grounds.

But the great excellence of the management consists in the very complete system of task work which is introduced

5. On December 31, 1832, the Carriacou population was reported as 3,823 people, of whom 3,360 were slaves. See R. Montgomery Martin, *History of the West Indies*, 1 (London, Whittaker, 1836), 267–68.
into every department of labour; it has continued for about three years. When first introduced, both Managers and Negroes set their faces against it—they were obliged to begin with less than their average quantity of daily work, but gradually increased it, almost unknown to the Negroes. They set a certain quantity of work to each Negro daily; suppose to make two hundred holes for planting canes. The whole gang has the same quantity, and works in the same field. They generally commence at 5 o'clock, that they may finish early, and often complete their task by 11 or 12, almost always by 2. They have the rest of the day to themselves.

It generally happens that if one or two are weaker than the rest, and have not finished their task at the same time with them, the whole gang will remain and complete the work of those that have been behind; this, however, is not always the case. The quantity of work done now is nearly one-third more than on the old system, so that this plan is beneficial to the proprietors as well as to the slaves. In consequence, however, of there being a superabundance of labour in the island, and it being against the laws to remove any slaves from it, the quantity of work done is not even now equal to the daily average . . . in St. Vincent. In a short time, the plan will be still further improved, by setting a weekly instead of a daily task, so as to allow them two or three days a week to themselves; so that they can never have any difficulty in raising money to purchase their freedom.

As it is at present, it is not at all uncommon for a father to purchase his wife and children, to send them to work in his ground, still himself remaining a slave, that he may retain his house and ground. The consequence of this treatment is that during the last seven years, the slave population—now about 3,200—have been increasing at the rate of 60 per annum—the total in seven years being 421. . . . These are facts which I can vouch for. . . .

Much attention is also paid in Carriacou to religious instruction. The clergyman visits each estate about once a
month and catechises the children. They receive a daily instruction from some person on each estate, and are, I understand, improving very rapidly. Marriages are frequent among them, and the married people are generally very regular in their attendance at church. There is a school in the small town which contains more than one hundred children, who receive daily instruction under the superintendence of the clergyman. Altogether, I cannot imagine any place more fitted for an experimental system of emancipation.

Thus Carriacou differed from nearby Grenada and other British West Indian slave colonies in the proportion of its population controlled by one benevolent proprietor, in its extensive use of taskwork, in its harmonious labour relations, in its “superabundance of labour,” and in the encouragement of marriage, the family, self-redemption, and religion. Under such conditions, the slave population increased naturally and developed co-operative habits. In addition, having purchased their family’s freedom, men could maintain them by themselves remaining slaves in order to secure the benefits attached to this position. Thus, even under slavery the father’s role was important in Carriacou. The slave-owner was by no means a father substitute; and male and female slaves shared responsibility for the nurture of their common offspring.

This idyllic state of affairs began to change in 1834 with the abolition of slavery and the introduction of apprenticeship. After long debate, the British Parliament had decided to abolish slavery throughout the Empire, while compensating slave-owners for their loss. They proposed a six-year transitional period, during which the slaves would be “apprenticed” to their former owners, and both slave and slave-owner would be supervised by stipendiary magistrates sent out from Britain. The old Consolidated Slave Laws of West Indian society were adapted as far as possible to this transitional situation, but the physical punishment of apprentices by their masters was forbidden except with the magistrate’s approval. Since work was a common source of dispute between planter and labourer, an official code of daily tasks was in-
introduced to guide both parties. For Carriacou this task system contained the following representative items:

**Canes:** Digging cane holes, land lined 4 feet square—140 in flat stiff land for 2 labourers, 170 in hillsides and light soil.
Cross-holing—126 holes in flat land, 140 in hillside for each labourer.
Weeding plant canes—2 labourers per acre (per day of 9 hours).
Number of labourers required about the mill to make 4 hogsheads of sugar—2 feeding, 4 carrying canes, 1 taking in megasse from the mill, 1 carrying away megasse, 1 mill boatswain and 2 engineers.

**Cotton:** Digging cotton holes—500 in stiff land, 800 on hillsides, for each labourer.
Picking cotton: 50 lbs. each labourer.

**Other:** Weeding lands for provisions where there is a considerable quantity of grass—9 labourers per acre.6

The statutory nine-hour day-task introduced under apprenticeship was a sharp increase for Carriacou. Whereas the volume of work may not have increased, emphasis on a nine-hour day was probably regarded by the apprentices as a retrograde step. Whatever the cause, production in Carriacou went into a steep and steady decline after 1835. In 1838, when apprenticeship ended and the slaves were finally freed, Carriacou, with the same number of agricultural workers and livestock as in 1835, produced 1,343,140 lbs. of muscovado, or only two-thirds of its 1835 output.7 In 1840 the island produced 709,766 lbs. of muscovado, about one-third of the 1835 output, and 90,000 lbs. of cotton.

7. Ibid., 13 March 1839, p. 88.
a third less than previously. By 1840, “a Carriacou planter” was complaining of the “most ungentlemanly conduct of our neighbours in Grenada . . . against the well working of our labourers . . . (by holding out) . . . enticements.” However, the writer stated that even so Carriacou still contained “a sufficient number of able-bodied people.”

Slaves were emancipated on August 1, 1838. Immediately their freedom of movement became a burning question. One act of the Grenada Legislature, no. 313 of 1838, was “for preventing the clandestine movement of labourers from the island.” This was disallowed by Lord Glenelg, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, on the ground that, “practically, this Law would render departure from the Colony of the agricultural labourers almost impossible.”

Movement of labourers from Carriacou to Grenada may have been important in reducing production and population in Carriacou. Unfortunately, being an intra-colonial movement, it is not adequately recorded. However, emigration from both islands to nearby Trinidad was a source of public concern, as records show. By August 1839, a committee of both houses of the Grenadian Legislature, reporting on the decline of agricultural labour supply in that island, listed among the causes “inducements held out of higher wages, etc., by the proprietors of estates in the neighbouring island of Trinidad, whose sugar soil is so much more productive.”

Not only was Trinidad more fertile than Grenada, it was also severely underpopulated, and Trinidadian planters encouraged immigration by advertisements in Grenadian newspapers. Thus in 1839 Dr. Neilson of Trinidad advertised:

a free passage to all labourers wishful of going there, where they will receive the following wages: 4/- currency with half-pound fish and a glass of rum per task of 200 cane stools; an able man can do two tasks a day, which amounts to a dollar; but he will be required to work weekly at

8. Ibid., 4 April 1841, p. 110.
10. Ibid., 5 June 1839. Minutes of the House of Assembly, 23 April 1839.
least five days at the estate. He will have a house free of rent, with as much land as he can cultivate for his own use. . . . Any person bringing over 20–40 field people will get immediate suitable employment on application to any member of the Agricultural Society. Government will pay the labourer’s passage at the rate of 5 dollars per head.12

This Trinidadian offer should be compared with the “new arrangement” adopted by one attorney of St. George’s Grenada, and recommended by him to his fellows. Under the “old arrangement” first-class labourers received 2/6d currency per day plus house and land valued at 15/- per month, giving a total monthly wage of £3.5.0. Under the “new arrangement” first-class labourers would be paid 1/3d sterling per day, giving a monthly total of £3.2.6. currency, from which 15/- would be deducted for house and land, leaving the labourer with £2.7.6. currency in hand as against £2.10.0. currency which he had received from his employer previously.13

Under slavery, labourers had received some rations, housing, and provision lands, but no cash for their estate work, which, with the sole exception of Carriacou, was carried out by day labour. Under apprenticeship, labourers retained their housing and other privileges but worked at tasks without wage. After apprenticeship various problems arose regarding wage rates, use of task- or day-work, and conditions governing workers’ provision grounds, and supplies of fish or rum. It appears that whereas the Trinidad planters favoured task-work on liberal conditions, the Grenadians preferred day-work on restrictive ones. In consequence, labour moved swiftly from Grenada to Trinidad, and by 1841 this Grenadian immigration was averaging 100 persons per month, of whom 13 per cent were from Carriacou, almost all adults.14 This implies an annual emigration of approximately 150 persons from Carriacou to Trinidad, in addition to the movement from Carriacou to Grenada.

In Trinidad, wages were higher and labourers occupied their house and provision grounds free of cost, receiving also “an acre

12. Ibid., 9 Sept. 1839, p. 334.
14. Ibid., 17 Feb. 1841, p. 54; 24 March 1841, p. 95; 5 April 1841, pp. 150 ff.
of land... for forty days' labour during the crop."

In Grenada, employers complained bitterly about the desultory attendance of their ex-slaves in field work and sought to improve this by increased charges for the rent of gardens and cottages. They developed a sliding scale by which rental rates increased in proportion to absenteeism. This system generated considerable friction, stimulating the emigration of labourers and forcing the planters to seek immigrant labour, initially from Malta and Madeira, later from India. At the same time the Grenadian planters sought to engage local labour for periods of twelve months at a time on a basis of written contracts, which omitted rental charges but reduced wage rates. In 1840 the stipendiary magistrates of Grenada reported to the House of Assembly that “the free peasantry viewed these measures as tending to place them under the apprenticeship system. In Carriacou there were no “written contracts”; and in St. Patrick’s parish, “no written contracts had been entered into, nor were likely to be while there existed a want of confidence between the two classes.”

We get a brief sketch of conditions in Carriacou from the stipendiary magistrate’s report of October 1841 to the Lieutenant-Governor of Grenada.

[The labourers] are industriously disposed, will labour willingly for a fair remuneration, have a natural desire of providing for their families, and will take their labour to the best market; are scarcely ever idle... are strongly attached to their native country, and evince a laudable disposition to cultivate domestic happiness.... They are fully sensible of the respectability and purity of the married state, and few there are who do not enter it and conduct themselves creditably afterwards. They are regular in their attendance at Divine Worship.... Their attention is directed now... to household furniture and other domestic comforts. They evince much respect for the laws and constituted authorities, where such authorities do not show any disposition of the olden times of slavery, and

15. Ibid., 19 May 1841, p. 158.
the not much better ones of apprenticeship . . . The offences committed by them are very few, . . . petty assaults and trifling thefts. . . . Effective labourers get 7½d [sterling?] for their daily task, which is generally performed in four or five hours. They have the occupancy of a thatched cottage in consideration of part wages, with a small portion of inferior land . . . for a provision ground, and have no other privilege. Though the cottage is held on such conditions, they are almost always compelled to put it in tenantable order themselves. They complain of not receiving their wages for, very often, six or eight weeks after they become due. They are satisfied with an employer whose language and actions tend to convince them of a desire to consult their happiness. They are anxious to invest their means in such portions of land as they are able to buy, having great satisfaction in the idea . . . of securing a home for their families; but very few attorneys and proprietors of estates are disposed to sell to them, from an apprehension of their being too independent. . . .

There is but one established Church. . . . There is one Colonial day school, and there are no savings banks or benefit societies. . . . From the wages being much lower than in Trinidad and St. Vincent, the estates here have lost many of their labourers who have emigrated. . . . Men who are emulous of respectability will have good surtouts and coats, especially those who have earned a few dollars in Trinidad . . . where wages are much higher.18

This report indicates that Carriacou wages were only half those current in Trinidad and in certain parts of Grenada. The day-task system instituted by Mr. Maclean had persisted with reduced benefits for the workers. Earlier tendencies towards marriage, sobriety, and care of their families are also evident. The people liked having a kind master, and already some of the emigrants had begun to return to their island home.

I have dwelt on the context and details of this initial emigration

because of its special importance in the history of Carriacou. The conditions and directions of the movement of labour which developed locally after Emancipation have tended to persist. The flow of population has sometimes increased, sometimes diminished, but, except during periods of unemployment overseas or land transfers at home, emigration from Carriacou has never completely halted. This movement initially involved agricultural labour; reduced demand in Trinidad or Grenada for plantation labour tended to occur at the same time, and for the same reasons, that local estate lands were made available to ex-slaves. Until the oil-fields of Trinidad and Venezuela were developed, migration from Carriacou remained a movement of agricultural workers, involving little occupational change. When the people could get possession of land, this movement slackened. When land was withheld or population pressure mounted, the emigration increased. The history of this emigration indicates that the local demographic abnormalities which developed shortly after Emancipation have been maintained by continuing migration. In view of its role in the development of Carriacou, we shall therefore discuss briefly the history of local land transfer.

**Land**

On resuming control of Carriacou in 1784, the British made a careful survey of the island. A copy of the resulting map appears below. The striking feature of this map is the system of land allocation it reveals. At that time and until 1838 the entire area of the island was divided in large blocks among a handful of planters. Cane and cotton were the principal crops. Camels were used as beasts of burden, and large ponds were established to conserve water supplies. The slaves worked provision grounds on sloping land unsuitable for commercial agriculture. After Emancipation, as we have seen, the proprietors at first refused to sell land to their ex-slaves. In these circumstances, many who emigrated to Trinidad and Grenada settled there permanently. However, with the repeal of Imperial sugar preferences by the United Kingdom Parliament in 1846, the uneconomic cultivation of sugar in Carriacou could not long continue. In 1847 the Carriacou Agricultural Association reviewed the planters' situation.
"A new and accurate map of the Island of Carriacou in the West Indies shewing the different bays & the lagoon, the sounding rocks, shoals, small islands, &c., with a plan of each estate; the proprietors names and number of acres in each diagram, the situation of the dwelling houses and principal roads."
There have been recent complaints of difficulty of obtaining labour, the people preferring the cultivation of their provision grounds. . . . The plan of curtailing the grounds hitherto allotted to labourers for the growth of provisions . . . has been tried, and without success, so far as enabling estates to command a more steady supply of labour, and this . . . will always be the case where so much land can be had at a low rent; . . . we do not think it advisable to discourage the growth of provisions, even should the staple products suffer a little thereby. In . . . denying the labourer his usual provision land, you drive him to rent, and thus the claim which you otherwise had over him for continuous labour is at an end.10

In short, by then some Carriacou workers were renting land from the estates. In addition, there was considerable squatting on such estates as Harvey Vale or Mount Pleasant, which were abandoned about this time.26

However, with the decline of the plantation system in Carriacou after 1840, cash rental became as difficult for the labourer as wage payment was for the employer. In these circumstances share-cropping arrangements were gradually developed. This complex is variably described as metayer, metayage, or metairie. Under the form favoured by estates, the Carriacou share-cropper cultivated cotton on a half-share basis and also gave the landlord portions of the corn which was inter-cropped. As local estates were abandoned, the use of metayage increased; but sales of land to the peasants remained rare until very late in the century.

By 1862 Carriacou’s sugar output was less than one-sixth of the 1835 figures, and its cotton production had also fallen considerably.21 Of 153 estates in Grenada Colony, 90 were under cultivation in 1867, 35 had been abandoned, and 28 were held in metayage.22 The sharp increase in the number of Grenadian

22. Ibid., 27 Sept. 1873.
estates to 194 by 1870 indicates that the process of fragmentation had then begun. In Grenada cocoa was replacing sugar, and nutmegs were gradually winning favour as a second tree crop; but the Carriacou climate ruled out these substitutes. By 1891 there were 285 peasant holdings having a total of less than 300 acres in Carriacou. By 1901 this total had grown to 373 acres. Half the island was then uncultivated; of the rest, 683 acres were under pasture and 2,486 acres mainly in provisions, cotton, limes, and coconuts.

With the economic breakdown of sugar cultivation, the planter class began to withdraw from Carriacou. This withdrawal continued throughout the century, as metayage, cash tenancies, and other forms of land exploitation proved unprofitable. One by one the estates were abandoned or leased out to locals who allotted them to cash tenants or metayers. By 1895, cotton, corn, peas, and groundnuts were established as the principal crops, and metayage or tenancy as the principal mode of land tenure and use. In 1892 the Colonial Government took the first legislative steps to deal with the Carriacou land problem, and purchased derelict estates for redistribution to the people. In 1903 the first two estates acquired by the Government, which had an area of 714 acres, were distributed among 244 persons. By 1938 there were only two “estates,” totalling approximately 2,000 acres, in the island, and the Colonial Commission of Enquiry into Economic Conditions found that

nearly two-thirds of the population are ... peasant agriculturists. ... The total acreage of small holdings is more than double that of estates. ... The estates grow limes as their principal crop, and cotton and corn are cultivated by tenants on the share system. [They] employ not more than 400 labourers, and that only for three months a year. ... If anything, land settlement has gone too far in Carriacou, with the result that if the peasant’s own little holding fails ... he cannot supplement his earnings by estate labour. 24

In 1946, there were 1,366 farms and small plots in Carriacou, of which 249 were less than an acre in size. These 1,366 farms included 2,571 plots, an average of 2.3 plots per farm and one farm per 4.9 residents. In addition, the majority of the estate area was worked by the peasants under metayage. On the three local estates of more than 100 acres, there were only 330 acres under limes and 44 acres in coconuts. All were absentee-owned, while landholdings below 100 acres in area were owned locally and operated as pasture or by tenants.\(^{25}\)

The collapse of sugar influenced the composition of population in Carriacou in two ways. First, it prevented any importation of foreign labour. The census of 1861 reported seven immigrants from Malta, one from Madeira, and one from India on the island. These were males whose descendants were easily absorbed. Thus the original population received no significant admixtures of different cultural elements by immigration. In the second place, emigration of the local planter class reduced the ethnic complexity of the local population at the same time that it simplified Carriacou society. With the planters went their agents and other occupational groups belonging to the West Indian elite. Only folk descended from ex-slaves remained, together with the Scottish and French enclaves at Windward and Petit Martinique. By 1953 there was in Carriacou only one recognised member of the Grenadian elite. With the departure of the planters, the ex-slaves and their descendants were free to develop their own social and cultural institutions. In this respect, the Carriacou folk have enjoyed a measure of freedom in managing their lives which is unusual in the British West Indies. It is therefore of special interest to see what they have made of these opportunities, and to compare their society and culture with other British Caribbean territories, which remained under the influence of Creole elites.

If the years between 1838 and 1870 were full of uncertainties for Carriacou, the subsequent period witnessed their resolution. After 1870, the people gradually established themselves as landholders, their former masters withdrew, sugar gave way to cotton and subsistence farming, emigration became a permanent feature of the culture, and the population increased steadily. By

1873, the direction and character of this emigration was beginning to change, as the records show.

It is well known that the people of Carriacou have been annually in the habit of seeking employment elsewhere during the crop season, and in consequence of the failure of employment for labourers upon many of the estates of Grenada, whither they were accustomed to go, they have swelled the list of deckers to Trinidad. Many have used Trinidad as a \textit{point d' appui} in their travels towards Nueva Providencia.\textsuperscript{26}

That year 427 natives of Carriacou migrated to Trinidad, and of these, 371 were men. Later with the development of refineries in Venezuela, Aruba, Curacao, and Trinidad, the migrating peasants of Carriacou increasingly obtained industrial employment and remained abroad for longer periods. Nonetheless, due to the extremely high birth-rate, the population on Carriacou continued to increase. After 1921 this Carriacou emigration was poorly recorded. In 1946 census officers discovered that although the recorded excess of births over deaths in Carriacou from 1921 indicated a natural increase of 3,402, the island population was actually 335 persons less than in 1921. This implies an unregistered emigration of 3,737 persons over 25 years, or approximately 150 per annum. The Grenadian census officer attributed this to "leakages of some magnitude . . . through schooners and other sailing craft . . . between Grenada and Trinidad."\textsuperscript{27}

In 1946 Trinidad contained 1,200 Carriacou natives, of whom over 1,000 had been there for more than five years.\textsuperscript{28} From my studies at Harvey Vale, it appeared that two-thirds of the absent natives of Carriacou were in Trinidad.\textsuperscript{29} Thus in 1946 the total number of Carriacou natives would be approximately 8,600, of whom approximately a quarter were abroad, leaving an island population with a density of 520 persons per square mile.

\textsuperscript{26} St. George's Chronicle and Grenada Gazette, 18 May 1874.
\textsuperscript{27} West Indian Census, 1946, Part B (Kingston, Govt. Printer, 1946), pp. xvi, lxxix.
\textsuperscript{28} West Indian Census, 1946, Part G (Kingston, Govt. Printer), table 43, p. 49.
Acculturation Long before the abolition of slavery, the Roman Catholic Church had established itself in Carriacou. The Anglican (Established) Church also had a parish priest in Carriacou before 1800. These two denominations competed with one another first for the allegiance of the proprietors and then for permission to minister to their slaves. We have seen that by 1833 there was a school at Hillsborough. Slave children were catechised and received some formal instruction on the estates, and adult slaves were encouraged to marry. After Emancipation, the church and the school were the two principal agencies explicitly engaged in promoting acculturation among the ex-slaves. To understand current cultural conditions in Carriacou, it is well to look at the religious and educational history of the island.

A news item of 1843 relates that

industrial schools for the education of children of plantation labourers . . . were commenced here by several proprietors four years ago. . . . [They appear] not to have been attended with the degree of success which might have been looked for. . . . The system adopted was plain and simple, namely that such . . . children as did not attend any other school be admitted free of charge, but that those of a proper age should perform some light work during a few hours of the forenoon, payment being made according to the abilities of the children; and that in the afternoon they should attend school, the master being paid by the estate for teaching to read, but those who choose to acquire a knowledge of writing, etc. . . . were required to pay the teacher a trifle. . . . The parents . . . being for the most part uneducated . . . do not attach importance to the instruction of their children [and] it appears that out of 1,360 children under 14 years of age, only about 300 are receiving any education worthy of the name.80

Within a few years the industrial schools had died, and the school population had declined further. In 1861 there were two

schools in Carriacou, one Anglican and the other Roman Catholic. The Anglican school had an average daily attendance of 76 pupils, while the Catholic school had 55. In 1866 there were approximately 400 active members of the Anglican Church and a nominal membership of approximately 2,500. In the next year the Wesleyan Methodists established a school in Carriacou. By 1897 all three primary schools in the island were Government-sponsored, and the total enrolment was 492 pupils, with an average daily attendance of 248. By 1927 enrolment in the three Government schools had risen to 1,003, and the average daily attendance to 558. The Roman Catholic Church had by then established a school in Petit Martinique with an enrolment of 78 pupils and an average daily attendance of 39. In 1952 the average daily attendance of the four Government schools in Carriacou amounted to 1,218 and that of the Roman Catholic school in Petit Martinique to 102. In short, there has been a slow if steady improvement in school attendance since 1847, but the level of education locally offered remains quite low, and even in 1953 few Carriacou children were sent abroad for secondary schooling.

We shall see later how Carriacou folk worship. Almost all the islanders are either Catholic or Anglican in affiliation, but active church membership is much lower than nominal attachment. As their ritual practices reveal, they reinterpret Christianity quite freely to fit their own cultural and social organisation. Both the Anglicans and Catholics have tried to establish Friendly Societies among their followers. The Catholics had 144 members in 1937, and the Anglicans about the same number in 1952. The churches have been no more successful in their religious work or in education than in these Friendly Society promotions. Nonetheless, by

31. Ibid., 30 Nov. 1861.
32. Ibid., 6 June 1868.
33. Ibid., 13 Sept. 1868.
36. Figures from the Department of Education, Grenada, by courtesy of Clifford Palmer.
comparison with other British West Indian territories, Carriacou
has unusually high rates of marriage and legitimate births. In
the first report of the Grenada Registry of Births and Deaths in
1866, it was observed that “Carriacou is the only District in the
Colony in which legitimate births are in excess of illegitimate,
but even there the illegitimate births are . . . 45%.” In con­
trast, “the Grenada returns exhibit the highest proportion of chil­
dren born out of wedlock as compared with other places. In 1866
the proportion to every hundred births was 63.59, in 1867, 63.0.”
Table 3 shows the number of legitimate and illegitimate births
in Carriacou for various years between 1866 and 1953, together
with registered deaths.

Table 3. Births and deaths in Carriacou for sample years between 1868
and 1953.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total deaths</th>
<th>Total births</th>
<th>Legitimate births</th>
<th>Illegitimate births</th>
<th>Per cent legitimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NK not known

These figures illustrate the persisting peculiarity of mating
relations in Carriacou. Marriage has always been important, and
on average three of every five births are legitimate, but marriage is
by no means the only recognised form of mating, and 40 per cent
of local births are outside it. While Carriacou attachment to mar­
rriage enjoys religious sanction, it is not directly motivated by
religious beliefs. Although all local marriages are celebrated in
church, the social aspects of this institution outweigh the religious.

38. St. George’s Chronicle, 6 June 1866.
39. Ibid., 16 May 1868. The illegitimacy rate in Britain was then 6.4 per cent.
40. Sources of data: St. George’s Chronicle, 18 June 1870, 7 March 1874, 13
April 1877, 24 May 1879.
Grenada Blue Book, 1861, p. R 38; 1914, p. 4; 1922, p. 5. Figures for 1900 and
1952 were taken from the Carriacou Population Register by permission of F. A.
Phillips, District Officer, Carriacou, 1953.
The population has adapted a religious form to its needs, in much the same way that it has reinterpreted the teaching of church and school to fit local conditions. These data suggest that the church and the school, which have been most directly concerned with acculturation in Carriacou, have had only limited effects.

Another permanent channel of acculturation has been emigration. Carriacou migrants learn many cultural skills overseas; it might be expected that those who return would introduce new ways and customs, and that this change would be cumulative over the years. This is partially correct; the migrants do bring back new items of material culture and some new technological skills. Any visitor to the island will immediately be struck by the regularities observable among the house types. By and large, successive waves of returning emigrants bring new house styles back to the island, and houses of the same style tend to be of the same age. Between 1950 and 1953, returning migrants had begun to build concrete bungalows with sunken tanks as open piazzas at the house fronts. New roofing materials were also being used. However, apart from items of technology and material culture, returned migrants do not seem to have contributed much that is new to the island culture. Why this should be so, granted such heavy migration, is an interesting puzzle which cannot be resolved without adequate analysis of the local society.

**Government**

Until 1838 only the handful of free proprietors had political rights in Carriacou. The island was then subdivided into estates, and formed an electoral district of Grenada, sending one representative to the House of Assembly in St. George’s in Grenada. After Emancipation, Grenada was administered by a Lieutenant-Governor responsible to the Governor of the Windward Islands in Barbados. The official history of Grenada notes that “the vast majority of the population were entirely unrepresented in this ‘representative’ body.” 41 In 1862 there were 24 electors on the Carriacou roll, less than half of whom cast their votes. In 1869, 12 Carriacou voters elected three representatives. In 1875 the Grenadian Legislature concurred in its own abolition, and a system of Crown Colony government was introduced.

under which the Governor of the Windward Islands administered Grenada through his deputy, the Colonial Secretary, who in turn administered Carriacou through an official known as Assistant Treasurer of Grenada, who exercised magisterial powers.

Throughout the period of "representative" government, Carriacou had had little voice in its own affairs. Under Crown Colony administration, it was placed on a more nearly equal footing with Grenada. Even so, the population of Carriacou remained politically disfranchised and had no way of influencing the policies by which they were governed. In consequence, Colonial officials stationed in Carriacou enjoyed an almost complete monopoly of political influence as well as administrative authority. Modifications of the original Crown Colony Constitution by appointment of nominated advisers from the Colonial population only changed the position of Carriacou for the worse, since these nominees were almost all Grenadians.

In 1886 the Colonial Government set up a Parochial Board for local administration in Carriacou. The Governor nominated half of its members, rate-payers elected the remainder. Some of the duties and powers hitherto exercised by the Assistant Treasurer were vested in this board, which had authority to levy and disburse local rates and to manage the township of Hillsborough. In 1891 this board was made fully elective, but the Colonial Government simultaneously reduced its powers by establishing another board which was authorised to disburse public funds and was responsible for roads and by-ways; to this new board were nominated the few remaining large landowners of Carriacou. Ten years later the Parochial Board was abolished and replaced by a Town Board at Hillsborough, of which half the members were nominated. Three years later this Township Board was itself replaced by a fully nominated Town Authority under the chairmanship of the senior resident official. The island was then gazetted as an Administrative District and placed under a District Commissioner. This Commissioner acted as Magistrate for Carriacou and was directly responsible to the Colonial Secretary. He also represented Carriacou in the Colonial Legislature, which was then wholly nominated. In Carriacou the Commissioner appointed the Road and Town Wardens and had undivided executive powers.
By the Constitution of 1922, five members were elected to the Grenada Legislative Council under restrictive property franchise. By this Constitution Carriacou and St. Patrick’s Parish (Grenada) formed a single electoral district which was the largest in the Colony. Carriacou at that time had 506 voters but had no elected member. Instead, the Commissioner continued to hold an ex officio seat on the Colonial Legislature as spokesman for Carriacou. In 1936 when Carriacou was given its own elected member, the restrictive property franchise was retained, and there were only 506 registered voters on the island. From 1936 until the introduction of adult suffrage in 1951, this handful of voters regularly returned the same individual to the Grenadian Legislative Council. With the introduction of adult suffrage in 1951, Carriacou contained 2,973 voters, 75 per cent of whom participated in the General Election at which the previous member was defeated.

In 1947 the status of the senior resident official in Carriacou was reduced from that of District Commissioner to District Officer, and a magistrate was instructed to visit periodically. By this change land cases from Carriacou have to be taken to the High Court in St. George’s. The District Officer has limited emergency powers to act as a magistrate.

Meanwhile the Hillsborough Town Board continued. In 1948 it had a revenue of $955 (BWI), or nearly £200; by 1949 its revenue had risen to £204. Apart from wages, disbursements were made for the care of buildings, streets, markets, sanitation, lighting, the town clock, and a unit which acted as a fish, flesh, and pound house. In 1953 the remaining estates were purchased by the Government for rehabilitation and redistribution among the people.

This outline history of government in Carriacou shows a continuing lack of popular participation. Until 1925 the people were denied political power; from 1925 till 1951 the more prosperous islanders were permitted to elect a Colonial Legislator who was himself powerless to initiate remedial change. The island is obviously too small and poor to have separate political status; but it is equally obvious that popularly elected boards wither away.

42. Pound: enclosure where stray animals are impounded until claimed by their owners on payment of a fine.
unless they enjoy power and serve some significant function.

The Carriacou people are well aware that they are ruled by policies which are alien, developed in St. George’s or the United Kingdom, often with little attention to or knowledge of local conditions. They still regard the District Officer as authority personified, and the political impotence of their elected representatives has served to encourage this. Nowadays, when the Grenada Government wishes to establish elected boards and committees on the island, it finds little interest among the people. Nonetheless, the islanders do have political interests. Having grown accustomed to being governed without consultation, they have formed their ideas and goals to fit their circumstance. The island population regards itself as a unit distinct from Grenada.\(^4\)

\(^4\) Grenada Council Paper No. 8 of 1939, p. 17. The Commission of Enquiry observed that “we are doubtful whether many [Carriacouans] would care to emigrate to Grenada. However, a list of those willing might be obtained.”
The Agricultural Cycle

Sea and rain dominate the Carriacou economy, but while the sea is always present, the rains are short, seasonal, and highly erratic. People expect rain between the end of May and late October, with a short dry spell in August. Women pick the last Marie Galante cotton in late January, before the plants are “cut back” and the herds of goats and sheep are “let go.” By February the dry season sets in. In March and April, the men clear bush and prepare new plots. The dry season is the favourite time for marriages, especially in the weeks preceding Lent. Village sacrifices are often held in this season, either to give thanks for the harvest, in atonement, or to pray for a propitious season.

While the goats run free in the dry season, men must still tend and water the larger stock, and the village ponds and watering places are cleaned and repaired by the villagers at this time without assistance from the Government. With the approach of rain in May and June, farm preparations and house repairing increase.
sharply. Roofs and water containers must be ready for the rains, and last-minute flurries of work take place in the gardens. Small stock are tethered. Women calculate their seed requirements carefully and may seek further supplies from their husbands, who must then either buy them at high prices or borrow what they can from their kin. Relations of tenancy and share-cropping, care-taking, or use of family land will be renewed, revised, disputed, or ended at this time. Fishermen look hopefully towards the increased catches which the rains bring while repairing their seines, fish-pots, and other tackle.

Planting follows the first rains, the new corn (maize) or cotton being put in by early June. In planting, men hole the ground first with long-handled hoes, while women put the seed in and cover the holes by stamping. Groundnuts are planted as pure stand or between corn in this way. Okras are put among the corn or cotton by either sex. Women plant pigeon or Congo peas between corn or cotton. They may also plant cassava in corn but never mix it with groundnuts or cotton. Meanwhile the men prepare yam-fields, banking up the yam-hills and cutting and setting stakes for the women to plant. Everyone is busy with his own programme of garden work at this season; and although people will help their ailing kin or neighbours, little hired farm work now occurs. The seasonal rush of work is often intensified by beliefs about the conditions best suited for planting. It may be delayed until the moon is in its first quarter. Some folk prefer to plant corn at full moon; others say that although corn planted then gives large crops, the grains are small by comparison with corn planted at new moon or in the last quarter.

Corn, peas, and yams are planted in two or more varieties. "Six-weeks" corn and black-eye peas planted in late May will be harvested in mid-July in good seasons. Since food stores are normally low at that time, these crops are highly valued. Other local varieties of corn are named after St. Vincent and Trinidad, from which they came. Both these types have to be weeded in July and August and should be harvested in September.

Pigeon peas, a perennial, and "bukusu," a runner, will be put among the corn, and will bear from December until June. The two main varieties of yam planted in Carriacou are known as "Ginger-
yam” and “Cut-em-throw-way.” Either type has to be banked up after planting and again at the end of the rains. They are harvested the following March and are planted mainly in flat alluvium, of which there is little on the island.

Planting over, there is a lull in work while the rains are watched anxiously, and share-croppers subdivide their fields according to its crops and their appearance. Women weed and thin out the plants, replanting where necessary. About six weeks after planting, the okras are picked, and continue bearing until December or February.

A second period of intense activity occurs at the main corn harvest between late August and mid-September. Women break off the corn cobs by hand and pile them in bags or baskets carried by children or donkeys. They then give the field a light cleaning to encourage under-crops, and if it contains cassava, the menfolk “mould” it—that is, bank it up. If there is no cassava, men hole the ground for sweet potatoes, and the women plant them, while the men heap earth around the roots. At this time also, men bank up yam-hills, and women hoe cotton-fields.

Another lull in garden activity follows until November, when the sweet potatoes begin to mature. Men and women harvest these together, but cassava planted the previous year and ready for harvesting now is only dug up by men. Men also dig the yams which mature soon after cassava.

December brings a short groundnut harvest, followed by the main harvest between February and March. In gathering groundnuts, men loosen the roots with a fork while women and children pick the nuts. In these weeks peas mature and are collected by women and children sporadically; but the harvesting of cotton, from December to February, is women’s work, the men folk being responsible for its transport and sale. Generally they take the cotton to Hillsborough by donkey and sell it to the Carriacou Cotton Commission, who gin it for export there. By late February the only remaining crops are potatoes, cassava, and yam; the gardening cycle is over, and the goats and sheep are set free.

Disposal of Produce    Co-operation between the sexes takes place in the storage, marketing, and preparation of food, as well
as its cultivation. Storage is particularly important to Carriacou, since there is little food surplus available for internal trade; but crops may be sold to raise the cash necessary for purchasing other household supplies. Crop storage is left mainly to women, who normally use their kitchens for this purpose; but crops are sold by men, especially groundnuts and cotton, the principal cash crops. Either sex can exchange or give away garden produce, but women usually preside over these transactions since they are responsible for conserving household supplies; and their husbands will only interfere if the women are being either unduly mean or lavish. Corn is the main food crop of Carriacou, and its storage is accordingly important. Peas stay in the garden till they are needed, as do the root crops. Groundnuts not marketed are roasted for preservation. Corn cobs, if wet at the harvest, are splayed and set to dry in the sun, and before they are stored in the kitchen loft, pepper is burnt there to drive away rats or mice. The corn cobs are then tied together in hundreds, to facilitate later calculation of household stocks, and the bunches are hung where heat and smoke from the kitchen fire will preserve and harden them. Before storage, a certain portion of the corn is put aside by the housewife for use as seed next year, and thereafter neither spouse may touch this portion without disputes arising. Corn is bulky to store, and the quantities actually available for consumption cannot always be estimated accurately from the number of cobs. Shelling by hand is done by the women or children, and women are also responsible for grinding and cooking.

Although single males carry out these tasks for themselves, they are ridiculed if they are found cooking or fetching wood or water, which are the traditional tasks of the women. The mixed economy of Carriacou enjoins regular co-operation between men and women, and this presupposes cohabitation.¹ Men who live alone are liable to ridicule.

Corn is the first food crop to be harvested, and the only one with a definite harvest period. In Carriacou a good corn crop means well-being to man and beast alike, since the stalks are used for feeding cattle; a bad harvest means want and hunger for all. It is not surprising then that the corn harvest should be marked

¹. Cohabitation is used here to mean the co-residence of mates.
by ritual. These harvest rituals may be public or private. Some people hold a private first-fruits ceremony before eating any of the new corn. In one version, the householder scatters some of the newly roasted corn in each of the four directions before his house or in his field, while making a silent prayer of thanksgiving to God and "the old parents"—that is, the ancestors. He concludes the prayer by asking that all may enjoy prosperity and health for the coming year. In another version, a boiled or roasted cob is set on a white cloth on "the table," a sacrificial altar in the main bedroom of the house, and a candle is lit beside it. The old parents will come that night to refresh themselves and bless the household.

Public rites are occasionally held by a community, when dream-messages from the old parents instruct the villagers to do so. Each community acts as an exclusive unit in holding such rites. Fifty years ago, first-fruits ceremonies may have been carried out by groups of neighbours in public. This is no longer done. The harvest festivals held by the Anglican and Catholic churches in Carriacou are not regarded as first-fruits ceremonies by the folk.

Cotton and groundnuts are the local cash crops. In 1952 the Carriacou ginnery bought 636,400 lbs. of seed cotton from 1,256 persons at an average price of 13 cents per lb., payable in two instalments. This gives an average of 460 lbs. cotton per vendor, with an average value of $64.50 (BWI) or £13.10.0.2 To allow for error, this average income from cotton should probably be reduced by about one-third. Even so, it forms a large part of the cash income of Carriacou households.

Income from groundnuts is not so easily determined. Carriacou men sold most of their groundnuts in Grenville, Grenada, for an average 1953 price of 25/- per half-barrel of unshelled nuts. Transport charges varied, but if we allow three or four shillings marketing costs per half-barrel, it is probably not a serious overestimate to set the average cash income of local households from groundnuts at between £3 and £4 in 1952-53. Although this is a useful supplement to cotton income, it is clearly secondary.

When cotton and groundnuts are sold, the men retain the cash

2. I am grateful to Mr. Louisoy, then Senior Agricultural Officer, Carriacou, for these figures.
they need before handing over the remainder to their mates for “home use.” A man may use his unstated portion to pay taxes or debts, to buy seed or other goods, or to assist kin, including those of his children who do not live with him; or he may spend it on gifts to women or clothes for himself, on building materials, or on stock. The woman will use part of her cash income from farming for clothes for herself and her children, part for the purchase or repair of cooking and other household equipment, and part for occasional gifts to her kin or their children. She may either save the rest, or invest it in small stock or some market speculation. Some cash may have to be paid for rental of garden land. Both sexes handle their cash separately and seek to avoid reputation for squandering.

Share-cropping and Tenancy  Share-cropping, or metayage, is more common in Carriacou than cash rental of farm land. Crops are shared on standard patterns. The landholder expects one-third of the corn and one-half of the cotton and pea crops reaped by the metayer; but he does not bother with the groundnuts, which are expensive to harvest. This pattern was established in the last century on larger holdings. It is observed by the few remaining estates of the island, and by local landowners who give out their spare lands on share. Some local landowners may control between fifty and a hundred acres.

The only crop not divided between landlord and share-cropper before harvest is corn. In all other cases, the land under share-cropping is subdivided equally between worker and owner before the harvest, and each then harvests his own independently. To minimise disputes, the holder divides the field into equal portions and gives the share-cropper the choice. Where inter-cropping occurs, separate divisions are made for each crop. Small holders who give out their land on metayage are interested in all the crops grown thereon, and take equal shares of groundnuts, sweet potatoes, and cassava, as well as the crops mentioned above. Like cash tenancies, share-cropping arrangements are only begun or ended between March and April, and, unless expressly stated, do not entitle the tenant to use or cut down trees on the plot. In these relations, the holder and the tenant discuss their bargain or
business directly with one another, not with or through their kin. Stock—such as cattle, donkeys, or small stock—may also be tended on share. Men look after horses, donkeys, and cattle, while pig-rearing is handled by women, and either sex may rear sheep and goats. This allocation of responsibility implies that some arrangements for share-tending animals may hold between persons of opposite sex. Only female beasts are share-tended, and arrangements for division of offspring vary with the type of animal. A donkey’s first foal belongs to the tender, her second to the owner. There is no service charge for donkeys; if there is only one foal, the owner and tender have equal shares in it. This division of rights holds for cattle also. When a cow has calved, its tender informs the owner, who then decides whether or not to give the tender the calf. If the calf dies before being given to the tender, its owner bears the loss. If it dies after transfer, the tender bears the loss. The tender is responsible for paying the charge to service the cow and for any charges of damage to crops involving the animal while in his care. In return, the tender has all milk left by the calf. These ideas of balanced shares and responsibilities apply to goats, sheep, and pigs also. Goats and sheep may have two or three young at a time; these should be divided equally, the tender getting the benefit with regard to sex so that he may raise further animals of his own. Odd issues belong equally to tender and owner. Piglets are distributed in the same way, when old enough to be tied. Deaths before this are ignored. If six young pigs survive, three male and three female, the tender receives two females and the owner one, but the tender has to pay the 3/- fee for the boar.

Raising animals on the share is the usual way for young people who remain in Carriacou to begin building up their own herds of stock. One man who began by share-tending a cow built up a herd of three cows, one bull, three donkeys, ten sheep, and five goats (apart from pigs, which his wife looked after) in about thirty years. Men having stock in such number and variety are envied locally. The division of labour by sex forbids women to handle cattle, and ownership of a few beasts allows men to wander about at leisure during the farm season, engaged in “studiation of stock,” while their wives enjoy themselves in cultivation.
Moreover, large stock are marketable in Grenada or Trinidad and are a useful liquid reserve. Smaller stock, with fowls and pigeons, are in frequent demand for sacrifices held by their owners or owners' kin; Carriacou folk often say that this is why they keep goats and sheep.

The Division of Labour by Sex  To farm a variety of crops successfully in the short rainy season of Carriacou, the continuous co-operation of two or more adults is necessary, and the most effective co-operating unit is a man and a woman. The co-operation of man and woman provides the basis for the allocation of economic roles in Carriacou. In some spheres the interdependence of the sexes is organic, in others mechanical. Thus, women are responsible for the homes and children, while men work out-of-doors in pasture or garden, at sea or abroad. Women are responsible for household subsistence, while men provide the necessary cash. In addition, there are many tasks that men and women carry out together in farming and in building old-style "mud" houses or ovens for baking unleavened bread; in sickness or during a ritual they must also co-operate. Cleaning the house, washing and ironing the family clothes, fetching wood and water, cooking, and tending the young children—these are the recurrent tasks of the Carriacou housewife, the specifically female activities in which her man takes little part.

In preparing cassava, the sexes have separate roles. Men dig the tubers, women skin and grate them, and men express the poisonous juices by crushing the tubers between heavy stones, or by squeezing them in a cloth bag between tourniquets. The crushed cassava is then given to the women who dry and grind it and make farine for the household or for sale either locally or in Grenada. Alternatively, they may prepare cassava dumplings, called bitti, for the family.

Houses are distinguished as "men's houses" and "women's houses." Men's houses are made of wood or concrete and are often described as "board" houses. Women's houses are made of "daub and wattle"—that is, of mud plastered on slats—and they are also referred to as "mud" or "dirt" houses. Only men build men's houses. All daub-and-wattle houses are owned by women,
and it is degrading for a man to live in one, and unthinkable that a man living in a woman’s house should marry, except in articulo mortis. Concrete houses generally contain three or more rooms and have a large water tank. Wooden houses vary in size and are usually two-room structures less than ten by twenty feet. Thatch is the normal roofing for women’s houses, shingles or corrugated iron for those which men build or own. Of the 75 inhabited houses of L’Esterre in 1953, 15 were daub-and-wattle structures; of the remaining 60 wooden houses, 37 contained two rooms apiece, while about a dozen had as many as six rooms and two stories each. The village also included five empty houses, most of them wooden. There is no practice or concept of house rent in Carriacou; consequently, in their owners’ absence, houses remain empty.

Kitchens are built a few yards behind the houses. Kitchens are usually daub-and-wattle structures, roofed with thatch. Fairly prosperous people have a wooden kitchen with an iron roof. Sometimes a successful man may convert his former two-roomed wooden house into a kitchen when able to build himself a larger house in front.

There are no commercial bakeries in Carriacou, and ovens are household necessities, but women make ovens of earth, men make them of stone. Earth ovens will last for three or four years and may then be repaired. They are generally built by people who are short of money, without permanent tenure, or undecided about their future movements. The more elaborate stone ovens are found at Hillsborough and Windward and beside the larger houses in all villages.

Women in need of cash for household purposes may seek employment in the Government road repair gang during lulls in farm work, since the heavy first rains usually damage the roads. Husbands object to their wives’ employment on such work, since it advertises their own economic failure. Road work, or travail, is traditionally disliked because its organisation recalls the slave gangs. Moreover, the road “drivers,” or headmen who command these labour gangs may belong to communities different from those which supply the workers, and they are not always highly esteemed for their conduct.

Men who need cash for household purposes during the rainy
season prefer their wives to work for hire in their neighbours’ gardens, provided their own garden work is done. Men themselves never undertake wage labour in gardens if they can possibly avoid it, and will only be hired for such tasks as cutting back cotton, clearing bush, or forking. Men arrange for their wives to do farm work for wages, and must approve proposals for such employment before their wives can accept. In 1953 women did day-labour for one another at L’Esterre for 3/- per day and lunch (or “breakfast,” as it is called). The official minimum wage for female labour was 4/2. But when men undertook farm work for wages, they demanded the official minimum rate of 5/- per day then current in Grenada. Apart from pig-keeping and some market speculation, the island women can only earn money by occasional washing or ironing, sales of bread, or by making and selling fishing nets.

Fish is an important article of food in Carriacou. It is also cured and sold in Grenada weekly. Curing of fish or meat is generally done by men. They open and clean the fish, rub in rock salt, damp it, and set it on trellises to dry in the sun for four or five days. Only if the weather is wet will the fish be smoke-dried in the kitchen loft above the fire, to keep away worms and maggots. Meat is sliced, salted, and sun-dried for six or seven days in the same way. After a household sacrifice there may be a small surplus of meat. At such events, the man who slaughters the beast is a specialist, since the sacrifice would otherwise fail. He receives two or three pounds of meat for his service. The householder keeps the head of the beast, which is corned for later home use as “souse.” The skins of goats and sheep are rubbed with ashes before being nailed to the house for drying. A few are sold locally as drumskins, but the majority are marketed abroad. Cowhides are sold to the few Grenadian firms established in Carriacou, but after their hair is scraped off, pigskins are consumed as stew.

**Fishing** Fishing is an important occupation for local males. It provides food and cash for the home and supplements the women’s garden work. For Carriacou, the fishing equipment is relatively varied and includes “vessels” (that is, schooners or sloops), sail or rowboats, seines or smaller fish-nets, fish-pots,
harpoons, lines, and lesser gear. Some carpenters specialise in building rowboats and sailing vessels, others in caulking them. Some men are sail-makers, others repair the boats. In addition, many men have sufficient knowledge of carpentry to build small rowboats or fish-pots in their leisure for personal use or sale.

Fish-pots are generally set at sea to leeward, where the water is calm. A boat working a set of fish-pots will have a fairly regular crew of three or four men, normally kin or neighbours.

The catch may be distributed at sea or on shore, one part going to the boat, another to the pot, and one to each of the crew. Thus boat-owners who work their own fish-pots with a small crew obtain three-fifths of the catch and can provide their homes with regular supplies of fish and cash income. Covally, snapper, grouper, rockhind, jacks, and sprats form the bulk of the catch, and the first two find a ready sale as specially tasty food. Men who work fish-pots pay close attention to moon and tide and set pots according to notions of the moon’s influence on the movements of the fish. Those men who lack their own boats and have not joined a crew fish less regularly with small nets for sprats, jacks, or fry, which coast about in schools. Net fishermen rarely obtain more fish than their households need.

Seines are important equipment in Carriacou. By local standards they represent a high level of capital investment, and they also require continuous maintenance and use, thereby creating important work opportunities within their communities. The seine-crew is the largest regular work-unit on shore in Carriacou. Often it catches an abundance of fish. In repairing or making the net, the owner supplies twine to people who knit sections, approximately thirty feet in length.

If the foreshore has an owner, he may claim a third of the fish when the seine makes a haul, while the rest will be divided in three: one part for the seine, that is, for its maintenance; one for its owner; and the other for subdivision among all who helped in the haul, in proportion to their contribution. The seine captain receives the largest share of the third portion; the seine-mender and lookout come next; divers and the crew of the seine-boat follow, and so forth. The returns from these exertions may seem disappointing to strangers, but not to islanders. Even a moderate
haul involves fairly wide distribution of fish throughout the village of the seine, via its crew. Specially large hauls call for thanksgiving sacrifices. Long periods without any catch require sacrifices of atonement. The seine-owner can evade neither, and would not wish to do so. In July 1953 the seine at L'Esterre made a haul of jacks weighing several tons. The catch was larger than village boats could cope with, and some people were brought over from Union island by blowing conch shells. The catch filled fourteen rowboats, apart from numerous baskets. In due course the seine-owner held a thanksgiving sacrifice. Interest and pride in the seine in the village to which it belongs, are thus quite understandable. The seine-owner has high prestige, and the seine-crew enjoy esteem.

Line-fishing on the British Guiana banks or in sailboats en route from Carriacou contribute little to local supplies, since these catches are usually disposed of abroad. Fishing, like boat-building and sailing, is men’s work in fact as well as ideal. However, there are one or two deviant women who fish for their livelihood, and one also works as seine-crew. These women are all unattached and have no small children to look after. I also observed one housewife helping her husband build his boat; but cases of women working at sea or on boats are extremely rare.

Carriacou corned fish is taken in sloops and sold in Grenada and St. Vincent. Since men sail, they also sell the fish abroad. Within the island, fishing is a subsistence activity, and although fish is sold, there is no developed fish trade. Only the surplus product is exchanged, and fishermen give most of their catch to their womenfolk.

**Seafaring** Carriacou folk distinguish vessels, which are built for sailing, from smaller boats which may or may not have sails. Boats are normally owned by individuals, and often the owner builds his boat himself. However, construction or ownership of sloops or schooners often involves two or more persons, usually men, but not necessarily kin. If the partners fall out, construction may cease and the unfinished hull may be left to weather on the shore between its huge supports. If the craft is seaworthy, one partner may sell his share to the other or occasionally to a third
party. In 1953 there were 25 schooners and 28 sloops registered at Carriacou, most of them owned singly. Some individuals had two or more vessels. Having operated one schooner successfully, they had invested the profits in purchasing a second. In 1953 all engine-driven Carriacou schooners were owned by L'Esterre people, and most of these voyaged between the Spanish Main and the Southern Caribbean; but although the Windward folk had not yet adopted boat engines, they roamed further afield, northward as far as St. Kitt's or east to Martinique, Guadaloupe, and Barbados. Windward also contains the expert schooner builders.

Wages paid to local sailors on these vessels were often below the minimum rate of 5/- per day which unskilled farm labour in Grenada then received. Where the traffic is brisk, schooner operation is highly profitable, provided no mishap occurs. However, the risks involved are considerable, since these schooners are usually sailed by uncertified skippers, without instruments or engines. In consequence they often founder or run adrift in the shallows, when currents, reefs, or winds are misjudged; and cases in which a man has lost two schooners in quick succession are not unknown.

Carriacou schooners have local values which vary between $5,000 and $8,000 BWI (£1,000 to £1,800) according to size and condition. They are the island’s most elaborate products. Their movements serve to mark the passage of time and bring news of absent kin and friends. They bring the island the supplies and cash it needs and transport its emigrants cheaply. A schooner launching arouses island-wide interest and involves large-scale celebrations with religious overtones. Before returning to sea after careening or caulking, a sacrifice must be held for the schooner by her owner and crew, to secure fair voyages. The histories of individual vessels are widely known in the island, and seamen pass judgements freely on the merits of different boats, owners, captains, crews, and sea routes. Without doubt, seafaring dominates the minds of many people in Carriacou, especially of those sloop-owners who are striving to acquire a schooner from

the profits of their sloop. Men evaluate one another in terms of seafaring skill, and women tend to accept the general opinion. In fact, there are substantial hazards in sailing the Grenadines with vessels constructed by rule-of-thumb, and widowhood by drowning is common in Carriacou.

Sloops dominate the short sea routes to Grenada and St. Vincent, being used in trading, or “trafficking” as it is called. Every Saturday a large fleet of Carriacou sloops descends on Grenville, Grenada; on landing, the crews busily sell cured fish, groundnuts, or small stock, and buy Grenada foodstuffs such as plantains, tannias, coco, or coconuts for resale in Carriacou. Another fleet of sloops visits St. Vincent on weekends, returning on Mondays with St. Vincent market women and barrels of pumpkins, pears, “gringies” (the St. Vincent variety of plantain), breadfruit, and the like. Probably Carriacou imports most of its ground provisions from Grenada and St. Vincent by sloops, and they also transport most of its groundnuts, corned fish, small stock, and poultry. Sloop-owners may increase the returns from their vessels by successful trafficking, and these opportunities also attract their crews. However, the income from sloops cannot be compared with that from schooners.

Three people can handle a sloop, but at least eight are needed on a schooner. On either vessel, the captain’s orders must be obeyed immediately; but whereas schooners have mates and other officers, sloops have only captain and crew.

Saving and Investment The Carriacou economy has low cash content. The island provides few opportunities for wage-employment, but the culture enjoins heavy outlays in certain circumstances. These conditions encourage thrift in the folk; and since the island has no banks, limited surpluses are invested in productive enterprises which can be turned into cash in emergencies. Cattle, sloops, and shops meet these conditions nicely, schooners somewhat less. Accordingly, investments confer prestige on their makers in proportion to their value. People admire those who husband resources and use them in worth-while investment, even though unable to complete this at once. It often happens that a man begins to build a sloop or schooner without
sufficient resources to finish the work. The brown hull may sit on the shore for years on end, waiting to be worked upon when cash is available. It bears witness to the builder’s efforts and intentions, and will attract favourable comment from passers-by. In Carriacou the inability to complete a vessel with immediately available resources is no reason for delaying the start, even though considerable sums may still be necessary. This attitude is due neither to over-optimism, nor to an inability to estimate costs; investment of scarce capital has intrinsic value in this culture, and it arouses public respect and sympathy for those who make it. Few behaviours evoke such wide disapproval as the squandering of money in gambling or “show” by young migrants returning on holiday. Surpluses being marginal, productive investment has popular approval.

We have seen how the local combination of production for exchange and subsistence assumes a complementary division of economic roles between the sexes and their cohabitation. Domestic units consisting of spouses and their children, or of old women and their sons, are better adapted to the local economy than are units containing adults of one sex only. However, it would be an error to overestimate the importance of co-residence. The important point is that men should contribute towards the upkeep of a household, whether living there or not. Given this, the contrast in employment opportunities between Carriacou and Trinidad, Aruba, or Venezuela stimulate emigration. Apart from occasional brief spells of road work at the uninspiring rate of 5/- a day, Carriacou can only offer its young men a handful of regular jobs as Government junior staff, shop assistants, uncertified teachers, or schooner-crew. Such local craftsmen as masons, mechanics, carpenters, or taxi-drivers must expect irregular employment. By themselves, these activities cannot support those who practice them or serve to establish or maintain their households. Moreover, cultural conventions allocate occupations partly on the basis of age, and young men devoting themselves to stock-rearing would be mocked severely, although this is a legitimate occupation for their seniors since the fields are unfenced and water is scarce. Overseas, wage-rates are higher and employment available. Such companies as Esso in the Dutch islands formerly recruited
British Caribbean labour and offered arrangements whereby their employees regularly saved set portions of their earnings. Such a scheme attracts Carriacou workers, since it enables them to save towards the establishment of their own homes.

Routine savings of this type also help those who wish to send money home regularly. However, even without these company schemes, Carriacou emigrants are keenly interested in saving, and they regularly send money home for purchasing land or for building, repairing, or furnishing their home with a view to marriage. Usually, but not always, unmarried emigrants ask their fathers to take care of their savings. Women are not expected to save, wherever they are; this is a male responsibility. Men who work abroad, having left their wives and families in Carriacou, contribute directly to their households, and will also send their mothers separate remittances. In this way, emigrant males make important contributions to the Carriacou economy, and often contribute to several households simultaneously. The money thus received is used to purchase goods and services which the men themselves might provide if they were in the island. The surplus is kept for future need or investment.

Not all emigrants honour their kinship obligations. Illness, unemployment, high costs of living, and low wage-rates may interrupt or frustrate their intentions; some may contract obligations overseas which seem more pressing than those at home; others may see opportunities for investment abroad, even in the form of further travel in search of better fortune. Yet Carriacou has little cause to complain of ill treatment by its emigrants, and the islanders are very proud of their record in this respect.

Emigration is important in the island economy. It provides wage-employment not locally available, allowing the men to earn the cash needed at home, to save for their own future households, and to return and settle. They will then be able to build the shops, sloops, or schooners or purchase the land and stock which alone offer assurance of sufficient income to meet future responsibilities for their families. Only those young men whose parents are relatively well off can expect a similar degree of security without emigration.
Occupational Factors

Until the abolition of slavery, Carriacou society was stratified in terms of legal status, the critical distinction being between free and slave. Within the free minority, class distinctions were based on property and political rights. The dominant group were white property-owners and their attorneys. Below them came white employees and craftsmen. Free black or coloured persons occupied the lowest position in the free stratum. We have no information from this period about the way in which the Carriacou slaves differentiated themselves; however, we can assume that the slaves of one estate formed a group differentiated from those of other estates; that slaves under a common owner recognised certain bonds, even when they belonged to different estates; and that slaves who were placed in authority over others would be treated with some respect. With the introduction of the task system, however, field slaves became separately responsible
for their allotted tasks, and the authority of slave drivers would accordingly be reduced. The principles and forms of stratification current among freemen did not include the Carriacou slaves. Instead, slave differentiation was probably based on sex, age, and location.

Nowadays Grenadians describe Carriacou as “a classless society.” This is not quite true since there is a handful of influential persons, most of whom live or work at Hillsborough, whose associational patterns tend to set them off as a marginal group. Most of these people are immigrant officials or merchants. This influential group is very small and internally stratified. On the basis of discussions and observations, its composition is as follows: the highest-ranking individuals are the District Officer, the District Medical Officer, and the Anglican and Catholic priests, none of whom are Carriacou natives. Next comes a group containing the former and present elected members, two head teachers who are Justices of the Peace, the Revenue Officer, Senior Agricultural Officer, wireless operator, Seventh Day Adventist elder, four local merchants who are all members of the Hillsborough Town Authority, and four branch managers of Grenadian merchant houses. A third stratum includes the three remaining head teachers, the junior officers and Government clerks, the junior agricultural instructors, the local police force, the dispenser, nurses, road officer, assistant teachers, and contractors who undertake Government work. Members of these three strata also differentiate revenue boatmen, student teachers, forest rangers, road drivers, property overseers, vessel hands, and the few domestic servants from the general population, whom they come to know mostly in the course of their work. In short, we can say that almost all of this elite have regular jobs or engage in trade. Only three schooner-owners are included in this group, and of these, two are merchants and members of the Hillsborough Town Authority. The few middling landholders on the island are not among them.

People involved in the exchange economy tend to make their status placements on the basis of roles in that system. In addition, administrators regard participation in administration as evidence of social prestige. Since the overwhelming majority of the Carriacou folk are neither committed to the exchange economy nor
employed in administration, we can expect that their notions of status and their system of status placement may differ as sharply from those current among this immigrant elite as that of their slave forefathers differed from those of the free population. In such a case the principles that govern status distribution in Carriacou will diverge from those that inform class systems, and the differentiation of persons in this society will proceed on other lines. These inferences are borne out by field materials, as will be shown.

Wealth, in the form of ownership of land or schooners, is important among the islanders; but the risks that attach to such property increase with its size. Schooners and sloops are frequently lost, and surplus land is only productive by virtue of metayage or cash tenancies. In short, prosperity has a precarious basis in Carriacou, and it is unusual for children to maintain their father's prosperity, due to the fragmentation of property aggregates on inheritance as well as attendant risks. Wealthier people enjoy somewhat better living conditions than do the less fortunate, and receive some prestige thereby. But differences in wealth do not promote class differences in Carriacou. A man has no more influence or authority than his neighbours by virtue of his wealth. Personal influence depends largely on character, age, kinship, and popular esteem. The wealthy man is esteemed for the way in which he discharges those cultural obligations associated with possession of wealth. The folk beliefs oblige seine-owners to hold sacrifices periodically, either to give thanks or to beg for fish and forgiveness. Schooner-owners do likewise after careening. Ships must be opened with a "big time," involving free distribution of food and drink. Community obligations attaching to wealth are expressed by these sacrificial distributions in which poor and rich jointly participate and express their social identity. Thus wealth provides no basis for class differentiation in Carriacou. Neither does colour, which differentiates the poor "whites" of Windward from the "blacks" of the rest of the island, but ranks neither group above the other.

Occupational differences are also unimportant in Carriacou status placements, except whose which are correlated with sex or age. Table 4, an analysis of the adult male population of
L'Esterre in 1953, will illustrate the narrowness of the occupational range in these communities.

### Table 4. L'Esterre males classified by household position and occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Household heads</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schooner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-captain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain and part-owner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors, garden, rowboat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors, garden, fishing</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sloop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-captain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing, rowboat</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing, rowboat, shop, shoemaker</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing, rowboat, carpenter, violin</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing, rowboat, carpenter, garden</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing, garden, shop</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing only</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net-fishing and garden</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net-fishing, sailing, garden, stock</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seine-owner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seine man, net-fishing, stock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seine man, garden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garden only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden, stock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden, shop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden, carpenter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden, painter</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD road “driver”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop assistant</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Almost all were adolescents used as unpaid family labour in gardens.

Of 39 female household heads in this village, 35 worked in their gardens as well as at home, one also occasionally washed and ironed for wages, one was a paid shop assistant, another a
part-time servant, and the fourth was a fisherwoman and net-maker as well as farmer. The previous occupational experience of these 39 female household heads and of the 31 resident mates of male household heads can be summarised briefly. Four of these 70 women had previously worked as paid shop assistants; another four had been domestic servants.

These data show how sharply different are the economic roles of men and women. In fact as well as ideal, local women are confined to the home and garden and do not compete with the men occupationally in any way. Moreover, among themselves the men do not compete occupationally. There is little chance for such competition to develop in the restricted economic context of Carriacou. Table 4 shows that 29 of the 36 male household heads depended on the sea for their livelihood, in greater or lesser degree. Four of these men owned schooners, another had shares in one, two men owned sloops, three owned rowboats, and one had a seine. Sailing was the most important occupation; and of the 20 male householders who had only one occupation, 17 were sailors. Only one male householder was fully engaged in farm work, while 10 of the 24 dependent males had no other work. Sailing, fishing, and garden work are the principal male occupations, and they are often combined with one another, or with carpentry or stock-rearing, the better to make use of time. With such a narrow occupational range, there is no opportunity for class stratifications to develop on occupational bases.1

Class stratification presupposes sufficiently wide occupational and economic differentiation, to permit social movement upwards and downwards; but the hierarchic class system prerequisite for such mobility is inconsistent with social organisation of Carriacou in which status is regulated by age, sex, and kinship.

Differentiation The occupational homogeneity of L’Esterre adults is simply one aspect of village life. In many other particulars, the people of L’Esterre are even more alike. In 1953 this village contained 60 males and 115 females above the age of

fourteen. Of these 175 persons, 156 were Roman Catholic, and 163 were bilingual in English and French patois. Only 22 persons in this village had joined the Friendly Societies of the churches to which they belonged. Of these joiners, 13 were household heads, including five males persuaded to join by their wives. Of the 175 people at L’Esterrre, only two were subscribing to the weekly savings group known as susu. Susu membership presupposes predictable weekly cash incomes, which few L’Esterrre people have.

Of the 36 male household heads, only one was known never to have left Carriacou. For another three, the data are inadequate. Ten had been abroad sailing or on holiday but had never worked there; 22 had worked overseas for differing periods. Three male householders had returned to Carriacou after working abroad for less than one year, an equal number within four years of their departure. Seven had worked abroad for periods between four and eight years, and an equal number from nine to twenty years before they returned. Concerning two, our data on this point are inadequate. Five of these 22 men had worked in Trinidad only, three in Aruba, one each in Dominica and Colombia. One man had worked in both Cuba and Colombia, one man in Grenada and Trinidad, another in Grenada and Venezuela, three in Aruba and Trinidad, and two in Aruba and Venezuela. Three men had each worked in three different countries, one in four. Of the 39 female household heads at L’Esterrre in 1953, 21 had never left the island, and our information on two is inadequate. Of those 16 who had travelled, seven had visited Trinidad, five Grenada, two Aruba, one Barbados and one the United States. Of the 28 resident mates of male household heads for whom our data are adequate, 18 had never left the island. Of the remainder, four had visited Trinidad, three Grenada, two Aruba, and one had been to Barbados and the U.S.A. In short, men travel more than women, work abroad for longer periods and visit more foreign countries. However, male travel experiences are so widely distributed that they provide no basis for individual differentiation.

Male household heads are more travelled than others simply because male household headship presupposes emigration in order to establish a separate home. With this exception, which is based on norms of kinship and finds its expression there, travel has no status implications between men. Finally, the fact that the occupational structure of L'Esterre reveals so little differentiation itself indicates that the skills learned abroad are of little importance in Carriacou community life.

However, it may be expected that land distribution would provide some index of community stratification or could furnish its basis. In view of the historical association of land ownership and status in Carriacou, this possibility requires careful examination. Of the 36 male household heads at L'Esterre, one who lacked his own land had charge of land belonging to others, and 16 were share-cropping. Of the 39 female householders, one was also caretaking another's land, and 23 were share-croppers. Of the 28 wives of male household heads, five were share-croppers. Apparently male household heads engage in share-cropping as often as not, the important differentiation here being age. Married women are less likely to share-crop while living with their husbands than are female household heads. These figures indicate that many village households lack sufficient farmland of their own.

Of the 36 male household heads, two had their houses on family land, one used family land but lived elsewhere, five had houses on their wives' land, four lived on land inherited from their fathers, two rented their house-spots, two acted as care-takers, and 20 had bought the land on which their houses stood. Of the 39 female household heads, ten had their houses on family land; eight had inherited homes from their husbands, and three lived there during their husbands' absence; one had received land from her son, four from their fathers, and one from her mother; three rented house-spots and another also rented garden land; three had been granted the free use of house-spots during their lifetimes; two were care-taking for absent people; and three were using family land but lived elsewhere. None of these 39 female household heads had herself purchased land or house.

Of the 36 male household heads, eight had bought garden plots
below an acre in size, and eight were using family land varying from \( \frac{1}{4} \) to \( 6\frac{1}{2} \) acres; four were working their fathers' land, which varied from \( \frac{1}{2} \) acre to 2 acres in size; an equal number worked their wives' land, which varied between 2 and 10 acres; and three had rented plots between 2 and 6 acres, the larger of these being used as pasture. Nine wives of these male household heads had family land, another had land from her first husband, and four had inherited the house-spot from their fathers; but five had no land at all, and some of the land held by these women lay at some distance from L'Esterre. As regards share-cropping, our information is less thorough. Plots share-cropped by male householders were rarely less than one acre in extent or larger than two. Some men had only one plot on the share, but most had three or four. Men would receive help from their wives in cultivating these plots, and some wives also had their own plots on their husbands' land.

These details from L'Esterre show how complex is the distribution of land rights within Carriacou communities. This distribution involves many variables, of which area is by no means most important. The sex and marital or household status of occupants, the mode of acquisition, the type of right and the use to which the land is put are also of interest. On the data presented, we can only conclude that although ownership of land may be unequally distributed, there are a sufficient number of culturally approved ways of redistributing control and occupancy of land to rule this out as a factor of status placement.

However, occupational and economic factors are by no means the only bases of differentiation. Cultural variables may be equally important, and political organisation can serve also as the basis of status distribution. We have seen that the folk at L'Esterre have remarkable cultural uniformity, and in this L'Esterre is fully representative of Carriacou as a whole. We have also seen that the administration of Carriacou provides no basis for differentiating among the island folk who play little part in their government. These negative conclusions are important but do not imply that Carriacou lacks social differentiation. They merely show that whatever the form of this differentiation, it involves neither
stratification nor a class system and makes little use of political, economic, or occupational variables among its criteria. Bearing these points in mind, we may now examine the territorial organisation of the island society.

**Territorial Organisation**

Until 1834 Carriacou was fully partitioned into a few score estates, each with its own name, owner and history. Over the years, some of these units were amalgamated and others were broken up and distributed among the people. Quite a few of the smaller holdings shown on the island map of 1784 were absorbed in larger holdings before the abolition of slavery. For the most part, their names have been forgotten, while names of the holdings which absorbed them still persist. The boundaries of those properties whose names survive are also remembered. Consequently, even today the land area of Carriacou is divided into a number of named localities based on these old land holdings. This system of local names and boundaries provides the informal framework of Carriacou territorial organisation.

Until recently there has been no official recognition of local divisions within Carriacou. However, together with recent efforts to stimulate popular participation in government, certain local divisions have been adopted by the Administration for various purposes. Thus, for the general elections of 1951, the island was divided into ten polling units: Hillsborough, Top Hill, Dover, Bogles, Windward, L’Esterre, Mount Pleasant, Bellevue South, Belmont, and Petit Martinique. In electing representatives to the Carriacou Cotton Ginnery Committee, the following eight divisions were used: Mount Pleasant, L’Esterre-Harvey Vale, Windward, Petit Martinique, Belmont, Bellevue South, Grand Bay, Dover. Each of these divisions denotes a distinct area. For administrative purposes the divisions are useful; but each includes two or more local units, and the various administrative groupings do not always agree with one another. Harvey Vale and L’Esterre are quite distinct villages. The community of Orange Vale forms part of the administrative unit of Windward but differs sharply. These administrative divisions are thus artificial. The Carriacou
territorial organisation is its system of communities and their interrelations.

To illustrate the significance of old estate boundaries and names in differentiating Carriacou communities is simple. The village of Bellevue South is distinguished from another unpopulated place, formerly an estate called Bellevue, which lies in the north of the island. Both areas take their names and boundaries from former estates. At L'Esterre there are local subdivisions following the boundaries of old estates which are still known by name as Experiment, Retreat, St. Louis, La Pointe (Pointe Cisterne), Morne Jaloux, Lower St. Pierre, and Coconut Vale. The population of L'Esterre distinguish themselves from those people who live on their boundaries at Experiment and Coconut Vale. No hostility or rivalry obtains between these neighbouring groups; they simply represent different local units, each differentiated from the others by locality, history, kinship, and descent.

Community thus provides the first and most general principle of social differentiation in Carriacou. Within a community, kinship, age, and sex are also important differentiae and the most important social units are the household and lineage.

Community boundaries do not imply abrupt breaks in social relationships. Persons living on the margins of communities may have kin or mates across the boundary; many people living in community centres have close ties with others elsewhere. Nonetheless, the community remains a distinct local unit most of whose members mate with and are related to one another. As we shall see in more detail, 75 per cent of the unions contracted by L'Esterre male residents were with L'Esterre women, while 66 per cent of the women's matings involved natives of that community.8 With such high ratios of community endogamy, it is not surprising that most members of a community are linked by kinship and that, with locality, kinship is the principal basis of community organisation. This high rate of local endogamy also implies sharp differentiation between communities as physical and as social units. Though the members of a community may have kin elsewhere, it is generally true that most of their kinsmen be-

3. For this calculation, only relations involving cohabitation or conception were included.
long to their village. Moreover, most of the community are related to one another directly or indirectly, and they form a distinct social unit on this ground.

Our data show that communities are neither fully endogamous nor completely closed. Numerous cross-community kinship and mating relations are present. Their variety and range is in part due to genealogical distance from the mating in which they originated, and to differences in the form of these matings themselves. Differences as regards cohabitation are especially important in this context, since children tend to remain with their mothers and mothers’ families unless their parents are married. In addition, when members of two different communities marry, the wife generally moves to her husband’s village. Community members whose mothers or fathers have come from other villages will have their maternal or paternal kin elsewhere. Those begotten outside cohabitation may only have maternal kin close by; and, since agnatic lineage is an important principle of social organisation, these differences will be important. Of the 85 L’Esterre women whose mating records have already been referred to, thirteen were born in other Carriacou villages, and two abroad. Of the 43 L’Esterre men already referred to, one had moved in from another village, while seven were not born in Carriacou. By comparison with the data already presented on the siting of households, it is clear that while Carriacou men rarely move to other communities to join their wives, they often move if the woman is a native of their own community.

Localised patrilineages are the only large-scale kinship units in Carriacou, and they are important features of the island society. Lineages are exogamous units within a four-generation span of agnatic descent, after which they tend to split at each generation. Because of lineage values, patrilateral kinship is distinguished sharply from uterine relations. However, the patrilineal principle is itself consistent with a wide variety of kinship usages, as will be shown below. By means of these adaptations, communities tend to be identified with their more prominent lineage units, a usage which stresses kinship solidarities rather than differences within a village. Ultimately this sense of community kinship rests on the fact that its leading patrilineages often help other community
members with their kinship or ritual responsibilities. Since children begotten outside of cohabitation tend to live with their mothers, each lineage will also include many persons who live as dependents in homes headed by members of other families, and some who live there as mates. Due to the intervillage movements and matings already mentioned, community members are internally differentiated by range and type of local kinship connections; but people who lack agnatic kin within the community will be associated loosely with the agnatic kin of their mothers or mates. Thus immigrants are locally sponsored by community lineages; and lineages also supervise the property and interests of their emigrant members. In short, the lineage principle helps to preserve the community's distinctness despite movements to and fro, and it also provides the community with an enduring principle of organisation which mediates between individual households and the total local group.

However, lineage relations often extend across community boundaries. We generally find that an exogamous lineage segment settled in one community has agnatic links with co-ordinate units settled elsewhere. It is also the case that all Carriacou communities contain two or more exogamous "bloods," as these lineages are called. Consequently there is a network of intercommunity lineage ties which serves to bind the islanders into a common society and counteracts the latent separatism of these lineage-based village communities. Thus the Josephs at L'Esterre are linked to another lineage of that name at Six Roads. When either blood holds a lineage ritual, the other must be invited and must attend. Members of one local lineage who wish to move to another community will often seek help from their linked lineage kin elsewhere, especially in obtaining land. Since agnatic kin rarely mate, even after formal exogamy lapses, these intercommunity lineage ties remain unaffected by problems of mating, parenthood, and child maintenance, which are most acute when members of different communities are involved.

To understand the constitution of Carriacou communities, we must therefore study the system of kinship and mating. In addition, we shall have to examine the system of ritual and belief which symbolises and sanctions this network of social relations.
This is all the more necessary because it is difficult to grasp the principles and functions of Carriacou kinship clearly without an adequate knowledge of the local religious system. Conversely, without an adequate knowledge of the social organisation, Carriacou ritual and belief is hardly intelligible. To understand the island culture and society we must be able to show how these two orders of behaviour are interrelated.

In Carriacou, community relations are based on kinship and expressed in ritual. These characteristics define communities as separate units. Each is a relatively discrete local group consisting mainly of kinsfolk; these local groups also have separate ancestor cults. Physically, their boundaries tend to follow those of the old estates on which they are settled. Politically, these local units have had negligible functions; but they are nonetheless important as organs of social control. The objects and forms of this social control will be dealt with later; the fact that kinship provides the basis of community organisation and differentiation indicates their probable content and range. Cultural prescriptions govern mating relations, parental roles and their discharge, inheritance, land occupancy, individual differentiation and status assignment, proper ritual behaviour, and the use and disposal of wealth. These rules to be maintained require sanctions. Through its household and lineage units, the community enforces their observance by pressure of public opinion and by such acts as ridicule, ritual observances, isolation, abuse, and the like. The range of a community's interests in the activities of its members is well-nigh all-encompassing; and although there is hardly any official recognition of this system of control, its efficacy is undeniable. There is no praedial larceny in Carriacou villages, and despite the permissive system of mating, there are hardly any cases of unacknowledged paternity. On their return, the young semi-urbanised emigrants are quickly made to observe local customs and conventions if they wish to remain on the island. The numerous land disputes that arise in Carriacou provide further occasions for community control, since land is recognised as a common cause of dispute between non-kin, and these disputes can only reach the local court under formal charges of assault; land actions being reserved for the High Court in Grenada. Al-
though the Government and the courts regulate those activities to which official sanctions attach, such actions vary widely in frequency and importance for the islanders, and many matters of interest to the community are not officially regulated. There are also many transactions such as inheritance or land transfer which the people prefer to handle themselves in ways not recognised by law. The diffuse system of sanctions which controls these relations is critical for the smooth functioning and continuity of the community.

In Carriacou, community integration involves three organisational levels: the household, the basic social and economic unit; the lineage, the major structural agency of social control; and the community itself, which is distinguished as a group from like adjacent units by reference to locality, leadership, local endogamy, and ritual organisation.

The distinctive community rites take place on instruction by ancestral spirits in dreams. These dream-messages may be received by any senior member of the community; and some of the village sacrifices thus enjoined are described below. On such occasions the participation of all households within the community is obligatory while members of other communities are excluded. Thanksgiving or atonement provide the most frequent occasions for community rituals. If any one keeps away through personal animosity, his absence may be justified only on the ground that the rite in question was held by a private individual and not by the community as a whole. This rationalisation simply underlines the obligation of community members to participate in community rites.

Besides such enjoined sacrifices, funerals, marriages, baptisms, and "stone-feasts" (entombments) also require community participation and reaffirm distinctness and solidarity. Attendance at these events is expected from at least one adult member of each household in the community. These kinship rituals mobilise family groups and recur frequently. Although members of other communities also attend, they form a minority, and the major contributions to the cost of the ceremony comes from the home village. When a new home is built or a shop is opened, a Big Drum rite must be held to obtain the ancestors’ blessing. Once again, the
majority of the participants come from the local community, and the food and drink then distributed includes their contributions.

On a secular plane, communities display their distinctness and unity in many ways. In the dry season each local unit will call out its young men to clean its pond in a separate “maroon.” The great majority of the tenancy and metayer arrangements involve members of the same village. The sale of community land to outsiders is disapproved. At a death, neighbours take turns staying with the bereaved family for the first nine nights; and all households send an adult to visit community adults when they are ill. At Carnival, Christmas, August 1st (Emancipation), and St. Peter’s Day, communities compete by representative teams of young people; and the District Officer or some other prominent stranger may be asked to judge the contest. Formerly, communities competed at cricket, but this is now uncommon owing to the rising cost of equipment. Each community also holds its separate “bouquet,” or “company,” dances. In any village there is only one series of bouquet dances at any one time, and as described below all the organisers are drawn from that unit. Although anyone may attend, the majority who do will be villagers. Maroons or other forms of free group-work which are used to build or move houses and to make coffins or repair boats are carried out within each community separately by its males. Under an institution known as *jamboni*, a man has four or five partners who work together in each other’s fields in turn. Jamboni groups are almost always formed within the community; and men only send their wives to do wage-work in gardens within their own villages.

No clearer demonstration of community sentiment can be given than the islanders’ response to a hurricane which hit them in 1954. A great deal of damage was done by the storm on land and sea, and for some days Carriacou was quite isolated. When contact had been re-established with Carriacou, the Grenada Government sent a senior official to assess the local damage and arrange for relief and aid. On arriving the officer found that the Carriacou people had already made substantial repairs. To do this, they had simply co-operated on community bases, each unit under its senior men, and each community had set about repairing all its damaged
houses one by one. The community leaders, who were senior men from the larger local families, had gone to the shops at Hillsborough and credited all available supplies. These were brought back to the villages as a common pool for use in repairing the homes. Such action demonstrates the reality and extent of community sentiment and organisation in Carriacou; but before discussing local leadership and seniority, a brief account of one community may be of value.

*L'Estere 1953* If the social basis of a Carriacou community is kinship, the settlement pattern mediates between the distribution of land and kinsmen.

As shown by the sketch-map of L'Estere in 1953, Carriacou communities have a dispersed settlement pattern. The major house clusters are sited near some road junction or important landmark such as the village pond. Although people prefer to place their houses near a motor road, most households live some distance away. Their dispersed settlement patterns reflect the growth of the villages and the transfers of land made within them. The bulk of these land transfers involve inheritance or sale; accordingly, since young men are expected to build their homes on their own land and the family home is generally left to their unmarried sisters, the members of a family are scattered throughout the village. In addition, as we have seen, people inherit land from either parent and consequently have rights in scattered plots. Only unwed daughters of a single mother are normally found living together in separate houses on a single inherited plot of land. One group of this sort is illustrated by households 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29 at the eastern border of L'Estere. Although the plot on which these houses are sited has been informally divided, the sisters who hold it in common by intestate disposition, describe it as “family land” and pay tax on it jointly. Plots of land acquired by purchase are generally smaller than inherited units and include many house-sites. The sketch-map of L'Estere in 1953 sets out the actual distribution of land at that time. Most houses are built on land owned by the householders, very few on

land held by rental or usufruct. In Carriacou, land ownership regulates the choice of house-site, and the dispersal and transfer of ownership produces a dispersed pattern of settlement and kinship groupings.

Our map shows the approximate relief of L’Esterrre land. Houses are built a little distance away from the sea, on flat or hilly land, as available. At the road terminus and junction are one or two shops, but like most Carriacou villages, L’Esterrre contains no church, school, or Government agency. The village pond, the two hills, and the roadway are the principal landmarks.

Differences in house type and size are indicated on the map, together with distribution of some family cemeteries. From a glance we can see that the village contains a wide variety of house types, and several uninhabited homes which are shown unnumbered. Kitchens are omitted, since all households had separate places for cooking. The old property boundary between L’Esterrre, Experiment, and South Sabazan is marked by the wide track which forms the eastern boundary of the community. The land reserve of Pointe Cisterne, at the western tip of the island, is used by L’Esterrre folk for pasture, provision grounds and supplies of fuel. The sea lies on both sides of the community, and the Government-controlled oyster-bed in the southern inlet is bordered by mangrove swamps. To avoid overloading the map, details of crop distribution collected as part of my survey are excluded. Except for a few coconuts on the two large plots to the northeast of the village, and some open spaces along the limestone slopes, the village houses stood between their gardens of corn, peas, cassava, cotton, and groundnuts. A few large trees provided shade, and an open space near the pond served the children as a playground on Sundays. Most houses having three or more rooms also had concrete cisterns which caught and held rain-water off the roof. Most two-roomed houses had large oil-drums for keeping rain-water. “Dirt” houses—that is, the “women’s” daub-and-wattle houses—generally lacked water storage facilities and depended for supplies on neighbours or the pond. A mile away on the road to Hillsborough was a large Government catchment which provided a reserve supply in case of distress. Only the larger households had separate pit latrines behind them. On the northern
"Plan of a portion of Harvey Vale Est. Carriacou known as Retreat. Surveyed under the Boundaries Settlement Ordinance No. 2 of 1892; in Oct. 1903 and Feb. 1904. Area 52 Acres, 2 Rods, and 3 Poles."
coast, above household 52, was a little cove where sloops were built. The seine generally operated in the bay to the northeast.

Fifty years before this, there were very few houses at L’Estere, and the land was held by a handful of people. In 1903, a holding called Retreat was broken up and sold to the people. By comparing the maps of L’Estere in 1903 and 1953, we can see how population growth and land fragmentation have proceeded together. Several families that held land at L’Estere in 1903, such as the Smiths, Juliens, Lewises, and St. Hilaires, were absent from the village in 1953. The Peter family had settled in the nearby community of Lower St. Pierre; but the Thompsoms, Brists, and Josephs still lived in the village and held fairly large blocks of land in joint family ownership under caretakers or trustees, while various members of the family worked separate sections. Many families that presently own land at L’Estere, such as the Scotts, Mitchells, Edmundses, and Georges, had moved in since 1903; and the main impression that emerges from comparison of the area after an interval of fifty years is of population movement. Immigrants to the community have displaced some, but not all, of the original families, while processes of inheritance and sale have broken down most of the initial holdings. That this immigration has been piecemeal and gradual in much the same way that the withdrawal of original landholders has been gradual is shown by the scatter of households whose principals belong to the same family. This gradual change in community composition has important kinship aspects. Those families that remained in the village tend to have more members and more ties with other households of L’Estere than recent immigrants. In consequence, we can expect to find differences of genealogical span and depth among the village families. Clearly, those families with the largest membership and greatest local continuity will probably carry most weight in community affairs; but such tendencies are also affected by differences in the reproductive rate of family lines and by the differing sex distributions of their adult members, as well as by their differing migration and mating histories. For example, the Fotos and Thompsoms have remained at L’Estere since 1903, but in 1953 these lines were represented by only one household apiece. Their land surplus was therefore given out on
rent or metayage. On the other hand, other lines such as the Bristols and Josephs had multiplied steadily, and by 1953 each of these included several households and was linked to many more. In consequence of such rapid growth, the Josephs, for example, have already become short of land and seek it from the Fotos and Thompkins. But as the largest single descent-line in the village, the Josephs are far more important in community affairs than are the Fotos or Thompkins. This status distribution is almost exactly the reverse of that which would be expected in a stratified society where status is based on income and property.

To assess the intensity and significance of kinship in this community, I shall summarise my data on inter-household relations at L'Esterre from two points of view. In Table 5, I name and tabulate cognatic family lines according to the number of L'Esterre households which contain their members. In Table 6, I classify households by the number of other village households with which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of houses</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Total families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 only</td>
<td>John John Joseph, * Placid. George, Edmund Joseph *</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 only</td>
<td>Thompson. Foto</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 only</td>
<td>Andrew. Munday, Thomas. Fraser, Vespy, Alexander, Adams. Benjamin (male line)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 only</td>
<td>Clement. Jones</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 only</td>
<td>John. Paulson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 only</td>
<td>Allert. Bartholomew</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 only</td>
<td>Edmunds, Parvey. Quarless, Matherson Joseph *</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 only</td>
<td>Sammerson, Benjamin (female line)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and 11</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>Frederick Joseph *</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To avoid inflating these figures, I have treated the four Joseph segments separately.
each is linked by ties of consanguineal kinship traced through the head of the household classified. In this tabulation, households are classified according to the sex of their heads, and information on the number of households linked by ties of consanguineal kinship traced through the resident mates of male household heads is given. Table 5 summarises my information on the first of these points. Table 6 summarises data which are analysed more fully in the account of lineages below.

Table 6. L’Esterre households, by sex of head and number of other village households to which they are linked by consanguineal kinship traced through their head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of linked households</th>
<th>Households with:</th>
<th>Households linked through resident mates of male heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Male heads</td>
<td>(b) Female heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with connections</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total connections</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per household</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1953 there were only 75 inhabited homes at L’Esterre, but the 28 families listed above have a total of 135 inter-household links, giving a mean of 4.7 households per family, excluding affinal relations. Half of these families are represented in three households or less; ten families have members in four to seven households each; and four include members of nine or more households. Such differences in family “spread” are clearly important, but they are not entirely due to differences in the local continuity of
these family lines, although this is an important contributing factor. The Joseph genealogy discussed later illustrates how emigration may reduce one branch of a family while another branch becomes dominant locally. My data show that emigration and reproduction rates affect different families differently. Those families which include members of five or more households have all been at L’Esterre for at least two generations. Several of the families dispersed in less than four households came into the community a generation ago.

A comparison of inter-household linkages within family lines and between individual households is also instructive. In Table 6, I classify these L’Esterre households by the sex of their heads and by the number of households within this community to which they are linked by consanguineal ties.

The kinship connections catalogued in Table 6 include immediate family ties, agnation, and other consanguineal relations but do not include affinity except for the final column which will be ignored for the moment.

Clearly the best measure of kinship density within a community is the extent to which its households are linked to one another by ties of kinship. Only six of the 75 L’Esterre households have no extra-domestic kinship connections within the village. Another 12 units are linked each to one household only, another nine to two apiece. Thus about one-third of the village stands on the periphery of its central kinship network. Six units are linked by kinship to three or four households apiece; and there are 29 households whose kinship connections include between 5 and 11 households each. At the other extreme are 13 households each of which is linked by kinship ties with 23 or more others within the village. All households of these last group belong to the leading L’Esterre lineage, the Josephs. If we ignore this group of households entirely, there remain 30 units under male heads with an aggregate of 167 connections and an average of 5.6. Under female heads would then be 32 households with an aggregate of 95 inter-household linkages and an average of three per unit. For the total 62 households, the aggregate of linkages would therefore be 262, giving an average of 4.2 each. Likewise, there would be 29 resident mates of male household heads connected by kinship to 80
L'Esterre homes, giving an average of 2.7 each. Ignoring these affinal ties and the Joseph linkages, we may take the mean incidence of inter-household connections as a useful measure to distinguish households according to their kinship integration with the village.

Although this seems an arbitrary procedure it receives some support from the correspondence between the mean inter-household linkages per family, which is 4.7, and the mean per household, which, without the Josephs, is 4.2. It therefore seems reasonable to treat those households which have less inter-household linkages than the average L'Esterre family as less closely bound to the village by kinship. On this basis, we find that of the 36 households with male heads, 12 seem marginal in differing degrees, excluding their affinal linkages. Of the 39 households with female heads, 21 have less than 5 inter-household linkages each and are thus marginal. In brief, whereas one-third of the households with male heads may be weakly linked by kinship to the village, more than half the homes with female heads are in this position. Even so, 56 per cent of the village households are strongly tied to the community by consanguineal kinship.

These calculations understate the kinship density current at L'Esterre by ignoring all relations of affinity and by excluding the massive network of agnatic ties which link households belonging to the largest lineage. Even so, the number and proportion of village households that are strongly bound to L'Esterre by these inter-household ties is sufficient to demonstrate the fundamental importance of kinship in defining the community boundaries and in ordering its internal relations.

Leadership and Seniority  Kinship provides communities with a system of status and role allocation. Since a community contains several distinct families, the specific behavioural roles of kinsfolk cannot be generalised throughout the community uniformly. Membership in one family entails some exclusion from another. Incest and exogamy restrictions forbid mating among kinsfolk and so distinguish kinship groups. However, if kinship principles do pervade a social organisation, they can supply an orderly basis for status placement by generalising compatible re-
lations. Naturally, the kinship order can only provide a frame for status allocation by emphasising those variables of the most general kind; and the selection of these variables will tend to reflect kinship interests and bases.

In Carriacou and comparable societies, the kinship elements which have general significance as criteria for status allocation are sex, age, and number of offspring. These three variables provide the basis for a fairly complex and orderly status structure which regulates relationships within and between communities and families consistently. The resulting status system integrates the kinship organisation with the wider social order, at the same time that it serves to distribute leadership and seniority within each community. Two important features of this type of status structure are the relativity of its placements, and its persistence despite perpetual change.

Men mature, age, and die. In their youth, whatever their achievements or resources, they are juniors without weight in the community. As they age, in spite of poverty, they acquire gravitas; and if their families are large, they generally become respected as leaders whose advice and opinion are important to all, including neighbours not their kin. After death they remain with the community, the most immediate of those ancestral spirits whose interest and intervention in local affairs is acknowledged by all.

In such a system, the individual has no fixed position but continually increases in status as he or she grows old. The fundamental division is based on sex, and men uniformly take precedence over women. But even so, relations between the sexes are complementary rather than competitive. For men, maturity presupposes marriage; for women, motherhood. Ritual actions dramatise the interdependence of the sexes which economy and society also enjoin. Moreover, the definition of seniority and leadership in terms of age and family connections applies to both sexes alike, despite male precedence.

It is obvious that class stratification is inconsistent with such a system of status placement. Community leaders are old men who head large families. Except for ritual sanctions, they wield no direct authority; nevertheless, they are called on to advise and
arbitrate and to supply, from memory, the genealogical details which are important in regulating social relations. Their wives are the women most often called on to supervise ritual preparations. The old men themselves serve as living links between the community and its past, and local contacts on the group level with other communities normally involve them.

Clearly such a system of status placement is inconsistent with stratification by reference to colour, occupation, wealth, class and the like, while being fully consistent with the idiom of kinship on which the local society is based. Granted the historic gap between community life and Government in Carriacou, this system of status placement on the basis of age, sex, and kinship provides a means of social control which is equally effective within the household, community, and island. To show how these principles develop and are expressed, I shall first describe the individual life-cycle of these islanders before analysing their kinship system.
PART II
THE LIFE CYCLE
5 · BIRTH
AND CHILDHOOD

Birth

Most Carriacou women have their babies at home, with the Government nurse in attendance. Difficult deliveries take place at the local hospital, which is under the charge of the District Medical Officer. Not long ago, local “middies” presided over child-birth on the island. During the past twenty years the Government has stopped untrained persons from practising midwifery, and this has reduced mortality among mothers and infants alike. The islanders complain, nonetheless, about the fees charged by trained midwives. In 1953 this was 16/8 ($4 BWI) for single deliveries.

The woman gives birth in the home in which she is currently living: this may be her husband’s, her parents’, or her mother’s. If the woman does not live with her mother, the latter will visit her for a few days before and after the delivery, and she will supervise the boiling of water, washing, ironing, and other work
for the birth. Women whose cohabitation is not based on marriage return to their mother’s home to have their first child.

When the child is due the expectant mother takes castor oil. She lies abed during labour and remains there for the delivery. The father is expected to wait outside until called to the bedroom. If the parents do not cohabit, the father or father’s mother is expected to visit the scene of delivery, bringing certain gifts which serve to acknowledge the child. Not to do so implies a repudiation of paternity or at least an intention to disclaim it later. However, the father will only be called to the mother’s bedroom if they have been cohabiting.

In difficult deliveries, the midwife summons the woman’s parents to make intercession for her. Her father pours white rum on the ground at each corner of the house while her mother pours out “sweet water” (sugared water). The libation concludes at the front doorstep with silent prayers to the “old parents” for a quick delivery. If ancestral spirits are obstructing the birth and this rite is carried out correctly, relief is immediate. Occasionally the woman’s husband or husband’s parents may be asked to make separate libations; however, it is more usual to call her mother. Even to-day, before difficult cases are taken to the hospital, the woman’s family carry out this rite.

The umbilical cord and afterbirth may be buried under a tree or in the kitchen floor, under the fireplace. The baby is washed in warm water immediately after the cord has been cut with scissors. The navel is then bandaged by the midwife, and she renews the bandage daily until it has healed. A broad band of cloth is wound around the mother’s stomach after delivery. No special foods are used at parturition, but the mother must remain indoors for several days. This period varies from one woman to another, but every woman observes the same number of days’ seclusion for all her deliveries. It is believed that this will guarantee recovery from later deliveries since it was successful with the first. There is no seclusion for still-births.

The mother bathes twice daily while remaining indoors. She sits on a pot filled with boiling water so that the steam may ascend into her womb and “purge out the blood-clots.” This treatment
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continues for an even number of days. If it were stopped on an odd day, results would be dire. The leaves of certain trees, such as the **numbé** (unidentified botanically), are put in the pot of boiling water and are used to splash the hot water on the mother’s abdomen and pudenda, to “melt all the blood inside.” A tea made from these leaves is drunk daily by the mother; this treatment prevents her from becoming unhealthy and bloated.

If the baby is born with a caul, this is given to the mother, who hangs it on the door of her room to be sun-dried. The caul will then be put away carefully, and when the child is ill or frightened small pieces will be given it to eat. Children born with caul are unduly sensitive to the spirits about them and are easily frightened when someone is dying nearby. By contrast, twins have “strong blood,” are hardly ever frightened, and are avoided by the **lougarou** (male witches) and **sukuyan** (female witches) who roam abroad at night and suck the blood from sleeping humans and beasts. Lougarou and sukuyan are old or middle-aged persons who live nearby and have the power of metamorphosis through witchcraft. Their strong blood also helps twins to excel other children in physical sports and explains their high infant mortality, for twins rejoin the old parents whose blood is so strong in them more quickly than do the weaker children born with caul. Still-births and children who die unbaptised are buried without ceremony in cardboard boxes outside the house after police inspection. Women who die in child-birth are believed to haunt the uninhabited Grenadines and are known as **Jablesse** (*diablesse*). These are the sirens with cloven hooves, who destroy the men they enchant by making them mad. To protect the new-born infant against **maljeux** (evil eye), a charm or “guard” of camphor, garlic, and washing blue is sewn into a small cloth and hung about its neck; but the Bible, left open beneath his pillow, remains the baby’s best protection till he is baptised. Special precautions must be taken to preserve an infant from lougarou who can easily “suck

---

it to death." A twin may be asked to sleep in the house to keep away lougarou; or sand will be scattered outside, since the witch must then count it all, grain by grain, before entering.

Suckling infants whose mothers die are given to any woman who has a baby of the same sex born in the same month; kinsfolk of either parent are preferred but unrelated women are quite acceptable. The woman who suckles an orphan in this manner enjoys a special position as its foster-mother. The infants she nurses together are regarded as brothers or sisters, and mating is prohibited between their children as if they were siblings. Being regarded as siblings of equal age, they are treated like twins. Although they have different fathers and belong to different patrilineages, they have equal membership in the nursing mother’s family. In a sense, therefore, the culture defines parenthood as the care of the young from infancy rather than as simple reproduction.

Until its baptism, the mother’s continual presence is necessary to protect the infant’s life; after baptism it can be left alone safely, since, having been named, it is now a “Christian”—that is, a human being.

**Baptism** Carriacou is a Christian society in the sense that all its members belong to some Christian church. In 1946 the Anglicans and Roman Catholics together included 98 per cent of the island population. Despite their differences, these denominations seem very similar to the islanders. Both are of long standing locally and have European priests, who foster primary education and Friendly Societies; and both churches practise elaborate rituals which have become progressively more alike with the increase of High Church influence among the Anglicans of the Windward Islands diocese. The rites and teaching of these churches therefore form a common element in the ritual system and cosmology of the Carriacou folk.

In Carriacou both the Romans and Anglicans baptise legitimate infants one Sunday and illegitimate infants the next. Although these church baptisms are important to the people, they must also be supplemented by rites conducted at home. In the home rites, the old parents rather than the Christian Deity are invoked, and
the community rather than the church is addressed. In effect, the islanders operate a dual system of ritual and belief. One of its components is official Christianity, Roman or Anglican, while the other is an ancestor cult which includes the Nation Dance, Big Drum or Big Time ceremonies, and many of the beliefs and rituals of private life. Both the Anglican and Catholic priests oppose this folk worship of the old parents openly; but there is no popular opposition towards the Christian church. The islanders’ attitude to Christianity is tolerant and sympathetic, and major religious celebrations, such as Shrove Tuesday or Carnival, Lent, Easter, St. Peter’s Day, and Christmas, enjoy popular support. The adherents of the ancestor cult do not compete with the Christian church for supremacy, and the folk do not regard these two religious orders as incompatible or in conflict. Rather, in the folk view, both systems are necessary, and each supports the other. Perhaps this view, since it emphasises the correct performance of church and folk rites separately, may account for the fact that religious syncretism is so poorly developed in Carriacou. In the Carriacou view, each ritual has an integrity which must be preserved. The two systems run parallel and are equally essential in important rites. Given this systematic correspondence, each retains its pure form.

At baptism, as in all Carriacou rites which mark status transitions in the individual life cycle, the rituals of church and ancestor cult have different settings. At birth, ritual actions focus on the mother, to ensure recovery and mark pregnancy’s end. At baptism, the child is the centre of attention, and the rite marks its acceptance as a member of the society. To symbolise this recognition, the child’s sponsors and its parents’ kinsfolk represent the groups in which the child is incorporated and have prominent ritual roles. For this reason, the head of the household in which the child’s mother is living has charge of the household ritual and, even if not her father, takes her father’s role.

Names symbolise the admission of the infant to community and church; but since these units differ, all Carriacou folk will have at least two names, the Christian or church name, which is rarely used, and the “house name” by which they are known in the community. Anyone involved in the church rites, such as the priest
or the principal god-parent, may give the child its church name. The child’s parents or grandparents may do likewise, or the church name may be taken from the religious calendar of Saints’ days. Likewise, anyone may give the child its house name, and apparently at any time, except for one set of house names which, once given, sticks permanently. These are the jida or mocking names by which the child’s parent, usually its mother, expresses chagrin at some feature of its birth. Thus, if paternity is disclaimed, a woman may call her child by some such name as “Is-me” (meaning “It is I,” “mine”) or “My-own,” which eventually becomes Myowni. Other jida names express disappointment at the infant’s sex. It may be called “Miss X-” or “Miss Mark X-” to indicate that its parents, having hoped for a child of one sex, had missed the mark and acquired another. Twins have coupled names, such as Thomas and Thomasite, Edwin and Edwina; and much ingenuity is devoted to whimsical or resounding house names in combination with the “title” or surname. Thus such combinations as Feeling (Philip?) Plenty, Gay Gay, Gabriel Gabriel, King Gabriel, or Propellor George are common.

Unlike the house name, the church name is kept secret, on the grounds that certain kinds of magical harm can occur only when an individual’s church name is used. Perhaps such beliefs were stronger in times past; but even though they may have now lost popular credit, they persist as convention. House names cannot be used to harm their owners by obeah (magic, sorcery). Thus the contrasting ritual significance of church and house names corresponds to the distinction between the sacred and profane aspects of human personality.

Under Grenadian law, illegitimate children are registered in the mother’s surname only. However, by Carriacou custom, all children are given their father’s surname once he has acknowledged them. Many Carriacou children are legitimised when their parents later marry. To acknowledge paternity, the child’s father, if on the island, sends kerosene, soap, sugar, washing blue, and money to pay the midwife and other expenses of accouchement. If he is abroad at the birth, he is expected to make these donations as soon as he learns the news. The child’s baptism may also
be delayed until late in the second month, awaiting paternal acknowledgment, since baptism terminates the period in which the father should claim the child. Carriacou folk dislike taking an infant to church for baptism without being able to name the father when the priest enquires.

The child’s father is expected to meet all baptismal expenses over and above gifts received by the mother; he selects the child’s two godfathers, while its mother chooses two godmothers. Although Anglican and Catholic clergy both prefer their own communicants as god-parents, the islanders generally ignore this difference. By nominating two godfathers to sponsor the infant, the unmarried father reaffirms his claim to it. If paternity is disclaimed, the child’s mother must then choose all the god-parents, and may choose more than the church stipulates in order to safeguard her child’s future.

In Carriacou, distinctions of legitimacy and illegitimacy are socially important, but they differ in many ways from those made by religion and law. Under Grenadian law, marriage, even if in articulo mortis, retroactively legitimises the couple’s children. Among the islanders, the distinction between the children of married or unmarried couples is neither so clear nor so consistent as the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate offspring made by church and law. In Carriacou the socially illegitimate child is the unacknowledged child, the one without a father. Such cases are rare and occupy an unambiguous, unenviable position, quite different from that of other children born out of wedlock. Social fatherlessness is absolute illegitimacy. The culture regards all children acknowledged by their fathers as socially legitimate, while recognising distinctions between those whose parents live together and those whose parents do not. Thus, while legal and religious illegitimacy may change later, the social illegitimacy involved in paternity denial may not. For this reason among others, the folk concept has special significance.

The child’s parents and grandparents do not attend the church baptism, but remain at the house, preparing a feast. Only god-parents take the child to church, although the child’s parents are expected to hire a car for the god-parents. The child’s parents pro-
vide the principal godmother with the church fee for baptism, $2 (8/4) in 1953. However, the head godfather often undertakes to pay this himself. In church the head godmother holds the baby, and the head godfather holds the lighted candle for the priest who recites the liturgy. Other god-parents are simply co-sponsors and witnesses; but each contributes from sixpence to a dollar towards the costs of the rite.

Their participation in the baptism establishes relations of ritual kinship between the child and its parents on the one hand and the god-parents on the other. In Carriacou god-parents have no special duties to their wards other than minor gifts at Christmas and Easter. They are suitable foster-parents if required. Before confirmation or first communion, the child must also obtain its god-parents’ consent formally, on bended knees. On these occasions the god-parents will contribute towards the new clothes required by the child. God-parents may also scold or instruct their wards, and they are vaguely responsible to the church for the child’s instruction. However, childhood is regarded as sinless in Carriacou, with or without instruction.

Relations among the god-parents themselves and between the god-parents and the child’s parents are symbolised by special terms of address in the local patois. Males and females linked by these relations call one another compère (co-father) or maçmé (co-mother). Such individuals maintain respectful behaviour towards one another, and intimacy or dispute among them is disapproved. The principal godfather and godmother are generally closely linked to the child’s parents. Often, parents select their own kin as god-parents for their children. In other cases co-sponsorship only establishes a limited bond of friendship among the persons involved. Persons of the same age also call one another compère and maçmé to express friendship; and strangers, too, may also use these terms of address. The bond of friendship between parents and god-parents lacks elaboration, since by cultural definition heterosexual friendship involves mat-

ing in Carriacou, and this is taboo between compère and macmé. Moreover, as already pointed out, each parent selects the sponsors of their sex, and thus co-sponsors are rarely mates or spouses. Co-parenthood may formerly have had more significance, and some current taboos suggest this. Thus, neither a pregnant woman nor her mate may act as a god-parent without endangering the life of their unborn child; and no person can act as god-parent to his god-child's child. Such rules limit the number of people available for these roles.

After the god-parents have left for church, the parents and both families assemble at the home. The child’s father sacrifices a goat or a sheep, or some chickens if neither is available. He calls on all present, including the old parents, to “witness” the new-born child. All kinsfolk present should each sacrifice a chicken, individually reading their auguries by the way the bird finally falls. Before it is sacrificed each fowl or beast is sprinkled with rum and water, led around the house, and set on the front doorstep facing the east; it is then dispatched with one stroke. The women assembled then cook the sacrifices while the household head distributes rum to the men.

When the infant returns from the church, the head godfather sprinkles some rum on the ground before the house, and at the table or altar, inside the house, on which stands the “parents’ plate” with a specially prepared portion of sacrificial foods, repeats his prayer to the old parents for long life, health, and prosperity. By then it is near noon and invited guests have begun to assemble. Visiting women are invited by the child’s mother, men by its father. The guests are entertained with rum, beer, wine, soft drinks, meat, fish, cakes, and cigarettes until near sunset. As they arrive, each guest places a contribution for the baby in a saucer set on a special table in the hall. Sometimes a “string band” or bass and tambourine is hired to finish the fête with a dance, but neither the Big Drum nor steel bands are used on such occasions. In this domestic rite, the sacred and secular activities are sharply separated.

People who sleep in the day and feel a gentle pressure on their bodies know that it is caused by the dupié, the spirit of a child
who died unbaptised. Unlike La Jablesse, these little spirits are harmless and only go about in the daytime to nestle against sleeping adults for affection.

Growing Up  With few exceptions, Carriacou women breast-feed their babies until the ninth or twelfth month. Nursing times are irregular, since the mother has many household and garden tasks. The infant is bathed twice daily in lukewarm water and is given soft foods such as pap, or kuku, after the fourth or fifth month. Rarely is there any space in the small two-room houses for a baby’s crib; in such homes infants usually sleep on bundles of rags on the floor. Elder children or females living in the household supervise the infant while its mother is busy; often, when visiting neighbours, mothers carry their small ones astride their right hips. To keep the child away from the kitchen with its fire hazards, the door is barred when it begins to walk.

The only type of abnormality which requires a ritual for infants is soft, curling hair; such hair is called dada or Shango-hair. It is most unusual for Negro babies to be born with such hair, and those who have it are known as “Shango children.” To cut the hair of Shango children a special sacrifice must be made when the infants are two years old, after which later growths will be a Negroid hair. In 1953 a Shango ceremony was held at L’Esterre for a child nearly three years old. The infant lived with its mother and mother’s mother, both of whom were unwed; its father also lived in the village, and although he could not attend the sacrifice in person, he contributed cash and provisions towards it.

The rite began at about 10 a.m., when preparations were complete. In the yard outside the house stood a table covered by a white cloth with a comb and scissors on it and a stool nearby. The brother of the child’s mother began by sacrificing a goat, after sprinkling white rum on it and leading it around the house, whose four corners were sprinkled in similar fashion. After this the mother, and the mother’s mother and sister each sacrificed a fowl in like fashion, reading their auguries individually. No spoken prayers accompanied these sacrifices. After being cleaned and quartered, the goat and fowls were turned over to the cooks. They were cooked without salt or garlic and were ready by about 3 p.m.
The sacrifice was placed on the table in a white plate beside a
glass of white rum, another of water, and a bunch of flowers in
a jam jar. A lit candle was set close by in a saucer. The child was
then brought out and placed on the stool, opposite the Big Drum
which had now arrived. The Big Drum consists of three single-
membrane drums made of goatskins lashed over the mouths of
small rum kegs painted red. They are tuned by tightening the
ropes, and are played with the open palm. The large treble drum
which leads the group stands in the middle and is played by the
leading drummer; the two smaller bass drums complete the team.
Before beginning, the drummers wet the drums with white rum
and help themselves liberally.

When the drummers were ready, the child’s principal god-
father took the scissors while the senior godmother took a saucer
from the table to catch the hair. After asking the child’s permis-
sion and pardon, the godfather proceeded to cut off the hair and
the godmother to cauter it, while the drums beat and the assem-
bled crowd sang “Open chosen O, Eyz male poniché, Open
chosen Arade, Eyz male poniché.” The singers could not say
what the words meant. The head godmother then took her saucer-
ful of hair into the main bedroom of the house and placed it on
the table of the saraca (sacrifice). The rum, water, candle, and
sacrificial food on the parents’ plate were then removed from the
table in the yard to this saraca table, and the head godfather gave
the child one dollar (BWI) for having cut his hair.

It was now nearly 4 P.M.; a fairly large crowd had collected at
the drumming. The father of the child’s mother had also arrived
to lead off the Big Drum in the absence of the child’s father. The
mother’s father traced descent patrilineally to slaves of the Congo
tribe or “nation”; consequently the Congo songs were the first
“Nation Dances”—that is, tribal songs—to be played on the Big
Drum at this rite. Accompanied by her former lover, now an
aging, respected married man, the mother’s mother “wet the
ring”—that is, sprinkled the dancing place—with a silent libation
of rum and water, following the mother’s father as he circled the
house with rum and re-entered the dance place to sprinkle it,
dancing. The mother’s father then blessed the drums with rum
and concluded by drinking the remainder with his former para-
mour to show the spirits that the drinks were not harmful. Following this, the drums played the Kromanti (Akan) “Beg pardon” (“Anancy Cudjoe-O”) which is the obligatory introduction to most Big Drum rites. During this “Beg pardon” the household head and family proceeded round the ring on their knees beating an old hoe-blade with a metal spoon. In this way the ancestors are asked for forgiveness. Since the spirits are summoned by the “Beg pardon,” humans do not dance to this tune.

Following this came another Congo danced by the child’s grandparents together, the man twirling two crossed towels that had been placed in the ring, while the old woman spun adroitly with flaring skirts. After this, other Nation Dances were played, and the old people present each danced their own Nation before dancing others. Apart from the Congo and Kromanti, the Nations played were Manding (Mandinka), Ibo, Chamba, Temne, Arada (Dahomey), Moko, and Yarraba (Yoruba), together with some secular songs such as the Quelbe, Banda, Juba, and Calenda. Dancing and drumming continued throughout the night, with a pause at midnight when the spirits of old parents would visit the dance site, and the first couple had to wet the ring again, after which the “Beg pardon” was repeated as before. Dancing then resumed with another Congo, and near morning the parents’ plate with the sacrifice, which had been guarded all night long in the main bedroom, was brought out and distributed among those present. The gathering then dispersed without further formality.

The ritual haircutting of Shango children is rationalised as necessary to protect the child, who will otherwise be “troubled and afraid.” If a ceremony of this type is accompanied by liberal distributions of food, cakes and drinks, it is known as a “Big Time.” The secular elements in a Big Time often prevail over the ritual, as at the opening of a rum-shop or at the annual Big Time of Carnival, to which Government contributes. The secular or sacred emphasis of a Big Drum ritual may vary, but the ritual element is always present. This Shango haircutting was not a Big Time. Except for marriage, entombment, and house-opening, it is rare for the Nation Dance rites de passage to be celebrated as Big Times.

In Carriacou, male children are preferred by men and women, and are treated more tolerantly than girls, being allowed to roam further afield and to do fewer household chores. As children grow older, this differential treatment increases, and in reality each sex has a different life-cycle despite common features.

For weaning, the child is sent to one of its grandmothers, normally the mother’s mother. It may remain there indefinitely if the old woman has no other children at home and becomes specially fond of it. In this case it may visit its parents in the day, while sleeping at the grandmother’s house. If it returns home, the child generally sleeps in its mother’s bed, if there is no crib, until it is two or three years old. It is then put to sleep with its elder siblings on the floor of the “hall,” which is the public room of the house. In one-room, daub-and-wattle houses, children sleep with their mothers until they are old enough to sleep in the kitchen. In these ways Carriacou folk try to prevent children from observing their sex life. The child has its meals with its mother in the kitchen, or with its elder siblings in the “yard,” which is the living space between kitchen and house. Toilet training is permissive, and infants are not expected to be house-trained before they are four or five years old, girls usually preceding boys. The family meal shared by all members is an unknown concept in Carriacou; it is not consistent with local ideas of proper behaviour for persons of different status, sex, age, and kinship to eat together: “We do not train like that, we feel shame.” Apart from these attitudes, joint family meals are impracticable in Carriacou, since husband and wife have full work schedules which separate them for most of the day, and domestic help is available to only a handful of local elite, mostly immigrants. The man of the house and his invited male guests may eat at the table in the hall. He is served there first, then his wife has her meal in the kitchen. Children get what their father leaves, together with tit-bits from their mother.

Parents do not like their younger children to wander far from home for fear they may get into mischief or harm. Children are scrupulously kept away from the water’s edge for this reason. They are kept either at home or close by in the garden or sent to a “private school.” Young girls are saddled from an early age with
such household chores as shelling peas and tending pigs or the
fire until they can wash, iron, clean the house, or sew. They re-
main under their mother’s eye about the home.

Nowadays there are few private schools on the island, and the
young are sent to the elementary school before they are five years
old. The former private schools rarely contained more than a
dozen children, who were placed under the care of some old
woman in the village for a nominal fee of about 3d a week each.
The teacher would supervise the children’s play and the elder
ones were taught little songs, but hardly any reading or writing.
The teacher could scold or discipline the children freely. To some
extent parents who now send very young children to elementary
schools regard them as substitutes for the old private schools,
which performed the function of a crèche.

Attitudes to discipline vary somewhat. Parents sometimes ob-
ject to interference with their children by people who are neither
relations, god-parents, nor neighbours. Formerly any village elder
or old woman would expect the support of parents whose children
they had had to punish. Nowadays there is some uncertainty about
this; but quarrels between neighbours over children only occur
if the adults concerned are already on bad terms with one an-
other. (The same is true of quarrels over damage to gardens by
livestock.) By contrast, parents object to chastisement of their
children at school and support their position by quoting a regula-
tion forbidding it. They may tolerate or even expect such action
by the head teacher, but object to it by his assistants.

Young girls learn the essentials of modesty by observing their
mothers, who use a nearby corn-patch if the house does not have
a latrine. By the time they are seven years old, they will not bathe
in the sea unclothed, and wash behind screens at home. Grown
women hardly ever bathe in the sea.

Men make toys for their children out of wood—kites, tops, or
model sloops and schooners which the boys race in the sea on
Sunday mornings. Children only play in the sea in groups on
Sunday mornings. The children of each village play together at a
set spot, perhaps to prevent accidents. On Sunday afternoons or
on holidays, the village children play rounders by the pond or on
the common till sunset, with the adults looking on. Chevy chase,
marbles, and hopscotch, which they learn at the elementary schools, complete the children's repertoire of games; but they are nimble dancers outside "the ring" at fêtes in their community.

When they have "got sense," at about seven years, boys and girls tend to play apart, and are further separated by their parents' demands upon them. Except for crabs, lobsters, and shrimps, which pre-adolescent boys seek in groups, there is no hunting on the island. Shortly after they are seven, the boys are given a fowl or young pig by their parents to "mind on the share," so they can learn about stock-rearing. Children "with sense" are put in charge of those without, and their mothers also use them to run errands in the neighbourhood. Boys and girls begin to learn garden work with their mother in the home plot; later they are sent with her by their father to other people's fields. When they are about nine, children may ask for a tiny plot to cultivate on their own. They pick up the folklore of farming from discussions they overhear. Occasional rides in rowboats to the nearby cays introduce the boys to seafaring and deepen their sense of difference from the girls.

Since children are so "bright" nowadays, they are usually confirmed when they are nine or ten, and many take their first communion shortly after. For confirmation they require a new white dress or suit and new shoes and the girls need a veil. Their parents celebrate the occasion with a small entertainment which the godparents attend, bringing gifts for their wards. However, confirmation does not mark any significant change in the child's status or relation to the family and community, and is never celebrated by a Big Drum ceremony.

The adolescent child finds its household chores sharply increased by the responsibility of caring for its younger siblings; this period sets the lifelong pattern of sibling relationships, by which the elder enjoys precedence and is expected to exercise leadership over and on behalf of the younger. Seniority now begins to be stressed, and younger children will address their older cousins as "Cousin X," being called by their house names in return. They also learn to call senior villagers "Pa" and "Ma," whether kin or not.
The child's life at this period is divided between school and home. Teacher and parent both expect the child to make some progress with studies; but children who fail to do so are protected by the cultural classification of young folk into "a few bright and many dull." Majority and minority are thereby consoled. Since Carriacou girls hardly ever receive secondary education, they are kept at home after their first menstruation, under the watchful eye of their mothers. This is done to guard them against "interference" by the boys, who often continue at school without notable progress until they are nearly sixteen years old, when they may be apprenticed locally, although a few may qualify for admission to the boys' secondary school in Grenada.

The transition at puberty or first menstruation has no ritual expression in Carriacou, because these events do not immediately involve any change in social status. Adolescents remain in their parents' care. It is very rare for girls in Carriacou to become pregnant at this stage, but when this happens, "it is the mother's fault." The father is also responsible if he lives in the household, but less directly. The girl's lover remains free from blame, since "it's the business of the owner to keep his own hens away from the cocks next door." This situation redefines relations between mother and daughter by emphasising the dominance of the senior females over the younger ones. The ambivalent attitudes thus developed in the girl may be generalised to kinswomen of her mother's generation, in contrast with favourable attitudes to her grandmothers and their siblings. In late adolescence, Carriacou girls learn the rules of Carriacou womanhood.

Only the bright girls will be kept at school, and then only if their chances of employment as uncertificated school teachers are good in the head teacher's opinion. If examination success seems probable, the girl will then have to "protect herself" while at school. Since pregnancy at this stage would end all her chances of a teaching career, the girl who remains at school for this purpose generally keeps away from boys. Alternatively, if her parents can afford it, they may place her with some respected or elderly dame nearby to learn sewing and embroidery some of the time. At home she will be responsible for the small stock and will gradually take over more of the family cooking and household
drudgery, such as fetching wood, water, or charcoal. Her garden
duties increase, and her training as a future housewife is pushed
pace. Most women require their adolescent daughters to give
evidence of menstruation monthly, and it is made quite clear to
the girl that she must keep away from boys. Young men are not
allowed to visit the home casually, they must state the reason for
their visit clearly, and be brisk about their business.

The young girl receives little money, except as gifts. She may
not sell her fowls or stock without her parents’ permission. When
she goes to wakes or dances, she will be chaperoned. She must
never loiter on the road nor talk to males there. She must always
be home at dusk unless chaperoned. The community assessment of
a girl’s character depends on her observance of these rules. In
her late teens a girl is still liable to occasional chastisement for
bad behaviour, and she may fear that her parents will eject her
from their home or that her father may take the ultimate step of
“wishing” her. Actually, I have not been able to trace any case in
which a man “wished” his daughter, but the girls still fear this.
A “wish” is a ritual curse in which the father or elder brother calls
on the old parents to withdraw their protection from the offender,
thus leaving him or her alone in the world. Wishing always brings
disaster to the cursed one, according to Carriacou belief. Fear of
these sanctions may be important in the adjustment of adolescent
girls.

Boys leave school at about sixteen years of age to stay at home
and help in garden work, or are apprenticed by their father to
some local craftsman to become a carpenter, mason, painter,
joiner, tailor, mechanic, blacksmith, shipbuilder, or caulker.
These are the recognised boys’ trades in Carriacou. Until they are
past twenty, young men are rarely taken on schooners or sloops as
hired crew, and few can find jobs in shops or with the Govern-
ment.

Apprenticeship is arranged informally by the craftsman and the
boy’s father. Until the youth learns enough to be given small jobs,
he is unpaid. Thereafter his teacher will pay what he thinks
appropriate. On the average, the Carriacou apprentice will not
receive any cash from his teacher during the first 18 or 24 months
of apprenticeship. When the boy is ready to receive his first pay-
ments, the relation may break up because of the trouble that often arises over provision of separate tools for the learner. In carpentry and mason-work, the half-trained apprentice needs a separate kit if he is to work without interruption and so merit reasonable reward. In other trades, or if the teacher has surplus tools, this may not be important; but if the apprentice needs his own tools, his father is expected to provide them. Often the father cannot afford this, in which case the apprenticeship may lapse. If the father provides tools, the apprentice tries to repay their cost as best he can, but the low rates of pay and irregular employment usually frustrate this. After some time he may decide to invest his savings in the boat fare to Trinidad, where conditions are better. Young men whose apprenticeships break down for lack of tools also look for local employment as sailors, hoping thereby to save their fare to Trinidad and fortune.

Until they can buy their own clothes and necessities themselves, young people in Carriacou remain under their parents' tutelage. For men on the island, this dependence continues until they have built their own home and established their own families. But, as pointed out before, there is so little local employment that few young men who remain on the island can achieve economic independence. Emigration is the usual escape from this economic impasse, the normal way in which men win economic and social independence. "Manship" like "womanship" presumes independence, and this is at once a social and economic condition; but in Carriacou, the independence which manship and womanship connote is not equivalent to social maturity.
Engagement

In Carriacou, as elsewhere, differences of household structure may influence the lives of young people. The intimate relationship between the alternative forms of domestic grouping and individual careers is most obvious in courtship and mating. An account of engagement and its alternatives should thus shed light on the development of individual careers and their relation to kinship units. Since this variability is greater among women in Carriacou, I shall discuss these developments from their point of view.

The young woman of eighteen or thereabouts faces four alternative mating and family careers. She may remain virgin; she may become engaged and may marry her fiancé, with or without first having a child and with or without previous cohabitation; third, she may experience a broken engagement; and finally, she may not become engaged at all.

The girls who face these common alternatives are differently
situated. Some live with both parents, others with a widowed mother and siblings, others with an unmarried mother and siblings; and still others live in a household of which some collateral kinswoman is a principal. Clearly, relations between these alternative domestic situations and mating careers may be complex and variable.

Is a question of respect. If anybody place question to them, and they have respect, then they [the girls] should tell him to place question to their father and mother, and make him know. But if they don’t have respect, then the man won’t know to speak to the father, and so they will get that child.

This states the issue clearly. If the girl allows men to accost her and “place question”—that is, to ask for her favours—she is at fault, and will probably lose her chances of engagement. Of course the men “know to speak to the father”; but they take care not to do so unless necessary, and even then may display an ingenious evasiveness.

Ideally, and to a high degree in practice also, engagement precedes marriage. The girl should especially reject advances from all married men and should instruct the suitor she favours to inform her parents of his suit. Since the girl’s parents may be abroad or separated or she may be living with some other person, this is not as simple as it seems. In any case, the man is expected to write a letter to the girl’s parents or guardian, stating his intentions and asking for permission to visit the girl at home. He sends this letter by his own parents if they are alive, after getting their approval. His parents will discuss the proposal informally with the person to whom the letter is addressed, before it is opened and read. There may then be several delays. The addressee may not be culturally accredited to discuss matters of this sort, or the letter may be unsuitable in its present form. Assuming for the moment that the girl’s father has received the letter, he consults her mother, who will find out from the girl whether she wishes to marry the writer or has already entered into a sexual liaison with him, or is already pregnant. If the letter has to be rewritten, the girl will be told why, and unless she is already pregnant, she will be ordered to avoid the suitor until an acceptable proposal is made. If the
proposal is quite unacceptable, for example on grounds of kinship, the girl will be told flatly never to speak to the man again.

This formal letter of suit is the basis of the betrothal contract, and an actual specimen is given below.

L'Esterre, Carriacou.
December 20, 1950.

Dear Mr. X,

It is with the greatest pleasure that I now take the opportunity of addressing you these few lines, hoping that it may reach you and the senior and junior family enjoying health, as same we be well for the present.

Before going further, I must state to you that I have for some time have an interview with your adopted niece, Ivy, concerning my affection towards her, and she therefore, gave me the privilege to address you these intend lines.

I wish to the possession of her hand, so I humble put the matter before you for consideration, hoping that you won't think that I am dictating any idle fancy to you. I know that there are older family. But I think that Ivy, I consider under whose protection she being kept, you will be able to joint with the older family, and put the matter right, and you giving your consent, I shall endeavour to do my best to make her happy.

For the Future, believe me, I remain

Yours truly,

E . . . C . . .

This letter was quite properly addressed to the head of the household in which the girl was living, and it correctly suggested that he should discuss the matter with her parents, so that the betrothal could be made. The letter was necessary although both the writer and person addressed lived within a stone's throw of one another and met daily. It was nonetheless unacceptable, since it made no mention of marriage and set no date. Its most obvious deficiency was the lack of a postage stamp. Un stamped letters of this kind are regarded by the folk as without legal validity; stamped letters of proposal are believed to be enforceable at law. Consequently,
however vague their contents, all letters of proposal should be stamped to ensure consideration.

Since the writer deliberately conceals his intentions regarding the girl and leaves the letter unstamped, he may have expected the recipient to inform the girl's parents of his proposal, and to be called on for a more explicit letter later on.

If the girl's parents are separated and she lives with her mother, the latter, as household head, should fully inform the father of the proposal, showing him the letter so that he may reply. The father may be abroad, but he must nonetheless be informed, and occasionally the girl's mother may tell the suitor to write the father directly. When the girl's father is on a nearby island, he may return for a short visit to arrange the matter himself, or he may ask his own father or brother to represent him. If the girl's father is dead, her mother may negotiate the betrothal herself, or she may ask advice from her husband, or present mate, her kinsmen, or the girl's father's kinsmen. The girl's father's family are usually content that the mother's present husband should supervise the betrothal if the girl lives in his home, and in that event will usually be consulted only to determine whether there are any objections to the marriage on grounds of kinship. If the girl lives apart from her parents with either grandmother, the letter will be addressed to the grandmother and should then be referred by her to the girl's parents, especially to the father, who will carry on the further discussions or ask the grandparents to handle the matter. As a rule, parents in Carriacou rarely allow others to negotiate their daughters' betrothals.

Difficulties sometimes arise if the girl's parents have disputed her control and maintenance. Such disputes hardly ever occur when the parents have married one another, but when they have not, the girl's father may have failed to contribute adequately to her maintenance, or he may have disowned paternity at or after her birth. In all cases of this kind the girl will probably have remained under her mother's control, living with the mother or mother's kin who have been responsible for her support. Women with such mating histories who receive proposals for their daughters' hands generally refuse to consult the girls' fathers. This happens even if the mother has secured maintenance under the
Bastardy Law via the Court, since such maintenance, which ceases when the child is thirteen years old, is less for girls than for boys (2/6 per week for a girl as against 4/- per week for boys in 1953), and women interpret this difference to mean that the law gives them control of the girl, while the boys “belong to the father.” But Carriacou women only go to the court if they have experienced prolonged neglect and if such neglect is interpreted as an implicit repudiation of the child.

Women who try to negotiate single-handed engagements for their daughters or wards place these girls at some disadvantage, since the men devote much ingenuity to the composition of persuasive but non-committal letters. They may also dispatch the letter by some relative not properly accredited to take it—for example, their father’s sister; and although the bearer may feel responsible for the writer, she cannot compel him to fulfil the contract. A man’s father can compel such fulfilment by the simple threat of “wishing” his son—that is, by placing a formal curse on him. Young men, if living apart from their father, sometimes ask their mothers to negotiate their betrothals. As their mother’s main support, they are hardly in her control, and when they emigrate to break the engagement they will have their mother’s backing because of her economic dependence. Moreover, in Carriacou a mother cannot “wish” her son or turn him out of her house, as she may her daughter.

Women sometimes negotiate their children’s engagements if both mothers are widows. In such cases they are often unaware of their economic dependence on the young couple, but such dependence reduces their authority over boy and girl alike and leaves the future marriage entirely up to them. Where authority over the girl or her suitor is divided or ineffective, the chances that an engagement will lead to marriage are correspondingly reduced. Under such conditions, the man’s personal attachment and the girl’s character are decisive. For all the betrothal formalities and preambles, young folk enjoy considerable freedom in deciding their own future.

The elaborate formalities that surround the letter of proposal are necessary adjustments to the many alternative distributions of responsibility and authority over young people, to their own
household membership and the positions of their parents. Assuming that the girl's parents accept the proposal, the suitor may then visit the girl in her home formally, by appointment. If the girl's father does not live in the house, he will nevertheless make it his business to be present, along with the household head. The young man will be interviewed about his financial position, opportunities, plans, and prospects. The girl's mother will already have collected all the necessary information about the young man's previous and current liaisons. The girl's father has to check whether there is any kinship barrier to the union and whether the man's ancestors have been responsible people. These data influence the outcome, since parents are loth as a rule to give men with "wild" habits the "privilege" of visiting their daughters at home, lest they should "enjoy the facilities" of the young women and vanish overseas, leaving unsupported offspring.

The fact of male emigration raises many problems. It invests the continuity and stability of the union with risks against which parents must protect their daughters; nonetheless Carriacou fathers take a coldly suspicious view of young men who linger on the island after seeking their daughter's hand. Only when the parents of such men are quite well off and themselves undertake responsibility to provide the couple with a house and see the marriage through will the girl's father refrain from pressing the young man to emigrate. Those men who allow youths to remain in Carriacou after engaging their daughters are said to court misfortune. Accordingly, betrothed young men who have not yet migrated do so soon after their betrothal. Those who have been abroad either write the engagement letter from overseas or return to the island for a brief visit in order to make their proposal. Often enough, even today, a young emigrant who has already saved enough money to build and furnish a house simply writes to his father to tell him that he is thinking of marrying and to ask him to select a suitable girl and arrange a betrothal. By all accounts, this was the standard procedure forty or fifty years ago, at which time young men rarely chose their wives themselves. Even now cases occur in which young men who marry girls of their own choice rather than of their fathers' are disowned by the latter. The father may express repudiation by refusing to attend the son's
wedding, by dismissing the son from his home, by forbidding the son to visit him, or by disinheriting him under a hastily prepared will.

Sometimes the conflict between father and son over selection of a wife involves the ultimate sanction of wishing. Such ritual cursing will take place only if the marriage proposal transgresses community mores as well as the father’s wishes. The shame heaped on the father and his lineage by such marriages ensure that they have community support, as the following example shows.

A young man and woman who were children of a brother and sister respectively fell in love and wished to marry. (The young man was then doing well in Aruba, and has since returned to Carriacou, where he has a schooner.) Ten acres of family land were shared informally by the brother and sister whose son and daughter wanted to marry. With one eye on the family land, the other on the young man’s character and industry, and both on the distressing fact that her daughter and nephew were in love, the girl’s mother supported the marriage proposal. The man’s father objected strongly and the community supported him, since the young couple were first cousins between whom marriage is taboo, as “the blood is still too close.” Matters came to a head when the young man, fully aware of his father’s opposition, wrote the girl’s mother, a widow, directly from abroad, and she agreed to his request. In this way the young man had excluded his father from his betrothal arrangements. On hearing the news, the man’s father went to his sister’s home and demanded that the engagement be cancelled. There was a scene and people gathered; when the girl’s mother refused to comply, her brother wished her to death before all present. Soon after the marriage was celebrated the bride’s mother duly fell ill, and after lingering for two years in pain, she passed away. Community taboos were thus validated; and punishment fell on the appropriate person, since the girl’s mother’s consent was essential to the marriage. Such incidents reinforce paternal control of betrothal and demonstrate the superior authority of men over women. They also illustrate the structural bases for betrothal. To ensure marriage, the parents of both parties should be in favour of it, although marriages can go through even if
they are desired by only one group of parents. But there is no chance of marrying in Carriacou if the parents of both parties are opposed; hence, in local opinion, by supporting this proposal, the girl’s mother was even more actively responsible for the marriage than were the couple themselves.

**Betrothal**  The betrothed girl remains at her home throughout the engagement. Her parents and guardians will be less worried about her future, since betrothal provides strong motivations for discreet behaviour. Nonetheless, the girl’s parents are still held responsible by both the fiancé and the community for her behaviour. In the fiancé’s absence abroad, the girl’s parents care for his interests; but when he has returned, her parents must exercise special care to supervise the young couple, lest their daughter become pregnant and the engagement terminate.

Men are allowed to visit betrothed girls at their homes between 4:30 P.M. and sunset, on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. These are known as “visiting days.” The girl’s father will make every effort to be at home for these visits; but if his daughter lives elsewhere, her household head, male or female, is responsible for supervising the couple and for dismissing the young man at dusk. Apart from kin, the girl’s fiancé will be the only young man allowed to visit the home. On no account will the girl’s parents knowingly allow the couple to have sex relations in their home. However, despite all these efforts, ardent couples generally find opportunities for love-making by arranging to meet without their parents’ knowledge. It is quite common in Carriacou for betrothed girls to become pregnant and to have children before their marriage.

When the girl’s pregnancy is brought to their attention, her parents ask her formally to say who is responsible, just as they initially asked whether she had given permission for the proposal. When the girl names her fiancé, her mother goes to inform the man’s mother of the girl’s statement. The boy’s mother in turn asks her son if the girl’s report is true. Unless he has good reason to believe that his betrothed is unfaithful, he will claim responsibility and either visit the girl’s home to tell her mother himself or ask his own mother to do so. The girl’s father then presses the
young man or his father to advance the marriage day. The young man will be directed to go abroad and earn the money required for the house and the marriage. If the two fathers agree, as is usual, the young man has to obey, and he will only return to the island when his house is complete and he can marry the girl immediately.

Sometimes another difficulty arises. The young man may be unable to marry the girl at the appointed time. The girl's father will then call him to discuss the engagement; he will ask the young man the amount he has saved and his immediate plans. If his daughter has not become pregnant, he will say frankly that he will not allow an indefinite engagement, since this places the girl’s future in her fiancé’s hands. Shortly after this the young man returns with his father, and the matter is gone over again, the man’s father being pressed for an assurance that he wishes the engagement to continue. Since men cannot break their engagements on economic grounds, the girl’s father generally secures a renewed proposal with a new marriage date. A second letter is required to record this agreement. The young man will then proceed abroad with a strengthened sense of urgency.

If a couple cannot marry by the set date but have already become intimate, the girl’s father has less control. But if the girl is not pregnant, she may be forbidden to see the young man again, although this cannot be enforced unless she lives with both parents. More often her father depends on the young man’s father for support to secure the marriage, and must also content himself with impressing on his daughter the fact that the engagement now depends on her remaining absolutely faithful to her fiancé. She will be subject to rigorous home supervision while her fiancé works abroad. However, when the young man is unable to go abroad for family reasons, and the girl has already become pregnant by him, her parents may instruct the couple to set up a separate house nearby, as the alternative to separation. Either arrangement is intended to protect the girl from gossip and to safeguard her against advances from other men, since the only ground on which a man can justifiably break his engagement in Carriacou is that his betrothed has been unfaithful.

Despite their variable histories, all successful engagements in
Carriacou have a common end, namely marriage. Ideally, marriage involves the establishment of a new household in a home built and furnished by the man, but there are variations. The young man may die at sea or abroad before concluding his engagement; or to protect their daughter, the girl's parents may demand that the marriage take place before the young man is ready. In the latter case the girl’s parents may vacate their own house in favour of the newlyweds for a short period before the young man goes overseas to earn the money for his own home. If the bride is left pregnant at her husband’s departure, so much the better. More rarely, the young couple will go to live with the girl’s parents more or less indefinitely. These adjustments are rare, and in all cases are due to the girl’s parents’ insistence on an early marriage. By their infrequency, they show how important the establishment of a separate home and household at marriage is to the Carriacou people.

Engagement Breaches In Carriacou, men may only break engagements if “the girl, she does not behave herself”—that is, if she has another lover. But however far the betrothal has gone, the man is expected to break it abruptly once this is known. Within compact villages, with their fine kinship network, there is little chance that a girl can maintain a liaison for long without some kin or friend of her fiancé informing the latter. Moreover, girls dare not contract such liaisons unless their fiancés have already enjoyed their “facilities.” However, even if the fiancé has already accepted responsibility for the girl’s pregnancy, he will often refuse to recognise the child as his own after hearing that the girl was intimate with another man. In effect, before and outside marriage as well as in it, a woman’s unfaithfulness is regarded as adultery, and her betrothed or husband is obliged by cultural constraints of pride and prestige, ridicule and shame to put her away once this is known. Whether the woman is betrothed or married, her parents will make no protest in such a case, although they may take her into their household or help her to migrate.

Carriacou men honour their betrothal or marriage commitments unless their women have been unfaithful. Nor do they accept gossip or flimsy evidence on this point. To do so would discredit
them socially. Acceptable evidence of a woman’s unchastity is apt to be scarce. It includes children begotten by other men or apprehension of the woman with her lover at a rendezvous. A well-known liaison in which the parties exchange visits is also accepted as evidence of infidelity. Under such conditions the man simply informs the woman and her guardians of the facts known to him and breaks off the engagement or marriage abruptly.

On the other hand, if the girl “conducts herself properly” by remaining chaste, the man cannot break the engagement and remain on the island. The duration of betrothal thus depends on the girl’s forbearance and her parents’ effectiveness. By the institution of visiting days, the man is prevented from making another engagement. He cannot be in two places at once, and he must visit his fiancée regularly at the allotted times. If she remains chaste, he can only terminate his engagement by marriage or emigration. His betrothal will be known and he can neither offer to “engage another woman” nor to live in concubinage with her. With the exception already mentioned in which a girl’s parents demand that the betrothed couple cohabit if the betrothal is to continue, domestic unions are impossible for engaged persons. If the man seeks to repudiate his initial engagement by marrying some other woman without a betrothal, he will be sued for breach of promise, as happened in one case reported to me.

Unlike her fiancé, the betrothed young woman is free to break her engagement or to marry at any time, even without notifying her betrothed. She loses no honour thereby, since “an engagement is not a marriage” — by which people mean that for women, although not for men, “an engagement can break for a marriage.” If her fiancé is not sufficiently attentive in his visits and gifts or if he sets up house with another woman, the girl will break off her engagement. But so long as he does not cohabit with any other, the betrothed girl can only complain about her lover’s affairs if these are costly and delay the marriage.

The contractual character of the engagement is thus unmistakable; if the striking thing about engagement letters is that they do not mention these conditions, the striking thing about engagements is that they are generally observed. Only two conditions
must be explicit in engagement letters: the promise of marriage and the marriage date. For the rest, the average person in Carriacou assumes common agreement about the conditions under which engagements can validly be broken, although he or she would probably fail to state these conditions concisely or fully. The context and form of engagement is peculiar to the culture.

The engagement contract also redefines the status relations of the two young people and their kinsfolk. The young couple occupy an ambiguous transitional status throughout the engagement, and relations between their parents are also ill-defined. Relations between the engaged couple are somewhat clearer.

**Alternative Patterns**

Is a matter of principle. Any time you bed a woman and you finish, for your principle, whether they ask you, you give them something, you show them your principle. They did not ask you, they did not charge you, but you show them the principle of a gentleman. Supposing I go with a woman to-night, when I finish I may give her five dollars (BWI = £1.0.10). Maybe the next time I give her nothing. Then a few times later I give her something again. But the first time I go with any woman, when I finish, I give her something for the principle.

Men respect women whose facilities they cannot obtain without betrothal or marriage, and they also respect those women who are already betrothed or married, since interference with them carries heavy risks. On the other hand, women are virtually excluded from the exchange economy of Carriacou, and depend on men for most of the money they need or receive. There are also approximately twice as many women as men on the island. These economic and demographic factors provide a context which permits and encourages many deviations from the ideal pattern of engagement and marriage. These alternatives are culturally sanctioned and observe cultural forms.

Undoubtedly liaisons develop on a basis of personal attraction, but this need not be deep, exclusive, or permanent. In addition, the “principle” of Carriacou gentlemen makes them generally
attractive to local women, and some of the younger women occasionally take two or more lovers, on grounds of attraction as well as income. If these patterns are considered from the woman’s point of view, they cannot be regarded as promiscuity or prostitution. But the Carriacou people strongly disapprove.

Women rarely engage in plural matings since they can only maintain such affairs if both are clandestine. If the second lover knows about his forerunner, he may “broadcast her name” or bring the matter to his rival’s notice. The girl thus runs a serious risk of losing her reputation and becoming compelled to emigrate. Moreover, since there are no rooms for rent in Carriacou, women who are not in charge of their own homes risk ejection for such behaviour, and thereafter may find it difficult to get alternative accommodation. Kinsfolk will rarely receive them in these conditions, and there is very little chance of finding accommodation as a domestic on the island. A fare to Grenada costs only two dollars (BWI), and going there may be her simplest course. There the girl may find work and a room to rent, but she remains an exile. If the girl with two or more lovers becomes pregnant, her prospects are even worse; emigration is more difficult because of the baby, who will almost certainly be disowned by her lovers. To remain on the island she will have to depend on her mother or other kinsfolk to take her into their home.

The position of the unengaged young woman, whether she has one or more lovers, differs widely from that of the engaged. Because of the “principle,” she receives more gifts than the betrothed girl, whose lover is expected to save for the house and the wedding. In return, she commonly gives more “facilities” and runs a heavier risk. But her lover’s gifts enable her to achieve economic independence more rapidly, and with these gifts she can buy her own clothes, household supplies, and small stock, or rent her own garden. In this way she gradually assumes womanship—that is, social and economic independence; but if her lover is poor and she becomes pregnant, she may become dependent on her kinsfolk once more.

Since it is also a principle that a man must claim his child and contribute to its maintenance and care as best he can, provided paternity is not in doubt, the unengaged girl with a single lover has
a certain security. And when the lover is not able to support the
girl as she would like, she may take another lover and gradually
break off with the first one. However, if there is a strong bond
between them, the couple are likely to go on having children
while living apart. If the man is unmarried, the girl's parents may
ask him to set up a common household with her and thus signify
his intention to marry as soon as he can. Unmarried persons who
live together as man and wife are said to be “keeping,” and the
woman is called the man’s “keeper.” Unwed mates who do not
live together are said to be “frien’ing” and the man refers to the
woman as his “keptress,” or, more rarely, “girl-friend.” Keptresses
are girl-friends of longer standing and closer ties.

Keeping is consensual cohabitation, not common-law marriage.
The law does not recognise the relation nor does the society re-
gard it as marriage, although the partners’ obligations are mod-
elled on those of spouses, thus invalidating the classification of
these consensual unions as concubinage. Couples do not keep
unless they have children in common. The islanders do not re-
gard keeping as living in sin, although the church does, but they
disapprove of it as anomalous in a mating system based on the
alternatives of marriage and extra-domestic mating. Unmarried
couples who keep thereby declare their intention to marry as soon
as they can, but meanwhile they are not treated as married people.
Although the community supports their intention to marry, such
cohabitation admits economic failure and is disapproved. The
male member of such a union is accordingly mocked and teased
and is not regarded as a full household head. The woman remains
under supervision by her parents as well as her mate, whereas
married women are only under their husbands’ control. In Carri-
cou, keeping is not indissoluble, and such unions sometimes break
up if they lack supervision and support from the couple’s parents.

If the partners are not married, keeping can only take place in
a woman’s house of daub-and-wattle. Keeping that involves
separated married persons may take place in a board or concrete
house; but an unmarried man having such a house can neither
cohabit without marriage in his own home nor join his partner
in hers. And no unmarried woman in Carriacou will join her lover
as his keeper in a board or concrete house, even if she is already
mature and has several children, unless the man cannot legally marry, being already married and informally separated.

According to the social logic of Carriacou, it is self-contradictory for unmarried people to keep in a board house, because keeping is a prelude to marriage, and a board house owned by the couple is the main prerequisite for marriage. Thus, by living with an unmarried man as his keeper in a wooden house, the woman repudiates the ideal of marriage and accordingly declares herself not a keeper but a whore. This is one of the three forms of behaviour classified as prostitution in Carriacou. House rental is therefore incompatible with Carriacou rules about cohabitation, marriage, and housing, and if it were practised locally, this mating organisation could not persist in its present form. For this reason, the culture rejects house rental although house spots are commonly rented; and keeping usually takes place in a woman’s dirt house.

Whether the man builds the dirt house or not, it remains a woman’s house, and usually it is built near the woman’s parents’ home, on their land and under their supervision. The saraca which is obligatory when establishing or moving a man’s house is not held when keepers move into a woman’s house.

Premarital cohabitation is rare, since it presupposes that both partners were dependents in other people’s households, that they wish to marry, and that the girl’s parents can compel the young man to live with their daughter by threatening to separate them otherwise. Legendary or not, it is commonly assumed in Carriacou that fathers will “brutalise” — that is, beat — their pregnant unmarried daughters or may even evict them. Actually, very few cases are known in which this occurred; but there are not many cases in which girls living with both their parents give occasion for this sort of treatment. It is therefore probable that the myth of the father’s brutality is created and maintained by men to keep the young people in order. This interpretation receives some support from the fathers’ ability to force young men to keep with their unbetrothed daughters when they become pregnant. In other words, paternal authority may preserve the girl’s future by early betrothal; or it may reverse a deteriorating relation by insistence on keeping or engagement.
The mother of an unacknowledged child is not regarded as a prostitute on that account. She loses prestige and is thereafter unlikely to marry; but in due course memories of the incident tend to fade, and her future standing depends, within limits, on her future behaviour. Such recovery of status is impossible for the prostitute as defined in Carriacou. The girl whose child’s father is doubtful differs from the prostitute in that the number of probable fathers is known and limited. For a girl to have two lovers simultaneously is bad behaviour and is treated as such; but this is not regarded as prostitution, perhaps because the men themselves practise plural mating with cultural approval. Moreover, since the men’s principle operates intermittently, it does not apply to prostitution but to liaisons.

Apart from cases in which an unmarried woman lives with an unmarried man consensually in a man’s house, prostitution has two other forms in Carriacou. Women who grant their favours indiscriminately on a commercial basis and live by this means are classified as prostitutes. Prostitutes of this kind must have land and a wooden house of their own, no senior kin to control them, and other kin willing to assist; but since this combination of conditions is quite unusual, such prostitution is rare. Since prostitutes are outcasts, few girls in Carriacou willingly remain in a situation that allows such gossip about them and instead marry, take a lover, or invite senior kin into their homes to protect their reputations.

The third type of prostitute in Carriacou is the woman who bears children for two men who are agnates within the range of second cousins. Such sex relations are rigorously taboo. This taboo expresses principles of patrilineal descent and lineage exogamy and protects the lineages against disorganisation through competition over women. In the same way that sex relations are taboo between close kin, they are also taboo between a woman and two men who belong to the same “blood.” Perhaps prostitution of this sort arouses the greatest horror of all. No mitigating circumstances are taken into account; the woman is branded for life as worthless, while the men who thereby “mixed the blood” are ritually impure and will be punished by the old parents for this breach of “the rule of the blood.” They can take no ritual
measures to purify or reinstate themselves. They may sometimes receive dream-messages to hold certain piacular sacrifices, but not always. Lack of expiatory ritual for offences of this sort indirectly protects the lineage by perpetuating ritual pollution. Even so, offending males are left to the ancestors whereas the woman is cast out by the living. This differing distribution of blame expresses the cultural theme that men are free to hunt, while women are not. Such anomalous sex relations rarely come to light except when there are children. These will belong to their fathers' blood, despite their irregular conception, but their fathers are more ambivalent about them than others and accordingly contribute less. Meanwhile, the mother will be disowned by any kin she may have in the village.

I have now reviewed engagement and its principal alternatives as they affect young women in Carriacou. The polar opposites of engagement and marriage are the three forms of prostitution described above, rather than unmarried motherhood itself. The betrothed girl often becomes the unmarried mother of her fiancé's child, and may remain unmarried; such falls from grace involve a loss of prestige greater than that experienced by unengaged girls who become pregnant for eligible young men willing to marry them. If the betrothal is broken because of the girl's "adultery," she loses further esteem. There may thus be less difference in the actual careers of young women than their betrothal statuses would suggest: the betrothed girl may remain unwed till death, and the unmarried mother may wed her first or some later lover. These developments and their relation to differing types of domestic organisation will be discussed later, but it is important to recognise here that the antithesis to engagement and marriage in Carriacou is neither extra-domestic mating nor single parenthood, but behaviour that contradicts cultural norms irreversibly and explicitly.

To illustrate the frequency and variety of these alternative mating careers, I shall summarise the relevant data from the case histories of all 115 adult women at L'Esterre in 1953.¹

Thirty-three women had married their fiancés before having any children, five after having children for their fiancés. In four

¹ See Table 8, Chap. 8, p. 170.
cases the men had broken their engagements without the women having any children; in five cases engagements had been broken after the women had borne children; in two cases the women had broken the engagement themselves after having children. In ten of these broken engagements the men later married other women; two engagements ended when the man died and four when the man remained abroad. In five of ten cases the engaged couple married after keeping; and most of the other keeping couples were still trying to marry. In ten of these marriages the men had already had children by other women; in another ten marriages the woman had already had children by other men; and there were 37 women who had never been betrothed but had had children. In four cases betrothal ended with the girl’s death. There were only five cases of disclaimed paternity in 240 births.

There were 18 extra-residential liaisons current in L’Esterre during my visit. In two cases the woman visited the man at his home and in another two cases she met him elsewhere. In only one case did the man, a fairly large landowner, visit the girl while she was living in her father’s home. In eight cases girls received visits from their lovers while living with their mothers, and in five cases while in charge of their own households.

 Classified by the community as prostitutes were one woman who had borne children to three men of the same lineage and another who had had children for two men of another lineage. There were no cases of commercial prostitution, or of persons eligible to marry one another keeping together in board houses.

**Marriage Ceremonials** Carriacou weddings are complex ceremonies with several distinct stages. The wedding date having been set, preparations begin; shortly before the wedding day there are pre-nuptial rites for the betrothed. On the wedding day there is a church rite and a ceremony at the bride’s home. A week later the couple revisit the church to “return thanks,” and with this ritual epilogue the bridal seclusion ends.

When he is ready to wed, the young man informs the girl’s mother, and her family will then confirm or decide on the date, after consulting the priest and publishing banns. Only if there is family opposition to the marriage will it be celebrated quickly
and by the more expensive method of a special licence. Once the wedding date has been finally set, each family prepares independently, although the couple consult each other. The sisters, aunts, and male kin of both the mother’s and father’s family of each party make systematic visits to all relatives on the island, announcing the marriage date; and kin overseas are informed by letter. Each family pools its information about probable contributions and gifts separately, setting these against the expected marriage costs.

The girl’s father provides her marriage dress and underwear and will “keep”—that is, hold—her feast for her, even if she is an “outside” child born out of wedlock and living elsewhere. Those fathers who can afford it usually add gifts of bed linen, curtains, and “wares” (crockery and glass). The bride’s father, alone or in association with others including the couple, will also provide a goat or sheep, or possibly a bullock, for the sacrifice. If the bride’s father has sufficient land, he may offer the couple the use of a house spot, or the use of a garden. If the girl’s father is dead or otherwise unable to help, her mother tries “to suit her out” with dress materials; but even if the father has done so, the girl’s mother will add some such gifts of her own. If the girl’s parents cannot fit her out in this fashion, the groom has to bear the expense.

The groom requires a new suit, new shoes, and new undergarments in which to approach the altar. He must also provide such house furnishings as a bed, tables, chairs, bureau, wagonette, another set of wares, pots, pans, and other cooking equipment, and sheets, towels, and household linen. In addition, he should provide a new wooden house having at least two rooms, an outside kitchen, and preferably a concrete water-tank or at least three large oil-drums.

Provision of these marriage requirements is perhaps the chief reason for male emigration, and emigrants will not usually return to settle until they can buy them. Those who return unable to do so may either postpone their marriage or live in the bride’s mother’s home until their own is finished. Usually such men marry between trips overseas and leave their brides with the brides’ mothers, pregnant, while they again work abroad. Overseas, they
save what they can to buy the land and build their own house. On their return they will take their family to their new home before emigrating once more in search of money to buy cattle, land, or a shop to provide for the growing family. Once an emigrant has married and has his own home and family on the island, he is very unlikely to remain away permanently. But the couple may emigrate together after marrying, if the groom has not built his own house. Even if a betrothed couple are cohabiting overseas, they will return to hold the wedding in Carriacou as long as their parents live there. The bridegroom’s commitments vary only as regards the house and its furnishings, and the wedding ritual will only vary in regard to the sacrifice for the new house.

The groom provides money for the church fees. He engages five or six taxis to take the bride’s party and his own to the church. He buys about six gallons of white rum (at $11.50 BWI per gallon in 1953) for approximately £14, an equivalent amount of wine for the female guests, a case or two of beer, some refined (weak) Barbadian rum for special guests, and the materials for a huge cake of about seven tiers plus about $5 for imported bread to be eaten with soup. This outlay is a severe obstacle to marriage in a society with limited cash resources; and men often complain of the cost of the wedding ceremony and of its non-productive character. Their criticisms show that the wedding outlays are obligatory by tradition, and that couples observe them under constraint. However, without these ceremonial outlays, the marriage might not be regarded as properly established; and, apart from death-bed celebrations, no marriage was recalled in which the ceremonial was lacking. Of itself the church ritual is insufficient to establish marriage as it is defined by Carriacou society.

The marriage season in Carriacou comes between March and May—at the end of the dry season and before garden work begins. Most weddings are celebrated on Thursday; on the preceding Monday a sacrifice will be held at the groom’s home, and on the following night at the bride’s. The two rites are similar in form, but since the groom’s is more variable, this will be described.

The groom’s family invite all his kin individually to his marriage fête. This is held at his parents’ home or, if his father is dead,
at his mother's house or at the house in which he is living. The location of the small sacrifice varies according to the residential position of either party and of their parents. Visiting kin bring gifts of cash, beasts, and fowls for sacrifice and other gifts such as glasses or crockery for the couple's home; but the wedding gifts are usually kept until a day or two after the church ceremony.

The groom's ritual begins at about 9 A.M. with a sacrifice at the home of the groom's father or site of the paternal grandfather's home. A beast is slaughtered there by the household head or by the groom's father. After an hour or two, the assembly moves to the groom's father's home, where another beast is slaughtered. Finally, if the groom has built a new wooden house, the assembly moves to it for a further sacrifice, usually by the groom's father or by some senior agnatic kinsman or godfather of the groom. “At first coming to a house, it is necessary to bleed (sacrifice) a beast.” When this rite takes place in the context of the marriage ritual, a portion of the sacrificial meat is cooked at the site of the new house, the remainder being sent to the groom's father's house, where the main fête will be held. As this series of sacrifices takes place, the Big Drum moves with the assembly from house to house.

As always at a sacrifice, the beast and the four corners of the house are sprinkled with rum and water before the slaughter takes place on the doorstep. The two women selected to cook the sacrificial plate must also sprinkle the beast: one with rum and the other with water. The prayers on sacrificing each beast or fowl follow a standard formula, asking for health, strength, peace, prosperity, and long life. Food for the parents' plate must never be seasoned or salted, nor should it be touched until the following dawn, when it is distributed. Except for these portions of the sacrificed beasts, the remainder is cooked with seasoning at the house where the fête is to be held, and will be distributed to guests by the household head. Some meat is roasted and kept for late comers, the rest is boiled. The groom's father distributes the rum. Usually men hold their marriage fête at their father's home. Otherwise the head of the household in which the fête occurs sees to the distribution of food.
At about 3 or 4 P.M. the parents' plate, with its sacrificial food, is taken into the main bedroom of the house and placed beside glasses of rum and water on a table covered in white. The household head—usually the groom's father—sets down the first plate himself, followed by the groom, and then by the sacrificial cook, an old woman who will guard the sacrifice against interference throughout the night.

The pre-nuptial dance begins at the scene of the first sacrifice after the ring and drums have been sprinkled. Since wedding rites are joyful occasions at which the old parents are pleased, no Kromanti "Beg Pardon" is played. Instead the ring is "wet" to the Nation Dance of the groom's descent line, or of the household head. Elderly persons dance, while juniors look on, forbearing to enter the ring, since the Nation Dance belongs to the "long-time people"—that is, to the elders and the dead. When the dance moves to another house, the new site must be sprinkled, and the new ring "wet," and the dance will re-open with the Nation of the present household head. At midnight, when the ring must be "wet" again, the drums play a song for the spirits who arrive at this time. The head of the house then dances his Nation again, and the dance proceeds as before.

Accompanied by her parents, the bride formally visits the fête at about 9 P.M. The bride and her parents are received as special guests and are entertained with rum, wine, and cakes in the house at a table prepared for them. The groom is not allowed to talk to the bride in private at this visit, which is intended to show respect to the old parents of the groom's family. If she is a maiden, the bride takes no part in the dance outside; but if she is in her womanship and has already had children, she will be asked to join the dance. After a brief stay, the bride returns home with her kin.

Pre-nuptial rites nowadays vary according to the type of dances that accompany the sacrifice. Wedding rites celebrated by the Big Drum involve such heavy distributions of food and drink to the attending crowd that they rank as a Big Time. To avoid these heavy expenses, the groom may arrange for music by a bass and tambourine band or, in Hillsborough, a "string band" of
clarinet, violin, guitar, banjo, and saxophone. The fee for bass and tambourine is similar to that for the Big Drum, while a string band is more expensive than either. But both the string band and the bass and tambourine play indoors, where there is no room for uninvited guests. This effects great saving on rum and food. Accordingly, younger men may arrange for these indoor dances, although their fathers prefer the Big Drum. However, as with the Big Drum, before the string band or bass and tambourine begins to play, the ring must first be wet with rum and water, and the household head, with his wife, will lead off to a reel-engaged, followed by a "Scotch." Thereafter the dance proceeds under the supervision of an "inspector," who names the dancers and type of dance—such as the quadrille, or lancers. The inspector selects young couples to dance only when the elders are tired. As with the Big Drum, at these indoor dances the ring must be wet again at midnight, and a dance-set consisting of four or six tunes will be played, without dancing, for the ancestral spirits. These indoor dances also conclude with the distribution of the parents' plate at dawn. The pre-nuptial fête at the bride's home the next day follows the pattern just described. On Wednesday everyone rests and final preparations are made for the wedding on Thursday.

The next morning the groom dresses early and awaits the followers he has asked to escort him to church. Of these, the chief is the "father-giver" or best man; all are males of the same age as the groom. When they leave in taxis, the elders and women, who remain behind, lead out a sheep and prepare it for sacrifice. The groom's father or the household head blesses it with rum and water, marches it round the house, and asks for long life, health, etc. when he kills it on the doorstep. The carcass is then sent to the bride's home, together with ingredients for mutton soup, liquor, and an elaborate cake covered like the bride with a veil and set amid smaller cakes wrapped in towels. These supplies are borne in a procession behind a man bearing a flag, with the groom's father and mother at the head and other kin following. The group marches to music, usually bass and tambourine or guitars, singing appropriate songs: "Prepare for us, we are coming down heavy," or "Prepare for me, we goin' soldar X's bam-bam." The flag,
carried on a bamboo pole, may be a Union Jack or a cloth embroidered with a phrase such as “Long Life and Prosperity” or “In God we Trust.”

The groom’s procession meets a similar group of the bride’s kin outside the entrance to her home. While the bands play, the two flag-bearers fight with their flags in the manner of a stick-fight, exchanging blows squarely for half an hour or so, until the bride’s flag is knocked down and the groom’s is crossed over it. The groom’s flag-group then pushes back the bride’s, forcing entrance into her house. At this point the fighting and music cease, and the two flags are hoisted over the house, the groom’s above the bride’s. As the groom’s flag is carried into the bride’s home, the two mothers meet ceremonially in the yard, the bride’s mother kneeling before the groom’s to demonstrate that the groom has honoured the bride and will now “rule” her. The groom’s mother may order that her feet be wiped with a towel by the bride’s mother; but this is a matter of personal choice which probably reflects their previous relationship. When the groom’s mother has lifted her up, the bride’s mother will kiss her, powder her face and hands, and then do likewise to all the women in the groom’s procession. She then directs the party to the place prepared for them in her home, and the two groups separate to prepare their parts of the feast with dispatch.

This ceremony of arrival is over by 10 o’clock. While the women prepare the food in the house, the men set up a tent of coconut palm branches in the yard and put benches, tables, and chairs beneath it. The cakes are then brought out and placed there, unless the bride’s home is large, in which case the reception will be inside. However small or poor the bride’s home, it is still exceptional for a wedding reception to be held elsewhere.

At the church the bride’s party consists of the “mother-giver” and the bride and her bridesmaids, all in new dresses and bearing flowers, the bride with a veil over her face. This group waits by the steeple until the priest appears. The bridegroom then comes out to the bride, wipes her face with his handkerchief, kisses her, and walks up the aisle with her, arms linked. The father-giver stands at the groom’s side, the mother-giver at the bride’s. The priest reads the service which joins them as man and wife. Then,
to conclude, he takes from a saucer on the altar a gold ring and half-crown set there by the groom on his arrival, he puts the ring on the bride's finger and the half-crown in her hand. To explain this the folk say, "You marry between silver and gold, you have made a step to good fortune." While the couple and the father- and mother-giver register the event in the vestry, the church bell tolls and is heard by the two families engaged in the flag-fight at the bride's home.

After paying the priest, the two parties may linger in the churchyard to be photographed before returning home in the waiting taxis. On arrival, they find an arch lined with flowers over the pathway to the girl's home. At this arch both fathers greet them ceremonially, dancing towards them to the music of bass and tambourine, and lead them into the yard, with linked arms. No precedence such as marked the greeting of the couple's mothers holds between the fathers. Within the yard the two old men continue dancing, and each approaches the couple in turn, wiping their faces with a kerchief, kissing them, scattering scent over them both, and concluding the dance by pressing an envelope of money into their hands. If either father wishes to make a speech while greeting the newly-weds, he interrupts the dance to say a few words in praise of their past behaviour. The mothers then take up the dance, without sign of precedence. After this dance is over, the groom's mother takes the bride by her arm, the bride's mother joins arms with the groom, and the young couple are led to the head of a long table, opposite the father- and mother-giver. The couple's parents then withdraw, leaving the father-giver to direct the proceedings.

The father-giver makes a speech in praise of the bride, cataloguing her virtues, and concludes with a toast to her, after which anyone at the table may offer a toast or a song. Only men may make speeches or give toasts, and only women may sing. Everyone at the table is an invited guest, the bride having invited all the women, the groom all the men, and the assembly at the table consists mainly of age-mates. In drinking toasts, men take rum, women wine. After several toasts, songs, and speeches, soup and bread are passed to the assembly. Next, the two large cakes are danced. Each cake has several tiers, but the groom's is always two
tiers higher than the bride's. Both are iced and made by local experts. They are danced by two old women to a polka without words. The couple's mothers never dance the cake. The dance concludes when the cakes are taken from a small table nearby and set opposite the father-giver.

The father-giver names a young man and a young woman at the table to come and "stick" (cut) the cake. Both must be unmarried, but they need not have known one another previously. The young man holds a knife, the girl a fork. They cut both wedding cakes, the groom's first and then the bride's, and amid music and laughter feed one another with these slices. Finally they must embrace and kiss. The two cakes are then removed, the groom's to be sent to his mother's house and the bride's to her mother's. A small portion of each cake will be sent to all the kin, whether on the island or overseas. No part of the wedding cakes may be given to friends; the young people who partake of these cakes represent all non-kin who wish the couple and their families well. On the wedding day there is no sacrificial plate in either of the homes linked by the marriage, although a sacrifice was held at the groom's home. The day is one of pure festivity and gladness. After the cakes are removed, the celebration concludes with a dance inside the couple's future home or in some large house nearby, without any wetting of the ring or Big Drum. Quadrilles, reels, lancers, and similar old dances are used. The first dance goes to the groom and bride, the next to the father- and mother-giver. Thereafter, the presiding inspector names the couples to dance each set. The newly-weds' parents may take part if they wish. The dance continues as long as food and drink remain and concludes informally with the gradual departure of the guests.

Throughout this ceremonial cycle the roles or obligations ascribed to particular kin, such as the couple's parents, may be assumed by other kin of the same sex and generation if necessary, and generally these substitutes are chosen from the same descent-line as the person whose role they play. Failing all else, god-parents are acceptable substitutes for missing parents.

If she is a maiden—that is, childless—the bride does no housework for the first week of her marriage. The couple's mothers will take care of them for that week, sending them food and doing
any services—such as washing, ironing, or gardening—that need to be done. If the newly-weds are to live in the bride’s mother’s home, they will have sole occupancy for that week. If she is a maiden, the bride remains indoors for the week, and no one may visit her without knocking loudly and receiving permission. But if she is already a mother, or otherwise mature, the bride will have to do the housework and tend the garden from the first day of her marriage.

The wedding cycle closes on the morning of the second Sunday after the wedding when the newly-weds return to the church where they were married to take Holy Communion. This is known as the “return thanks.” They are accompanied by all who attended their wedding service. After Communion, the group goes to the couple’s home by car, and there they take cake and wine together quietly in the forenoon to celebrate the return thanks.

These marriage ceremonials are the most elaborate rite de passage of the island culture, and their organisation expresses several principles that inform local society. Throughout this ritual cycle, the generations are kept apart. The post-nuptial fête belongs to the couple and their contemporaries, while the pre-nuptial sacrifices belong to the parental generation; in both events one generation is prominent while the other takes little part. The junior generation is charged with cutting the cake, but their seniors carry out the flag-fight, and the two groups only join in the ceremonial dance of the couple and their parents. There is an equally clear distinction between the church ritual and the ancestor cult. The juniors attend the former, while the latter belongs to the “old heads.” The principle of sex differentiation in role and status and the more complex kinship principles of lineage, household, and family are also evident in the wedding cycle. Kinship forms and values are expressed by the distribution of the wedding cakes, in the flag-fight, and most purely in the two pre-nuptial sacrifices dedicated to the dead.

Thus wedding rites integrate and dramatise differentiation by generation, sex, kinship, and ritual at the same time that they

mark the status transition of bride and groom and establish new kinship relations in culturally approved forms. Perhaps this explains why the bride’s role varies with her maidenhood or maturity and why the groom’s sacrifice varies according to whether or not he has built his house. The return thanks after the week’s seclusion, concludes the rite de passage which began at the groom’s pre-nuptial sacrifice. The ritual mobilises the kindred and ancestors of both parties to redefine their status. It restates and reinforces the approved relations between the sexes on the one hand and between alternate generations on the other and employs the Christian and ancestor religions together to sanctify the union and bless the new household.

Pregnancy and Maturity Carriacou ideas of sex and pregnancy observations remain bizarre unless interpreted in context. In this section I shall mention some of these customs and ideas and show how they may be understood. The Carriacou theory of conception does not concern us here; it is significant in relation to descent and filiation, and will be discussed below. However, other ideas about sex and maturity merit attention.

Continence is only possible for females, according to local ideas, but, if overdone, it will “cause the blood to go to their head.” Women who suffer severe headaches often announce after visiting the doctor that they have been advised to “take exercise”—that is, to copulate. Most continent women have absent husbands and seek to recall them by letters which tell of doctors’ orders or some other compelling need. Carriacou husbands appreciate their wives’ fidelity, and when informed on their return of the true reason for the summons appear quite complacent. Only if husbands fail to return after two or three warnings will their wives consider alternative courses.

Condoms can be obtained in Hillsborough, but such contraception is not widespread. There are curious ideas about the rhythm of ovulation and natural control. Some men believe that a woman will conceive three days before or after menstruation but at no other time. This error may be general, or peculiar to a few. Many also believe that conception can only occur at simultaneous orgasm. Some women claim to know the moment they conceive, and
Some rely on dream-messages. Everyone knows that conception halts menstruation and is preceded by copulation. There is a general idea that if a woman has intercourse with her lover frequently, whether or not contraceptives are used, she will become pregnant unless either of them has “a fault in the blood.”

If a couple remains childless, the woman is entitled to break off the relationship, even though married. However, if the woman is known to have had several men without conceiving, she is the one to blame: she is “a mule,” she isn’t “good.” But barren women, while disapproved for their condition, are sought by men who do not wish extra children from minor adventures. Fertility is itself a value, and abortion is rare. Gum aloes and epsom salts may be drunk privately to “wash away the baby,” but massage methods are unknown. People believe that women who have committed abortions will thereafter suffer from headaches, rushes of blood, and the like. One version of the La Jablesse myth holds that the numerous little pigs that follow these cloven-hoofed beauties are the infants they aborted while alive. The high value placed on fertility is sanctioned and expressed by the belief that God locks up childless young women in heaven, if they ever get there, because they did not obey His desires in sending them on earth, namely “to increase and multiply.” Certain African “Nations” are thought to produce births of different types; thus, Yoruba children may have Shango hair, while Ibos produce most albinos and twins; there is no belief that the number of children each woman will bear is set by fate.

Several food restrictions are peculiar to pregnancy. Pregnant women in Carriacou do not eat rice or green mangoes. Unless they want an “abortion” (miscarriage), pineapple is also taboo. In addition, many women will not eat bluggoes (plantain) while pregnant. These food taboos are balanced by individual fads; some pregnant women eat dry farine in large quantities. The husbands must humour these compulsions or the child will be born with the marks of its mother’s frustrated desires. Pregnant women are easily frightened, and these frights are said to mark the baby.

Work routines are not so easily patterned, but the pregnant woman usually stops washing and ironing clothes in the fourth or fifth month. She continues to carry out essential house and
garden work until the birth; and if there is no one else to do so, she will fetch the household wood and water throughout her pregnancy.

However, the great majority of ritual actions or prohibitions during pregnancy lie outside the economic system. For example, neither the pregnant woman nor her lover or husband may sponsor a child at baptism because this would cause the death of their own. This prohibition denies the priest the opportunity to reject unwed enceinte women as god-parents.

The woman’s lover or husband may also fall sick after conception if “the woman’s blood is stronger than the man’s.” This happens whether it is the man’s first or fifth child and whether the couple are married or not. The woman may or may not be sick during pregnancy, but extensive ritual sickness is impracticable, because Carriacou women have heavy work routines and are often pregnant. In fact, neither the man nor the woman can afford to stay in bed, and consequently their ritual pregnancy illness is a light fever or “stomach sickness” which lets them go about their business. The man’s sickness at this time may serve to express his participation and concern about the event. It also permits some self-identification of unmarried fathers.

Two pregnant women must never sleep together, since the child of one will “suck the blood” of the other, thus causing a stillbirth. By implication, this means that no women should sleep together before the menopause. Another prohibition that serves to remind pregnant women of their dangerous ritual state is against stepping over ropes that tether donkeys. To do so will lengthen the woman’s pregnancy to twelve months, like that of the ass. However, there is a remedy: the woman must drink the tea made from boiling the end of the tethering rope.

No one, but especially no “long-foot woman,” may step over the legs of a pregnant woman, or the delivery will be made more difficult. Local classification of women as “long-foot” or “short-foot” is based on rough comparison of leg length in relation to body height. These differences in anatomical proportions among the islanders may reflect differing racial types among the ancestral Africans. Guinea Coast types such as the Ibo approximate the Carriacou short-foots, while Sudanic types such as the Kro-
manti, Mandinka, or Yoruba approximate long-foots. According to local belief, delivery is more difficult for long-foot women than for short-foot, and if a long-foot woman steps over the legs of a pregnant short-foot, she transmits these difficulties. As we shall see, lesbianism is not unknown in Carriacou, and this may provide a possible ground for these restrictions.

Sex relations during pregnancy are governed by taboos and injunctions. The pregnant woman must be “chaste”—that is, she must only have intercourse with the man who got her with child; otherwise she will harm or destroy the baby within her. On the other hand, she needs “regular exercise”—that is, copulation—to widen the channel to her womb and facilitate delivery. This is especially important during a woman’s first pregnancy, and her parents often instruct the lover to discharge his duties regularly in order to assist the girl. Of course, this parental command is only necessary if the couple are unmarried and do not live together. There is no belief that regular intercourse nourishes the child; but the emphasis on intercourse in pregnancy, coupled with the taboo on in chastity at that time, reduces the scope for paternity dispute by regularising relations between unmarried couples. Carriacou folk do not see these connections, however.

The customs mentioned above are representative Carriacou pregnancy beliefs and observances. To understand these, we must determine their social functions—that is, the part they play in social life. Their role is most obvious in reference to the development of the individual life cycle. Pregnancy and parenthood ideally follow marriage and should recur during the long span of adult life which opens with the marriage ritual and ends with death. Throughout this period there are no set occasions for public rites de passage to mark changes of individual status. Nonetheless, the individual’s movement from early adulthood through maturity to seniority is important, especially in such a society as Carriacou where age is an index of status. There being no fixed occasions for public rituals to mark this development, pregnancy is ritualised as an informal and private rite de passage. Its recurrence makes repetition of the same observances obligatory for individuals although different individuals may have different observances. However, some customs are common to all, for example, rules
about sex relations or not stepping over the donkey’s rope. These general observances owe their existence to the fact that a certain modicum of common customs is necessary if these private pregnancy rites are to have public recognition.

All Carriacou women stylise pregnancy, and its recurrence marks their march to maturity. Marital status does not serve to distinguish the island women in this respect, because the number of legitimate and illegitimate births are roughly equal; maturity through age and motherhood is common to wed and unwed alike. However, some observances refer specially to pregnancies that develop outside marriage, such as the father’s sickness, or his obligation to “exercise” the mother, especially at her first pregnancy, or the girl’s obligation to be chaste. The woman’s status increases directly through recurrent child-bearing, but the male role in pregnancy observances is marginal, and its significance for male maturation is indirect.

In Carriacou, pregnancy alone does not confer independence or maturity. Often, especially on its first occurrence, it emphasises the woman’s dependence; but its cyclic recurrence marks the normal course of female maturation, in the same way that the series of sacrifices men hold mark their increasing seniority. Few Carriacou women ever have sufficient means to hold a Big Drum sacrifice; but most of the fixed occasions for these sacrifices centre on kinship and stress descent, parenthood, and the maturation of children. Thus parenthood links the maturation of both sexes. But men hold sacrifices for both alternate generations, their ancestors and offspring; and as the number of sacrifices they hold increases, so does their maturity and community prestige.

Whether he is married or not, a man is conceded adult status at about thirty years of age, but he is not considered to be fully mature until he is married and has his own house. This is the Carriacou distinction between “manship,” which is social independence, and being a “full full man,” or a mature member of the community. Women of about twenty-four years of age, even if they are unmarried or childless, are recognised as adults in their “womanship”; but maturity is delayed until middle age, by which time they should either have several children or be in charge of their own homes. It is in this context that Carriacou ideas about
barrenness and fostering become intelligible. Barren women are condemned as "mules," since female maturity is normally achieved through motherhood. But the infertile or childless woman is usually a foster-mother, and by rearing foster-children, she achieves effective parenthood. If she lives in her own home, she has a leading role in the Big Drum rites carried out on behalf of her wards. Her position is the exact reverse of the young unbetrothed girl whose first pregnancy underlines her dependence.
According to Carriacou belief, the dead and the living may interact and affect each other. Their interaction is expressed and patterned in ritual, which demonstrates and validates belief. Although the islanders do not distinguish beliefs from ritual, for purposes of exposition it is convenient to do so.

**Beliefs** Magic, science, and religion are all present in Carriacou. By magic I mean ritual manipulations of impersonal forces to affect empirical events. By religion I understand the interrelation of personal spirits and living beings. Science is a procedure based on experiment and observation of empirical events.

In Carriacou, modern science is represented by Government officials such as the resident physician and agricultural officers. Christianity is represented by the Anglican and Catholic priests.
and by their senior churchmen. Magic is represented by obeahmen (sorcerers) or look-men (diviners). Witchcraft (kakomé) is also prevalent: male witches being known as lougarou, females as sukuyan. Magic, science, and religion are similar in that they all offer explanations of events in this world and guides to action within it. Logically, therefore, they cannot avoid competition; but in fact they usually co-exist without this competition becoming explicit, perhaps because cultures are not purely logical systems and also because neither magic, religion, nor science is an exclusive behavioural system.

Professional exponents of these three systems are usually aware of their competition; but though widely influential, these persons are few in number. The folk belief integrates the alternatives and stresses their interdependence rather than their uniqueness. It does so by two means: first, it treats scientific—that is, medical—successes or failures as conditional on magico-religious events; second, it bridges the antithesis between Christianity and magic by means of the ancestor cult.

Of the professional exponents of these three systems who live on the island, only the magicians are wholly drawn from the folk. The churches in Carriacou, despite popular enrolments, are under alien direction, and their creed, worship, and organisation leave the folk uncertain about their own place within them. This uncertainty is accompanied by popular support of the ancestor cult. Thus Carriacou contains two quite distinct religious systems—one of which, Christianity, is characterised by formal places and times of worship, a priesthood, creed, organisation, and activity too well known to require description; while the other, an ancestor cult, lacks priesthood, organisation, set places or times of worship, and indeed almost everything that we habitually associate with sect or ecclesia.

However, although the priests regard these two religious systems as in conflict, in the folk view, as shown already, Christianity and the ancestor cult are both essential. The church deals with God directly through its hierarchy of priests, saints, and Madonna, while the folk deal with their ancestors and other spirits, who are also the servants of God. "Our old parents believe in God faithfully; and the Word of God is the word of our old parents."
We believe in God too, but if we believe in It like them [the old parents], then you see the world change right away like it was” (my italics). In short, the failing faith of the present generation has caused a fall from grace, and people cannot now approach God directly but must do so through the old parents and the church.

In due course we shall notice several other connections between folk creed and church teaching. Purgatory, for example, is widely believed in by Anglicans as well as Romans in Carriacou, perhaps because it permits convenient assimilation of ancestral and Christian beliefs. To the folk, dead souls remain in their graves as long as their descendants remember them individually. Normally this period spans three successive generations: “The people say if you don’t know a man, you can’t make a dream of him, because you can’t recognise him.” During this time the dead souls are in purgatory, as the church teaches; but they remain at their tombs in the villages while in purgatory, and they are sometimes to be met doing their penance on the roads at night. As they fade from individual memory, they withdraw heavenwards, while their dead descendants replace them in purgatory. In similar fashion, the church and folk religions both emphasise such rituals as Requiem Masses, All Souls Day, exorcism of evil spirits, and sacrifice. Their systematic correspondence includes the rites de passage of baptism, marriage, and burial.

Beliefs in dream-messages and in the residence of the dead in their graves are basic to this folk-religion; and each belief supports the other. The old parents who remain in the community express their interest in living kinsfolk by various actions, of which communication through dreams is the most common. This theory of dreams in turn derives plausibility from the belief that the old parents are close at hand.

If I dream tonight, and my parents tell me that they are hungry, they want dinner, and won’t leave me to-day, this is a true fact, you know, we believe it; so I get a quart of rum, a pound of rice; is a very serious thing, you know; is a very serious thing. We don’t mean that they eat after they die, but anything they like when they alive, we put
it inside on a table, and a woman to watch it so that they stop the young people from stealing.

Most dreams are requests for sacrifices. If they are not carried out, punishment will follow.

What they ask for, if I have a cow, sheep, or pig, that beast will fall down and die, or lie down and don’t eat anything, for is the beast they want, and if they ask us and we don’t do what they want, they will take the beast, or we lost our children, or take we ourselves, for they ask us and we don’t do what they want, then they going to punish us.

If he is unable to carry out the required sacrifice promptly, the individual declares his intention to do so by a private rite which consists of a libation of rum outside his home and an offering of a plate of boiled white rice inside, together with a prayer to God for help to hold the sacrifice. Cases of misfortune which befell persons who failed to execute recurrent dream-messages reinforce beliefs in dream-messages and in the old parents’ power simultaneously. Such beliefs sanction descent and kinship, explain mortality, and unify communities. The dreamer must first report his message to his senior kin, who will explain its meaning, and offer leadership or support in its execution. He should not act independently in ritual matters. Even more far-reaching is the principle that one person may receive a dream-message for another and this message must be obeyed. For example, one of the seine-crew at L’Esterre “made a dream” in 1953 which required an unusual kind of sacrifice from the seine-owner. This was obeyed at once, but the “owner” of the sacrifice took no action throughout the proceedings without consulting the dreamer.

The following case illustrates several aspects of the folk religion. A certain woman was instructed to give a sacrifice involving the Nation Dance, and did so. At midnight another old lady attending the dance dreamed that one of the dead who was coming had fallen lame and could not arrive in time. This message reinforced the belief that the spirits arrive at midnight for the dance, and was in turn validated by this belief. It was therefore necessary to repeat the sacrifice, since according to local belief the late-
coming soul could not return to its resting-place until it had received the expected entertainment, and would otherwise remain in the house and punish its members. Eight days later the woman who had held the Nation Dance made a smaller sacrifice. Shortly after this second rite, a third old lady in the same village “made a message in sleep” to thank the woman who had given both feasts and to say that the old parents were very pleased at their treatment. Since the community had contributed freely to help the woman in this distress, the rains fell, the crops flourished, there was an abundance of fish in the sea around, and the harvest was heavy that year.

Sacrifice is the ritual form that integrates the dead with the living, the dream with reality, the belief with the act, and the individual with the society. Only if both persons belong to the same community will one receive a dream-message for the other, or will either act on it. Normally such indirect messages are given to women, and often they are intended for other women. Men sacrifice readily to execute dream instructions that emphasise kinship and descent; but dream-messages may apply to the entire community as well as to an individual, and such messages are generally given through women, whose subsistence activities make them specially concerned with village welfare. Thus in a very real sense the village has its old parents in common, and acts as a unit to discharge common ritual obligations. No one contests the validity of dream-messages that apply to the whole community, but only respected elders ever receive them.

Sacrifice is essential at all public rites de passage. It is the usual form of dream observance and is sometimes communal. In addition, sacrifices are held by individuals or communities without any dream instruction. The intention or cause of the sacrifice is never mentioned, though its immediate purpose may be obvious, such as the village thanksgivings at harvest, which were common until 1945. All major economic undertakings—launching a boat, opening a shop, entering a new house, blessing the seine, or sending out a schooner after careening—require a sacrifice, but only the prosperous make these; the poor are limited to those held at rites de passage and in obedience to dreams. Since ritual obligations increase with prosperity, the rich man is expected to give
a Big Time when he holds a sacrifice; and this event integrates the prosperous and the poor. Poorer folk may discharge their duties by private saraca where only a few kin and friends are invited and only a few fowls are killed. All who attend by invitation contribute to the sacrifice to honour the dead as well as to help the "owner." Appropriately, also, even at kinship rites the offering is made not only to the donor’s ancestors but to all the dead, especially the dead of the village.

Sacrifice is sanctioned by the belief that non-observance will be punished and observance rewarded; but it also brings its holder the respect and repute due to those who fulfil cultural ideals. There are very few in the island who would risk the isolation, suspicion, and ill-repute that go with nonconformity, even if they have no personal fear of the ancestors.

Through sacrifice and the Nation Dance the ancestor cult maintains its vigour, despite the church’s opposition and the emigration of young folk. It mobilises kin and community and enjoins their participation far more effectively than does church ritual. It dramatises community links with the past, and it makes common human experiences significant and sacred. As the folk say, "Sacrifice is good; it have sacrifice in heaven."

Not all dreams are messages from the old parents. Many are simply warnings of things to come. Such dreams consist of symbols, and may be interpreted by reference to a dream book. Thus a pulled tooth means a death, and if the tooth is the dreamer’s, the death will be in his family or kin-group. A funeral means a wedding; a fire means a "confusion," or quarrel. A dead person means the return of an emigrant. Flying means quick news, and so forth. Interpretation of dreams makes use of similarity and contrast alike. Some dreams are also conditional. Thus a man seeking employment may be warned in a dream that if he stubs his left foot on the way to seek work, he will be disappointed. Such precise dream conditions play a variable part in guiding action, but are often employed to rationalise behaviour.

Some more elaborate dreams may warn of coming disasters or reveal cures, as in the following example. A Carriacou man in Trinidad fell ill with malaria. He got a prescription from the doctor which a druggist undertook to supply. That night the
sick man dreamt that he should not take the medicine because "it came from an enemy place." He disobeyed this, however, and when the bottle of quinine arrived he swallowed the lot in one dose after reading the inscription, "one draught." The immediate effect was depressing, but when he recovered the fever had gone. Some months later he developed tinnitus, a dizziness accompanied by ringing in the ears, which results from damage to the nerves of the inner ear, often after an overdose of quinine. The dream was now recalled and understood. The man still had the medicine bottle and, looking again at the inscription, observed that he had only read the first two words. This showed that he had been "tricked" (magically constrained) to misread the inscription. He consulted doctors for relief and diviners for his assailant's identity, and had to abandon his post as a schooner captain as his condition became worse. Eventually he was informed that his condition was unlikely to respond to medical treatment. This confirmed his belief that it was magically caused. Nonetheless, he was quite convinced that all would be well if he could "get a cure in dream." To obtain this dream, the contents of which were unknown, the invalid made his sacrifices promptly and observed all the obligations of ancestor-worship. Besides illustrating the protective role of the ancestors, their ability to advise in dreams, the observance of sacrifice to secure a dream reward, the specificity of dream contents, the simultaneous use of magic, divination, medicine, and ancestor-worship and the explanation of illness, this case also reveals the circular nature of this belief system; but since these beliefs form a system, there are definite limits to the variety of post hoc propter hoc explanations consistent with them. The Carriacou belief in dream guidance does not therefore dispense with logic, although its premises and terms of thought are unfamiliar.

There is no idea of reincarnation in Carriacou, although certain descent-lines are distinguished by peculiar birthmarks such as a tiny gap in the ear lobe. It is believed that conception is followed by the purely physical growth of the foetus for an uncertain period. Later the soul arrives, and still-births are explained by its non-entry. People are believed to have only one soul each—even witches. The soul may wander about at night in its own or an-
other's dreams. In so doing, it may give or take messages, or may come to harm. It may also suffer from witchcraft, evil spirits, or magic. After death, souls are believed to retain their bodily characteristics as well as their interest in affairs of this world.

The soul of the recently dead becomes aware of its condition on the third day after death, the day when Christ left the tomb. Preparations are therefore made to receive it that night at the home in which death occurred. If death was sudden and painless, the newly awakened soul may not need much refreshment; but if the illness was long or agony preceded death, a sacrifice must be made to restore the strength of the soul with the food and drink it liked best. If the agony is intense, the dying person may have a coma, when his soul will travel abroad through the roads and fields for the last time before he dies. At such times, people who are not aware of the invalid's condition may meet and talk with him, only to find later that he was then dying or already dead. Those born with cauls are especially sensitive and often see the travelling soul at its death.

The newly-dead soul needs great care and attention. It is just as attached to its former home as the newly-born infant to its mother, and for the same reasons—succour and nourishment. To supply this, a cycle of mourning rites and sacrifices are held; during this cycle the newly-dead soul accommodates itself to its new situation and gradually enters the society of souls, crossing over the threshold. But during its death and for some time thereafter, the soul is specially vulnerable to magical manipulations and influence.

The soul's vulnerability is most apparent in the preparations for burial. The corpse must be measured by the head grave-digger, who uses a wooden stick. At the same time and by the same stick the soul is measured since it is the counterpart of the body, and once having measured them, the stick commands the souls. Anyone struck with this stick dies soon after. Its owner can command doors to open, and he may also recall the souls measured by his stick from their graves. Grave-diggers are thus the foci of ambivalent sentiments. They are essential at death but dreaded otherwise. Some are leading drummers in the Nation Dance. Such drummers are ritual personages. Grave-diggers are sought after
for magical assistance; they always keep their grave-sticks, which are inherited, with them, and they are fully protected against obeah (magic), witchcraft, and similar evils.

Since spirits remain in their graves, the living have access to them under certain conditions. Grave-diggers are not unique in having power to control them. Twins “in age”—that is, in maturity—are also able to effect this due to their birth. For example, if someone has suffered “interference”—that is, sexual assault or chastisement from dead ancestors in sleep—a twin may be asked to assist. The twin and his client together, will visit the grave of the spirit concerned. The twin will sprinkle rum and water on the grave, lash it three times with a tamarind switch, and order the spirit to cease such behaviour if he does not wish to be beaten. Although it is common for children to be reared by their mothers, the old parents who chastise or interfere with persons in their sleep are usually fathers.

Twins may call up spirits and command them to execute certain tasks, but they will only do so on certain occasions. For example, if divination has established that a death was caused by witchcraft, poison, or sorcery, then the eldest male child of the deceased may seek to punish the person responsible, with or without consulting the rest of the family, and he may ask help of a twin in age. The twin will sprinkle the grave with rum, but the man who is “setting” the spirit has to administer the lashes to awaken the dead, and he must address the spirit personally. If wise, he will give it a conditional command, saying, “If X [the suspect] caused your death, then I deliver him over to you.” If X was indeed responsible, the spirit will then leave its grave and hound him to death, settling in his home and harassing him wherever he may be; but if X was guiltless, the spirit will leave him in peace. If the command was unconditional—“I deliver X to the grave”—then the spirit evoked may turn against the person who evoked it if it is unsatisfied or if X was not at fault. Obeahmen also send grave-spirits against their victims.

We can now understand the curious local beliefs about twins and children born with cauls. Those with cauls certify Carriacou beliefs in the after-life by witnessing the spirits, while twins ex-
exercise a benevolent power over nearby spirits, especially in countering malevolence. Both the caul-born and the twins derive their beneficial powers from God by birth.

Dead souls have more power than the living, and the power of dead souls varies according to their age at death. Infants who die unbaptised have harmless, affectionate souls. Children and young people who die have such weak souls that they are quickly forgotten, especially, perhaps, since grave-vengeance has to be carried out by the deceased’s adult son. Young people just in their manship and womanship cannot practise witchcraft. Age being equal, the souls of the living have less power than the spirits of the dead. In Carriacou, the word “soul” refers to the spirits of living people, while “spirit” refers to the souls of the dead.

Belief in the superior strength of dead souls is an essential precondition of any ancestor cult by which the living conserve traditions through fear of the dead. This belief explains the fright of the caul-born and the existence of specialists who mediate between the dead and the living. It also sanctions beliefs in effective grave-vengeance and leaves the door open for obeah in various forms.

This is not the place for an extended discussion of obeah; but some general remarks on it are necessary. Obeah falls into two classes: book-magic, revealingly called “science,” and a variety of other practices, which use herbs or animal parts and which are generally referred to as “medicine.” Book-magic has the greater prestige and is the more dreaded. Most Carriacou folk have some private knowledge of herbal or animal preparations which may be used to ensure good garden yields or as love potions, cures, charms, and the like. But it does not seem that this system includes techniques for evoking or controlling grave-spirits, although certain “medical” charms or guards are used to ward off spirits. Moreover, since bush medicine is historically and ideologically linked to the ancestor cult, it involves manipulation of dead spirits, who are propitiated by sacrifice. In contrast, book-magic is especially dreaded in Carriacou for its positive manipulation of spirits and souls. Mature persons of either sex may practice obeah, but the “scientists” who practice book-magic in Carriacou
are all male. They are consulted for charms, potions, divination, grave-vengeance, and other purposes, and practice their science for reward.

Carriacou culture operates selectively on the magical lore of such books as the “Titalbeh,” “The Black Arts,” “The Sixth and Seventh Books of Moses,” or “Pow-wows with a Lost Friend.” Some techniques are accepted, others are not. The techniques that operate on humans through the manipulation of souls and spirits have won widest local acceptance, while others that pursue the same ends without recourse to spirits have been rejected. Practices such as the setting of vials or other “dressed” (charmed) objects such as eggs in an enemy’s yard are interpreted in Carriacou as operating on the victim’s soul to produce “home confusion” or “bad living,” rather than on his body to produce incurable sores—as for instance is commonly believed in Jamaica and Grenada. This does not mean that Carriacou people explicitly reject all magic that does not involve souls or spirits. Many magical sequences of this kind have long been known on the island, and on many occasions, such as the case of tinnitus discussed above, the exact character of magical action is difficult to determine. Nevertheless, the islanders, having well-developed ideas about souls and spirits, tend to adopt those foreign techniques which make similar assumptions, and they also interpret different techniques along familiar lines.

In Carriacou then, obeah generally achieves its aim indirectly, by its influence on the souls of the living and dead. Only the less drastic forms of magic do not deal with souls. To produce death or events that lead up to it, the obeahman will normally “trick,” or “spoil” the soul of his victim, or he may employ a grave-spirit to destroy the person. Grave-spirits addressed in correct fashion by expert “scientists” cannot refuse to obey. Normally the spirit is sent to infest the victim’s house until he dies, goes mad, or surrenders to his antagonist. The spirit often gives notice of its arrival by poltergeist effects, by home confusion, or by causing some young person there to “lost away”—that is, to behave abnormally. The victim will ask the priest to exorcise the spirit. If exorcism fails, a Big Drum sacrifice will normally lay the spirit for a time, perhaps permanently; but over the past few years it
seems that the severity of these spirit persecutions has greatly increased, perhaps as the result of scientific advance, so that Grenadian specialists who practice spirit-possession have now been called in. The first ritual involving spirit-possession to take place in Carriacou was held in 1952. Introduction of these Grenadian spirit-possession cults may thus be a consequence of the local increase of book-magic since World War II, and may mark a new phase in the island’s religious history.

Carriacou obeah also includes practices which supplement the traditional sacrifices at a shop-opening or the launching of a vessel. It permits precise discharge of personal tension, even though in error. It also creates many possible sources of tension. Obeah promotes uncertainty about the causes of misfortune, illness, death, and the like; but it also seeks to reduce this uncertainty by divination. Obeah invites and facilitates retaliation precisely because divination can incriminate or acquit. These functions are of interest here in relation to death and grave-vengeance.

In Carriacou belief, a single death may have several causes, each of which has its appropriate counter. Illness may be magically induced, and its conscious remedy must thus be magical, although dreams may reveal a cure. Some illnesses result from breaking taboos, and these can only be cured by the appropriate rites, which normally involve sacrifice. Other illnesses may be due to witches, who must then be driven off to permit recovery. Even well-intentioned spirits may cause illness if their instructions have not been fully observed or if they have not had their meed of respect. A sacrifice will terminate such illness. But if the illness is due to an evil spirit—that is, to a spirit which has been magically set upon the victim—then apart from the temporary relief which a Big Drum dance or firing a rifle inside the house may bring, magical measures must be employed to lay the spirit. In addition, Carriacou people recognise that some illness is due to natural causes; and these may be cured by the Government doctor.

In Carriacou belief the plural “causes” of illness also apply to death. Death from poison is followed by divination to determine the murderer, as well as by post-mortems and police enquiries. Death from drowning is far more frequent; but the “cause” of the drowning must often be established by divination. A spe-
cialised knowledge of poisons is an elementary part of obeah; the discovery of poison is the task of the physician and laboratory technician before an inquest. However, popular opinion sometimes rejects official findings which contradict expectations; in such cases mistakes in the laboratory analyses or misplacement of test-tubes are commonly alleged to have occurred, especially if the suspected poisoner has confessed, as may happen. Carriacou folk do not commit suicide, and I have not been able to trace a case of murder. Since fatal accidents, such as the capsizing of a boat or the first fatal motor accident on the island in 1953, are unusual, they are also explained by obeah.

By virtue of this multi-causal theory of illness and death, it often happens that the same condition requires simultaneous treatment by physician, priest, obeahman, and Big Drum sacrifice. Under such circumstances, natural therapy may be overlaid by the supernatural. This itself shows that the folk recognise no conflict between the principal therapeutic and explanatory systems available to them. In the folk view the physician who treats a magically induced condition single-handedly can expect no more success than the magician who single-handedly treats a complex natural disorder. For the best results, in many cases, the skills of physician and obeahman must be combined by the patient; and the order in which these specialists are consulted largely depends on the circumstances of the case. Unless dreams or conscience direct otherwise, the Government physician is liable to be called in first, after home remedies have failed. Treatment prescribed by the physician may not be followed for various reasons and, in consequence, may not succeed, in which case the belief that magical or spiritual forces have caused this illness is strengthened, and divination may be necessary. Sometimes a second physician is consulted, perhaps to check on the first but more often to get “the needle,” or “life injection.” Since the doctor administers injections himself and these take effect or not irrespective of the patient’s co-operation, they are far more effective than other forms of medication. They are thus regarded as a cure-all and are desired as such. Moreover, since the doctor can “inject life,” his “science” commands as much respect as that of the obeahman; but some people are impatient with inferior sub-
stitute, such as pills or medicine, especially when convinced that magic has caused their illness and that only magic, in the form of a "life injection," can cure it.

If the illness gets worse despite the physician’s medicine, this proves its supernatural causation. After an initial sacrifice to pacify the ancestors, diviners will be consulted to identify the assailant, and magical assistance may be sought to counter and cure. Obeahmen may be consulted locally or abroad, and if the patient dies, energies are focused on retaliation. In such circumstances, the heir may set the dead spirit on the murderer that has been identified by due and proper divination.

In action as well as belief, several conflicting principles and procedures may be employed together. Frequently enough, there may be two or more physicians and an equal number of obeahmen and diviners treating a case, and occasionally the priest also. Each practitioner is usually unaware of the others’ ministrations. Such action is obviously expensive, self-defeating, and anxiety-laden. It is also quite frequent, given the eclectic character of local belief. Health presupposes good relations between an individual and his ancestors, and such good relations may often produce dream-cures when there is illness. Church ritual alone cannot give these dream-cures, and it must therefore be supplemented by the ancestor cult; but now that “scientists” have begun to “use the Devil” to send grave-spirits against the living, even the Big Drum dance may not give full protection, and church exorcisms are often necessary.

The Devil’s role in Carriacou culture has two major aspects. On the one hand, by his activity he indirectly validates church teaching and ritual. On the other hand, he limits the number and type of local obeahmen by removing the unskilled and over-adventurous with greater efficacy than either the church or police. The Devil controls the volume and character of obeah in Carriacou with admirable economy. He removes those who frequent graves inordinately, and those who seek excessive profits thereby, as well as those young and inexperienced sorcerers who mistakenly invoke him in the wrong situations. According to Carriacou informants, the Devil’s standard technique with sorcerers is to offer them special powers and fortune in return for living souls,
the alternative being the sorcerer's immediate removal. Immediate removal is really preferable to this partnership, which will end in the sorcerer's death anyway, but in this case only after diabolic anxiety. The confessions that local obeahmen and others sometimes make at their death provide evidence for these beliefs. Such confessions dispense with the need for divination or grave-magic to determine responsibility for recent deaths.

Thus grave-magic, which is the most dreaded form of sorcery, itself contains conditions that limit its incidence. Local folk say it is unlikely that the four or five leading Carriacou obeahmen raise more than that number of spirits per year; and this may well be the irreducible minimum necessary to preserve a vivid belief in this spirit world. In short, Carriacou is not abandoned to the misguided or misinformed spirits of the dead. Thanks to the Devil, there are limits to local obeah, and Christian ancestral spirits dominate the island.

**Ritual**  Although incomplete, the preceding summary is a fair synopsis of the Carriacou world view and correctly represents the way in which the various elements of this system are related to one another. All the principal rites by which these beliefs are expressed and maintained have already been described, except for the funeral cycle. According to the hour of death, this cycle begins with the wake or the burial. On the third and ninth nights after death, prayer-meetings are held at the deceased's home; and if either of these meetings is omitted, or if the deceased was drowned at sea, there may be a prayer-meeting on the fortieth night. Annual sacrifices or Requiem Masses are held on each anniversary of the death until the grave is entombed with a Stone Feast, when the funeral rites conclude. The period between death and the Stone Feast varies with the ability of the deceased's heirs to finance the ceremony, their emigration, illness, or other responsibilities. The earlier rituals of this series occur at fixed times and have a constant form.

If death occurs before noon, the burial is held that day. Otherwise it will be postponed till the next. The Medical Officer will be called on for a death certificate which registers the cause of death. As he is usually called in shortly before death, he normally
DEATH AND THE AFTERLIFE

has a fair idea of the cause. If the invalid was mature and his illness seemed dangerous, his kinsfolk and neighbours would be informed early, and he would then receive a continuous stream of visitors. It is obligatory for adults to visit their sick kin and neighbours in Carriacou, and when a person is dying they come to say farewell. The resident mate and adult children of the deceased, or close kin, are in charge of his burial. The grave and coffin must be prepared immediately; the priest must be asked to officiate. The death must be announced throughout the island before burial, and if there is a wake, people must be told where. Neighbours know of the death by the ritual wailing of the women, “Wooo, O Yaye, Yaye, Yail” as they throw themselves to the ground. Some men also wail, especially the deceased’s close kin.

The corpse is sponged down, laid on the main bed of the house in which the death occurred, and covered with a sheet. The jawbone is tied and the great toes are bound together; twins and people old enough to be immune from spirits are asked to prepare the corpse. Village carpenters by a form of free group work called maroon prepare a coffin as rapidly as they can with the materials at hand. Grave-diggers are called in, the head grave-digger bringing his measuring-rod; but no man who has washed the corpse may dig the grave. People who combine these functions at a death are punished with periostitis or arthritis. Only women wash a female corpse. The corpse remains naked until shortly before burial, its face uncovered for kin and neighbours to see. Those who washed it keep all equipment they used—razors, scissors, soap, towels, basin, and the like. Married men are buried in black suits, the unmarried in flannel or linen; all women are buried in white. Marriage rings are removed before burial. The coffins of young people are varnished red, those of mature folk are black. Children less than eight years old may not receive the same sort of burial given to senior folk, but wailing is longest and most intense for those who die young. If there will be a wake, some young men are sent around on donkeys to other villages to announce this in fixed ritual form, “Za ki tan, parlez l’autres” (You who hear, tell the others). “X die at —. They goin’ bury him to-morrow at [such an hour]. They holdin’ the wake at Y’s house. Bring your vickles [victuals].” This patois announce-
ment is used only at death, and serves to inform the old parents in the villages as well as the living. Many attend the wake to comfort and reassure the bereaved, for “We have no enemies here at death; everybody is one.”

A wake is an assembly at the house where the corpse remains. If the deceased was old, the assembly will spend the night singing hymns or elegaic patois songs known as cantiques, or sailor songs if the dead was a seaman. Anancy stories are recited, and people play word games such as riddles or question-and-answer games. There is a brief pause at midnight, and some food is served, after which the entertainment continues till dawn, when the visitors leave. If the deceased was an elderly man, a barrel will be broken in his honour by his male age-mates at the wake. A pole is fixed in the centre of a barrel having two crossed sticks above the open mouth; holding these, some old men take the barrel about “the ring,” singing as they bump it on the ground till it breaks. No barrels are ever broken for women or immature males.

The various activities of a wake are spatially separate, and the groups involved usually differ in age. If the house is large, it will have a large table around which the young people sit, singing hymns and drinking coffee. Most of the hymn-singers are young women, but one or other of the young men present will preside and keep order. All the singers will be neatly dressed in their best clothes; despite the mournful singing, some flirting goes on, and assignations are often made at such gatherings. Wakes and prayer-meetings are among the very few occasions when parents permit their unmarried daughters to stay out late. This is understandable, since sex relations are taboo until mourning ceases to all who attend the wake or remain in the house of death.

Just outside the house, a little way from the hymn-singers is a four-cornered “ring” with benches along its sides and in the rainy season a covering of bamboo or coconut branches. Bottle torches (masantos) and oil lamps light up the area on dark nights. It is in this ring that the Anancy stories are told, the cantiques or sailor songs sung, and the barrel broken. Between one Anancy story and the next, riddles are banded about. The people here are mainly very old or very young, representing alternate generations, but old men are the principal actors. Their
narrative styles and techniques are matters of pride and interest. To be known as “A ’Nancy Story Man” is a mark of esteem to men over fifty and brings invitations to all wakes and prayer-meetings in their part of the island. As a rule there are three or four expert tale-tellers at any ceremony, and these take turns telling tales, trying to cap one another. Although ring activities are purely secular, they have little sexual undercurrent. Throughout the night, the hymn-singing and story-telling proceed separately, the young people remaining at the table in the house, while the elders tell their children or grandchildren the history of Compere Zien and his wife Zing Zing outside. Rum is drunk by the men at the ring.

Anancy or Zien, the hero of these tales, is a mythical spider who bests his opponents by cunning and wit and gets out of ticklish situations by craft. The cycle of Anancy stories is widespread throughout the Caribbean and has clear West African origins and inspiration, Anancy himself having a Kromanti—that is, Akan—name. Besides these Anancy stories, other animal stories are recited at Carriacou funeral rites. Each tale is preceded by a patois song, the story-teller singing the theme as he hops into the ring, while the audience responds in chorus, clapping their hands at the narrator’s gestures. This continues until a vigorous rapport has been established; then the story-teller abruptly discontinues his singing with the cry “Cric!” to which the audience replies “Crac!” as he plunges into his tale. Virtuosi tell their stories with various embellishments, digressions, and repetitions of the opening song and chorus. On each occasion the singing ceases with the leader’s “Cric!” and the audience’s “Crac!” Every tale is an individual performance, although the audience provides an accompaniment. As one story-teller ceases, another jumps in the ring to recite.

The content of these Anancy stories closely reflects the culture. In this sense the tales are educational and express cultural values and adjustments to various situations. They are guides to behaviour within the contemporary society and outside it, not simply survivals from an era of slavery. In each generation they are subject to change and addition, and through these processes of reinterpretation they have continued to perform their func-
tion of portraying the culture and evaluating behaviour in different social situations.

Group recital of these stories is limited to funeral ceremonies; as the most elaborate self-reflective cultural expression, they are the appropriate secular response to the presence of death, being humorous, lewd, vulgar, unsentimental, rich with portrayal of deceit, vanity, and ambition, occasionally gruesome. Morals explicitly attached to these tales are clear inventions. Their hero, Zien or Anancy, is an inimitable trickster whose adventures mirror local life. Yet the cumulative significance of these tales is profound. They state the aims and desires of the living; they describe the frustrations, stratagems, and humour of their condition, and they reaffirm the value of society in the face of death.

Dying persons may ask to be buried alongside their mother or other kin; where possible, these requests will be met, but there may be difficulties. In Carriacou there are two kinds of cemeteries, those belonging to the Government, in which grave-spots cost $2 BWI (8/4) each, and private or family graveyards. Such villages as Harvey Vale have Government cemeteries nearby, but most of the villages lack Government cemeteries, and bury their dead as of old in family graveyards. However, recent immigrants to a village may lack a family graveyard, and they will then be buried in cemeteries which belong to their affines or kin in the community. Contrariwise, large lineage groups within a village may have two or more graveyards but little space in them, due to the pressure of their numbers on lineage land. In such circumstances, some members may be buried in the cemeteries of other family lines—for instance, with their maternal kin; but location of a person’s grave is important to the individual and his kin.

It is said that the priest may refuse to perform the burial service for people who showed little interest in church affairs while alive. In this case the burial service will be read by one or another of the literate villagers regularly called on at such times. Burial normally takes place at about four o’clock in the afternoon. The priest or his substitute visits the home where the body lies waiting after the people assembled have had a last drink in memory of the deceased. The corpse lies in an open coffin and nothing is placed beside it. Before the priest or his substitute comes, any
close kinsman of the deceased who feels strongly that a particular person has caused this death, may go to the corpse and address it in such terms as "I deliver X to you." Naturally, such public application of vengeance magic is very rare. The service is held inside the house, with prayers and hymn-singing, and the coffin is then taken out to the appointed place by men who are usually, but not always, kin of the deceased. It is then lowered into the grave, and the rite concludes with the formal wailing of women. The assembly lingers about the grave after the priest has gone, singing and drinking.

Mourning begins at death and must be observed strictly for forty days, after which its intensity diminishes. It is initiated ceremonially at the wake or funeral. Until the ninth night, the bereaved receive visitors each evening, and all sit together, singing hymns and praying, until midnight, when they all go to sleep in the house, the visitors leaving at dawn. These visitors are mainly close kin, neighbours, and friends of the bereaved. The great majority belong to the same community; there is no need to invite anyone on these occasions, since the house is open to all members of the village. Moreover, "is a society here that, when somebody die, you come and carry a shilling or 36 cents or so, and give them, or a dollar to the wife or husband. . . . If you can't come that time, you bring your gift the day of the third night." For these nine nights the bereaved are never left to sleep alone. By its attendance, the community protects them against the newly-dead spirit and demonstrates its care for the household and its own bereavement at their loss. The shared mourning creates solidarity and reintegration, and it also reduces individual distress by spreading the loss among many sympathisers. Sex relations are taboo to all who remain in the bereaved home for the nine nights after a death.

In mourning, widows wear black, remain in the home, may not go out alone, may not dance, may not have sexual relations, and should not play cards, although they may smoke and take alcohol. The deceased's father and siblings will wear black armbands, while the mother, like the widow, wears a black dress for at least the first forty days after death. During this period the deceased's children observe similar behaviour restrictions and wear black or
white. Mourning prohibitions apply only to parents, children, and wed or co-resident mates, although non-resident mates may voluntarily undertake them. When a man dies, his mother, but not his widow, is obliged to wail formally each morning.

Women preside over wakes and prayer-meetings, while men preside at sacrifices and Big Drum rites. Sacrifices are necessary for both the third and ninth night ceremonies. The sheep and chickens to be sacrificed are sprinkled and led around the house before being despatched in the morning. Two "parents' plates" are usually prepared, corn, bluggoes, sweet potatoes, and peas being added to the meat and chicken of the sacrifice. A glass of rum and one of water and a lit candle are placed beside this offering on the table in the main bedroom. All present in the house may be called to kneel down and recite the Creed, the Hail Mary, and the Lord’s Prayer as the sacrifice is placed on the table. The newly-dead soul revisits his former home on the third, ninth, and fortieth day after death, before settling down in his new home, the grave.

If the deceased left a will, it is read at midnight at the third or ninth night ceremony, when the spirit returns to the house. The executor or senior witness of the will should read it, if he is on the island. Not to do so casts doubt on the validity of the will. In Carriacou, most people die intestate, and few wills are ever registered, but their contents become well known through recital on the third or ninth night. Since women generally survive their husbands, the latter's estate is normally administered by his widow during her lifetime. If the deceased leaves no widow, his heirs postpone execution of the will or partition of his estate until the deceased has been properly tombed, and until then, unless the will has specified otherwise, the deceased's land remains under the control of his spouse or eldest child, who should contribute most to the costs of his funeral. Often the eldest child is absent, and in practice the one who contributes most to the funeral has temporary charge of the estate, even though the others must be consulted on any change.

Funeral expenses are heavy, since it is essential to show respect and love for the deceased by a good burial. Apart from funeral costs, food and drink for the prayer-meetings must be bought.
Few families on the island can finance the wake and the third and ninth nights unaided, and without the community contributions mentioned above, these funerary rites would probably disappear. In fact they are obligatory on bereaved and community alike. In a very real sense, the community is “a friendly society,” sharing its funeral expenses as well as its grief. However, families that suffer a succession of deaths may substitute the cheaper Requiem Masses for these prayer-meetings. Requiem Masses cost $10, $15, or $20 (BWI), according to style, but entail no general distribution of food and drink.

The wake or burial opens a ritual cycle which closes when the grave is tombed. This tombing may be delayed for ten or twenty years after death or only for two. Whenever it occurs, the tombling is celebrated by a Stone Feast for the setting up of the tombstone. Entombment is obligatory for all mature or senior dead, but sometimes wealthy persons will also tomb their children. Delays in the entombment and Stone Feast are generally due to their cost; but these ritual responsibilities are clearly defined. Widows should tomb their husbands before they die themselves, receiving help from the husband’s kin and his children. A man does the same for his wife, being helped by her kin as well as his children. Orphans obliged to tomb either or both their parents can rely on assistance from their father’s brothers and sisters and from their mother’s kin if the tomb is for her. Orphans will set about tombing their parents under the leadership of the eldest son. They distribute the cost according to their individual means, although equality is the aim. Unequal contributions may be used later to support claims for unequal shares of the inheritance.

The foundation for a Carriacou tomb usually requires four bags of cement at a local cost of $13 (BWI) in 1953. Masons’ fees vary between $12 and $14 (BWI). In 1953 the marble facing of the tombstone cost about $40 (BWI) in Trinidad, with transport costs extra. Another $75 (BWI) or more is required for the Big Time at the Stone Feast. This Stone Feast consists in the usual distribution of rum and food, but the sacrifice that accompanies it requires as many beasts and fowls as possible. Thus the minimum cost of a Stone Feast will be about $140 (BWI) or £30, which is more than the average annual cash income of Carriacou house-
holds. Emigrant heirs are the main contributors to their parents' Stone Feasts, and even if settled elsewhere, they will try to return to the island to attend the entombment.

Between the end of mourning and the entombment, the deceased is by no means forgotten. On All Souls' Day and at other times of the year, his grave will be cleaned and flowers may be placed on it. At All Souls' the grave is surrounded by burning candles, all the family being present, and candles are also burnt in church that night in memory of the deceased, while others are lit on the doorsteps, to guide the dead spirits revisiting their homes. On these, as on all other occasions when the living visit the grave, they must pour a libation upon it and pray for health and strength. This rite is essential whenever the living initiate interaction with the dead.

A saraca will be held in the home of the dead annually on the day of his death; but there is no Big Drum on these occasions or at private saraca held in response to dream demands by the deceased. In preparing such rites, all who share responsibility for the Stone Feast are consulted, and attend if they can, bringing their contributions and sacrificing their fowls. When the offering is to be made, the assembled family kneel before the parents' table in the main bedroom. The owner of the sacrifice asks God for help with the entombment, and asks the old parents to be content with this plate, which is the best they can manage for the moment. Sometimes this prayer may be made by the senior kinsman present. All the family dead are called on as usual, and the rest of the night is then passed in praying and singing hymns, with no Anancy stories or other diversions.

The cultural alternative to these private saraca is a church Mass for the dead, and for this the names of all dead members of the family and descent-line are written down and handed to the priest to recall in the service. Both churches in Carriacou hold such Masses; but occasionally these Masses or private saraca fail to satisfy the ancestors, who return in dream to demand the Big Drum. Such a demand arouses anxiety, and the senior kinsmen of the deceased will be consulted immediately and asked to help. Such requests mobilise lineage interests and assistance, even though the major cost of the ritual will fall on those responsible
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for entombing the deceased. People who delay in holding the Stone Feast are often visited by their offended ancestor with demands of this sort. But once the tomb has been erected, the dead person never returns to trouble those who have fulfilled their duties. "The stone is the last you see. After that they never ask you for anything. Your part finish." The youthful dead hardly ever make these demands for food. Only dead ancestors or collaterals with whom one has lived may do so. The help which lineage kin will give a sibling group whose untombed ancestors repeatedly demand the Big Drum, reflects the lineage opinion of them. If the siblings are too poor to finance the Stone Feast, their kin will help with the Big Drum; but if there is reason to believe that they can finance it, the lineage may not do so.

The Stone Feast marks the final discharge of a person's obligations to his or her parents and guardians and thus the full assumption of maturity and independence. The inheritance should only be distributed after the Stone Feast, which is always a Big Time, with widely publicised preparations leading to a large gathering. Stone Feasts are not simply occasions of individual achievement and rejoicing. The lineage and community also celebrate the event, and visitors attend from all parts of the island. The main preparations, of course, relate to the stone and accompanying sacrifice, but there may not even be a stone to set at the grave head. Tombs with marbled headstones are known locally as "expensive tombs"; those without have a cement foundation which may or may not be engraved. They sometimes have a wooden cross at the head, and these are known as "local tombs." The type constructed varies with the family's means. Expensive tombs are preferred to local ones, and the latter are only set up by people who fear they might die before fulfilling their duties. Once a tomb is set up, nothing further is done to it.

The day before the stone is put in its place, the foundation of the tomb is laid down by a mason. A relative of the dead person accompanies the mason to the tomb and sprinkles it with rum and water before the earth is disturbed. The mason then makes his libation, apologises for disturbing the dead, and sets to work. Children assist by bringing small stones. The mason leaves a recess in the tomb face for the stone to be erected on the morrow.
Meanwhile, at the home of the person setting up the tomb, the beasts are sacrificed, while the stone is being collected from the mason’s shop in Hillsborough. Five libations of rum and water are made to the stone: first by his kinsman, normally the head of the deceased’s descent-line, sent to collect it from the workshop; next, on its arrival at the home of the feast, the household head will sprinkle it in the yard; then when it is removed from the hall to the bedroom, before being “dressed” it will be sprinkled again by the deceased’s family; and when it is removed from the bed to the tomb next morning, the fourth libation is made. Finally at the tomb the mason also sprinkles it before hoisting it into position.

Throughout the rite the stone represents the deceased, and when the deceased’s spirit returns at midnight during the feast to enjoy its last sacrifice in its old home, it settles permanently on the stone. Thus the Stone Feast is a second and final burial which brings peace to dead and living alike. On its way to the tomb, the stone is carried on wooden poles by the deceased’s kinsmen, who set it to rest on chairs when they change hands, exactly as is done with coffins. But the only prayer addressed to the stone is that made by the senior kinsman who first received it, when he asks for health, strength, prosperity, and long life, while pouring his libation. Like the corpse before its burial, the stone also is put to lie on the same bed and covered with a veil.

Two varieties of Stone Feast seemed to be current in Carriacou in 1953. One involved a Big Drum dance without the usual “Beg Pardon,” since this, like marriage, is an occasion of pure celebration. In the other version, the bass and tambourine accompany the stone to the yard, are then dismissed, and the feast proceeds as a prayer-meeting with cantiques and hymns but without any of the secular accompaniments such as breaking barrels, Anancy stories, sailor songs, or the like. Stone Feasts of the second type are still quite rare, and are only conducted by those too poor to provide the traditional Big Time. When the Big Drum accompanies the Stone Feast, dancing starts at 4 P.M., after the sacrifice has been laid on the parents’ table beside the bed where the stone rests. The feast continues, apart from the usual break at midnight when the ring is wet again for arriving spirits, until
dawn, when the saraca is distributed and people make ready to
conduct the stone to its tomb.

"They carry the stone same as they carry the body," with one
exception, namely that, as becomes an occasion of pure rejoicing,
the stone's procession is often accompanied by bass and tambourine. Otherwise, only hymns are sung. While the stone is being
set up, there is more hymn-singing, but when it is in place, the
gathering disperses without further ceremony. The tomb, with
its brave new stone, is a witness of its builder's devotion to future
generations as well as to those past and present; by keeping the
deceased's name alive, the stone helps to stabilise relations among
his or her descendants, all of whom will be taken to see the place
in their youth, when the achievement and values which it repre-
sents will be explained to them. Among these values, age is im-
portant, and in a sense, aging continues after death, just as kin-
ship and descent continue. Since women are usually buried in
their husbands' family cemeteries, graveyards are linked with
patrilineal groups. Finally by this rite of reburial which concludes
the Carriacou life cycle, the lineage ancestors are transformed
from forlorn and slightly menacing spirits into friendly custodians
of kin and community.
PART III
KINSHIP AND MATING
Introduction

Although I have tried in preceding chapters to describe the context of Carriacou society rather than the society itself, some reference to the social organisation has been unavoidable. Our problem now is to describe this organisation by defining its components and measuring their incidence, and by analysing their interrelations to determine whether they constitute a single system, and if so, how that system works. We shall also have to show how the mating, family, domestic, and lineage organisations of Carriacou are connected, despite the plurality of forms. Finally, we must enquire how the kinship organisation influences community life and promotes social integration.

Because the mating organisation has a central position in the kinship system and in the society as a whole, it is an excellent point of departure, and I shall analyse it first. I propose to begin with an essentially quantitative description of Carriacou mating...
drawn from my census of L’Esterre, my island sample, and a genealogical census of Harvey Vale. In Chapter 9 I shall then discuss the differing individual relations which enter into this mating organisation, paying special attention to their economic, domestic, and ritual features, as well as their differing distributions of rights, duties, and controls. In Chapter 10 I shall discuss the domestic organisation with which this mating system is linked, using data from my study of Carriacou households. By this analysis I shall try to extract the principles which govern domestic organisation, and I shall call these principles “the family structure.” When these principles have been set forth, we shall be in a position to examine in Chapter 11 the relations between mating and family organisation and to discuss lineage relations directly. In conclusion I shall try to show how the kinship and community orders are connected.

Throughout this discussion I shall restrict the term “mating” to those unions which involve conception, cohabitation, or community consensus and familial action. Where paternity is disputed, I cannot speak of mating. Where the community and kin of a couple who live apart regard them as mates, the relation possesses duration and the tolerance, if not approval, of the partners’ families, as well as public recognition. We cannot speak of clandestine or casual relations as mating, since such relations lack public recognition or family sanction.

**Sex Differences in Reproduction**  The adult population of L’Esterre in 1953 is analysed in Table 7 by sex and age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the ratio of females to males at L’Esterre is slightly less than the average for my island sample, especially in regard
to the reproductive period between 15 and 54, it is still remarkably high and thus typical of the whole island. Consequently, having made a thorough study of L'Estérrere, I shall use data from this community to illustrate and define the mating experience of Carriacou adults, and I will then compare L'Estérrere frequencies with others from the island sample. In Table 8 I have therefore classified the adults of L'Estérrere by sex, age, and mating status in 1953.

The categories of Table 8 require one comment. They form a series and describe marital status in 1953 rather than mating history. Thus persons who cohabit consensually are classified as such, provided they have not married, whether childless or not, but married persons who cohabited consensually before their marriage are excluded from the consensual category and are listed among those married. Of the five L'Estérrere couples whose marriage followed previous cohabitation, two females and one male were widowed after separating from their spouses. Such details are omitted from the classification which informs Table 8.

With regard to the 14 males and 24 females aged between 15 and 24 years whose mating records are either non-existent or not known, the great majority are adolescents whose relations lack public definition. Having defined mating as a conjugal relation which is publicly recognised, either through parenthood, cohabitation, or community consensus and familial action, unattached persons are classifiable as never having mated, not mating at the time of survey, or position not known.

There were 45 men living at L'Estérrere in 1953 who had experience of mating. Of these, 7 were childless or had no living descendant. Of the childless males, 3 were married and 4 single. Of the 9 unmarried fathers in this village, 4 had children by one woman each, another 4 by 2 women each, and one by 5 women. Together, these 9 men had experienced 17 matings and begotten 30 children. Of these matings, 8 had borne only one child each, 5 had produced 2 children apiece, and there were 4 unions with 3 children apiece.

Of the 27 married fathers, 9 had children by one woman each, 9 by 2 women apiece, and a further 9 by 3 women apiece. Thus these 27 men had participated in 54 matings, giving an average of 2 each. Twenty-four of these matings had yielded one child, while
<p>| Mating Status, 1953 | Males | | | | | | | | | | Females | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                   | 15-24 | -39 | -54 | -69 | 70+ | All | 15-24 | -39 | -54 | -69 | 70+ | All |
| Childless single persons | 8 | 1 | - | - | 9 | | 8 | 1 | - | - | 9 | |
| Mating now not known | 6 | - | - | - | 6 | | 16 | - | 1 | - | 17 | |
| Never mated | 1 | 2 | - | - | 3 | | 3 | - | - | - | 3 | |
| Not mated in 1953 | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | |
| Mating in 1953 | 14 | 1 | - | - | 15 | | 26 | 3 | 1 | - | 30 | |
| Total childless single persons | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Single parents* | 2 | 1 | - | - | 6 | | 6 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - | 6 |
| Mating now not known | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | |
| Not mating in 1953 | - | - | - | - | 6 | | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | - | 5 |
| Mating in 1953 | - | 5 | 1 | - | 6 | | 3 | - | - | - | 5 | |
| Total single parents | 2 | 6 | 1 | - | 7 | | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | - | 20 |
| Consensually wed, etc.† | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | 5 | | 5 | - | - | - | 5 |
| &quot; in 1953 | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | |
| &quot; separated, childless | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | |
| &quot; , with children | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | |
| &quot; , widowed, single | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | | - | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | |
| Total consensually wed | 3 | 2 | 1 | - | 6 | | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 12 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married persons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married, spouse present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married, spouse absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated, single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total married persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Widowed persons</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed, single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total widowed persons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 matings had yielded 2 children; 3, 3; 7, 4; one, 5; and 12, 6 or more. These 27 married fathers had a minimum of 154 children between them.

The village also contained two men who had separated informally from their wives. Both had children—one by 2 women, the other by 4. Their 6 matings had produced 10 children, 4 unions yielding only one child apiece while the other 2 yielded 3 children each.

The 38 L’Esterre fathers had begotten a total of 200 children by 76 women. Of these 38 men, 13 had all their children by one woman and 14 had children by 2 women, 10 by 3, 1 by 4, and another by 5. Of these 200 children, 35 had no full siblings and 48 had only one full sibling each. On the average, each father had had children by 2 women, and there were no significant differences between married and unmarried fathers in this respect.

Of the 85 women at L’Esterre who had already participated in mating by 1953, 9 were childless or lacked living issue. Of these childless women, 4 were married. There were thus 76 mothers in the village, only one of whom was less than 20 years of age. Thirteen were between 21 and 30 and 18 between 31 and 40. Forty-four were over 41 and unlikely to have further children. The 76 resident mothers included 28 who had never married, 28 who had married, 13 widows, and 7 women who had separated informally from their husbands. Of the 28 unmarried mothers in this village, 14 had borne children for one man each, 9 for 2 men each, 3 for 3 men each, and 2 for 4 and 5 men respectively. Of the 28 wives, 21 had had children by one man, 3 by 2 men each, and 4 by 3 men each. Of the 7 women who had left their husbands, 6 had had children for one man and one for 2 men. Of the 13 widows, 10 had all their children by one man and 3 by 2 men.

These 76 mothers had therefore made a total of 113 fertile matings, giving an average of 1.5 matings per mother. Fifty-one women had all their children by one man, 16 by 2 men, 7 by 3 men, and 2 by 4 and 5 men respectively. The 28 unwed mothers had a combined total of 50 fertile matings. The 28 wives had engaged in 39 fertile matings; if widows and separated wives are included, then the 48 married mothers of L’Esterre had a total of
63 fertile matings between them, with an average of 1.3, as against the average of 1.8 per unwed mother.

Of the 76 mothers, 22 had only one child each, 16 had 2 children, 10 had 3, another 10 had 4, 5 had 5, and there were 15 with 6 or more each. Between them, these 76 women had borne 240 children, or an average of 3.2 each. The 38 L'Esterre fathers had an average of 5.3 children each.

The only L'Esterre mother below the age of 20 had one illegitimate child; the 13 mothers aged between 20 and 30 had borne 35 children, of whom 18 were unlawful; the 18 women aged between 30 and 40 had a total of 66 children, of whom 26 were unlawful; the 44 women above 40 years of age had between them borne 138 children, of whom 48 were unlawful. Of the 240 children borne by all these women, 93 were illegitimate.

Of the 113 fertile unions in which these women had participated, 64 had yielded one child each, 17 had 2 children each, 6 had 3 children each, 10 had 4 children each, one had 5 children, and 11 unions had produced 6 or more children each. Since the 240 children borne by these women exceeds the aggregate issue of the 38 resident fathers by 40, this difference is the minimum number of children borne by L'Esterre women for men not resident there in 1953. Some of these absent fathers were villagers who had emigrated, others were members of other communities on the island, others had died, and a few were foreigners.

The 38 L'Esterre fathers averaged 2.6 children per fertile mating. The married fathers had an average of 6 children by 2 fertile matings each; the unmarried men had an average of 3 children each by an equal number of matings. The majority of the unmarried fathers belonged to the junior age groups, and none was over 51 years of age in 1953.

It is true that age influences reproductive output; but the average number of children borne by the 44 women over 41 is the same as the average for all 76 mothers, so that in Carriacou average fertility does not appear to increase beyond a certain age. This equivalence may be due to the selective effect of marriage among island women. Although marriage and high fertility go together in Carriacou, only three-fifths of the adult women
can marry, and those who remain unwed suffer a sharp decline in probable fertility as age increases. The magnitude of this decline is apparently equal to the increased fertility which marriage confers. In short, middle-aged women who remain unwed lose their chances of child-bearing to younger women more quickly than do their married age-mates. Of the 113 fertile matings in which the 76 L'Esterre mothers had engaged, only 48, or 42 per cent, were marriages, but 61 per cent of their total issue were legitimate. The 65 fertile extra-marital unions in which these women had engaged had an average fertility of 1.5 children each, while their 48 marriages averaged 3.2. Thus, for women fertility in marriage is twice that of other mating forms.

Whereas our L'Esterre fathers averaged 2.0 fertile matings apiece, these L'Esterre mothers averaged 1.5. Whereas the men averaged 2.6 children per fertile union, the women averaged 2.0. Thus the average number of children per father was 1.6 times as great as the average per mother. Of the L'Esterre fathers, one-third had had children by only one woman; but of the L'Esterre mothers, two-thirds had all their children for one man. There were 24 men and 25 women with 2 or more fertile matings apiece—two-thirds of the married men belonged to this group, as against one-quarter of the married women. Clearly, men suffer no great restriction of sexual activities at marriage; women do. For the latter, marriage means surrender of sexual independence to their husbands. Our sample contains no married woman who had borne another man's child during her marriage. In compensation for their loss of independent sexuality, married women enjoy increased fertility. Exactly half of the L'Esterre mothers have only one child apiece, while the remainder average 4.5 children each, and all women with 6 or more children have married. Of course, as already mentioned, several of these married women had borne children for men other than their husbands before marrying. But on the average, twice as many unwed mothers as wives have children by two or more fathers. Put otherwise, only one-third of the women who have had children for only one man are unwed. Even so, it is clear that single motherhood does not imply plural mating, although single status permits it.
The 24 L’Esterre fathers whose individual mating careers involved 2 or more unions apiece have an aggregate of 62 fertile matings and an average of 2.5 each. The 25 women with 2 or more matings apiece have a total of 62 fertile matings between them. However, it would be wrong to assume that these 24 males and 25 females were engaged in a game of sexual musical chairs. Each sex group includes individuals whose mates are not included in the other, for reasons already given.

The 200 children of the 38 L’Esterre fathers include 69 born out of wedlock, giving an illegitimacy ratio of 34.5 per cent. The 240 children of the 76 women include 93 illegitimates, with a ratio of 38.6 per cent. Thus, although the overlap in the mating relations of these two groups is undoubtedly high, their recorded unions do not correspond exactly. Little more than one-fifth of the women of L’Esterre who bore illegitimate children subsequently married men who were not the fathers of these children. In several other cases, single mothers married their children’s fathers. Some data on these points have already been presented in our account of engagement. Men have approximately 2 legitimate children to every one illegitimate; for women the ratio is 3 legitimate to every 2 illegitimate. Seventy-eight per cent of the children of the L’Esterre married fathers were legitimate, but even so, these men had an average of 1.4 illegitimate issue apiece. Six of the 10 children of informally separated married men were illegitimate. Including widowers, the married fathers had an average of 6 children apiece. Seventy of these children were under 10 years of age in 1953, 11 per cent of them being unlawful. Fifty-six of these children were between 11 and 20, and of these, 15, or 27 per cent, were unlawful. Another 17 were over 20 but less than 30, and of these, 9, or slightly more than half, were unlawful. There were also 19 children between the ages of 31 and 40, of whom 3, or 15 per cent, were unlawful. Of these 27 married fathers, 8 were less than 40 years of age, 10 were between 41 and 50, and the remainder over 50. None of the 8 younger married fathers had children more than 20 years old; and few of the men over 51 had children less than 10 years old. We can interpret these figures as indicating a tendency for married men
to reduce their extra-marital affairs, especially during the early years of marriage. Our data also suggest that married men in their prime displace their seniors in the competition for single women.

**Age at Marriage** I was able to collect precise information on the age of both parties at time of marriage from only 24 L'Esterre couples. Although this sample is small, it includes most of the 29 L'Esterre couples currently married in 1953. Of these 24 wives, one had married when she was 17, three when they were 18, and another 10 between their 20th and 24th birthday. Thus 14, or approximately three-fifths, of these women had married before they were 24. Another 5 were between 24 and 29 years of age at the time of their marriage, and the remaining 5 were over 36. Of these last 5 women, 3 were between 36 and 38 years of age at marriage, one was 40 and the other was 64. Over three-quarters of these married women had wed before they were 30, and 4 of the remaining 5 finally married as they entered middle age. Undoubtedly, the pattern is for girls to marry young. Those who are unwed at 24 struggle to marry before they are 30, beyond which age there is a six or seven-year period when they may cohabit consensually or mate extra-residentially with men whom they try to marry.

Of the 24 husbands of these women, 5 had married between their 22nd and 24th years and another 5 between their 24th and 30th; thus approximately 40 per cent of the men had married before they were 30. Another 8 married between their 30th and 33rd years. Thus three-quarters of these men had married before they were 33. Of the remainder, 2 had married in their 36th year, 2 when they were 41, one had married when he was 47, and the other at 59 years of age. Almost certainly, these 2 late marriages were preceded by "keeping"—that is, by consensual cohabitation. The sharp increase in the incidence of marriage among men between 30 and 33 requires little comment: this is the latest period by which L'Esterre men should provide the homes and furnishings necessary for marriage. Two-fifths of the men marry before they are 30, but only one-fifth before they are 24.

Almost three times as many women as men marry before they are 24; the number of men and women who marry between 25 and
30 is equal; but almost twice as many men as women marry between 30 and 39 and three times as many between 40 and 47, beyond which age marriage is rare for either sex.

Among these 24 couples, spouses were of equal age in two cases. In another three, the wives were older than their husbands—in two instances the age difference being one year, in the third, 5 years. Of the 19 husbands who were older than their wives, 11 were less than 6 years older and 7 were between 7 and 11 years older. In one case the man was 19 years older than his bride. On the average these 24 men were 4.33 years older than their wives. This analysis of age differences among spouses shows that men generally marry women who are their juniors by several years. In most cases where the age difference is 5 years or more, the men may have had unsuccessful engagements before marrying.

Of the 15 L'Esterre men between the ages of 15 and 24 in 1953, only one had married. Of the 17 L'Esterre men between 25 and 39 at that time, 8 had married. Of the 18 males between 40 and 54 then living in the village, 14 had married. Of the 10 men above this age, 9 had married. In short, the overwhelming majority of men over 40 are, or have been, married.

Of the 33 L'Esterre women below the age of 24 in 1953, only 2 had married; but half of the 24 village women between 25 and 39 had already married. Eighteen of the 30 women aged between 40 and 54 had been married, as well as 20 of the 28 women above this age. It is possible to interpret this increase in the ratio of married women in senior age groups as due to the greater security which marriage gives women, as expressed in lower emigration and death rates among them. Even so, the incidence of marriage among males is far higher than among women, in the aggregate and by age groups. For comparative purposes, the distribution of marital condition and parental status among the island sample is given in Table 9.

To compare this distribution with that given in Table 8 for the L'Esterre adults, it is sufficient to multiply the figures in Table 8 by three, since the number of L'Esterre households studied was one-third of the island sample. However, my information for L'Esterre was fuller than for the other communities studied; consequently, the L'Esterre analysis lacks the category, "Single,
otherwise not known.” A casual examination will reveal the remarkable correspondence between these two samples, once these different levels of knowledge are taken into account.

Casual examination of Table 9 is also sufficient to reveal the distribution of mating experiences by sex and age in Carriacou. Of the 77 men below the age of 24 in the island sample, 3 were single fathers and 2 had cohabited, one of these by marriage. Clearly, men do not generally form domestic or reproductive relations with women before they are 24. Of the 51 men between 25 and 39, 11 were single fathers, 3 were cohabiting consensually, and 20 were married. Of the remaining 19, we lack adequate data for 15. Of the 41 men in this sample aged between 40 and 54 years, 36 had already married and 2 had cohabited consensually. Twenty-one of the 23 men aged between 55 and 69 had already married, together with all above this age.

### Table 9. Island sample: all adult members classified by age, sex, marital condition, and parental status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital condition and parental status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>70+</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, otherwise not known</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, childless</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensually wed, widowed or separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married in 1953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of 106 young women below the age of 24, 7 had married, one was cohabiting consensually, and another 11 were single mothers. Like males, women do not normally enter into mating before they are 25. However, we lack adequate data on 40 childless young women of this age group. Of 91 women in this island sample aged between 25 and 39 years, 23 were single mothers, 6 were cohabiting consensually, and 39 had already been married. For all the remainder our information is incomplete. Of the 82 women between 40 and 54, 18 were single parents, 36 married, and 9
widowed, while one had cohabited consensually. Thus 55 per cent of the women in this age group had already married, as compared with 88 per cent of their male age-mates. Of the 86 women aged between 55 and 69, 9 were single mothers, one had cohabited consensually, 28 were married, and 34 had already been widowed. Thus 72 per cent of the women of this age group had at some time been married, as against 92 per cent of the corresponding males.

We can safely exclude all adults below the age of 24 from further discussion, since they take little part in mating at that age. This leaves 128 males and 287 females above the age of 24. Of these 128 males, 32, or 25 per cent, are single persons. Of the 287 females, 112, or 39 per cent, are single. Whereas 71 per cent of the men at some time had been married, only 167, or 57 per cent, of the women had been. Of these 167 women, 82 lived with their husbands in 1953, 24 had absent husbands, 9 were informally separated, and 59 were widowed. The incidence of marriage is especially high among men of senior age groups. As we should expect, there is a higher incidence of single parenthood among women also. The most striking feature of Table 9 is the extremely low incidence of consensual cohabitation (keeping) therein represented. Of these 205 men, only 7 had cohabited consensually without marrying thereafter. Of the 393 women, we know of no more than 9 who have done so without marrying, and another 2 who did so after marrying.

The island sample contains 5 adult women for every 3 adult men, and between the ages of 25 and 54, women outnumber men by two to one. Since marital status and household position vary according to age, it is useful to examine the distribution of mating and parental status among the heads of the 224 households which constitute the island sample.

Without entering into a discussion of household headship or its distribution, we may notice some obvious features. Females form 58.5 per cent of this sample of household heads. Since they outnumber males by two to one in Carriacou, this need not surprise us. Among males, headship is associated even more closely with marital status than with age. The only married male below the age of 24 is the only household head in his age group; of the
20 married men between 25 and 39, 15 are household heads; and of the 35 married men between 40 and 54, 33 are household heads. Above this age the correspondence is complete for males. For women, on the other hand, marriage has the reverse effect. Only one of the 82 women who lived with their husbands was recognised as household head. However, all 59 widows were heads of their own homes, as were all 7 widowers.

**Table 10. Island sample: household heads classified by sex, age, and marital condition, and parental status.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital condition and parental status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, otherwise not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, childless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensually wed, widowed or separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married in 1953 *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes 2 men and 5 women separated from their spouses

Of the 107 single males in the total sample, only 4 were heads of their own homes. All 4 were above the age of 25. Of the 210 single females, 49 were household heads, and 25 of these were single mothers also. All 49 single female household heads were above the age of 25. Whereas single males who were heads of their own homes formed only 12.5 per cent of the total number of single males above the age of 25, single females who were household heads formed 44 per cent of the corresponding female group. In short, whereas few male household heads were unmarried, most female household heads are either unmarried or widowed.

**Village Endogamy** To determine the forms and frequencies of mating within and across community boundaries, I shall use data from L'Esterre. In 1953 this village contained 45 men and 85 women with mating experience. Of the 45 men, 42 were mating at the time of my visit, and of the 85 women, 48 were mating then. To calculate the ratio of intra-village matings from the mat-
ing careers of these individuals, we must analyse the sum of all their unions, including those current in 1953. Thus we shall be concerned with all the unions of these 85 women and 45 men.

Of the men, 7 were born outside Carriacou. Three of these aliens were reared from childhood at L'Esterre, 2 were married in L'Esterre, and 2 were cohabiting consensually. The 3 younger men brought up in L'Esterre were mating extra-residentially. Of the remaining 38 men, 37 were natives of L'Esterre and the odd man had moved to L'Esterre after marrying a woman of this village. Of the 37 men born in L'Esterre, 3 had brought their wives from other villages in Carriacou and one was cohabiting consensually with a woman born abroad. Thus 33 of the 45 men in this sample chose their mates from their own native village. Of 32 marriages entered into by all 45 men, 26 were purely intra-village affairs and 2 involved alien males.

Of the 85 women with some mating experience, 2 were born abroad but had come to live in the village after marrying L'Esterre-born men. Thirteen had been born in other villages of Carriacou, and of these only one did not cohabit while mating at L'Esterre. Three of these 13 women had cohabited consensually at L'Esterre and the remainder had all married into the village, 4 of them being widows in 1953. The remaining 70 women—that is, 82 per cent of the total—were L'Esterre natives. Of these 70 women, 5 had mated with natives of other Carriacou villages but remained at L'Esterre; of these 5 inter-village unions, 2 were extra-domestic, one was a consensual cohabitation, and 2 involved marriage. Another 2 L'Esterre women had mated overseas with foreigners, while 7 L'Esterre women had mated at L'Esterre with people born abroad. Three of these last 7 matings were marriages, 3 were consensual cohabitations, and one was extra-residential. The remaining 56 L'Esterre-born women had mated with L'Esterre men only. Thus 80 per cent of the native women of L'Esterre had mated with L'Esterre men only, while 33, or 89 per cent, of the 37 native L'Esterre men had mated with women from this village.

A different measure of village endogamy is obtained by including all L'Esterre residents, irrespective of birthplace. In this case, 56 of the 85 women were L'Esterre-born persons who mated with other natives of the village. Of the 45 men, 33 were in a similar
position. Thus, the ratio of intra-village mating among the total adult male population of L’Esterre was 72 per cent, while that among the females was 65 per cent. The proportion of intra-village marriages is even higher; but the very small number of unions at L’Esterre in which neither of the principals were natives of the village is especially impressive. There were only 3 cases of this kind in the total just analysed. In effect this means that the great majority of L’Esterre natives had kinsfolk on their mother’s and father’s side living in the village.

Of these 85 women of L’Esterre, 15 had moved into the village, most of them because of mating. Of the 45 males at L’Esterre, 5 had moved to the village upon mating and 3 others were aliens brought up there. Thus, women move to their husbands’ villages more frequently than men move to their wives’ villages. Within the village, the locus of cohabitation is not critical. Men should build their own homes on their own land before cohabiting, and generally they purchase house-spots within the community. But as the couple’s kin are close at hand and married folk very rarely live with their parents, the location of the household is only important with regard to inter-village unions. Community preferences for intra-village mating and for virilocal residence where inter-village matings involve cohabitation ensure stable associations between children and their agnatic kin, with a few deviations.

To determine the connection between community membership and mating type, let us examine the sample of 85 women. As shown in Table 8, in 1953 L’Esterre contained 39 wives, 13 widows, 20 single mothers, and one childless woman who was mating extra-residentially. Of the 52 married women, 40 were natives of the village, 10 were born in other Carriacou villages, and 2 were born overseas. Of the 12 women who had cohabited consensually, 9 were born in the village and 3 elsewhere in Carriacou. All 20 women who had mated extra-residentially were natives, and of these extra-residential unions, 2 involved men living in other villages, while 3 involved aliens brought up at L’Esterre. Thus 75 per cent of the extra-residential relations and consensual cohabitations of L’Esterre women were with L’Esterre men, while 87 per cent of their marriages were with natives of the village.
The Character of Conjugal Relations In Carriacou, as we have seen, there are three types of conjugal relation, one of which is extra-domestic or extra-residential, while the others involve cohabitation, with or without marriage. Of these three mating forms, consensual cohabitation is the least esteemed and has the lowest incidence. Marriage, the most esteemed, has the highest incidence, and the natives of Carriacou do not regard casual, clandestine affairs as mating or conjugal unions.

In the following chapter I shall discuss these differing forms of conjugal relation in greater detail. Here I wish to consider their implications for Carriacou parenthood, especially as regards the distribution of responsibilities for children. The legitimacy of children implies their parents’ marriage; but as we have seen, many children are born to couples before they marry, and in some cases the parents of these children do not marry one another in the end. Although marriage is the only conjugal union that legitimises offspring, it does not entail higher degrees of co-residence among parents and children than does consensual cohabitation. In this respect, as in many others, the structural opposite of marriage is the extra-residential, or non-domiciliary, union. All the children of such extra-residential unions will be illegitimate, and whether the union continues in its present form or breaks down, almost all of them, during their infancy at least, are likely to remain with their mother apart from their father. If former extra-residential mates cohabit, legally or otherwise, they usually take their children to their new home. Thus, cohabitation redefines parental roles, and these are further redefined by marriage.

There are some deviations from this simplified pattern: after marriage, a man may go abroad, leaving his wife and children alone or with their kin, to all intents and purposes in much the same position as the extra-residential mate; or the married couple may emigrate, leaving some children with their kin in Carriacou; or a man may keep some of his children by extra-domestic unions in his home or in the homes of his kin, while his mate may also distribute hers among her kin in other households. The death or separation of the parents introduces other variations. The single widow living alone with her children occupies a position similar to that of the independent single mother. If a woman co-
habits after separation from her previous mate, she will usually take some of her children into the new home. Given the variety of conjugal forms and the inherent instability of such relations, it is clear that the distribution of children and the definition of parental roles will vary according to the conjugal relations and the mating histories of the parents. Granted such divergences in conjugal forms and parental roles, we have to ask whether and in what way the total body of mating and family relations forms a system of inter-connected parts or elements. To answer this question, we must, in the first place, consider mating and family relations separately and then relate them to one another. In Appendix A, I examine this question of unity in the mating organisation. Here I wish to consider the distribution of children and parents, paying special attention to differences of birth status since these differences imply others in the conjugal relation of the parents. For this purpose we may examine the residential position of the 200 children of the 38 fathers at L’Esterre whose mating histories have already been discussed. These data are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Children of 38 L’Esterre men, classified by birth-status, sex, marital status of father, and residential position with regard to father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s marital status</th>
<th>With fathers</th>
<th>Not with fathers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unmarried</td>
<td>— — 3 5 8</td>
<td>— — 11 9 20</td>
<td>— — 14 14 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Married</td>
<td>47 52 2 1 102</td>
<td>14 14 17 15 60</td>
<td>61 66 19 16 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Married and separated</td>
<td>1 3 — — 4</td>
<td>— — 5 1 6</td>
<td>1 3 5 1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48 55 5 6 114</td>
<td>14 14 33 25 86</td>
<td>62 69 38 31 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LS lawful (legitimate) son
LD lawful (legitimate) daughter
US unlawful (illegitimate) son
UD unlawful (illegitimate) daughter

To simplify this table, I have omitted age classifications. However, the relevant details are easily set down. Of the 28 children of unmarried fathers, only 5 are over 10 years of age, and all these are less than 20. Of the 162 children of married fathers, 70 are under 10, 56 are less than 20, 17 are between 20 and 30, and the other 19 are over 31. Of the 10 children of informally separated
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married men, 5 are less than 10, 3 are between 11 and 20, and the other 2 are less than 30. In aggregate, 98 of these 200 children are below 10 years of age, and 64 are between 11 and 20. The remaining 38 are divided equally among the next two ten-year spans. Half of these 200 children are boys. Sixty-five per cent are legitimate, the remainder being the children of unwed parents, born outside cohabitation. Of the total, 43 per cent live away from their fathers and more than two-thirds of these are unlawful. Of the 131 legitimate children in this sample, 107 are less than 20 years of age—that is, they are too young to live on their own. Of the remaining 24 legitimate children, only 3 live with their fathers, the others being on their own, either overseas or in Carriacou. Only 7 of the 107 lawful children below the age of 21 live apart from their fathers. Of the 55 unlawful children less than 21 years of age, only 10 lived with their fathers, and 8 of these were children of current consensual cohabitations.

These data demonstrate the definitions of parental roles and residential placement which characterise the alternative conjugal forms practised in Carriacou. Cohabitation almost always entails co-residence of the elementary family. Extra-domestic mating is usually extra-marital mating also, and it involves the residential dispersal of the elementary family. In consequence, unlawful issue are usually accommodated in the homes of their mothers or their mothers’ kin, while lawful issue are brought up in their fathers’ homes, and the unlawful issue of consensual cohabitation remain with both their parents in “women’s houses.” The principles which govern these distributions are expressed most clearly in the residential placement of the lawful and unlawful children of men who have married and then separated. Of these 10 children, the 4 legitimate ones lived with their fathers, while the 6 illegitimate ones did not.

We can summarise these data simply. Men often have children by non-domestic unions before they marry, and they usually continue to do so afterwards. Married men keep their lawful children in their own homes until the latter are about 21 years old, after which they either emigrate or marry and establish their own homes. But whether or not they are married, men leave their illegitimate offspring by extra-residential matings in the care of
the children's mothers. When married men emigrate singly, their lawful children remain at home with their wives, and the migrant fathers, so long as they are physically fit, retain full responsibility for their families.

These facts indicate that the dominant principle of descent among legitimate issue is patrilineal, whereas among illegitimate issue, uterine or materterine kinship may be of equal significance. By comparing the distribution of L'Esterre children absent from either of their parents, we can check this formula indirectly. Since most Carriacou men are married and also participate in plural matings, some residential differentiation of the children of these men by different types of union is unavoidable. Unmarried men, whether or not they have plural mates, can have their children with them only if they themselves live with some close kinswoman, such as their mother, or with the mother of their children, in a keeping union. To examine the influence of these factors in Table 12, I classify all L'Esterre children absent from either of their parents by reference to their birth status, residential position, and kinship with the guardian.

The children whose residential and birth status are described in Table 12 are offspring of the 38 men and 76 women of L'Esterre whose mating records we have already discussed. As shown in Table 11, 86 children of these 38 fathers are separated from them. Consequently, 15 of the 32 children classified as "away from both parents" in Table 12 are children of these men, the remaining 71 being entered in Table 12 as "away from fathers." Of the 240 children of these 76 women, 89 live apart from them, and of these, 56 are adults, either abroad, keeping, married, or otherwise on their own. Of the 68 young children who live apart from either or both of their parents, only 10 are with their fathers' kin and only 10 are legitimate. Of the 58 illegitimate young children separated from either or both parents, 35 are with the mother and

1. Professor Isaac Schapera, who recently introduced this term, defines it as follows: "I use this term [from Latin matertera, maternal aunt] for cousins whose mothers are sisters." See Isaac Schapera, "Marriage of Near Kin among the Tswana," Africa, 27, no. 2 (1957), 139–59, especially p. 154, text and footnote 2. In the present discussion, I extend the term further to include all persons whose parents were themselves materterine cousins—that is, persons whose grandparents were sisters or the children of sisters.
Table 12. Children of L’Esterre parents, absent from either or both, classified by residential position and kinship of guardian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guardian’s kinship status</th>
<th>Away from fathers</th>
<th>Away from mothers</th>
<th>Away from both parents</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Mother (wed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Mother (single)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Mother (keeping)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With M and M’s M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With M and M’s F and M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With M’s Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With M’s F and M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With M’s sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With M’s kin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. With Mother and/or matern-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al kin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With F’s Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With F’s F and M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With F’s sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With F’s kin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. With paternal kin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (A) and (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With non-kin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. On their own</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L legitimate (lawful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U unlawful (illegitimate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mother’s kin and 15 are with the mother’s kin apart from the mother; thus 50 of these 58 illegitimate minors are in the care of their mothers or mothers’ kin. It would be difficult to imagine a more convincing demonstration of the principle that mothers or
their kin are responsible for accommodation and care of young unlawful children begotten in extra-residential relations.

Of the 131 lawful children of these 38 men, only 28 live apart from their fathers; of these, 21 are adults on their own, 2 live with their fathers' kin, and 5 live with their mothers' kin. Of the 93 illegitimate offspring of these 76 women, 33 are adults on their own, living away from their mothers; only 23 of the 60 remaining minors are not with their mothers, and 15 of these live with their maternal kin. Thus matrilocal residence is the norm for illegitimate offspring of extra-residential mating in the same way that patri-local residence is the norm for children of domestic unions almost all of which are based on marriage. The data presented in Appendix A show conclusively that these alternative modes of mating together form a single interdependent system.
Cohabitation and Its Opposite

In the preceding chapter we examined the mating organisation from different points of view by means of various samples. In this chapter I wish to discuss these differing mating and family relations at an individual rather than a statistical level.

"To be important here, a man must marry and have children." This is true but incomplete. Marriage implies cohabitation and presupposes the man’s ownership of a house. Thus, to be important, a man must build or acquire his own home, marry, and live in it.

However, as we have seen, cohabitation need not be based on marriage. Consensual cohabitation, or keeping, is permissible in "women's houses" under certain conditions. While the islanders use this mating form to adjust to certain situations, they nonetheless disapprove and eschew it. In L'Esterre, for example, at the
time of my visit, there were only six unions of this type. In one of these, an informally separated wife lived with a man born abroad and in her own house as household head. In four of the remaining cases the women involved had come from other villages, and three of these were orphans expecting to marry shortly.

If a single man and woman live together in a wooden house, the woman is classified as a prostitute, because there is no impediment to marriage. Only in the case already mentioned of the separated wife who could not remarry did I find a couple keeping in a wooden house. Of the fifteen "dirt houses" at L'Esterre in 1953, ten were inhabited by women and their children, and the other five by couples keeping. In short, keeping is rather an anomaly. It either precedes marriage or follows on its dissolution; it lacks the normative character and religious or legal sanction of marriage, and reveals the man's economic failure.

In Carriacou, the structural alternative to marriage is extra-residential mating. Marriage is a conjugal relation with legal sanctions and a domestic form. Non-domestic unions are not recognised by law and lack direct legal sanction. They are open to unmarried individuals of both sexes and to husbands, but not to wives. For married women, all extra-residential unions will have been pre-marital, but for 40 per cent of the women of Carriacou they are the most frequent, and maybe the only, form of mating.

Extra-residential unions may be classified by reference to betrothal. The extra-residential relation which develops in betrothal differs from that contracted by independent women living alone or with their children in homes of which they are heads. The visiting pattern in these situations is seldom possible for young girls living with their fathers, although a few may permit their daughters to receive visits from prosperous married men, who undertake to maintain the girls.

Extra-residential unions which are free to develop into marriages must be distinguished from those which cannot because the men are already married. Other important differences between these unions include duration and fertility. Although most non-domiciliary unions rarely produce more than one child, many do. Unions which bear two or more children are clearly neither
casual nor clandestine. In addition, many extra-residential unions of varying duration produce no children. Of the eighteen unwed L'Esterre women who were heads of their own homes in 1953, about one half received visits from their lovers, and several were almost wholly dependent on their lovers for support. The fact that extra-domestic unions generally dissolve after varying periods in no way reduces their significance; such dissolution cannot be taken to deny the conjugal character of these unions. Married couples also separate informally. Dissolution itself presumes the existence of the union thus dissolved.

Marriage, keeping, and extra-residential mating are quite distinct forms, but each accommodates a wide range of individual variations. These variations require greatest attention when the form is least fixed and stable. Of the three mating forms, the extra-domestic union is clearly the most flexible and the most open to change and development. Often the immediate cause for a change in form is quite simple, as in the following case.

A woman in her early thirties lived with her mother and brother, and received visits from her lover at her home. She already had children by other men as well as this one. Eventually she wanted him to spend the night with her. Her mother objected, quite correctly, and ordered her out of the house. The woman and her lover set about building a dirt house on a nearby slope, and established their common household. Thus this extra-domestic union was converted into keeping through the mother's action, despite the fact that neither of the partners had yet considered marriage.

This case illustrates the rule that parents will not allow their children to cohabit consensually in their home. Indeed, only five or six households in our island sample contained couples living in homes of which their parents were head. In all cases the parents were mothers, and the couples were married. Keeping unions are never permitted in parental homes. Hence this mother's objection when her daughter proposed to keep her lover overnight. The extra-residential union is thus quite distinct from keeping, and only becomes consensual cohabitation when the partners set up their own dirt house. Alternatively a couple can marry, and the woman may remain with her parents while the man emigrates to
obtain the money needed for his own house. Women who engage in extra-domestic unions while living in homes of which they are heads are all unwed and free to marry or to cohabit consensually; but their lovers are usually married men who cannot contract new domestic relations without repudiating their marriage.

Aging parents prefer their children to mate extra-residentially rather than to keep. This preference encourages married men to establish extra-residential relations with unwed females “in their womanship,” whether or not these women have children or live with their mothers. Since married men cannot receive visits from a mate at their own home, and will rarely be allowed to visit her if the woman lives with her father, they rarely maintain extra-residential relations with girls who live in their fathers’ homes.

Such factors tend to reduce the variability of extra-residential unions. This variability is partly due to the differing circumstances and social roles of the mates. Such variable relations contrast sharply with the highly uniform definition of roles in marriage and keeping.

In all three mating forms the women must remain faithful to her mate. Not to do so is “adultery,” and the man is obliged to break off the relation. For men, the position is different. Married men and those who mate extra-residentially may engage in plural mating; those cohabiting consensually may not. The man who is keeping cannot establish an extra-domestic union without repudiating his current domestic one. Either his keeper ejects him from her home, or she will take steps to break up his “outside” relation. Being herself an unmarried mate, committed by her cohabitation to seek an early marriage with her partner, she lacks the security of the wife and cannot tolerate a rival. Since the house is hers, her partner occupies a weak position and will rarely attract other women. When a couple who have been mating extra-residentially set up house together in a keeping relation, the man must therefore abandon his other mates. Since conjugal extra-domestic relations are publicly known, clandestine or casual affairs are not regarded as mating.

These clandestine or casual relations are difficult to enumerate or classify. Although obviously common to most societies, they have special importance in the mating organisation of Carriacou.
Casual or clandestine sex relations are almost all extra-residential, but do not qualify as conjugal or mating relations since the condition of "adultery" cannot apply within them. The woman engaged in clandestine relations with one man is free and likely to do so with another, and, the relation with her lover not being exclusive, adultery cannot develop. Since in this culture women alone can commit adultery, only if the clandestine relation becomes an open exclusive association is the woman recognised as her lover’s "keptress," and she then becomes subject to the adultery regulations, since the union is no longer casual or clandestine.

"Children in passing" or those whose paternity is disputed are offspring of clandestine affairs, which men regard as "nothing to speak of." These affairs rarely turn into stable unions and are almost certainly discontinued. Relations which are "nothing to speak of" cannot produce two or more children. Community opinion about these relations is influenced by the status of the man and by his promptness in "claiming" the child. If the girl is betrothed to someone else, she loses prestige and may find her position at home very difficult. If she is independent and "in her womanship," the possible ambiguities of paternity are recognised, but her age and ability to manage her own affairs eases her position.

An important condition which distinguishes casual relations from others is the possibility of their continuous development. The Carriacou conception of mating emphasises the chance of development. Married men with a stable extra-residential relation may also have affairs, but regard these new relations as "nothing to speak of," unless they can be maintained. Young men who are pledged to marry one girl may have casual relations with others, but do not thereby contract any permanent obligations.

The casual relation is further distinguished from conjugal unions by its specificity and shallowness. It is limited essentially to sexual intercourse, and its conditions are undefined even with regard to the exclusiveness of the sex relation. As if to symbolise this, the men demonstrate their "principle" and regard these relations as "a paid-for time." As we have seen, such payments are intermittent and irregular, and the casual relation is not fully commercialised. It is therefore quite as different from prostitution on the one hand as it is from the conjugal union on the other. None-
the payments are mainly in cash, and they indicate the man's belief that his lover may also have other men. If the relation persists and deepens, cash transfers diminish and gifts in kind of fish, produce, wine, or cloth increase, at the same time that the woman undertakes some domestic duties for her new mate, such as preparing food or washing his clothes. Such "domestic" activities characterise extra-residential relations and give public expression to the reciprocities of mating.

**Alternative Parental Roles**

Parental roles clearly differ according to the types of conjugal union. This being so, I now wish to describe the principal alternative forms of parenthood associated with the diversity of mating forms discussed in Part II and analysed statistically in Chapter 8. Later we shall discuss relations between parents and children more fully.

However situated with regard to one another, parents and children are a family in Carriacou. But in Carriacou usage the word "family" refers to a cognatic descent group of variable constitution: for example, the speaker, his resident mate, and their issue; or the speaker, his parents, and grandparents. Collateral kin may be included in either of these two family groups. In yet a third usage, the term "family" refers to the domestic group; but even if the children live apart from this group, they belong to their parents' family. However, children who belong to their parents' domestic group are members of their family in both senses of the term, while those who live elsewhere are only included in the descent group.

Since extra-residential matings are common and usually involve some separation of parents and children, the islanders have special terms to distinguish children according to residence and birth status. Moreover, since parental roles vary with sex, men and women classify children somewhat differently.

Men classify their children by birth status as lawful (legitimate) or unlawful (illegitimate). They also distinguish between them by reference to residence: children who live with their fathers are called "home-children," or "house-children," and those who live elsewhere are called "outside-children." Most outside-children are also illegitimate, the offspring of non-domiciliary unions. How-
ever, some illegitimate children may live with their fathers, either in keeping unions or apart from their own mothers in the father's married home. Thus unlawful children are not always outside-children. Lawful children may also be living elsewhere, but this is unusual. Indeed there is an insistence that married men support their wives and children in their own homes, and few people “ask for” such children. Thus, despite inevitable variations, for men the lawful children are generally house-children and the unlawful ones are normally “outside-children.”

Here again, keeping is anomalous. In such unions the unlawful children are house-children. Unmarried men who mate extra-residentially seldom employ the preceding classifications, since all their children are unlawful and such children are rarely with them at home. These differing classifications thus express the different paternal roles associated with the alternative mating forms.

Whatever the mating form, young children are left with their mothers. In consequence, women do not distinguish between house-children and outside-children, even though some of their children may be living elsewhere with their kin. Such absent children are referred to by their mothers as “the ones at my sister,” “the ones at my mother,” and so on. The distinction between their unlawful and lawful children cannot arise for unwed women. Thus, unwed parents of either sex scarcely differentiate their children except by reference to the other parent, although women sometimes refer to a foster-parent. There is a fairly close equivalence in this respect between unmarried fathers and mothers.

Married women, also, rarely apply the classification by birth status to their own children. They avoid this differentiation, since both sets of children normally live with them or indirectly under their care and both have equal inheritance rights to the mother’s personal estate. However, if they wish to distinguish their lawful and unlawful children, married women describe the latter as outside-children, even when they are living at home with them. Thus, whereas the married man’s classification of outside-children is based on residence, his wife’s is based on birth status. These differing references aptly demonstrate the principal differences in parental roles between the sexes and between individuals of the same sex.
There are other variations of this classificatory scheme. Wives often bring their own unlawful children or young kinswomen into their husbands’ homes, since the husband is obliged to care for his wife and family, including his wife’s other children and unfortunate kin. The husband may include these accretions in his domestic family, but will not refer to them as his house-children, since they are not of his blood. On the other hand the wife may describe her resident junior collaterals as her own or her husband’s house-children or family, even though she may still differentiate her own resident illegitimate children as outside-children if necessary.

Women whose grandchildren live with them will denote these by reference to kinship as “my daughter’s children” or “my son’s children.” They never classify them simply as lawful or unlawful children, though they may add this qualification if pressed to do so, saying “my daughter’s lawful children.” They may also occasionally refer to these children as house-children, but never as outside-children. Most commonly they describe them as their “grans.”

As we have seen, few adults remain with their parents after their twenty-fourth year. Before they reach this age, their parents may die, or the young people move out or abroad. When offspring move out on their own, the house-outside classification used by married men no longer holds; but the married woman’s house-outside classification, which is based on marriage, does. Widowhood emphasises the distinction between a woman’s lawful and unlawful children in terms of her dead husband’s estate and the children’s funerary duties.

“Adoption” or fostering introduces further variations. Children may be adopted by their godmothers, and they are then referred to as “god-children”; but if they are adopted in early infancy, after their mother’s death, they are referred to by the woman who nursed them as “my children.” If they are taken at a later age, they are described as “my adopted child” or “my house-child” by their female guardians. Since men are not directly responsible for the care of children, they rarely initiate fostering themselves, and will do so only for a close kinsman’s child, who is referred to by kinship terms. However, married women must obtain their hus-
band's consent before adopting children into the home, and in this way the husband becomes the children's guardian and includes them in his family.

Children "in passing" or those of uncertain paternity are simply described by their mothers as "my children"; strangers find difficulty in getting more specific classification, while other villagers would not need to do so. The *fida* names already referred to express assumption of full parental responsibility by the mothers of such children; and even if they live apart from their mothers, they will be designated by reference to her. Similarly, children who are fostered by a series of different people will be described by reference to their mother. Single childless women, who are the most usual foster-parents in Carriacou, speak of "my adopted child," or "so-and-so's child," but not "my house-child."

The classifications we have just been considering are a key part of Carriacou kinship terminology. They vary according to the domestic group, the mode of mating between the parents, and the guardian's marital status. The classifications used by married men neatly express the dual mating relations these men maintain. In their domestic and non-domestic unions their paternal roles are sharply distinguished; and despite obscurities of common usage, the resulting family ties are also distinct. The house-children belong to the man's family more fully than do the outside-children. Use of the term "family" to refer exclusively to the household group indirectly reveals this. When outside-children are included in their father's family, the term refers to a widely ranging group of cognates inhabiting several households rather than to the closely knit domestic group. The variable classifications that men apply to their children contrast sharply with the simple uniform reference made by women. The greater differentiation which men affect is associated with the fact that most men are married and maintain a greater variety of parental relations, besides having a greater number of children. In short, whereas the woman's parental role remains fairly constant despite variations of mating, the man's is defined by the mating relation itself. For the woman, the variable relation is that between herself and her mate, and this is defined by the mating form. Whereas the bond between mother and child is fixed and unbreakable, whatever the circum-
stances, men say “the house-child more cleave after you [the father], and so you take more care of them.” Moreover, since the house-children are almost all lawful, “the men cleave to their own lawful.” The fact is that children brought up with their mothers or mothers’ kin are closely assimilated to her family and are correspondingly differentiated from the father and his house-children. But men rationalise these differing paternal roles in terms of the children’s fondness for them.

One further point worth mention here is the variable composition of the domestic units indicated by these schemes of classification. This variability is clearly structured and reflects on two levels the complex mating organisation of Carriacou; the forms of conjugal unions are distinguished by residential criteria and by the differential distribution of their offspring in domestic units of differing form. When these conjugal alternatives have been discussed, we shall be able to study their relations with the domestic organisation.

**Husband and Wife**  
Marriage is the ideal mating form in Carriacou, and the most frequent and durable conjugal relation. Despite its intricacy and complexity, the form of this union is also the most clearly defined: the many-sided relations between husband and wife have important ritual, residential, sexual, economic, and authority aspects, some of which are purely personal while others have social ramifications. Even dissolution of marriage by death does not annul its obligations, as we shall see when considering inheritance and succession. In view of the complexity of this mating relation, I shall describe each aspect in turn, hoping thereby to provide a reasonably full picture.

The sexual aspect of marriage has already been discussed in various contexts. The men may have other mates, but their wives must remain faithful to them. The married couple generally live in the man’s home, and, as master of the house, the man can eject the unfaithful wife without ceremony the moment her infidelity is known. I could only find one man in Carriacou who had retained his wife after she had been unfaithful. If a couple is abroad, the man will send his unfaithful wife back to his father or, if his father is dead, to hers. This cultural emphasis on female fidelity is not
peculiar to the marriage relation; but in Carriacou, men rarely make advances to one another's wives whether the husbands are on the island or not. Men respect married women and treat them in a quasi-fraternal fashion. Perhaps this attitude reflects the importance of agnatic lineages. The husband's agnatic kinsmen watch over his wife in his absence, and they also render assistance when she needs it.

Married men often remain overseas for considerable periods, and sometimes they never return. Unless they intend desertion, they remit money to their wives and families in Carriacou as regularly as they can, and in this way they maintain the marriage relation, fulfil their obligations, and demonstrate their wish to return. Nonetheless the grass-widows suffer sexual deprivation. Such women know the consequence of unfaithfulness too well to risk it. They rarely live alone unless they are pregnant or have several small children. To recall their husbands they generally allege some illness, but if this fails they may establish homosexual relations with other women.

Women who practise such homosexual relations are referred to in the French patois as madâvine or zami. Not all madâvines are married by any means, but many are said to have adopted this habit during their husbands' absence overseas. Unwed girls may also enter such relations while living as wards of their senior collateral kinswomen. Once developed, these Lesbian appetites may reduce the woman's interest in men considerably and eventually lead to a breach in the marriage relation. The active partner is always the elder, and has usually been married. Senior Lesbians may have several partners who must be kept apart to avoid the disorder that their jealousy provokes. The men are well aware of these relations but dare not discuss them with the women's husbands. Men say that "women are hotter than men"—that is, they have stronger sexual appetites—and consequently only women can satisfy one another. Female homosexuality is explained thus, and its existence is taken to prove this explanation. But, in fact, men often marry women several years their junior and then depart overseas, having imposed severe prohibitions on their wives' heterosexual relations, with the result that some wives adopt Lesbianism as the only alternative open. No definite rule seems to guide
husbands in the treatment of Lesbian wives. Some men dismiss their wives after unsuccessful protests while others increase their own extra-marital relations. Once women cultivate this particular habit, they are unlikely to abandon it lightly.

It seems certain that local priests know of this practice, but it is unlikely that they are informed about individual cases. The priests are therefore unable to act effectively. Indeed, from the point of view of the church, the problems of illegitimacy and single parenthood may seem far more important.

There is no male counterpart to female homosexuality in Carriacou. Nor is the practice to be explained on biological grounds since the active Lesbians generally have heterosexual records and are often mothers. In effect, Carriacou Lesbianism is a form of deviance stimulated by the island culture and partially institutionalised in it; its existence demonstrates the remarkable constraint imposed on women by the mating system. The fidelity of Carriacou wives is the pride of their men and the puzzle of nearby Grenadians; but the Lesbianism which has developed in this context is not well known abroad. We have here a neat example of the way in which a culture and society may promote abnormalities among normal folk; and some knowledge of these abnormalities is necessary for a full understanding of this complex mating organisation, which is permissive to males, restrictive to females. I could trace only one wife among the hundreds whose histories were known who had borne an unlawful child after marriage, although many had been left by their husbands for rather long periods.

Lesbians exchange gifts, the senior receiving perfume, as becomes a male in this culture, while the junior is given earrings, underwear, and the like. The wives of prosperous men may have several junior partners since they can afford the necessary gifts. If these women reject their husbands, their marriages may break down, as in this case. A rich man’s wife had an attractive female partner. The wife rejected her husband’s attentions, and he then made advances to her Lesbian mate. Being well off, he left his wife, acquired another home, and moved there with his wife’s concubine. After the latter’s death, he mated extra-residentially with yet another attractive young Lesbian whose father’s grave he
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obligingly tombed and to whom he gave a house near his own, but during the man's frequent absence abroad the young woman resumed relations with other madivines, although her mother tried to control her. The man's wife lost some of her influence with younger women in consequence of his withdrawal of economic support. Poorer men who cannot discredit their wives in this fashion may be sexually insecure if they have been abroad too long. They may also seek to excuse their absence and justify their actions by reference to these Lesbian practices.

We have seen that men suffer no restrictions of sexual activity through their marriage. The parents of young girls naturally disapprove of advances to their daughters from married men; but the important man who undertakes to support the girl and her offspring may be accepted. Unwed females "in their womanship" are free to mate as they please, whatever their domestic situation. Thus, except for the Lesbian relations which upset men, sexual jealousy is limited to females. Men abruptly terminate any relations which give cause for jealousy, but women are neither expected nor permitted to retaliate in this way since they depend on the men for maintenance. Fights between a man's wife and his mates are exceedingly rare on this island, although a wife will generally know about a man's extra-residential relations and frequently refer to them. Sometimes the man will discuss these relations with his wife and ask her advice. The wife's complacency is appreciated by her husband, but he will not object to her scolding or nagging, so long as this does not threaten his dominance and the marriage. Married women, for their part, avoid extremes of protest which endanger their unions. The real purpose of their objections is to reassert priority of the lawful family's claim on the husband's income and attention. Although a man's extra-domestic matings may produce some tension, most wives accept them as a condition of their marriage. In this regard it is significant that Carriacou women do not attribute their infants' deaths to the malice of rivals, a common allegation in nearby Grenada. Rivalry between women is limited by the permanence and fixity of the marriage bond and by the precedence accorded the wife. The extra-residential mate of a married man is quite free to break off her relation if she receives insufficient attention; but the man
is obliged to place his wife first to avoid accusation of "brutalising" her.

Regular sexual relations between husband and wife are assumed, and pregnancy does not unduly interrupt them. Intercourse is resumed soon after child-birth, and women who have given birth twice in twelve months are applauded for fertility at the same time that they are teased for "heat." Marriage, despite its prominent domestic side and the status it confers, is regarded as a primarily sexual relation, and the relatively small number of local marriages that break down through sexual maladjustment indicates that most Carriacou couples are well suited.

Sex is assumed to be the primary aspect of any relation between men and women of the same generation. Girls who allow men to speak to them are deficient in self-respect because it is assumed that such conversations "put question"—that is, solicit sexual favors; and men and women of similar age who are not kin are systematically separated in order to prevent sexual relations. Separation is formalised at prayer-meeting, in rituals, and in visiting. Since all first cousins and all agnatic second cousins are prohibited from mating with one another, they are also forbidden to associate freely in public. Such restrictions are regarded as necessary precautions against breaches of taboo.

Husbands and wives observe similar formalities in public. Each usually goes to church or market with persons of their own sex or alone, but if they proceed as a couple, the wife follows behind the husband at a set distance. Such Western conventions as hand-holding or embracing in public are foreign to Carriacou because of the attitude towards heterosexual contacts. Proper behavior between men and women is a mixture of light-hearted bantering and business talk, carried out briskly. Prayer-meetings are the only recurrent occasions for formal assemblies of young people, and they are also the only ones governed by a general taboo on sex relations between those attending.

Selection of marriage partners, however, is governed by other assumptions, which reflect norms of male dominance. Husbands should be older and more mature than their wives, although both spouses should enjoy similar esteem. Differences of birth-status are irrelevant here, personal behaviour and character being the
basis of judgement. Men naturally prefer to marry childless young women of good looks and reputation, but single motherhood is not a bar. An old widower who married a woman with numerous unlawful offspring of dubious paternity was thought to be the victim of this woman's obeah. Young men who marry women older than themselves are also “victims of tricks” and will “live as beasts” when they awaken from these spells with “clear eyes”; but men may enjoy casual sex relations with women older than themselves without magical constraint or disapproval.

Such notions reveal the values that govern and formalise relations between husband and wife. The ways in which these relations are patterned reduce occasions for dispute between spouses, and thereby enhance the stability of their unions. Behind the facade of public observance and separation, there is a clear pattern of authority between spouses which guides their mutual adjustment. The sexual freedom of married men is only one expression of their precedence. But as we have seen, this sexual freedom is limited by economic obligations to their lawful families. Granted the conditions which restrict the protests of married women at their husbands’ extra-residential unions, it is obvious that formal relations between spouses serve to strengthen the union and protect the wife.

As we have seen, Carriacou economic conditions place special value on the cohabitation of man and woman. In these circumstances the woman is perhaps less dependent on her mate than he is on her, although the complementary economic roles of man and woman provide a firm basis for their continuing cohabitation. To pursue exchange activities effectively, the man needs a woman to care for his house, garden, and his children. A woman, on the other hand, can fend for herself provided she receives enough cash gifts from men related to her in various ways. Although “the man is head of the house” and owns and controls it, his wife has charge of its internal economy. Unmarried men who live with their mothers are not recognised as head of the house, since they are junior by kinship position and depend on their mothers for domestic help. Such men are usually forced to form their own domestic unions when their mother’s death leaves them stranded.

Economic relations between husband and wife are symbolised
by "house-money"—that is, household cash. "When I fish I can give away or sell some before I meet home. But if I meet home and deliver to my wife, then the business is she own, and she keep the money too." Men usually contribute cash, because most of the household food is grown and harvested by the wife. But whether men give their wives money or goods for the household, "the business is she own," and they have no more say in the matter. Since "men is more squandering than women's," the wife has charge of all household supplies. Thus the man provides the household money and the principal capital resources, such as land, fish-pots, or stock; the woman controls the household supplies, and she will be asked by her husband to make gifts therefrom as occasions arise. These may be gifts for ritual purposes or to the husband's outside-children or kin. The husband may protest only if the wife's gifts seem disproportionately niggardly or extravagant, but he cannot make these gifts himself directly.

Apart from initial provision of the home, furniture, and linen, the husband is responsible for repairs and replacements; for new kitchen equipment, farm tools and seed; for clothing his wife and children; and for meeting their medical and other occasional expenses. Transactions involving about three dollars (BWI) or more are carried out by the husband for the wife. Thus she will ask him to sell her small stock or to purchase shoes or similar items. But the daily household purchases involve trifling amounts which the wife handles herself. She also attends the weekly market at Hillsborough to dispose of small surpluses and to purchase the provisions she needs.

A wife's earnings from such activities as sewing, knitting fish-nets, or working for other women in their gardens belong to her only, but she often uses some of this money for clothing or household needs. She cannot "work out" at her own discretion, however. Her husband's consent is necessary; and he may send her with their children to help his mother, sister, or brother's wife. Men rarely permit their wives to do Government road-repair work (travaux), because its gang organisation under a "driver" recalls the days of slavery and thus does not befit married persons. Such labour also publicises the husband's inability to provide cash for household needs. The wife forced to work on the road has a legiti-
mate complaint against her husband on grounds of status as well as economics. A husband’s incapacity to provide for his family is one of the few locally accepted grounds for the wife’s desertion. One woman left her husband after a spell in the road gang, and went to live in another village, berating his laziness. Few men will risk such action by their wives, but few women quit their husbands because of economic failure alone, if they have children.

The husband’s role in garden work is important though irregular. He clears and forks the land, thus limiting the size of the fields. He also cultivates supplementary food crops, such as yams, which are important staples. In addition, he provides the household with the necessary land, by rental or metayage. Most wives also try to obtain a small plot of their own, which they farm with their children or with occasional hired help from other women. The produce from the wives’ plots belongs to them alone, although it is stored with the household supplies grown on the husband’s own rented garden. Wives try to keep most of these stores intact to sell in the scarce season or to use in case of illness or other emergencies, but they also use their own produce to feed the household when necessary. Such private food reserves increase the wife’s independence when her husband learns that his garden produce is inadequate for household needs.

Similar patterns apply to the small stock which women tend on share or for themselves. Husbands rarely interfere with their wives’ arrangements for share-tending stock without good reason, since they know that stock-rearing supplies the woman with cash for her own and the children’s clothes and provides reserves which may be needed in time of shortage. Men prefer their wives to share-crop or share-tend the property of other women, thus ruling out possible scandals. A man may help his wife to work her metayer land or to tend her beasts held on share, but he has no direct relation with the owner. Wives work their husbands’ metayer land as directed, as they do the home garden.

Marriage does not cancel the couple’s obligation to help their parents, although it naturally reduces and redefines this assistance. Young married couples whose mothers are widowed find these obligations weigh most heavily on them when their siblings are overseas. A man’s mother is expected to resent his wife, and this
is explained by their competing claims on him. In consequence, women almost never go to live with their husband’s mother. On the other hand, the wife’s mother will normally be friendly to the husband, who supports her indirectly through his wife.

The norms which differentiate these attitudes to the two mothers-in-law correlate with changes in the economic relations between the couple and their parents. Before his marriage the man’s mother receives substantial help from him: if abroad, he remits money to her; if on the island, he works in her garden and gives her produce, fish, and money. After marriage the man has a smaller personal surplus, and since he has no access to household stores, most of the contributions he can make to kin pass through his wife’s hands. Even though he can send his wife to work in his mother’s garden and he normally tries to give his mother cash and goods directly rather than through his wife, the man’s mother loses income through his marriage. A wife, however, can help her mother more freely since she controls household supplies and can now farm more land for herself with her husband’s assistance. Thus, the child’s marriage changes the mother’s position sharply: from a possible economic burden, the daughter becomes an asset to her mother; from a regular supporter, the son becomes an occasional help to his. Consequently, after a child’s marriage, the bond between mother and daughter strengthens, while that between mother and son tends to weaken. Since a father receives no substantial economic support from his children unless “well in age,” the child’s marriage in no way affects the paternal relation.

The main exception to the rule that men must hand over their produce and earnings to their wives arises from the relation between the couple and the man’s mother. A man has full control of his cash and kind income until he delivers it to his wife. He may either withhold certain portions for his mother or he may instruct his wife to set these aside for her. To avoid friction between his wife and mother, the man will often give his mother her portion himself. He may try to do likewise for his non-domestic mate and her offspring unless he finds that his wife is quite friendly towards them, as shown by her gifts to these children when they visit his home. The man’s aim in both these cases is to avoid domestic fric-
tion; if this is no problem, he will leave his wife in full charge of his disbursements. The woman’s kitchen loft is her castle, and her house-money is hidden or buried in various corners.

Such patterned economic relations between spouses reduce occasions for dispute to a minimum. The value-system disapproves strongly of bad relations between couples. The respected wife is “cold, no noise at all, she see, she ain’t see; she no meddle in nobody’s business, she quiet, she straightforward.” As for the ideal husband, “if a man can’t command his house, nobody respect him. You must understand to rule your house, put your children in sense.”

Male precedence finds expression in property, ritual, and inter-household relations. We have already seen how the ritual idiom assumes and expresses this. The Big Drum beats the husband’s Nation first, and he makes the libations, prayers, and sacrifices on behalf of his household, while his wife presides over the prayer-meetings, wakes, and lesser funeral rites. With regard to property, the distribution of roles is much the same. Women who control land in their own right usually place their husbands in charge of their holdings. Men who wish to leave land to their married daughters often will it to the daughters’ husbands, knowing that these holdings will pass to their daughters’ children. Women often ask their brothers to supervise their land for them, or they may occupy family land nominally under the charge of their brothers. A wife will only object to her husband’s management of her estate if her children’s inheritance rights are thereby jeopardised. For his part, a husband will not let out his wife’s land on cash or share without her agreement. On a man’s death intestate, his widow has charge of his land and home during her lifetime.

A detailed study of land rights and their transmission was made at Harvey Vale.¹ This showed that wills were made only to record or initiate deviations from folk norms of inheritance or to point out divergences between real and apparent titles to land. Many local wills observe the norms of folk inheritance for most of the land, and hardly any are registered or executed at law.

Usually husbands die before their wives. If the latter die first, the widowers often remarry. The regulation of inheritance differentiates between first and second wives, and wills are more frequent if there is a second wife. Their purpose, under such conditions, is to protect the interests of the first wife’s children and to exclude the second wife and her children by other men from the inheritance. In this respect a second wife occupies a position in some ways similar to that of the husband’s extra-domestic mates.

Widowed first wives sometimes interpret their power over the husband’s estate as a right to make dispositions by will. Occasionally they may will portions of the estate to one or another of their outside-children. Unless she has received it under a will, the widow has no legal right to alienate her husband’s land, and it passes to his children by her on her death. If the widow is a second wife, the first wife’s children normally inherit after the funeral, unless the deceased husband set aside special portions for the second wife and his children by her. If he dies intestate, a man’s house and furniture belong to his resident spouse or mate; but she has no power to alienate them if there are any surviving children. Many alleged wills are oral death-bed instructions; many other dispositions are made informally by men, before their last illness. A father may subdivide his plots among the children but retain occupancy until he dies; or he may allow the children who are on the island to occupy their portions while he retains portions for absent ones. Such distributions favour the lawful children, and, especially where land is concerned, they favour sons over daughters.

A man’s row-boat and house are his widow’s property. If the house is a small one and there are no children, she may dispose of it as she likes. Sloops or schooners are normally bequeathed by oral or written wills which place them under the care of the eldest son and allocate shares in them to the family, the widow receiving the largest portion during her lifetime. Fish-pots are left to sons; seines are bequeathed in the same way as schooners, if they have not already come under the control of one or other of the owner’s sons before his death, as usually happens. Stock are allocated orally on the death-bed. A man’s fish-nets become the property of his
last son; his garden tools remain with the house, but his trade tools, such as a carpenter’s kit, are distributed among his sons. If he makes a will, a man’s widow may ask him to dispose of her personal holdings also in that document.

Inheritance norms express the priority which married mates have over those not married. This distinction is quite as important in the husband’s lifetime as after his death. Men do not leave their house or land to their extra-residential mates, nor to wives who have deserted them, unless they have no children alive. Women’s property is inherited by lawful and unlawful children equally, never by mates who live elsewhere. There is thus a clear economic separation between non-domestic mates which contrasts sharply with the shared property interests of married partners. These differences in the economic positions of a man’s wife and his outside mates are linked with the fact that the wife normally has more children for him than all his other mates collectively. Thus the wife’s life-interest in her husband’s estate reflects the majority interests of his lawful children. If a man’s first marriage has proved barren while his second has borne several offspring, he will leave his land to the second wife’s children and give her life control of the home. If a marriage has been childless, the husband may instruct his wife to give his unlawful children shares of his holding, or he may do so directly by his will. Only if he has no issue at all is the widow free to alienate his land; but even in such a case his non-domestic mate has no claim. The most a man may do for such a mate is to leave her small shares in his boats or stock. The outside-children have secondary claims to land and may be willed house-spots or similar small portions. If the man’s wife left him before his death, the estate passes directly to the children, who inherit the house jointly if it has not been left to the youngest daughter alone. Thus outside-children fare rather badly in paternal inheritance. However, it is bad form for men to ignore their unlawful children entirely in distributing their property. In this conflict of interests between their different elementary families, men’s wives have a stronger position than the outside mates since they already occupy the property. Men rationalise this unequal treatment of their different sets of children by saying that house-
children have a stronger claim to their property because they have usually been working it. This merely recognises the inequality of treatment.

Thus, by reason of her husband's dominance, the wife receives a degree of security and support during and after his lifetime which is not otherwise available to women. This security is itself based on her submission to the husband's authority. Her privileged position is lost if the wife challenges his dominance in ways which warrant separation, whether by open disobedience or by clandestine actions such as adultery. Effectively, the man rules his home, since he provides its principal resources and controls its relations with other units. In short, the husband's authority is manifest in his regulation of social relations between the family and outsiders. The wife's security is manifest through her strong economic position within the household. Just as her role is central to the household economy, so the husband's is central to property transmission, ritual actions, and relations with the rest of the community.

Authority between husband and wife is clearly defined. The man alone can invite or permit males to visit the house for ritual or other purposes, although the wife invites women on these occasions. The husband controls the family's labour team, arranges his wife's wage-employment, and can send his wife to work on his kinsfolk's plots. He is specially charged with supervising his daughters' "home training," engagements, and betrothals. In all important transactions, such as ritual, property, or mating, he represents the household. He selects the house site or, if he lacks a house, he tells his wife where to live while he is abroad, and she must remain where he puts her. Whenever an outside party is involved, the wife must obey her husband's decisions. But it is in regard to the children that the husband's authority is most evident.

The four circumstances in which the distribution and control of children may affect the marriage relation directly are fostering, the temporary separation of the couple from one another or their children by emigration, the engagement and marriage of daughters, and informal divorce. Apart from these occasions, the wife supervises the children in the home or garden, and the father will only exercise authority when the mother has failed. But resident
children are left in little doubt that the father rules. He gives them daily orders about garden and other work, and may occasionally scold or beat his wife. He sees that the children "have sense"—that is, know how to conduct themselves—at the expected age, although they learn such sense from their mother.

It is essential that a married couple agree before their child is adopted out of the home or other children are adopted into it. In theory, any kin who "ask for a child" cannot be refused, especially the father's kin, but a man's obligation to look after his lawful children takes precedence. And since husbands generally refuse to give their children to their wife's mother while wives object to adoption by the husband's kin, adoptions involving legitimate children whose parents live together are few. It is common, however, for a child to visit its kinsfolk during the day, eating in their homes but returning to its parents in the evening. In this way the child participates intimately in two or more households. In contrast, widowed men may freely place young people with their kin.

As pointed out above, men rarely initiate adoption; and children are mainly adopted by their mothers' kinswomen. Thus the preferred foster-mothers are sisters, aunts, or female cousins of the child's parents, and usually of its mother. Since a man's wife has charge of the house-children, his relatives will not place their children in his home so long as their married kinswomen can take them. For the same reason the man's extra-marital mate will refuse to let their child live with him: she does not want her child "to serve his father's wife."

Women may wish to take the unlawful children of their female relatives or to provide temporary accommodation for other junior kin whose parents are abroad. The husband will usually consent if he can afford it. Couples with few or no children at home are especially likely to take in some of the wife's kin. In addition, the wife's children by previous mates may live in her husband's home. Although the husband is indirectly responsible for these wards, his wife has immediate charge of them, the husband exercising his authority over them as household head in ways already described. He should treat these wards as he would his own children but difficulties may arise. In a probably unique case, a childless married woman brought a kinswoman aged six years into her
husband's home. The girl grew up there and later had a child by the woman's husband, but all four continued to live together. There are strong prohibitions against sex relations between guardian and ward; although some women may have homosexual relations with their adopted kinswomen, heterosexual relations between household principals and house-children are regarded as incest.

The following cases illustrate the considerations which govern the placement of wives by absent husbands. A young man whose widowed mother lived in a wooden house at Hillsborough married a girl from another village. He brought her to live with his mother and then emigrated. The wife and mother-in-law did not agree, and the younger woman eventually withdrew to her father's home, where she received her husband's remittances for a while. She prepared a "dirt house" right beside her father's house for her husband and herself. On his return, the young man refused to live in this dirt house and ordered his wife to accompany him back to his mother's home. This she refused to do. He then pointed out that married couples could not live in dirt houses and that as his wife she would lose all claims to future maintenance if she did not follow him. Stressing her difficulties with his mother, she remained where she was. The couple, who were childless, then separated.

In another case a couple emigrated together. The husband, suspecting his wife of infidelity, sent her back to live with his father till he returned. After a while the wife moved to her mother's home, and her husband stopped his remittances. When he returned to the island, the wife sued him for maintenance for herself and the children. She lost, on the grounds that she had disobeyed her husband's instructions regarding residence. She was also informed that she could expect no maintenance if she kept the children with her; consequently the children were returned to the husband. These are unusual cases, but they express the principles which govern location of the household when the husband has no home of his own. They also indicate the necessity for men to have their own homes before marrying.

In describing betrothal, I have already mentioned the father's role. Even if a daughter lives in another household, her father is
ultimately responsible for negotiating or approving a proposal, but when the girl lives apart from her father, there is an actual division of authority between her father and her household head, of which she may take advantage. Girls who live with their parents are fully subject to their father’s control, whatever their mother’s feelings may be. If the girl’s behaviour is grossly improper, her father may eject her, while her mother tries to arrange alternative accommodation with her own kin; but as already mentioned, in no case did a young woman living with her parents give birth to unacknowledged offspring and warrant such harsh treatment. The father regulates visits to the home, whether he is on the island or not, and in this way, as well as by his insistence on a satisfactory letter of proposal, he safeguards his daughter’s future.

Nowadays men have less influence over their son’s engagement. The father must approve his son’s offer, but not long ago he was often asked to select a wife for his son. Even to-day fathers are asked by absent sons to supervise the building of the house, to acquire its furnishing and the like, and occasionally to select and purchase the site. Since the son’s unlawful offspring remain with their mothers, fathers do not object to their son’s philanderings as they do to that of their daughters. On the other hand, men object if their sons propose to marry women of bad reputation, their seniors in years, or close kin. In such cases fathers may be driven to make use of the extreme ritual measure, the formal curse. But often, due to the lateness of marriage, men die before their sons are ready to marry.

Carriacou people do not use legal divorce. However, informal separation of spouses is locally regarded as divorce; the broken cohabitation cannot be resumed, and the separated spouses cannot marry again. Perhaps this rejection of legal divorce is due to religion, but there are also serious legal and financial difficulties facing local couples who seek divorce through courts in Grenada. The grounds for informal separation express the husband’s authority, as do the arrangements for custody and maintenance of the children. The unfaithful wife forfeits all claim to future maintenance, but there is no unfaithful husband in Carriacou. The wife may leave her husband if he is lazy or otherwise fails to provide for the family; but men thrash lazy wives to improve their per-
formance. Although most separated couples are childless, this is not cited formally as ground for separation. The childless wife has a special cause for objecting to her husband’s outside relations since his limited household obligations permit him to increase his gifts to his other mates. It may be that couples with children are more willing to exercise tolerance, perhaps to keep the children with them. On the other hand, many childless couples live together in harmony and rear a succession of foster-children. Disobedient wives may be dismissed or deserted, but not on frivolous grounds.

The normal method for such “divorce” is desertion, the men either emigrating or moving to another house on the island; the actual expulsion of a wife from her husband’s house is highly disapproved. There were two such deserted women at L’Esterre in 1953. Both were household heads, and at that time their husbands had been absent for more than twenty years. One of these women had taken a Dominican man to live with her in her home and, as they were childless, she had also adopted one of his children, who had been born in British Guiana. The other abandoned wife withdrew from mating entirely, but since she continued to live by herself, she was generally thought to be a lougarou, or witch. If her lifelong continence was clearly abnormal, so was the other woman’s household: after separation, spouses may mate extra-residentially, but they are neither expected to cohabit again nor to withdraw from mating completely. Widowers may remarry, but otherwise widowed persons are expected to remain continent, and I know only one person who ignored this rule—a widow who remarried. During her second marriage she continued to live in her deceased husband’s home where her new husband, who lived in another village, visited her regularly. This was also the only case of extra-residential mating within marriage which I encountered.

I found no cases in which men had deserted wives who had borne them children; but there were several cases in which betrothed mothers had been abandoned on grounds of adultery. For example, one young man left his betrothed pregnant and went abroad. When he returned twenty years later to marry her, the girl had of course entered into relations with someone else. The man accordingly broke off the engagement and, marrying another
girl over fifteen years his junior, again returned overseas leaving his pregnant wife in his newly-built house. After ten years, his wife had joined the madivines.

Women who wish to leave their husbands have a difficult choice since they are likely to be separated from their children as well and cannot claim maintenance for themselves or their children. Nor can they usually claim maintenance from the husband if he leaves on any culturally approved grounds. If he leaves for any other reason, he generally quits the island also, and is effectively out of reach. Under folk convention a woman who leaves her husband also loses all claim to his property. It is true that such a woman is no longer formally responsible for tombing her husband, but she will not be tombed by him either, if he outlives her. At separation, marital relations are broken finally, and separated wives tend to avoid their husband’s parents just as separated husbands avoid their mothers-in-law. But relations between the separated husband and his wife’s father or senior kinsmen depend largely on the circumstances of the separation. Although husbands defend themselves at law against claims for maintenance by their former wives, they are expected to treat the children liberally—even if these are with their mother, as may happen if the children are very young at the time of the separation.

Affinal relations are easily described. Relations between the married couple are “their business,” especially the husband’s business. His brothers and sisters may comment occasionally, but the wife’s siblings hardly ever intervene on her behalf. Her brothers regard her as under her husband’s authority, and however much his use of that authority may be distasteful, they will not challenge it openly. Without infringing this convention, they will give their sister all the help they can; and they may “watch out” for the husband in case he oversteps his rights. In one case where a husband, a foreigner residing on the island, treated his wife shabbily her brothers did not interfere until the husband extended his abuse to her mother also. At this point he received an admonitory beating from three or four brothers, and for a long time afterwards the wife enjoyed peace.

A man’s relations with his wife’s siblings vary. He is expected to respect his wife’s parents and senior kin. This respect is formal-
ised in rituals. He is obliged to respect the wife's mother especially, and the wife treats his kin and parents in like fashion—her closest contacts normally being with her husband's sisters. The couple's parents take an interest in their union and may occasionally try to smooth over difficulties. In such cases the injured party's parents ask the offender's parents to speak to their child. But more often this is not done because of the belief that marriage is the couple's business. A couple's parents try to maintain friendly relations with one another and often address each other as "Compère" and "Mâcmé."

The affective tone of the marital relation in Carriacou is not easy to summarise, but may be inferred from the foregoing account. Individual couples vary considerably in their relations with one another; most married pairs in L'Esterrre gave a general impression of equability. My contacts with couples in other parts of the island suggest that this is fairly general. There may be occasional furors, in which case the husband is expected to reassert his authority swiftly and clearly; but men must devote their greatest attention to their wives and homes. Sailors bring their choicest gifts of liquor, trinkets, cloth, and the like to their wives; and these women, by their self-contained demeanour and quiet pride, display satisfaction with their situation. During her husband's absence the wife effectively controls the home, but she asks his advice or instructions on his return and, with their children, receives preferential treatment over his outside friends. Carriacou women are not feminists and cannot conceive of sexual equality. What they most desire is first claim on a man's attentions, and marriage most nearly guarantees this goal. They do not expect their men to be entirely faithful to them but are not backward in claiming their share of their husband's sexual attention. If this is not forthcoming, bitterness towards the rival develops. Otherwise a Carriacou woman seems quite content that others should be attracted to her husband.

*Keeping* Relations between people who cohabit consensually are modelled on those between husband and wife: but there are notable differences. Keeping is continuous cohabitation, whereas cohabitation may be intermittent in marriage. Couples keep in
women’s houses and marry in men’s. Keeping is an intermediate form of union which may develop into marriage, the final form. Keeping lacks the legal or religious sanctions attached to marriage: the offspring of such unions are illegitimate, and the partners are free to marry one another or someone else after separation. Keeping lacks a ceremonial beginning. Spouses may advertise their separation in the Colony newspaper to signify dissolution of their economic partnership, but keeping couples do not, since legally they are not responsible for one another’s debts. Married men may mate extra-residentially, men keeping must cease such relations when cohabitation starts. Husbands who wish to leave their wives must usually emigrate, but men who are keeping simply leave the woman’s house. Whereas the husband is dominant in marriage, the woman is the dominant partner in keeping. Marriage is the first major ritual a man can undertake independently, and men who cohabit consensually cannot carry out such rites.

Nonetheless, in routine aspects, keeping resembles marriage. In either relation the woman cooks for her man and eats separately. If the man is working away from the home, she should send or keep his share of each meal. She must care and clean the house, “turn out” her man decently, fetch water and fuel, and see to the children. If the woman has sex relations with another man she is guilty of adultery, but the male keeper also cannot take extra-residential mates without thereby disrupting the union. This fact differentiates most sharply between marriage and keeping.

The man’s authority in keeping depends on the prospects of the union. If the woman expects to marry and her man is building his house, his position is strong; in other cases the woman is effectively the head of the household, and if the union breaks down she will remain there, while her mate has to leave. Few separated married women enter keeping unions; those who do, keep in homes which belong to them and of which they are quite clearly the head. Few married men who have separated from their wives will cohabit consensually thereafter; but if they do, they also will remain in their own homes. Even so, when keeping unions break up, the children, being unlawful, remain with their mother. In marriage, the reverse is usually the case.
As already pointed out, keeping is a composite category of mating: in some cases the cohabiting couple can marry and are expected to do so; in others their cohabitation cannot be legalised, and the unmarried party in such unions loses community esteem. This is most strongly expressed in the description of unwed women living with their lovers in board houses as prostitutes. Inheritance patterns also differentiate between these two types of keeping unions. Keepers free to marry will wed in articulo mortis if possible. In such cases the normal patterns of intestate inheritance apply, and the widow controls her husband’s estate. If a man dies in an unlegalised union, his land and possessions remain with his widowed keeper in trust for his children, especially for those he had by her; but his other children by extra-domestic mates have equal claims, since all are unlawful. These claims may be disputed by the mothers concerned, but the estate is not likely to be large, since only poor men cohabit consensually. If the keeping union is childless and the man had children by other women, the widowed keeper loses occupancy of his land, although the house and its plot remain with her, since she already holds them, and so do the man’s fish-pots and other minor equipment in her possession. If the woman dies first, her house and property remain with her children to be administered by her family, and the man generally moves elsewhere. This is also the rule if the deceased was a separated wife. The property of a separated husband who dies in consensual cohabitation belongs to his lawful children unless a written will explicitly allocates portions to the keeper or her issue. In such cases his house also belongs to the dead man’s lawful children. If there are no lawful children, separated husbands may will their land among their different sets of unlawful children, perhaps giving their keeper a life interest. Thus the keeper, unlike the married woman, retains the children if her union dissolves but gains little from inheritance.

Widowed keepers have the same mourning duties as widowed wives, and ideally they are also expected to entomb their dead mates. However, I know of no such case, and it is unlikely that men who keep or die keeping have sufficient wealth or family support to furnish a tomb. Such men are often migrants, separated
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from their kinsfolk and without adult children. Thus, in practice at least, tombing duties differ in keeping and marriage.

The rules which govern house-money are similar for marriage and keeping, but the woman who keeps is free to work on the road or to arrange her own wage-employment, metayage, or share-tending relations. She may also undertake her larger cash transactions, and in general she contributes more actively to the household income and resources than do many wives. In fact the viability of her union depends heavily on her economic activities, as does its chance of maturing into marriage. His position of dependence discourages the man from seeking extra-residential mates, and it also discourages women from considering him in this role. If the keeping union breaks down, the man can expect that his mate may sue him for maintenance of their children since their cohabitation is legal evidence of his paternity. But if he is married and separated, the position is different, as shown by the following case.

A Carriacou man married a Grenada woman in Trinidad. She was unfaithful, so he dismissed her and returned to Carriacou. He then took into his home, an ordinary man’s board house, a local woman who had already had various affairs. They had two children. During one of the man’s visits abroad, this woman was also unfaithful. The man put her out of his house but retained their younger child, who had just been weaned. At first, his mother, who lived close by, helped care for the child, but he later took another woman into his home, and although the displaced mother was angry, she could do little. When the child was nearly six years old, the mother accosted it on the road and took it home. The father tried to claim the child and a fight developed. The child’s mother took the father to court for assault, but the case was dismissed, and the child returned to the father. The frustrated mother then declared that the man’s present keeper was likely to poison the child. On hearing this, the father called the police and delivered the child to its mother in their presence, receiving a written statement which freed him from all further maintenance obligations, since the child’s mother could not then repay the maintenance rate of 3d per day for the child for the period since
their cohabitation ended. For slandering her rival, the mother lost her reputation; she was classified in Carriacou as an unsuccessful whore, and became the subject of satirical songs. Such events are rare in Carriacou; but the case illustrates conditions which adults strive to avoid.

A man who keeps cannot simultaneously engage in extra-residential relations. But, as we have seen, the culture encourages men to have two or more mates. Consequently men, particularly young ones, are likely to dissolve keeping unions. However, the sharp distinction between the sexual and domestic aspects of mating is consistent with marriage; and as they permit men to participate in domestic and non-domestic unions simultaneously, marriage and extra-residential unions form a system of interdependent parts. The principles which permit this system to function smoothly in most of its phases discourage inconsistent forms such as keeping.

Keeping is also anomalous with family organisation. In Carriacou, marriage is the basis of domestic elementary families, and such units have a different status and structure from others based on extra-residential mating, the members of which are dispersed in different households. In the first case the couple’s children are lawful and have legally protected inheritance rights; in the second they are unlawful and have no direct claims on the father’s estate but full claims on the mother’s. Keeping systematically obscures these differences for unpredictable periods. In one type of keeping, the unlawful family which normally remains outside the man’s home lives within it; in the other, the lawful family which properly belongs inside the man’s home is located outside. These residential deviations may be impermanent, but while they persist they contradict the norms of family structure.

Keeping is also inconsistent with the descent system. In all cases descent is traced patrilineally, but the extra-residential family are less closely knit to their father’s patrilineage than are the lawful children who live in his home. Conversely, a man’s outside family have closer ties with the kin of his mate than his lawful family have with the kin of his wife. Even where the parents belong to the same community, these differences are important, due to the ritual and property relations involved. In this
system the children of keeping couples occupy an ambiguous position: if their parents' union dissolves, as often happens, they remain in their mother's control and their ties with their father and his family are weakened; if the union develops into marriage, membership in their father's family is formalised, but their previous matrilateral attachments continue to divide their loyalty, even after the household is set among the father's kin.

Keeping is thus inconsistent with the mating, familial, and descent systems of Carriacou, and with its ritual order. Since it contradicts the values which sanction and reflect this social organisation, it is rare and disapproved.

Extra-residential Mating The true alternative to marriage for Carriacou women is extra-residential mating. This alternative is also open to men in their youth; and when they have married it is a complementary form. Since the island contains more women than men, the frequency of this form of mating is high. Even among young women, many remain unbetrothed; for such women the alternative to lifelong chastity or Lesbianism is the extra-domestic union. Although this is not an ideal as marriage is, it is a socially approved mode of mating, not marked by the deviance that invests keeping, Lesbianism, or prostitution.

Family forms associated with non-domestic unions are the most varied and flexible of all, and contrast sharply with the uniform organisation of units based on marriage. In addition, the regulation of property rights, authority, and economic relations between extra-residential mates differs systematically from that between spouses, and these differences qualify the formal membership of children in the descent units to which their parents belong.

Extra-residential mates call one another's parents "mother-in-law" and "father-in-law" and one another's siblings "brother-in-law" and "sister-in-law." These terms are accompanied by the behaviours appropriate between affines. Extensions of these kinship terms and behaviour are most frequent where there are children of the union; but they show that the extra-residential relation is a socially recognised conjugal form which establishes new ties between the partners' families. Naturally, affinal relations derived from extra-residential unions have a narrower content than those
derived from marriage; but just as the dissolution of a marriage does not abrogate those relations of affinity, neither does the dissolution of an extra-residential union dissolve these. A man will still address or refer to the kinsfolk of his former extra-residential mate as his "in-laws" and will adjust his behaviour accordingly. Such terms and behaviour do not hold between casual lovers and their kin.

Extra-residential mates refer to one another variously. The man may speak of his mate as his "keptress" (never his "keeper"), his "girl-friend," "friend," or even as his "common-law wife"—which she clearly is not. The woman will generally refer to her lover by name or will speak of him as her "friend" and occasionally as her "husband." When the union is broken, the couple refer to one another by name or indirectly by reference to their common children. They may be described loosely by other people as "husband and wife" but more usually as "friends" or by reference to their common children.

Three important sorts of relation arise through extra-residential mating: between the mates as mates, between the mates as parents, and between mates and their children on the one hand and their kin on the other. Despite the parallels in affinity based on marriage and on extra-residential union, there are consistent differences in the economy, distribution of authority, inheritance, ritual, and kinship aspects of these two unions, as well as their form.

Lack of a common home reduces the field for economic cooperation among extra-residential mates to the transfer of gifts—in cash, kind, or labour. Unlike the exchanges of marriage, the gifts are almost all made by the man and are easily distinguished as those intended for the woman and those for the children. As we have seen, the married man's contribution to his wife is used by her as she wills. Economic transactions between casual lovers also differ from those between extra-residential mates. This difference is summarised by "the principle" under which men from time to time make cash gifts to casual lovers. This principle does not operate in strictly commercial relations, which are described as "paid-for-times," or in extra-residential mating, which involves transfers of labour and goods as well as cash.
In extra-residential unions, ritual occasions are limited to childbirth and action on behalf of the children. The partners in such a union have no obligation to entomb one another but should attend their partner’s wake, funeral, and prayer-meetings. For women the usual mourning restrictions apply. In general, the sexual, authoritarian, and economic aspects of these unions are so closely interwoven that it is difficult to discuss them separately.

I have defined extra-residential mating as an openly recognised sexual association between two persons who live apart. They may or may not be betrothed, but the relation will be neither clandestine nor casual. So long as the union endures the woman may not have sexual relations with other men; for her to do so is adulterous and, if discovered, disrupts the union. In that event, the paternity of her next child may be ambiguous, and the former mate would at the very least delay acknowledgement of the child until it was recognisably his, at about five or six years of age. However, his mother or mother’s sister may claim the child as his before he does, and he will not repudiate this. Most women gladly observe the restriction of their sexual freedom.

Except for his monopoly of sexual rights in the woman, there is hardly any sphere in which a man has direct authority over his outside mate. Despite the help she receives from the man, the woman who mates extra-residentially has to provide for most of her own needs, and there is no fixed pattern of economic cooperation since these unions vary widely in character and context. Because the distribution of authority is directly correlated with the distribution of economic responsibilities in these unions, there can be no simple uniform pattern of authority between the mates.

Females “in their womanship” rarely live in the same house as their fathers; they are sexually independent, and unless they demand it, a written request for betrothal is not necessary on their account. However, some women in this position request letters proposing betrothals, even though marriage is unlikely and the liaison has already begun. These letters are addressed to the woman’s household head and serve to formalise the relationship. Often such women live in households where their mother or senior kinswoman is head. Whether these household heads were previously married or not, their domestic groups will differ little
in constitution and authority structure from others headed by unmarried mothers.

In such households the young woman’s extra-residential mating often disturbs her relations with her guardian by causing changes in her economic position and in the domestic authority structure. Until she becomes pregnant, the young woman’s independence increases with the contributions she receives from her mate, but during the later stages of pregnancy and while her infant is small, her dependence increases if her needs outrun her mate’s gifts and have to be met from household resources. These changes are somewhat unpredictable since the man may be absent from the island for various periods or the girl may not conceive. Such variability in the young woman’s position may itself exacerbate relations with her guardian, especially as the balance of authority within homes which lack adult males tends to reflect economic responsibilities, and recurrent changes in the young woman’s financial position involve reversals in the domestic structure. Under such conditions the senior woman may force the younger to leave her home or try to break the relation with the extra-residential mate. Alternatively, she may create so many difficulties that the union breaks down, the man often going abroad. However, after a certain age the senior woman’s headship is largely formal, and if the younger one is mature, she effectively controls her own affairs and is responsible for the household economy. Thus the authority relations which have critical value for the stability of extra-residential mating are those between the young woman and her guardian or senior kin rather than between the mates themselves, as their union provides no basis for the partners to exercise much authority over one another.

After they have had children, non-domestic mates may wish to marry even without betrothal. In such a case the man will have to go abroad to earn the necessary money, his mate remaining with her guardian. If the man’s remittances are small or irregular, the woman, feeling her marriage chances are slight, may abandon the relation, treating her mate’s gifts as maintenance due for the children. She is then likely to begin extra-residential mating with another man or to take casual lovers. On the other hand, emigrant males have to work abroad for some years before they can save
sufficient money for their marriage, and this period may be lengthened by their obligations to maintain a family meanwhile. Thus extra-residential unions tend to break down if the man goes abroad, notwithstanding the couple’s intentions.

Relations between women and their mothers are affected differently by marriage and by extra-residential mating. The married daughter contributes more fully to her mother’s upkeep than before, while the unmarried one who mates extra-residentially tends to do the opposite. In consequence, a mother’s relations with her married daughter are smoother, if less intimate, than those with her unmarried daughter. The married daughter may, of her own will or at the mother’s suggestion, adopt her unmarried sister’s children into her home. She will certainly try to contribute as she can to her mother’s household. Her increased contributions strengthen the bond between her mother and husband, just as the unmarried daughter’s dependence increases her mother’s disapproval of the extra-residential mate.

The pattern of economic assistance between a man and his extra-residential mate is not formalised. If they have children together, the man may help in replacing household equipment or repairing the house, provide garden land or beasts to share-tend, pay her taxes or medical costs, or donate money for clothing and other occasional expenses as well as maintaining the children. To maintain the child, he must maintain the mother, and if he cannot, she will probably place the child with some kinswoman who can care for it. Because the man’s contributions have no set pattern, form, or period, an element of uncertainty invests these relations. For example, if his gifts or attentions decline observably, the woman may interpret this behaviour as a change of affections. Married men are obliged to care for their house-children before assisting those outside, and to do otherwise is to “brutalise” the wife. Although the external mate recognises the priority of “home obligations,” she needs support from the man, especially if she has several children with her, by him or her former mates. If the man is married, the woman may provide him with meals and domestic help when he visits her. If he is unmarried but lives by himself, she may clean and care for his house, help in his garden, wash and iron his clothes, repair his fish-nets, etc. while remaining
in her own home, where he comes more or less regularly for his food. Nonetheless, economic relations between extra-domestic mates vary so widely that these unions are much less stable than marriage, which has a fixed economic form.

Non-domestic unions may collapse through the woman’s action or the man’s withdrawal: the woman’s usual method of breaking such a union is to transgress the adultery rule; the man either reduces his support, emigrates, or discontinues sex relations with the woman. Thus, when the man initiates the dissolution, the woman enters a period of celibacy; but when the woman wishes to end the relationship she either enters a new mating relationship or has a series of casual affairs. But however the union breaks down, the woman retains control of the children, and if she takes a new mate, he will be expected to take these into account in his contributions. If she has a child subsequently, the new mate is expected to maintain that child as well.

The first mate should continue to contribute to his children’s maintenance, but he is rarely allowed to deliver these contributions to their mother if she has another mate. Instead, the children visit him periodically, and at that time he asks his wife to give them what foodstuffs she can, adding small cash gifts for clothes, school books, and the like. The children take these gifts back to their mother as evidence of their father’s interest. Whether the gifts are adequate or not, the children visit their father’s home easily and come to know their half-siblings quite well. If their father is wed but overseas, they may visit his wife occasionally. However, if the father is unwed and off the island, the children may be fully dependent on their mother: the emigrant father should send cash remittances for his children to his former mate, but he is less likely to do so if there was any bitterness between them.

The precise point at which an extra-residential mating dissolves is often difficult to determine. Such ambiguity simply reflects the lack of pattern which characterises this mating form. These unions, once broken, can only be resumed if the woman has remained celibate, but even then such an event is rare: occasionally a man may try to re-establish relations with a woman after she has sued him, as in a case cited below.
“If I belong to Carriacou and you belong to Carriacou, and I put you to court, that is the worst crime.” Suing is considered especially abominable if the parties were former mates or kin. Rationalisations developed to explain this disapproval include some which are patently spurious. Men say that the children involved in maintenance lawsuits will find it difficult to get employment abroad, since their passports must then record their illegitimate status. Women say derisively, “When you and him took up your business in private, nobody knew. Now why you have to go and publish it abroad that you finish?” The female comment is nearer the truth but also misleading. First, extra-residential relations which are more than casual affairs are not strictly private, though they may have begun that way. Second, their dissolutions are generally well known before any issue can come to court.

In fact, the general disapproval of bastardy maintenance suits has a deeper foundation: it helps preserve the present mating organisation by discouraging demands which would be prohibitive, especially for married men. In short, the women cannot have it both ways. In this culture where many women can only have children by extra-residential unions, the unmarried mother is permitted to keep the children, deriving pleasure and assistance from them, and in turn she is expected to assume willingly the responsibilities consistent with this mating form, albeit receiving whatever support her mate can give. In suing her ex-mate, she also indirectly sets the children against their father, even though both belong to the same “blood” and should maintain the greatest solidarity. In short, such action by the woman is inconsistent alike with mating, family, and lineage organisation. The maintenance case acts rather like the newspaper advertisement by which married couples may announce their separation, but it advertises the woman who initiates it by putting her to shame before other islanders for contravening the social norms.

Unless his parents cohabited, the child’s paternity must be established at law before the maintenance can proceed. However, when a man’s former non-domestic mate sues him for maintenance, he does not usually deny paternity but simply pleads that he has fulfilled his obligations as best he can. “There is no special amount a man gives the mother of his child; anything you have you give
"NO MATING her." Few bastardy cases are tried in the Carriacou court, and most of them arise from keeping unions, where paternity is easy to prove.

The court awards bastardy maintenance in set terms. In 1953 it was approximately 4/- per week per son and 2/6 per daughter, to be paid in cash. If the couple have had several children, the father cannot normally fulfil the order. In one case a woman had five children by an extra-residential mate. After he went overseas to seek the means to marry, she took another lover. The former mate then married someone else, but continued to contribute to his children’s upkeep. After he married, his previous mate sued for maintenance of their children, and the man was ordered to pay 4/- per week for each child. His monthly earnings as a schooner sailor were then $8.00 (£1.13.4) so this was clearly impossible; but even after the court reduced the amount, he was still expected to pay $3.50 (14/7) per week—again an impossible sum. In due course, he was arrested at his former mate’s request. His kin and friends together paid the claim. Community sympathy was towards him rather than the woman, whose prosecution was explained by bitterness at having lost her chance of marriage, albeit through her own adultery. Her demands were seen as unfair, since the father made whatever gifts of produce he could afford and yet remained liable for the weekly cash payments. Moreover, three of the five children had left their mother to live with their father’s lineage kin, who were quite willing to take the others. Eventually they pressed their mother to abandon her claims, but the woman’s actions had set the entire community against her, and in due course she emigrated.

If a man’s former mate tries to avenge herself by a bastardy suit, he is entitled to take evasive action. He may emigrate or try to renew relations with the woman. In one case a married man was sued for his child’s maintenance when he transferred his attentions from its mother to another extra-residential mate. He paid the weekly amount until he was advised to evade it by resuming relations with the woman who had sued him. He discussed the matter with his wife, who told him to do as he wished, but to take the consequences. He maintained the renewed relation for a couple of years, during which time he took the usual gifts in
cash and kind to the woman at her home, but when he again decided to terminate the union, he unfortunately told the woman and as he was leaving she seized a knife and cut him in the back of the neck. The matter came to court, the woman claiming maintenance, the police prosecuting her for assault. She lost her claim when it transpired that she had resumed relations with her mate since their former appearance in court, and had been receiving gifts from him. She was also fined £3 for assault, the man receiving 15/- compensation. He offered the money to his wife, who refused it, saying “You got what you wanted”; whereupon he sent it back to the woman who had sued him, “to buy clothes for the children.” Thereafter he fulfilled his obligations according to the local rather than the legal code, mainly by gifts in kind to the children when they visited his home, where they were always welcome. This incident provided local composers with a theme for satirical songs.

Even during the extra-residential union a man’s control of his children is slight and his influence varies with the support he provides. After the union is broken, he loses all control and influence. In extreme cases the mother may change her children’s “title” (surname) from the father’s to her own, to symbolise his ineffectiveness and her authority. The change of title is not registered—the mother simply announces it—and does not affect the lineage affiliation of the children. Such action is rare, perhaps because seldom necessary, but also because it suggests that the children’s paternity is in doubt.

When the court has made a maintenance order the father must support his child until it is thirteen years old, after which age he is not legally liable. If the man has had to comply rigorously with the terms of this order, he may refuse to contribute to the child’s support after that time; but if there has been no maintenance suit, he will usually contribute as custom requires, until the child becomes independent. He will also try to arrange for his son’s apprenticeship and to supervise his daughter’s betrothal, as he does for his lawful children, and he may include them in his will, especially if his wife is well disposed towards them. Often the former mates continue as friends after their relation has lost its sexual focus, the children providing a common interest.
Children supported under court orders remain fully in their mothers' control throughout this period and beyond it if the father does not continue to support them. But children supported by their fathers should not go abroad without the father's consent, and in the course of an extra-residential union the woman should inform the father before sending his children to live with her close collateral kin, though she can send them to her own parents without consulting him. Men may wish to have the children by their external mates living with them, but law and social custom guarantee the mother the right to refuse such requests, as she always does unless assured that the children will remain with the father's mother or close kinswoman. Although single mothers rarely consent to let their children live with the father's wife, they may ask the father's mother or sister to "care" the child if they are unable to do so.

After a man's death, his outside-children may receive occasional support from his brothers or adult sons. If the children are in distress, the father's brothers may offer to adopt them into their homes. To do this for orphaned children is an obligation of close agnatic kin. But if the mother has another mate or is otherwise caring for the children satisfactorily, the dead father's kin will not contribute formally to their support, although they will welcome the children into their homes and give them liberal gifts. If the mother is emigrating, the dead father's brothers, or sisters, may offer to foster the children temporarily. Men rarely provide their sisters' children with similar assistance, since mothers prefer their kinswomen as foster-parents for their children.

Custom provides the single mother with two possible sources of support for herself and her children apart from the children's father: her kinsfolk, especially her maternal kinswomen, and her subsequent mates—an extra-residential mate, a keeper, or a husband. The woman's security and the assistance she receives will vary with the form of her next mating. Single mothers are naturally loth to keep with men unlikely to marry them because of their previous children. On the other hand, men often marry women who have children by other mates, and these children may go either to their relatives or to their mother's new home. If the children are left with their maternal kin, the children's father con-
tributes as before. If the mother takes the children into her married home, her husband becomes their stepfather and will be called "Papa" or "Daddy" even though the children know he is not their father. Children living with their mother's husband receive the usual gifts from their father and father's brothers when they visit these men's homes; but the father cannot visit his former mate to deliver his contributions, and usually the woman's husband takes responsibility for those house-children who were born to his wife before her marriage. By law the married woman too can claim support for her unlawful child from its father, but no married woman in Carriacou is known to have done so. In effect, the man who marries a single mother is responsible for her children as well as herself. This responsibility is sometimes extended to include her collateral kin. In consequence, it is quite common to find some member of the wife's kin living in her husband's home, especially if she has no children of her own there.

A husband's control of his wife's children by a former mate derives from the rule that their own father may no longer deal directly with their mother. These relations are formalised at rituals held for the children, when the child's father and stepfather have clearly defined roles. In these circumstances, the stepfathers are largely responsible for disciplining the children, while the real fathers have little say. Because they seem correspondingly indulgent, the children are fond of their fathers and visit them often, receiving gifts for themselves. Thus, despite their legal and residential disabilities, these outside-children normally identify themselves with their father's family and lineage, and may later leave their mother's community to join their father's, if the parents live in different villages. In arranging the apprenticeship of such outside-sons or the betrothals of the daughters, the fathers and stepfathers co-operate; but once the children have emigrated, they deal directly with their father about land purchases, house building, or other investments. If the father is dead, they may ask his brother or their stepfather to discharge these functions.

The authority that a man exercises over his outside-child depends on his contributions to its support. This correlation is sometimes most evident when the child's parents disagree about its home, the mother being unmarried. If she depends heavily on
the father's assistance, he may veto her proposals. If not, she may ask him to pay off his arrears of maintenance, reckoned at 3d per day per child, before interfering with her plans. Such a rejoinder is rarely made except to adoptions proposed by the father which the mother opposes. Comparable disagreements over daughters' betrothals have already been mentioned. The betrothal may be successful despite exclusion of the girl's father if the mother's husband is effective; but widows or single mothers undertaking to handle these relations themselves often throw away their daughter's chance of marriage. Apart from ritual obligations on their behalf, the father is obliged to meet the medical expenses of his outside-children or to reimburse those who initially paid them. If the children's mother remains celibate, the father will frequently be called in to assist around the house and garden, even though he himself is married and his sexual relation with the children's mother has lapsed. His wife will know about these visits and his outside-children will come to assist her in her garden. If his wife agrees, the father may even allot portions of his farm land to these children for their use or inheritance.

Despite variability in relations between extra-residential mates, the relations between such parents and their children tend to have a common form, as we have seen. The principal variations reflect uncertain paternity attribution, either at birth or subsequently. As stated before, men will accept as their own those children whom their mothers have claimed on their behalf; but in such cases their influence and responsibility is naturally slight. It may also happen that the single mother of a child aged six or seven suddenly names a different man as the father. The new father may not make a public denial; but he will rarely shoulder fully his unforeseen paternal responsibilities. Either of these eventualities is extremely unusual and indicates that the mother was mating with two or more men; and both jeopardise future support for her children. Consequently, the child's mother will change its paternity only if the initial father has already expressed such doubt or has failed to support it. Children whose paternity is ambiguous suffer from lack of firm paternal interest and control. The remarkable infrequency of these ambiguous filiations restricts this condition.
Parents and Children    Relations between parents and children also vary according to the parents’ mating relations. Nonetheless, there are many common features. The ancestor cult, with its saraca, dream-messages, prayer-meetings, grave-vengeance, rites de passage, stone feasts, and paternal curse—dramatises and asserts the values of parenthood and filiation for children of all categories. In this belief system all depend on their dead parents’ goodwill and especially on their dead father’s benevolence. A man’s prestige also reflects his observance of ritual obligations for his parents; even emigrants of many years’ standing do not escape these obligations. While the parents live, children must see to their needs and maintain them properly. To do otherwise is to alienate their affections and to invite retaliation after their death. In addition, the community casts shame on those who allow their parents to become destitute; and to permit one’s parents to be dependent on poor relief is the most extreme form of filial ingratitude: “This would be a big shame for the children. People would talk it too much.” On the other hand, a man or woman lose no prestige by allowing a brother or sister to draw this relief, since “the Government takes so much advantage of people,” although the pauper usually receives further help from his kin.

Apart from their latent economic value, children have special social value. Maturity, gravitas, and seniority within the community are accorded only to successful parents or foster-parents. Full adult status depends on bearing and rearing children, just as the children’s prestige depends on fulfilment of their filial responsibilities. As we have seen, the fatherless child is the true illegitimate in Carriacou, and even in his mother’s kin group he is only a marginal member. Orphaned adults may enter keeping unions without undue loss of esteem, simply because this sort of union offers some hope of later marriage, a home, a secure reputation, and substitute guardians. Younger orphans may be adopted by the father’s brothers to safeguard their future.

In Carriacou parenthood includes the rearing as well as the bearing of children. Grandparents who rear their children’s children do not displace the parents, but show the family’s concern for the children. The presence of grandparents, children and the children’s children in the same village reduces the significance
of co-residence and separation, because parent and child meet daily. During the parents' absence abroad, grandparents are surrogates. The foster child adopted after it is five or six years old already knows its real parents, and will inherit from them rather than from its foster-parents; while the child adopted in infancy may inherit equally with the real children of its guardian. The man who refuses to care for the child of his extra-residential mate loses the right to influence its future. Such children are also among those most likely to remain permanently overseas.

The parent whose mother or father fosters a child may lose some influence thereby, but such children are even more removed from the kin of their other parent, as are those who live as wards in the home of their collateral kin. Naturally, such processes of differentiation reflect other factors, including the spatial distance between parents and child and the child’s age, birth status, kinship with adoptive parents, and length of residence in the new home. Compensations are present also, especially the fondness between fathers and their outside-children living elsewhere, which the fixed ritual obligations of paternity serve to strengthen.

Irresponsible fatherhood has little place in Carriacou society. Men rarely fail to do their best by their various children, since by doing so they lose the affection of mother and child, together with community esteem. They will also find that the “old parents” are displeased with them and make heavy demands through dreams. On the other hand, economic levels are low, reproduction rates are high, and men are expected to mate with several women, some of whom might not otherwise be able to have children. We have seen that paternal responsibilities are defined and distributed according to the alternative mating forms. By these norms, a wife enjoys security while the unmarried mother may not. In return the wife is subject to her husband's authority and loses considerable independence. She is partly withdrawn from her family into her husband's. The unwed mother, on the contrary, remains a full member of her family and lineage, independent, and in control of the children. Through her family and lineage position, she has direct access to land and other resources, and can usually provide her children with some inheritance since male emigration leaves women—especially unmarried ones—in occupancy of fami-
ily land. Thus the differences between wed and unwed mothers are partially offset by their respective kinship positions and by lineage and ritual emphases on the obligations of paternity. These factors take effect through the age-status system, by which lineage seniors control junior males.

Perhaps the most striking proofs of paternal interest are the regular long-term remittances which men overseas send back to their children, lawful or other. And those who remain on the island may provide more than the equivalent in kind of the cash support required by the law, if ceremonial expenditures are included. To conclude from the small cash transfers that men neglect their children would be a mistake; the primary focus of the economy is on domestic subsistence, and its cash levels are low. Even when informed that a child aged six is his, a man rarely makes public denial and may undertake these new responsibilities, though at reduced levels. In acting thus males are constrained by kinship norms, heavily buttressed by ritual, which hold each man responsible for all children born to him.

While he lives, the father controls his daughter’s betrothal of mating until she is fully adult. This paternal control is based on a myth of paternal severity, as we have seen; but informants could not recall any actual cases of men cursing (“wishing”) their daughters or expelling them from their homes. Adult girls living in their father’s home will be his favourites, and their affectionate relations allow him to prevent the situations that might warrant such treatment. Women scold their daughters more often than men do, but they say little about their sons’ love affairs until marriage is mentioned. Daughters respond to this maternal preference for sons by closer identification with their fathers.

While living at home, sons make frequent cash gifts to their mother, who has charge of household supplies, but they rarely make gifts to their father. Women like their sons for this liberality and look to them for support in widowhood or if their union dissolves. Consequently, they dislike the idea of their sons’ marriage, which implies reduced support, and prefer the sons to emigrate, since this usually provides increased income and postponement of marriage. As noted before, the economic difference between sons and daughters correlates closely with the mother’s attitudes to
them, and the economic factor is also important in differentiating relations between a woman and her married and unmarried daughters. Despite variation, the latent opposition between a mother and daughter living at home reflects the conditions linked with alternative mating forms. Beyond a certain point this opposition may lead the young woman to move out on her own, alone or with her children; and because they anticipate this men prefer their outside-children to live with their own mothers.

After a man has married and assumed economic independence, his father’s authority becomes progressively less specific and more clearly bound up with status and ritual. A man’s increasing maturity is demonstrated by increasing identification with his seniors, especially with his father; and this in turn involves increasing concern with the maintenance of social norms, especially those of ritual, descent, and filiation. This maturation is usually accompanied by a loosening of bonds with his mother. However, if the mother is widowed or his father old and infirm, the son tries to support them both as best he can. This is obligatory, although the parents are not thought of as dependants. But even when mature, the son remains under his father’s ritual charge. While his father lives, the son will not often receive dream-messages demanding sacrifice, and if this occurs, he must act on his father’s advice. The father still has the power to curse or disinherit the son, but there is hardly ever any occasion for such action after the son’s marriage. If the son dies first, his father acts as trustee for his property and young children until his own death, although the son’s widow retains formal charge of his holding. In all important transactions—such as the purchase of land, the building of a house, engagement, marriage, or the acquisition of a schooner—the father acts as his son’s representative or adviser. In ritual his seniority and guidance are also explicit. Thus the economic independence of sons does not remove them from their father’s influence. Rather the reverse, since maturity and independence increase as a man identifies himself more and more with his father. Good relations between fathers and adult sons continue after the father dies, when the sons entomb his grave, setting their father at peace and winning his spirit’s protection. When he is too old to manage his property, the father may distribute it among his
children, who support him thereafter. At this time a man may give his outside-children portions. Relations between men and their married sons, lawful or other, are very similar, perhaps because sons never stay with their fathers after marriage and very rarely after they are twenty-five years old.

A man’s attachment to his mother is expressed in the saying: “A wife you can get any time, but you only have one mother.” This antithesis neatly points out the contrary pulls on a man, but it misrepresents their relative effectiveness. The married man with children can only give to his mother out of his surplus. It is his mother who will be informed by young women of his responsibility for their pregnancies, and even if he disclaims paternity, she may later claim as his issue a child whose appearance supports the attribution. She helps at the birth of her son’s children, and her presence on these occasions formally acknowledges them to be his. She often rears some of his children in her home, and after death is a frequent dream visitor, bringing messages or asking for food.

Relations between guardians and wards are modelled on those between parents and children, except for those between a child and the grandmother with whom it lives. In such cases the grandmother combines the disciplinary, organisational, and affective roles of both parents. Otherwise the guardian’s role and interest vary with the sex of guardian and ward; with their kinship, ages, and household positions; and with the length and context of their relation. Children brought up under their father’s care have special advantages and often marry early. Lacking a father’s guidance and authority at home, children may grow up without adequate motivation to fulfil cultural norms. Although a man’s brothers may admonish and assist his child, they can only supply the accustomed mixture of paternal control and motivation if the child lives with them, which is rarely the case. Thus widows and unmarried mothers with children of marriageable age face similar problems of control and guidance. For example, young men who do not intend to marry often seek liaisons with girls whose fathers are not there to protect them. One occasionally comes across a cluster of houses inhabited by two old sisters, their daughters, and daughters’ children. In 1953 L’Esterre contained two of these
clusters. Such groups represent extreme deviations of kinship structure, in the mating histories of their members, and in their economic and social condition. Usually the senior women are immigrants to the community, and if they married, their daughters’ unfortunate matings occurred after their fathers’ deaths.

**Relations between Siblings** The differentiation of siblings in Carriacou involves filiation and birth status as well as sex and age. Many individuals who have no siblings have several paternal and maternal half-siblings. Such persons may become attached to those half-siblings with whom they live, or to those having the same father. Paternal half-siblings are lineage kin, but maternal half-siblings more often live together. The situations which manifest these different pulls rarely overlap. Patrifiliation dominates ritual and lineage relations, matrifiliation the domestic and familial organisation.

Among full siblings of lawful status, sex is quite the most important difference, but age receives first emphasis, since the mother puts her younger child under the elder’s charge. How seniority will regulate relations in adult life depends largely on the differences in age and sex among the children; but the elder child is expected to exercise leadership over and on behalf of his younger siblings in adult life. If male, the eldest child will be the parent’s executor, the one responsible for tombing him, probably the first to build his own home and marry, the first to emigrate, and the one who makes arrangements to accommodate others overseas. The eldest daughter will take charge of wakes and prayer-meetings held for the dead parents, since this is “women’s business.” If there are no daughters, the wife of the eldest son will supervise these rituals, and her husband has formal charge. Ceremonial outlays should be undertaken by siblings as a unit under the eldest son, who handles the business transactions involved and should try to make the largest contribution. After the mother’s death, the eldest son should arrange for one of his unwed sisters to occupy the parents’ home. He must also see to the distribution of the parents’ property. When Requiem Masses are being held, the eldest daughter usually makes the arrangements.
There is no formal domination of junior by senior. Instead, the eldest son's authority is an informal leadership based on the solidarity of the sibling group and exercised with their consent. If he is sufficiently senior, the eldest son may assume some of the father's advisory roles after the latter's death: he will be consulted about betrothals, dream-messages, or land transactions, and will consult his lineage seniors informally on behalf of the group. His position perhaps owes most of its strength to the lineage structure, of which the sibling unit is a segment. During their lifetimes parents do not differentiate between their adult children explicitly according to birth order. To the parents, the significant differences among their children are those of sex, birth status, and residence.

The distinctness of the sibling group begins to emerge after the father's death, when they have to provide for their mother and complete their father's funeral rites. The basis for group action is laid down long before in other family rituals, which oblige all siblings to sacrifice (bleed) a fowl at one another's rites. If the family has its own cemetery, all are concerned with its care, and this property, like some other portions of family land, is held jointly. If their father is dead and his brothers are absent from the community, the eldest son is responsible for negotiating his sisters' betrothals; but once they are married his responsibility ceases, and they come under their husbands' control. The only direct action that a woman's brothers are permitted to take against a husband who "brutalises" her is to order him to remove his house from their land if it is sited there. Such action is rarely necessary, since husbands are strongly motivated to care for their wives. Men also lack direct authority over their unmarried sisters who have "taken up their womanship." Such females are free to mate as they please and often live on their own. If the father had many acres, an eldest son may hold it in trust until all his siblings have attained their legal majority; but delays in dividing an estate may also arise due to the absence of some co-heirs.

Sisters seem to be the principal parties in disputes over land inheritance, perhaps because women are directly concerned with farming and normally have separate household responsibilities. It is unusual for a man to try to dispossess his siblings of their in-
heritance, but quite common for him to do so with half-siblings. Brothers and sisters may also dispute the size of their portions, especially if the sisters have married. The brothers may claim that the married sisters have "lost their title"—meaning at once their name, family membership, and claim to the land. They may then give them a share equivalent to half their own. In oral or written wills fathers may also leave married daughters half the shares allotted to sons; but in this there is no uniformity, perhaps because fathers often die before their children reach marriageable age. If women are poor, widowed, unmarried, or have few economic prospects, their interest in land inheritance increases; and in these conditions two sisters may dispute an inheritance. As land cases may not be heard by the magistrate’s court in Carriacou and women cannot afford the expense or unpredictability of suits in the High Court at St. George’s, Grenada, such disagreements can rarely be settled except by the intervention of kinsmen. Efforts at mediation often fail because of the women’s hostility to one another. The few disputes over land between close kin which came to my notice in Carriacou all involved sisters who were household heads and had no brothers in the community.

Quarrels between brothers and sisters are rare. A man will send his wife and children to help his unmarried sister in her garden, and she may take one of his unlawful children into her home. If the subdivision of the inheritance is delayed by the absence of heirs overseas, needy sisters will be allowed to use the absentees’ portions. The folk disapprove quarrels between siblings, and the formal division of inherited land is interpreted as being due to disagreement. No surveyors are ever called in to effect this division, and "the worst crime" is to bring a sibling to court on these or similar matters.

In short, siblings are constrained to demonstrate solidarity. Since each mates independently and has separate domestic responsibilities, the scope for possible controversy is reduced to such tasks as they undertake in common, or to those obligations which they must share. Recurrent rituals renew and reaffirm these solidarities and role allocations, as do the changing circumstances of mating and family life. The prosperous sibling is expected to help the needy; the prolific to provide the childless with children.
Often an economically independent sibling will refuse to occupy his portion of the inheritance; or a man may sell his house to his brother for a nominal figure after building himself another, arrange apprenticeship for his brother’s son, or give his sister beasts or land on the share. Being more actively engaged in the exchange system, men assist one another with cash when they can. Women, being more heavily involved in the subsistence sector, assist each other with labour or goods in kind. After a man’s death, his siblings will assist the orphans if necessary, often by taking them into their homes. Men also help their brother’s widow and children with the cost of his tomb, but a woman’s brothers do not assist her to entomb her husband.

Brothers and sisters are generally very fond of one another, especially younger brothers and elder sisters. If the age difference is sufficient, the sister may act as a mother-substitute for her younger brothers after the mother’s death. Brother and sister incest being unthinkable, their interaction has few restrictions. A man may enter his sister’s room unannounced, sit on her bed, and generally treat her with greater familiarity than he shows his brothers. He is correspondingly friendly towards her children, who become specially fond of him for the presents he gives them. Sisters indirectly link brothers together by their warm and affectionate relations with them. Since men help their sisters when they can, unwed women who have brothers living in the community are much better off than those who do not. Men tolerate their sisters’ husbands and mates as long as the sisters are well treated. After their mother’s death, the eldest sister may claim as her brother’s a child of obscure paternity whom she wishes to rear. In Carriacou, the freedom and warmth of brother and sister relations is without parallel.

Co-operation between brothers, like that between brothers and sisters, is an inter-household one, but relations between brothers are more heavily formalised. This formal framework stresses equivalence at the expense of warm individual ties. Relations between sisters are usually less deep and close than those between sister and brother but are not as formal or extensive as those between brothers. They tend to lack a definite pattern, in response to the variable mating positions of women; and their
heavy responsibilities as mothers further differentiate the sisters. The children of siblings visit one another’s homes frequently; relationships between first cousins tend to resemble those between their parents. Residential separation during childhood naturally weakens the ties among adult siblings.

Among full siblings, equivalence is stressed. Among half-siblings, differentiation is the rule. A couple who each have children by other mates will normally take an interest in one another’s outside-children; but the wife’s outside-children are not related to her husband’s outside-children, although both of them are half-siblings of the couple’s house-children. This differentiation of half-siblings is further influenced by residence. If the couple’s outside-children live in separate households, they may have little chance to develop close ties; but if any of these outside-children also live in the couple’s home, then the others outside assimilate them to the couple’s own children. In this way, indirect kinship relations may be extended informally.

In discussing relations between half-siblings, differences of birth-status, residence, and the sex of the common parent are of special importance. Unlawful children usually remain with their mothers apart from their fathers, in contrast to the father’s lawful children. Inheritance issues underline and perpetuate the differentiation expressed in differences of residence. Unlawful children who live with their father tend to develop close ties with his other house-children. A man’s outside-children who live with his kinsfolk are thereby distinct from his house-children. Even so, in adult life paternal half-siblings co-operate at rituals for their common father, as maternal half-siblings do for their mother. The marginal position of the outside-child is expressed by the location of the rituals in the father’s home and by the prominence of the house-children, who are mainly responsible for them. But the outside-child’s membership in the group descended from the father is clear despite these differences. He must be invited to all family rituals and should attend them. In turn, he will invite his paternal half-siblings to his own ceremonies, including those held on behalf of his mother, and they will usually send a representative. Until emigration interrupts their association, the paternal half-siblings, although differentiated among themselves
by residence, matrification, and birth-status, exhibit solidity and distinctness in these recurrent activities commensurate with their structural position as a lineage segment. In lineage terms, all children of siblings or half-siblings are equally first cousins and are subject to the same behavioural norms. In practice, however, relations between paternal half-siblings are often similar to those between agnatic first cousins, and perhaps for this reason the grandchildren of siblings are sometimes spoken of as first cousins once removed, while the grandchildren of paternal half-siblings will always be spoken of as second cousins. In other words, differences of matrification are sometimes expressed in generation terms.

Children who live with their mothers have strong ties through the mother to one another, despite differing paternity or birth-status. A maternal half-sister may be the focus of a group of brothers who are her maternal half-siblings, and this bond may persist through life if they live near each other. In such cases the maternal half-sister will usually be asked to live on the family land and will lead her brothers’ rituals for their deceased mother. Residential separation of a woman’s children has the contrary effect. With such intense differentiation, a classificatory system of relationship or terminology cannot develop.

Aunts and uncles who are siblings of a child’s parent are free to discipline him, as are maternal half-siblings of either parent. The parents’ paternal half-siblings, although formally free to do likewise rarely do so unless there are special bonds between them and the child’s parents. Maternal half-siblings approximate siblings more closely than do paternal half-siblings, especially if the former were brought up together. Such differences among siblings are later extended to one another’s children. Nonetheless, after the death of their parents the children of one man by several women share more common obligations and interests by virtue of their common lineage membership than do the children of one woman by several men.
We have seen that the alternative forms of mating in Carriacou are systematically associated with alternative definitions of parental roles and alternative family forms. In this chapter I shall examine the domestic organisation directly in order to discover whether its structural variety corresponds with the mating and family relations already described. We may then be able to determine whether we can best understand the domestic organisation by treating it as a necessary correlate of mating and parental forms. In this way, I shall try to explain domestic relations and groupings by reference to the wider context of kinship, rather than try to explain the kinship system by means of the domestic organisation. For the present analysis I shall use data from the island sample of 224 households.
Households and Their Headship  The household is a domestic unit. It may consist of a single individual but more commonly contains a group. Household members are those persons who share a dwelling, food, and supplies. The group generally functions as an economic unit for subsistence production; but its adult members may have individual incomes and expenditures, as well as separate occupations. Members of a household may sometimes sleep or eat in other homes, but they make their major domestic contributions to their own household and recognise common leadership or responsibilities within that unit. Although households consisting of single individuals lack any internal complexity, their relations with other domestic groups nearby vary with the type of attachments these single-person units exhibit.

Our island sample contained 27 units of single adults. In 7 cases the solitary individuals were males, in 20 they were females. Of the 7 males, 5 were between the ages of 25 and 54, and none were under 25 years of age. Three of these 7 men were widowers, 3 were young unmarried men, and the marital status of one was not known. Of the 20 women, 14 were above the age of 55 and only one, a young bride whose husband was abroad, was under 25. Nine of these women had never married, 7 were widows, 2 were informally separated wives, and 2 had absent husbands. In all cases, these solitary householders maintained quite separate units of domestic economy, and their attachments to nearby kin were clearly defined. Single-person units are, then, one alternative form of domestic organisation and their frequency and characteristics require an attention equal to that given to other forms.

As just shown, these units reflect the prevailing family structure in their low frequencies and the condition of their solitary members. To begin with, women outnumber men in such units by nearly three to one. Of the men, nearly half are senior widowers who, under current mating norms, cannot renew cohabitation without marriage. An equal number are mature men between 25 and 54 who have never married but live in board houses. Their parents being dead, they must live alone unless they marry or cohabit with a woman in a “dirt house,” since as adult males they cannot live in their siblings’ households. Of the 20 solitary
women, 7 are widows and 2 are separated wives, for whom further cohabitation outside of marriage is forbidden by status factors. Another 9 are spinsters without children in their homes. For these women, most of whose parents are dead, cohabitation is the only alternative to solitary living, since co-residence in the homes of their siblings, married or other, is marginal to this family structure. Moreover, the excess of adult females over males in the local population is such that at any time some of the unmarried women will be living alone if they do not have young children with them. Notably, only 2 of the 20 women had absent husbands. One wife was pregnant, and in the other case it was uncertain whether the marriage continued, although the wife lived alone awaiting her husband's return.

In all households other than single-person units, there is at least one head and one dependant. In Carriacou men head units based on cohabitation: "The man is the key of the house"; "a house is man's business, a garden is for the woman"; "the man must rule in the house." However, there are some exceptions. Men keeping in "women's houses" or with informally separated women in the latter's board houses may not be heads of those homes. If a husband is infirm and incapable while his wife is hale and energetic, his infirmities will disqualify him for leadership, and the woman may be recognised by the community as the head of that house. Ritual roles formally identify the household head. Men living with their mother in the latter's home are dependents rather than heads, even though they may be the principal economic support of the unit. Such men will always be unmarried, since men may not remain in their parents' homes after marriage. It occasionally happens that a married man will take his mother into his home, in which case she is the dependant and he is the head. Women who remain with their mother in the latter's home are never heads of these homes whatever their marital status, since kinship seniorities prevail over marital status among women.

The ownership and control of house, site, and garden are not completely correlated with household headship. A wife will become household head when her husband dies, but during his lifetime the husband is head, even though the house is located on
his wife's land and its farm land also belongs to her. In fact, the greater part of local farm land is occupied by women through inheritance and their kinsmen's emigration; but men own most houses. Even when a couple keeps in a woman's house, the man is household head if they expect to marry and move into his house.

Thus despite its lack of ambiguity, household headship has variable significance in different types of domestic group. The dependants' positions also vary. Wives, male keepers, or adult children living with their aging parents occupy a position different from those of other dependants in these households. For this reason among others I shall distinguish between household principals and household dependants. The household head will always be a principal, and may indeed be the only one. But the head's cohabiting mate will also be a principal, as will adult children living with their aged parents in certain types of unit, or a dependant mother living in her married son's home, or a dependant sibling of the head in the few households where these are found. Adult members of the household who are affinal kin of the head are not principals, since they cannot succeed to headship of these units. When husbands are absent, women exercise temporary headship of units in which they are otherwise principals. Children and most household members of a generation junior to the head will not be principals, with the exceptions already mentioned. By distinguishing principals from other household members, we recognise the variable conditions of headship and dependence in domestic units of differing constitution, and are thereby enabled to analyse these structural varieties by reference to the kinship connections within them, including the age, generation, and marital status of the leading members.

Although cohabitation does not always imply male headship, it normally does. In such units the household head is also the dominant person. He is responsible for the maintenance of the group, for its economy and expenses, and for decisions affecting senior as well as junior members. He decides when and where to send children to school, when to notify the doctor or other officials, when to allow adoptions into or out of the household, and so on. He must provide the principal household resources, and his
death or emigration involves the transfer of headship as well as property. He controls the household labour force and is its sole representative in most inter-household relations affecting the group as a whole. He is the ritual leader, selects the house site, and says where its members are to reside during his absence. In short, headship has functions which validate its importance as a social form.

Headship exercised by women is more variable than that of men. Mature single mothers living with their children have much the same controls and responsibilities as do male household heads, along with the additional duties of motherhood; but older women whose adult children live with them are not solely responsible for the unit's economy or so fully in command. The economic dependence of these female heads on their adult children reduces their authority in the home, and as we have seen, there is an ambiguous and changing distribution of control between the household adults which is partly reflected in the mating relations of the young. In short, the role of principals other than the head varies according to the sex, age, and marital status of the head as well as the principals, and with the constitution of the domestic group.

The Distribution of Headship To appreciate fully the conditions associated with the distribution of household headship in Carriacou, we must examine the local demographic structure, using the island sample. These data are presented in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-14 &quot;</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-24 &quot;</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-39 &quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-54 &quot;</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-69 &quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+ &quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demographic abnormalities of Carriacou are well illustrated by the figures in Table 13. Nearly 43 per cent of the sample population are less than 14 years of age; 60 per cent of the total sample are females, and between the ages of 15 and 54, which can be regarded as the reproductive period, women outnumber men by 5 to 3. In the age group 55 to 69, there are 7 women to every 2 men as shown in Table 9, and 34 of these women were widows. The heavy male emigration characteristic of Carriacou is largely responsible for the marked sexual imbalances which begin to show in the age group 15 to 24; but there is a notable difference in the life expectancy of men and women, shown by the large number of widows. Obviously this difference will influence the distribution of headship and the constitution of household groups, just as the sexual imbalance among adults will influence the sex ratios among household heads. In Table 14, I have classified the heads of these 224 households by sex and age, giving the percentages in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three homes in every 5 have female household heads. The proportionate distribution of household headship by sex corresponds very closely with the sex ratios of the sample population. However, this does not mean that men and women have equal chances of becoming household heads. Of the 205 males over 25 years of age, 45.5 per cent are household heads, as against exactly one-third of the 393 adult females.

Over 99 per cent of the Carriacou household heads are above the age of 25, over 85 per cent above 40, and 53.1 per cent above 55. Of the 77 males aged 15 to 24, only one was head of his home.
Of the 51 men aged 25 to 39, 20, or 39.2 per cent, were household heads, as were 90.5 per cent of the 41 men between 40 and 54. Of those in the immediately senior age group, 96 per cent were household heads; and all 13 men above the age of 70 were heads of their own homes. Of 106 young women aged 15 to 24, only one was a household head. Of 91 women aged between 25 and 39, only 10, or 11 per cent, were heads of their own homes. Of those 82 aged between 40 and 54, 36, or 44 per cent were household heads; but 62, or 72 per cent, of the 86 women between 55 and 69 were heads of their own homes, as were 22, or 78.5 per cent, of the 28 women above the age of 70. In other words, age influences the distribution of household headship profoundly, but headship is more fully associated with seniority by age among males than among women.

Looking back at Table 14, we find 20 male and 10 female household heads between the ages of 25 and 39. But in the age group 40 to 54, there are 37 male and 36 female household heads; and in the next age group, 55 to 69, female heads outnumber males by almost three to one. Even so, the distribution of headship by age within each sex is markedly different. The chances of men between the ages of 40 and 54 heading their own households are more than twice as high as those of women; in fact, the distribution of headship among the sexes beyond the age of 39 expresses the adult sex imbalance most clearly. Moreover, since 84 of the 131 female household heads are above the age of 55, we can expect a high incidence of domestic units containing three generations under female heads. Since only 35 of the 93 male household heads are over 55, such generation depth will be less evident in households with male heads. Conversely, since 58 of the 93 male household heads are below the age of 55, we can expect a high incidence of households under male heads based on couples and their children. Since only 47 of the 131 female household heads are below 55 years of age, the frequency of units which contain only mother and children will be relatively low.

The distribution of headship is influenced also by marital status and parental experience. I have already discussed these relations in Chapter 8, and shall only summarise their most striking features. Of the 93 male household heads, only 4 were single.
Seven were widowers, another 77 were married, and the remaining 5 were cohabiting consensually. Of the 84 married men in these 224 households, 77 were heads of their own homes. Of the 107 single men in the sample, only 4 were heads of their households; of the 7 men who were keeping, 5 were household heads. Clearly, marriage is quite as strongly associated with male household headship as single status is with male dependence. Keeping is variable.

As shown in Tables 9 and 10 in Chapter 8, all 59 widows in this sample were household heads, but only 21 of the 115 married women whose husbands were still alive were heads of their own homes. The majority of these 21 wives had absent husbands, but there were a few separated women among them. Of the 65 single mothers in the sample, 25 were heads of their own homes; of the 118 childless single women, 87 were below the age of 24 and 8 were household heads; of the 27 women whose marital and parental statuses were unknown, 16 were household heads. Forty-nine of the 210 single women were heads of their own homes, as compared with 21 of the 115 wives. Thus, single women are more likely than married ones to assume household headship, and widows are more likely to do so than either. These distributions illustrate the relation between headship and marital status in both sexes. The rule is that men should marry and head their own homes. In consequence, the majority of female household heads are widows or mature single women.

The Composition of Household Groups Only two-fifths of the sample households have male heads, yet more than half of the sample population live in homes with male heads. In Table 15 the sample population is analysed by sex, age, and sex of household head for comparative purposes. Nearly half of the population living in houses with male heads are below the age of 14, as against 37 per cent of that living under female heads. Four in every 7 children less than 15 years of age live in homes with male heads, as do 3 in every 5 males of the sample, including children. Households with female heads contain five-ninths of the total female population, including children; but in such units, females outnumber males by more than two to one. The sexes are
far more evenly balanced in households with male heads. On average, there are 3 children below the age of 15 in each household with a male head, as against 1.5 in each household with a female head; but households with female heads contain almost one-and-a-half times as many members of the two senior age groups as do units with male heads. These data suggest that whereas many households with male heads consist of these men's elementary families, with or without attachments, many households with female heads will contain a woman and her grandchildren, with or without the children's mother.

Table 15. Age and sex distribution of persons in the 224 sample households, classified according to sex of their head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Households with male heads</th>
<th></th>
<th>Households with female heads</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including single-person units, the average population of households with male heads is 5.7, that of households with female heads, 3.9, and of both, 4.6. Excluding single-person households, units headed by males average 6.1 members each, and those under females average 4.4. Of the 24 households containing only 2 persons, 22 have female heads; of the 40 households containing 3 persons each—the modal size—29 have female heads. Of the 33 households with 8 or more persons, 23 have male heads. In short, households with male heads are on the average larger than those with female heads, and this expresses their different position in the system of mating and kinship as well as the economy. Other differences in the kinship constitution of these two categories of households are shown in Table 16.

Since households heads are excluded from the preceding table, single-person units do not enter into it at all, and the classification deals only with the dependent members of domestic groups,
Table 16. Household populations, classified by sex of head and relationship of members to head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of kin</th>
<th>Households with male heads</th>
<th>Households with female heads</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spouses and mates</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HH's sons</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HH's daughters</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH's children</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HH's sons' sons</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HH's sons' daughters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HH's daughters' sons</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HH's daughters' daughters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH's grandchildren</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HH's sons' grandchildren</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. HH's daughters' grandchildren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lineal issue of HH</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HH's mate's sons by others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. HH's mate's daughters by others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. HH's mate's sons' sons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. HH's mate's daughters' sons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. HH's mate's daughters' daughters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of HH's mate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. HH's brothers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. HH's sisters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. HH's brothers' issue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. HH's sisters' issue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH's siblings and their issue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. HH's mother's sister</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. HH's mother's sister's issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. HH's m's m's sister's issue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH's other collateral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Household populations, classified by sex of head and relationship of members to head (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of kin</th>
<th>Households with male heads</th>
<th>With female heads</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. HH's mother</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. HH's child's mate or spouse</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Kin of HH's children's mates</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Other kin of HH's mate/spouse</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. HH's adopted children (unrelated)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Boarders</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HH = household head

including principals other than the household head. To avoid overloading the table, I have ignored distinctions of age and birth-status and have simply entered the resident kin of the household head’s mate, other than their own issue, in one category, No. 25. In the following discussion, we shall have occasion to examine some of these composite categories in greater detail.

Certain categories of kin are either entirely absent or sparsely represented in either or both types of household. For instance, no fathers live as dependants in homes of which their children are heads. The only resident dependent mother of a household head lives in her daughter’s home. Men are absent from their brothers’ and sisters’ homes entirely. Households with male heads also lack any of the heads’ sisters or their issue, any of the head’s children’s mates or their kin, any boarders, or any grandchildren of the head’s sons. Households with female heads contain a wider variety of the head’s kinsfolk, but they also lack any of the head’s present or past mate’s grandchildren by other women. Units of either type contain few adopted children not related to the head and only one boarder, who lives under a female head. Households with male heads do not contain such materterine kin as the mother’s sister or grandmother’s sister’s issue. Each house con-
tains a distinct household. In no case do two households occupy the same house.

There are striking differences between units with male and female heads. Households with female heads contain almost as many grandchildren as children of the head; but in those with male heads, the head’s children outnumber his resident grandchildren by more than six to one, and there is only one great-grandchild. The resident lineal issue of male heads represent two-thirds of the dependent population in these units, as against three-quarters of those under female heads. As we should expect,
holds with male heads, they form 13 per cent. Thus, if we exclude mates resident with household heads of either sex, the principal structural differences between units with male and female heads consist in the varying proportions of resident grandchildren, collaterals, and affines of these heads. In analysing the domestic system, we shall therefore have to show whether these differences are interdependent expressions of the principles that regulate Carriacou family structure.

We may begin by considering the collateral component of these households. In households with female heads, this component consists of individuals directly related to the head; but, as we have seen, there are hardly any such collateral kin living with male household heads: the collateral component in these latter households consists of affines of the head, linked to his mate or spouse by collateral kinship. Analysis of kinship factors among the resident collaterals of female principals in either category of households should thus reveal the principles that govern their domestic placement. The two preceding diagrams describe the
kinship connections between these women and their collateral kin exactly, including the collaterals' birth-status. As shown in the first diagram, the resident kin of women living in their husbands' homes include 2 mothers and 6 unrelated persons who were grandchildren of the unwed former mate of one of these women. As these 8 persons are not consanguineal kin, they have been excluded from Table 17.

Table 17. Resident collaterals of female principals, classified by kinship category, birth-status, and sex of household head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinship category</th>
<th>Houses with male heads</th>
<th>Houses with female heads</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of siblings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrilateral kin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrilateral kin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L lawful
U unlawful
NK birth status not known

Apart from the 35 kinsfolk of female principals living in homes with male heads (see Table 16), there are also 22 persons descended from these principals. Of the 35 other kin, 25 are collaterals, as are all 68 residents classified in Table 17 above as collaterals of the female household heads with whom they lived. Together, these 2 collateral groups amount to 93 persons, of whom 19 are lawful, 17 are of unspecified birth-status, and 57 are illegitimate. In short, illegitimates outnumber legitimates among the resident collaterals of female principals by three to one. Matrilateral kin outnumber patrilateral kin among these collaterals by two to one; and although only 6 per cent of the total are siblings of the principals, 68 per cent are descendants of siblings.¹

Types of Domestic Unit The principles which govern the constitution of domestic units being known, it only remains to show

¹ For more detailed analysis of the lineal and collateral components see Appendix B.
the frequencies with which different types of unit occur in the sample. This distribution is presented in Table 18.

In Table 18 domestic units are distinguished according to their bases and by the presence or absence within them of persons other than those specified in the definition of the categories to which these units belong. Units which contain accretions form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18. Frequency of differing types of domestic unit within the sample.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Houses with male heads</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HH and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Childless couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Couples and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HH and grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Couples and grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Children and grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HH and issue to 4th generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Couples and issue to 4th generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HH household heads

approximately one-third of the total, and they are equally distributed under heads of different sex. These accretions are mainly collateral kin of the female principals, as shown in Table 16, but "outside" issue of the mate of the household head, the resident mates or spouses of the head's children, adopted unrelated persons, and the solitary boarder are also included. Such people are obvious accretions to the domestic core; and their presence or absence does not alter the classification of units materially, provided that units having accretions are distinguished from those
which have not. Thus 27 individuals live completely alone. Another 17, all women, have some distant kin or unrelated person living with them. From a structural point of view, these 44 households belong to the same category, that of single persons living with or without accretions.

Morphological classification of units by domestic cores emphasises such factors as conjugal basis, lineal constitution, and generation depth. In this classification I have included a separate category for those units whose principals are siblings living together with or without children, since siblingship offers the primary alternative to lineal and conjugal relations for the constitution of domestic groups. Where either sibling has a resident mate, the unit is included in one or other of the categories based on couples. As shown in Table 18, units based on sibling relations are marginal to this domestic system. One other feature of the classification which informs Table 18 requires explanation. The category “childless couples” includes all couples living together as principals of a household which contains no person descended from them jointly. This category is sociological rather than biological, since some of these couples may have children living elsewhere. The important structural point is that no one living with couples classified as childless is descended from them jointly. In other words, units of this type have no lineal constitution, despite their conjugal basis.

Categories 6 to 11 of Table 18 tend to correspond closely with differences in the sex of household heads. For example, Category 6 isolates groups with cores consisting of the household head and the head’s grandchildren, and we already know that such heads will be mainly females. Category 7 isolates cores which consist of couples and their grandchildren, and the heads of such households will usually be men. Categories 8 and 9 on the one hand, and 10 and 11 on the other, repeat this alternating classification, and differentiate units according to their current conjugal basis. Even so, conjugal differences do not correspond completely with differences in the sex of the head, as is shown by the 2 households in Category 8 which consist of male heads, their children and grandchildren. In short, the structural classification which informs Table 18 is analytically independent of the differentiation
of households by the sex of their head. Because this is so, the comparative frequencies of units of differing structure under heads of different sex are genuinely expressive of the principles which regulate domestic groupings throughout the population as a whole.

Of the 32 units under male heads which contain accretions, 5 include the kin and “outside” issue of the head, while 24 include such kin and issue of the head’s wife or mate, and in one case each, the couple have their “outside” issue and kin living with them. The last case includes an unrelated adoption. Of the 42 households under females which have accretions, 31 contain kin of the heads, 9 contain adopted persons or others mating with the head’s children, and 2 contain kin of the head’s present or past mate or spouse.

The first point to note about this typology is that units of Categories 1 to 3, and some of Category 4, cannot be equated with the domestic elementary family or explained as developments of the domestic elementary family. Between them, Categories 1 to 3 represent 33.5 per cent of the sample households. With the addition of units based on childless couples, many of whom are biologically childless, nearly 40 per cent of these domestic units cannot be explained adequately by theories of domestic organisation which assume co-resident elementary families as the foundation of all household groups and forms. Many of the 56 households which contain female heads and their grandchildren, with or without the household head’s children, have also developed outside the framework of domestic elementary families. In short, the typology shows how far and in what ways the hypothesis of household derivation from domestic elementary families is here inadequate. It also shows that 33 per cent of the households in this sample contain accretions to their domestic cores, and that these accretions, as just shown, are mainly members of other elementary families dispersed within these homes. We must accordingly recognise a systematic variation in the domestic organisation of elementary families in Carriacou which rules out any general and uniform relation between family and household.

We have already seen that these alternatives are associated with alternative modes of mating and parenthood. The frequencies presented in Table 18 illustrate the relations between these alternative forms of mating and parenthood and the system of household groupings.

Of the 93 homes with male heads, 83 are based on conjugal relations of their heads; and in 54 of these, the couples and their children form the domestic core. In another 14 cases, childless couples are the structural core; and the remainder are equally divided between units which contain couples and their grandchildren, with or without the intermediate generation. Of the remaining 10 units with male heads, 7 are single-person households, one consists of the head and his children, and 2 of the head, his children, and grandchildren. Thus male household heads who lack resident mates live alone more often than otherwise. Nearly 3 in every 5 homes with male heads contain elementary families of the head, and over two-thirds of these units consist exclusively of such elementary families. By comparison, 4 in every 5 homes based on childless couples contain accretions. In short, the distribution of these accretions is influenced by the size and character of the domestic core. Although single males prefer to live alone, single women tend to accommodate accretions. Those who have their children or grandchildren only with them, are unlikely to do so, but those who have their children as well as their grandchildren will often accept extra dependants, normally their collateral kin.

Of the 131 households with female heads, 32 per cent consist of the head, her children, and grandchildren; 28 per cent of the head alone or with accretions; and 20 per cent of the head and her children, with or without accretions. Thus these three alternative domestic situations between them account for 80 per cent of the households under female heads. A further 11 per cent of all homes with female heads are based on the head and her grandchildren, without her children. Clearly the systematic differences in the frequencies of these structural alternatives among the households with heads of different sex can only be explained as effects of a system of principles which regulate domestic relations among the population as a whole. These principles define
the family structure which integrates the alternative forms of household mating and parenthood with each other.

Structural differences between domestic units under male and female heads are not limited to their kinship constitution as set out in Table 18. Households having heads of different sex also differ in the number of generations living together, as is shown in Table 19.

**Table 19. Households under heads of different sex, classified by structural type and generation depth.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural category</th>
<th>Houses with male heads</th>
<th>Houses with female heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Single persons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Siblings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HH and children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Childless couples</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Couples and children only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HH and grandchildren</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Couples and grandchildren</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HH, children, and grandchildren</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Couples, children, and grandchildren</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HH and issue to 4th generation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Couples and issue to 4th generation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HH household head

Three-fifths of the households with male heads, but only three-tenths of those with female heads, have a depth of two generations. Three-tenths of those with male heads and half of all homes with female heads have a depth of three generations. The modal generation depth of homes with male and female heads varies in correspondence with the distribution of headship by age and marital status as well as by sex, and so reflects the principles of family structure. Of the total sample, 31 households, or 14 per
cent, include persons of the same generation only. A further 93, or approximately 42 per cent, contain members of two generations, and another 94 contain members of three generations. There are 6 with a generation depth above this.

Inter-household Connections The importance of inter-household relations in regulating the composition and development of domestic groups has been amply demonstrated above, especially

Table 20. Households at L’Esterre, classified by sex of head and number of other domestic units in the village with which they are linked by different categories of kinship, traced through their heads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of linked households</th>
<th>Under male heads</th>
<th>Under female heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary families</td>
<td>Agnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total households with links 25 | 29 | 23 | 77 | 25 | 21 | 19 | 65 |
Total number of links 58 | 198 | 63 | 319 | 33 | 191 | 43 | 273 |
Total households 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 |

with regard to mating, parenthood, and the distribution of children. To examine them more closely, I shall use the 75 households of L’Esterre, which formed one-third of the island sample. In this manner I shall try to show how these relations form a network of kinship ties which ramify throughout a local group and how this network defines the group’s boundaries as well as the position of the households within it. The data necessary for this type of study can only be collected by a genealogical census
based on households; but the variety of kinship relations connecting households raises problems of classification and exposition.

In my initial discussion of community and kinship, I included a summary table of households classified by the sex of their head and by the number of other units at L'Esterré to which they were linked by consanguineal kinship traced through their heads. To analyse these ties in greater detail, I now distinguish between elementary family relations, agnation, and other consanguineal connections, all of which are traced through household heads to household heads or adult dependants above the age of 15.

Of the 36 male household heads of L'Esterré in 1953, 22 were linked by elementary family ties to a total of 44 household heads, and 11 were also linked to dependants in 14 homes. Sixteen male household heads were linked by elementary family ties to another 32 male household heads as follows: 3 heads were sons of another 3 heads, 12 were brothers of another 27, and one had 2 sons who were household heads. Another 12 inter-household connections within this kinship range were to female household heads: 9 male heads were sons of 5 female household heads; 2 had 2 sisters who were household heads, and one had a daughter who was in charge of her own home.

Of the 39 female household heads in L'Esterré, 25 were linked by elementary family ties to a total of 32 household heads, as follows. The father of one woman was a household head; 2 brothers of another 3 women were household heads, and 9 sons of a further 5 were household heads, giving a total of 12 male household heads. Three female household heads had 3 mothers who were also household heads living nearby; another 11 had 14 sisters who were household heads, and there were 3 mothers whose 3 daughters were also household heads. The total 32 inter-household linkages within this range of kinship traced from female household heads includes 3 symmetrical relations between mothers and daughters, each of whom was a head, just as the total inter-household linkages traced through male household heads includes 3 symmetrical relations between men and their fathers, each of whom was a head. Relations between men and their mothers or sisters on the one hand, or between women and
their sons or fathers on the other, are not symmetrical in this sense, since the household heads concerned are differentiated by sex.

Nonetheless, in making a census of inter-household connections, each household must be examined separately for such relations, and these ties reappear when the other households are examined in turn. Since the relations involved are reciprocal, the minimum number of households linked thereby is half the number of relations. Thus the 76 \((44 + 32)\) elementary family relations holding between the 25 male and 25 female household heads of L'Esterre represent a minimum of 38 units linked by such ties. Six of these 25 female household heads were also linked to sisters and daughters who were dependants in as many homes. Of the 32 resident mates of male household heads, 10 were linked by immediate family ties to 11 male and 5 female household heads and to 5 female dependants in other homes—4 of whom were their sisters. In all, these 10 women had 21 elementary family kin living in a total of 15 homes.

Elementary family relations are by no means the most frequent type of inter-household kinship connection however, as is evident from Table 20 in which such ties, agnatic ties, and all other forms of consanguineal kinship are enumerated by their frequency for each household. They are, in fact, the least numerous, while agnatic links to other households are by far the most frequent. There are 13 households in the village, each of which is linked by agnatic kinship, traced through its head, with between 15 and 30 other units. As already shown in Table 6, only 2 households under male heads and 4 under female heads completely lack consanguineal kinship connections to other households in this village. If we include affinity among these inter-household ties, this extremely small number of isolated households is halved, and the average number of inter-household connections at L'Esterre is further increased.

On the average, each of these 75 households at L'Esterre is linked by elementary family ties traced through its head to another 1.28 households in the village, by agnation to an additional 5.16 village households, and by other consanguineal kinship ties to a further 1.41, giving an aggregate average of 7.85 inter-house-
hold connections per domestic unit. In this finely woven network of inter-household kinship, agnatic relations are by far the most important category, and they are therefore the ones which most clearly define community boundaries. In the next chapter I shall discuss these agnatic relations in detail.
The Carriacou social system is a finely articulated synthesis of alternative institutional forms. Mating, household, and elementary family relations vary structurally in systematic interdependence, and are integrated by two principles—namely “family” and lineage. Thus the organisation of extended kinship relations, like all other important kinship institutions in this society, has alternative forms. Of the two, agnation is both more extensive and more clearly defined. I shall accordingly describe the norms of agnatic kinship and analyse these lineage forms before discussing the relations between lineage (agnatic) and “family” (cognatic) principles in Carriacou. Both are widespread, but the principles by which lineages recruit their members are exclusive and especially important in this society.
Conception and the “Blood”  “We are one blood from the father. Is the father that make children.” “A woman never give a child nothing to make it; all the giving is the man. A woman only convey children, that is what the womb is for.”

These statements summarise the Carriacou theory of conception. In other words, they believe that the male semen is the vital principle without which conception cannot occur; the baby derives its life from the father’s blood, ejaculated in the semen. The man “gives” the woman the child as “seed”; the child owes its being to its father and has its father’s blood, blood being the symbol of vitality and life. The woman “conveys” (carries) the child in her womb as a schooner conveys passengers. Since women menstruate between pregnancies, their blood lacks the vitality to create new life. Menstrual difficulties indicate women’s need for intercourse, which will simultaneously regulate their organisms and make them pregnant. The tendency for women to feel ill during pregnancy is also taken to show the superior strength of the male, as are the various physical changes women then experience. These differences between male and female are summarised by the statement that “women cannot transmit the blood, only men can”; the corollary of this is the injunction that women need to receive this blood in order to keep healthy and vigorous.

The mother’s blood enters into the baby’s composition, but it does so as a base material, vitalised by the father’s; and the male and female blood are popularly distinguished by reference to the yolk and white of an egg. “If you have a cow and you don’t bring it to the use of the bull, you don’t get no calf. . . . The man make the children, the women only bear them.” In this quotation the man (singular) makes children which women (plural) bear, but in the previous quotation the man gives the child to the woman. These statements unconsciously reveal the impress of social facts.

The implications of this conception myth for descent are stated clearly by the folk themselves: “My two sisters’ children are not relative. They only style themselves relative, but they are different fathers. The two sisters are relative, but their children not relative. They only relative if they are the same father”—that is, if they had the same father or if their different fathers were
agnatic kin. Thus agnatic kinship is sharply differentiated from other kinship relations, despite recognition of the latter. "Relative” here is used by the speaker for agnatic, or “blood,” kin, by his sisters for “family” kin. The exclusive character of agnation is thus stressed by the speaker, in contrast with the inclusiveness of cognatic kinship.

By the same token groups of agnatic kin several generations deep are differentiated from one another. These patrilineal groups are locally referred to as “bloods” (singular “blood”), since each is defined by descent, identified with men’s blood. Thus the blood which is the vital male principle in conception gives its name generically to those kinship groups recruited by patrilineal descent. Carriacou folk lack the word “lineage,” and they often use the term “relative” to denote lineage kin only. Though without the term, they have the concept, as well as the form, in their “bloods.”

The rule about surnames is clear: “The title [surname] is not the blood.” Unacknowledged children take their mothers’ names and are reared with their mothers’ families, but they are not members of their mothers’ bloods. Being “fatherless,” none can tell to which blood they belong. They will inherit from their mother and depend on her kin; they are members of their mother’s family but not of her blood. Many other members of the mother’s family do not belong to her blood: “They only style themselves relative.”

Although children whose fathers acknowledge them are usually given their father’s surname, women may give their children their own surnames to express dissatisfaction with the father’s support. A woman may also give an adopted child her own surname, often to indicate that it will inherit from her; or a woman who has borne a child before her marriage may later give it her husband’s surname if he supports it and if it will inherit from him. Thus some maternal half-siblings may have the same paternal surname. In such cases blood membership still differs. For example, a certain L’Esterre woman long ago had a child for a man whose surname was Parvey. She later married another whose surname was Joseph, to whom she bore several children. In due course she changed the name of her first child from Daniel Parvey to Daniel Joseph, and Daniel Joseph’s descendants still carry the surname Joseph;
but they are members of Parvey, not Joseph, blood. Such cases show clearly that the blood is not a name group. Widows commonly assume their maiden surnames: thus Mrs. Reggie Bedeau of L’Esterre is again known as Fifi Joseph. While her husband was alive, she used his name; after his death she took back her maiden name to reaffirm blood membership. Only if the child’s name is changed in consequence of changed paternity attribution will its blood affiliation also change; but for such changes to occur the child must show birth-marks characteristic of its new father’s blood. These family birth-marks are naturally best known within the descent line, and consequently it is the man’s mother or sister who usually claims his child on these grounds, since women have a special interest in children. Even in such cases the child’s paternity and blood affiliation remain ambiguous, although the new father will take no positive action to repudiate the attribution, and the former “father” cannot argue against the birth-marks nor seek to recoup his contributions to the child’s support without severe loss of esteem. The child adopted shortly after birth and nursed by its foster-mother belongs to its genitor’s blood (although it may take its adopter’s surname), but to the fostermother’s family, and commits incest if it mates with her children. In short, blood membership is defined biologically, not by social fatherhood.

“A mother doesn’t make children. Is the father makes the child. The day a girl get married, the family gone. As soon as she change her title, she change the family.” “Family” here refers to the household group at one moment, to the blood at another. The former is referred to explicitly, the latter by allusion. Upon marriage, women move to their husband’s households and in that sense they change their family as well as their title; but they also come under their husband’s authority, and are accordingly removed from effective control of their lineage kin. Nonetheless, they remain formally members of their father’s blood, and must participate in his blood rituals as well as in those of their husbands. However, the children a woman bears belong to their genitor’s blood and if she is married, to their father’s family (household) as well. Children cannot belong to their mother’s blood; they belong to their father’s: “Women bring the blood to an end.”
In contrast with married women, the unmarried retain their paternal surnames and usually continue to live in their parents' homes, under the authority of their blood kin and without any ambiguity of blood or family membership. The unmarried woman, if she is her father's senior offspring and lives in his home, may even act as a leader in the new segment. Although rare, such combinations of conditions sometimes occur, and they illustrate clearly the different lineage positions of married and unmarried women. The married woman can act as a leader neither in her own lineage segment, however small, nor in that of her husband. She is the mistress of her husband's household and supports him in such rituals as he holds at their home, but she can neither initiate ritual action on her husband's behalf nor on her own without the approval of her lineage kin. Thus the alternative forms of mating and family are associated with differing lineage positions of married and unmarried women. These differences emphasise the greater identity of interest which the unmarried woman has with her blood.

Despite overlaps, the differences between blood and family are quite clear. The blood is an agnatic descent group; its members are usually dispersed in different domestic units and may even have different surnames—especially the married women, whose position is ambiguous functionally if not formally. Certainly many members of a blood belong to different families; and in any family, the members belong to different bloods. The distinction between lawful and unlawful issue is indeed important in determining the character of blood membership; but this difference in no way affects the fact of agnatic descent. As we have seen, family ties, even within the closest degrees of kinship, frequently cross household boundaries in Carriacou, and a considerable proportion of local households have female heads. Under such circumstances household units, elementary families, and patronymic groups vary widely, and only the principle of patrilineal descent provides a clear basis for supra-familial groupings and organisation.

The household and family obligations which a woman assumes on marriage have formal precedence over those to her own kin. For this reason her importance to the blood diminishes; and so
does its responsibility for her. But even death cannot effect a change in her blood affiliation, and although her spirit may “make messages” to her children, it will also make messages to her blood kin and to other consanguines adopted into her household. The unmarried mother also after her death “makes messages” to her children, who may belong to several bloods, as well as to her blood kin and former household dependants. Men, on the other hand, only make messages to their blood kin or widows. Here again, mothers occupy an interstitial position between blood and family in consequence of the rule that their children belong to their family but not to their blood. Given their ambiguous position during and after life, it is not surprising that women often receive messages from spirits not related to them by blood or family, and that most of these visiting spirits are also female. Men rarely receive such communications.

**Lineage Structure and Development**  
The bloods defined by patrilineal descent are rather more than simple aggregates of individuals: they have the attributes, norms, and functions of lineages. An adequate account must therefore include descriptions of lineage structure, development, and scale; lineage activities and norms; relations within lineages, and between lineages and other social units. We have already analysed the principles of lineage recruitment. Descent and lineage membership are traced through males only, and biological rather than social paternity determines descent. A man and his mother’s brother belong to different bloods; and so does a man and his sister’s children, or a woman and her own children. These principles imply the possibility of an endless succession of lineal generations; but Carriacou folk do not organise their lineages thus. In this descent system, common blood membership implies exogamy which prohibits casual sex relations as well as marriages.

“We plant cassava. We reap it. We call it cassava stick. It make cassava. We grate cassava. We make cassava pap. We strain it, we make starch. We come back, we take starch, we make porridge. You never call it ‘cassava porridge,’ you call it ‘starch porridge.’” This is the standard parable defining the limit of close lineage ties within a span of four generations. The limit is also
described in another way: "In the third generation, your blood start to weaken. After the third generation, it start to weaken. Older and older, you leaving the blood, till you go on to the sixth and seventh. Then you see we is not family again. That time, your blood cut, you pick up your own blood."

The effective limit of immediate blood membership is defined by the taboo on sex relations among agnatic kin. This taboo holds between agnates having a common ancestor within a range of four generations. Second cousins or second cousins once removed may not mate if they are agnates. But even first cousins who are not agnates occasionally marry, and many first cousins once removed who are not agnates do mate. After the fourth generation, when agnatic kin are permitted to marry, "we call it the same blood but we is far away, going, the generation coming to an end, because as soon as it pass the third generation you could marry to one another children." Thus persons tracing descent through males to a common great-grandfather may not mate with one another, since they belong to the same blood. Agnates having a common great-great-grandfather occasionally marry; but even at that remove it is felt that the blood is too close. Such marriages are extremely rare, and they arouse keen discussion, since the young folk support the removal of mating prohibitions, while the old heads regret "splitting the blood" by such marriages.

"The people say if you don’t know a man you can’t make a dream of him, because you can’t recognise him." Thus the folk religion limits effective ancestor worship to about four generations, a period corresponding with that of the agnatic group as an exogamous unit. After this length of time the "generation" comes to an end, as does the taboo on the mating of agnatic descendants, since its founder "is far away" and has lapsed from the range of immediate ritual interest as expressed by dreams and demands for sacrifice.

Marriages were probably first permitted to Carriacou folk about 1830, only six generations ago if we include adults then alive. Although male slaves in Carriacou enjoyed conditions favourable to asserting paternity and maintaining their conjugal relations, patri-descent could not then prevail, since the issue of slave women belonged to the woman’s owners, and men had no effec-
tive claim on their children unless they could redeem them. These historical conditions may set a maximum limit to the generation depth of Carriacou lineages; but they do not entail any uniformity in their depth such as both exogamy and ritual imply. Given this history, we shall later have to consider how these lineage units came to emerge at all. But first we must examine the effect of this four-generation rule on lineage structure.

Given a constant four-generation level of effective blood ties as defined by exogamy and ritual, each successive generation would progressively split the blood, without, however, changing the membership of antecedent generations in a common blood. The following diagram illustrates this successive segmentation schematically. It shows a lineage whose founder, A, had two sons, B1 and B2, each of whom had two sons in turn, and so on until the fifth generation, E1 to E8. Within the first four generations exogamy prevails, and the lineage of A forms a single ritual unit; but in the fifth generation agnates may intermarry, and at this point the units descended from B1 and B2 respectively are distinguished by separate exogamy rules and ritual obligations. At the next generation the descendants of B1’s two sons are similarly distinguished on the one hand, while those of B2’s sons are also separated. Thus at each generation the apical ancestors of the effective bloods are pulled downward one generation, to keep the constant four-generation span of separate bloods; however, this does not involve the fission of the original lineage into two quite distinct bloods.

Let us re-examine the model. E1 is free to marry the sisters of E5 to E8, but not the sisters of E2, E3 or E4. At the next generation, F1 may marry F3’s sister as well as more distant kin, but cannot marry F2’s. Since the alternate generations E and F will be alive together, and F is junior to E, exogamy prohibitions and blood kinship of generation E differ from those of F; and this difference maintains the blood descended from B1 as an effective unit down to the level of E’s generation, while permitting the gradual emergence in the next generation of two separate bloods founded by C1 and C2 respectively, when E1 to E4 are all dead. Thus cumulative generation differences involve a certain relativ-
selves. The uniform four-generation level within which exogamy must be observed gives rise to a system of relativistic references, the junior generation tending to define their blood by reference to their great-grandfather, while their fathers' generation define it by reference to the juniors' great-great-grandfather.

These differing blood identifications of successive generations have three noteworthy implications. First, a man's blood is always more inclusive than that of his son, and generally refers to an agnatic group twice as large as that of his son, although it is only

one generation deeper. The father, therefore, maintains lineage and ritual relations of a wider range than his son, and the father's lineage membership clearly includes that of his son. Thus, although the son is formally free of exogamy restrictions beyond the fourth generation range, he rarely attempts to mate with or marry his agnatic third cousins. In short, the effect of this four-generation exogamy rule is to delay marriage between agnates until they are six generations away from their common ancestor. For this reason I could find only one case in which agnatic third cousins married, and the fathers of this couple had died long before. This explains the imprecision of our previous quotation:
older and older, you leaving the blood, till you go on to the sixth
and seventh [generation], then you see we is not family again.”
While this is the actual practice, the rule is far narrower: “As
soon as it pass the third generation, you could marry to one an-
other children.”

Second, because his father’s lineage kinship is far more exten-
sive and embraces many senior males, a man is constrained to obey
his father’s wishes, in order to retain the approval of the father’s
lineage peers; but progressive redefinition of lineage segments at
each generation does more than this. It emphasises generation
differences between father and son and generalises them as a
principle of lineage development and change. By the same token,
it provides the basis for male status assignments on grounds of
seniority and age and for the social control of junior males by
those of senior generation.

The third point to note about this progressive redefinition of
exogamy limits over the generations is its effect on the span of
lineage relations. The differing ranges within which fathers and
sons must observe exogamy are associated with differing lineage
spans; and, as we have seen, the father’s observance is generally
followed by his son. The father’s blood membership, although not
by rule obligatory for the son, whose formal obligations have a
narrower range, is nonetheless maintained. In short, although
strictly men belong to segments of a narrower span than those of
their fathers, they remain members of the wider segment to which
their fathers belong. Agnation is thus effective beyond the range
of exogamy prohibition. Bloods defined by common exogamy are
segments of wider agnatic lineages which also incorporate superior
as well as co-ordinate segments. Co-ordinate segments are “linked
bloods” and each is an exogamous unit. The superior segments also
form an exogamous unit up to the father’s or grandfather’s gen-
eration; and this hierarchic structure, having a common apical an-
cestor several generations removed, instead of forming a single
exogamous body, represents an organisation of exogamous units
within the inclusive blood of senior generations.

Of course this paradigm is purely formal. We have assumed
that A and his immediate descendants had two sons apiece, giving
the lineage a symmetrical form. We have ignored possibilities of
lineage accretion, emigration, telescoping of generations, assimilation of different lines by attribution to a common ancestor, or the contrary differentiation of one man’s children by ascription to others. Such departures preserve the four-generation unit while allowing lineage forms to develop flexibility. To understand these departures from lineage norms, we must examine an actual case. For the moment, the important point is that the formal and the actual lapses of exogamy take place at different generations so that the span of agnatic kinship is wider than the formally exogamous group.

Within the four-generation range, lineage relations are clearly defined and obligatory. In this span the senior lineage male must be consulted before members may carry out their ancestor rites. For such rituals, at least one representative from each household of the local segment must attend, and there will be at least one senior member from each linked blood. Symbols of common origin which serve to maintain links between exogamous units include common ancestral homes, tombs or former graveyards, a common name and genealogy, and occasionally some “family land”; but it is within the four-generation span, and especially on its margins where blood redefinition is proceeding, that the organisation of precedence and authority is most precise. Beyond this range agnation is primarily distinguished from other consanguineal kinship ties because it links groups rather than individuals; but the more extensive and indirect these linkages, the less easily are their operations distinguished from other forms of consanguinity. At the sixth or seventh generation remove, agnatic links are hardly effective, although they persist. At this distance the lineage ancestors are indistinguishable from other “old parents” for ritual purposes: “The people say if you don’t know a man you can’t make a dream of him. . . . We call it the same blood, but we is far away, going, the generation coming to an end.”

A Carriacou Lineage To illustrate lineage form and development, I shall discuss the Joseph blood. The Josephs trace descent patrilineally starting from the present adult generation through five generations to a man whose first name is no longer remembered, but who is simply referred to as “Old Joseph.” Below the
present adult generation are another two, the second consisting in 1953 of infants and children only. Some members of the sixth generation descended from Old Joseph had already married, while others were children at the time of my visit. Genealogical generation and age-grading do not correspond exactly due to local mating practice. Wide differences of age within a generation may lead to later elision, telescoping, or extension of generations within the genealogy.

Old Joseph had two sons, Blackie and Antoine, whose descendants presently form separate bloods. Blackie’s sons were John-John, Edmund, and Frederick. Antoine’s sons were Josiah, Mitchell, and Matherson. No daughters of these two men were remembered by my informants. In 1953 one of Matherson Joseph’s grandsons married a granddaughter of Frederick Joseph at L’Esterre. This was the first mating to have taken place between any of Old Joseph’s descendants, and it expressed a “generation” segmentation into two bloods, descended from Antoine and Blackie respectively.

A study of the Joseph genealogy reveals the influence of various factors which affect the growth and structure of Carriacou lineages. Perhaps the most obvious of these influences is male migration. The three senior generations of Josephs are all dead; but several of Old Joseph’s great-grandchildren are still alive, the majority of these being over 70 years in 1953. Of John-John’s children, only one woman remains on the island. John-John’s brother Edmund migrated to Westerhall, Grenada, and married there, leaving behind several children by a former mate at Dover, Carriacou. The majority of Edmund’s descendants in Carriacou remain at Dover near Windward, while Edmund’s legitimate issue born in Grenada have continued to live there, except for one woman who was adopted by Edmund’s brother Frederick at L’Esterre, and who later married a man of the Bristol lineage. This old lady was still living at L’Esterre in 1953. A widowed daughter of John-John also lived in that village.

Blackie Joseph’s third son, Frederick, spent his life at L’Esterre, Carriacou. By 1953 Frederick’s patrilineal issue were principals in fifteen L’Esterre households. Frederick Joseph’s agnatic issue
were then the largest blood group in the village, and proportionately fewer members of this segment had migrated from L'Esterre than of any other.

The descendants of John-John, Edmund, and Frederick form one blood; those of Josiah, Mitchell, and Matherson form another. These two bloods are of equal and co-ordinate status, since they are descended from brothers. With certain exceptions discussed below, the senior members in each of these bloods know the genealogy of their own segment fully. But the descendants of Blackie cannot usually give comparable details about the genealogy of Antoine's segment, nor vice versa. Only the senior members in either blood have some detailed knowledge of the genealogy of their collateral segment. Nonetheless, all members of both bloods know that Blackie and Antoine were Old Joseph's sons; even those of Edmund's descendants whom I met accidentally at Latante, Grenada, knew of Antoine and his children.

Antoine's son Josiah is said to have had only one son, O'Donnell, who died overseas, leaving three daughters and a son at Belmont, which is a mile and a half from L'Esterre. Two of O'Donnell's issue have emigrated, leaving two daughters at Belmont. Josiah's brother, Mitchell, also lived and died at Belmont, as did his sons Macdonald and Shervington. The descendants of Macdonald and Shervington are mainly to be found at Belmont; but most of the senior males of this segment are either dead or abroad, and only the daughters or widows presently remain there.

Antoine's third son, Matherson, settled at L'Esterre, and his descendants are mainly to be found in that village. In 1953 Antoine's eldest living child was a man called DeCale, who had married a L'Esterre woman but who also had another family by a mate who lived at Belmont. One of DeCale's unlawful sons, born at Belmont, had moved to L'Esterre to live near his father, but the others had remained at Belmont or gone abroad. A large proportion of DeCale's lawful children have also emigrated, together with some of his brothers' issue. In 1953 DeCale was 86 years old. Although formally head of Antoine's segment, being its senior living member, his leadership was principally effective among the descendants of Matherson who lived at L'Esterre. The
issue of Josiah and Mitchell living at Belmont were mainly women and too few to have an effective say in blood affairs, while those abroad could not participate.

This review illustrates how migration within the island and outside it influences the structure of agnatic groups in Carriacou. Lineage segments are defined genealogically but qualified by locality. The distribution of lineage segments within the island reflects the past movements of lineage males and the pattern of extra-residential mating. Thus, Edmund Joseph’s extra-residential mate at Dover bore several children, and their descendants at Dover, although genealogically a minor segment, now operate as an independent unit due to the distance that separates them from collateral segments at L’Esterrre, Belmont, or Grenada. After Frederick Joseph’s son Isaac had died, Isaac’s widow, Sweet Annie, a native of the nearby island of Union, returned to her home, leaving her children by Isaac at Hillsborough in Carriacou. DeGale also had several children each by three women. One section of DeGale’s descendants remains in their mother’s village at Belmont; the other is settled at L’Esterrre with their father. Emigration disperses lineage members and may also disperse lineage segments; but the dual mating system of the islanders is the principal factor responsible for dispersing segments locally. This dispersal arises as well through the movement of males into their wives’ communities. However, members of dispersed segments sometimes move to join their blood in other communities. Thus, one of Edmund Joseph’s lawful grandchildren lives at Dover, and one of DeGale’s unlawful sons has moved to L’Esterrre.

The effect of permanent emigration on lineage genealogy is progressively to obscure precise connections. Thus, senior members of Frederick Joseph’s segment at L’Esterrre knew that Clarissa was Edmund’s daughter and their father’s brother’s child; but they were poorly informed about Edmund’s other issue, and although they knew that the Dover Josephs were close agnatic kin, several of them could not specify the exact connection, while many were also uncertain about Edmund’s issue at Westerhall, Grenada. The L’Esterrre-born descendants of Matherson are likewise vague about their connection with O’Donnell’s daughters at Belmont; O’Donnell’s segment being minute, he is sometimes re-
garded by Matherson’s descendants as a son of Mitchell—that is to say, O’Donnell is moved downward one generation in the lineage genealogy, to become a brother of Macdonald (Kanaan) and Shervington. Only the most senior persons, such as DeGale, remember the link through Josiah clearly; but DeGale’s unlawful son who was born at Belmont, close to O’Donnell’s issue, also knows the connection between Matherson’s segment and Josiah’s. Agnates who grow up in the same community generally know their relation exactly; but agnatic groups settled in different communities are less well informed about each other’s genealogy, especially if neither unit contains senior males. For this reason, parents must consult their lineage seniors about any proposals of marriage involving their children, and the latter should keep their parents informed about their extra-residential mating relations.

Lineage segments are local groups and function as such. They are also genealogical units, the parts of which may be dispersed, in consequence of which the character and form of lineage relations will be affected. To summarise the factors that influence the distribution of Carriacou lineage segments is difficult, due to their number and variability. At any moment, any local or genealogical segment will have a certain proportion of its members abroad, and most of these will be men. Many emigrants may never return, but so long as their siblings are hale, or their mates and children remain in Carriacou, the permanency of their absence is rarely admitted.

On the island, lineage segments are scattered as effects of inter-community extra-residential mating and the movement of men into new communities. This dispersal generally corresponds with differentiations by reference to matrifiliation or birth-status. Dispersal obscures differences of maternal origin and birth-status in each local genealogy. Even though most extra-residential matings are intra-community relations, these unions also contribute to the internal differentiation of lineage segments by differentiating the issue of lineage males according to parental co-residence and separation, responsibilities, and mating forms. Children living in their father’s home are best placed to become the dominant members of the segment descended from him. Their siblings who live
with their mothers in the same community, although closely integrated with the father's segment, are less likely to become its leaders, and may have close relations of a different kind with their matrikin; those siblings who live with their mothers overseas or in other communities, with or apart from their fathers, are defined as a distinct local segment, whatever their maternal origin or birth-status.

Most L'Esterre-born descendants of Matherson Joseph in Antoine's blood classify Clarissa, Edmund's daughter, and Fifi Joseph as members of Blackie's blood, and only within the senior generation of Blackie's segment at L'Esterre are John-John and Edmund distinguished clearly. Members of Matherson's segment often describe Blackie Joseph's segment as Frederick Joseph's blood, Frederick being the most prolific of Blackie's sons and the best represented locally. Similarly, most L'Esterre-born descendants of Matherson do not distinguish clearly between Shervington's lawful and unlawful issue at Belmont: genealogical and local distance makes such distinctions irrelevant to the relations which hold between Matherson's issue and Mitchell's. Within a community, if they are important, such differences of matrification are quite well known; and neither the Josephs nor other L'Esterre folk confuse Frederick's unlawful and lawful children. Thus, within a local segment, matrification provides a principle of differentiation. It also serves to differentiate dispersed segments descended from the same man; but it is ignored by segments in other communities, if the initial matings took place outside them. Thus the same genealogical point will have different significance in differing segments, and this variation may be further increased by changes or confusion of surnames which do not correspond with descent.

To illustrate this point I will mention a few cases. Frederick Joseph had two unlawful daughters by a woman called Jane Benjamin; Jane never married but bore other daughters to other men. One of these was for Gaison Joseph from Petit Martinique, the girl being called Myown Joseph. In due course Myown bore a daughter called Ophelia for one of DeGale Joseph's sons. Although Myown and her child's father had the same surname, they were not related, and by local standards the mating was quite unobjectionable. Another of Jane Benjamin's daughters called Har-
riet Williams bore a child for one of Frederick Joseph's sons; this mating was also unobjectionable, since Harriet and her lover were completely unrelated. Yet another of Frederick's outside-children grew up with her mother at Lower St. Pierre and has the surname Janet, but belongs to the Joseph blood.

John-John's wife had a son for another man before her marriage, to whom she later gave the title Joseph. Except for Fifi, her children for John-John all died abroad; but her unlawful son Daniel Parvey, renamed Joseph, left five sons by the name of Joseph, and although these children of Daniel Joseph distinguish themselves as Parveys by descent and blood membership, they are sometimes treated as distantly linked agnatic kin by L'Esterre-born descendants of Antoine in the co-ordinate blood, who occasionally move Daniel Joseph back one generation and describe him as one of Blackie's children. To other Joseph segments settled in different communities, Daniel's children are simply members of Blackie Joseph's blood. Even within the blood of Frederick Joseph, where the Parvey origin of Daniel's children is most clearly known, they are often represented to strangers as Blackie's descendants and blood members. In these circumstances their inclusion expresses an emphasis on blood unity and a reluctance to divulge relations between blood members. However, this kinship fiction only functions externally; within Frederick Joseph's blood, Daniel's descendants are quasi-kin, through their name and their father's membership in John-John's household, but their differing descent enables them to mate as they please with the Joseph daughters and obliges them to share ritual with the Parveys. Nonetheless, when invited to rituals by the segments descended from Frederick or Matherson, Daniel's issue attend out of respect for their foster-grandfather, John-John, and for Frederick's issue. There is, however, no accretion of Daniel's descendants to the L'Esterre Josephs, genealogically or functionally, because of this stress on biological connections.

These genealogical ambiguities have less functional significance for a lineage than may seem likely, simply because relations between lineage members are modulated by the lineage structure itself, and this structure is an arrangement of parts composed of descent lines. Even if Matherson's descendants at Belmont should regard all Frederick's issue as children of one woman, or if they
classified Daniel Joseph's descendants in Blackie Joseph's blood, the form of the agnatic relation would limit the significance of these errors. Relations between members of linked agnatic segments are modelled on the relations of the segments to which they belong; moreover, since bloods linked beyond the fourth generation are separate units for exogamy and ritual, they are not greatly concerned with one another's internal differentiation. Macdonald's descendants at Belmont recognise their co-ordinate status with Matherson's issue at L'Esterre and their common membership within Antoine's blood; but the differences between, and relations among, the descendants of Frederick, Edmund, or John-John are of little importance to them.

It is indeed primarily because relations between members of different segments are modelled on relations between the segments themselves rather than on other individual kinship ties, that we must regard these patrilineal structures as lineage units. As Gluckman rightly says, a lineage is first and foremost an organisation of parts; and it is precisely because of this that the individual constitution of co-ordinate parts or of their subdivisions is only of interest to the members of these segments themselves. To other lineage kin the important relations between segments are expressed genealogically as connections between the founders of co-ordinate bloods or co-ordinate segments within the same blood. Below this level, segments differentiate within themselves and may differentiate themselves from one another, but they neither need nor are able to differentiate accurately within other segments. For the unity and persistence of blood ties, it is only necessary that members should observe the canons of lineage obligations with care and distinguish behaviourally between their immediate segment, their blood members, their agnates in linked bloods, other kin, and non-kin. The ritual co-operation of linked bloods perpetuates these relations at the same time that it expresses them: in this context the "old heads" who belong to the original blood revive its failing unity, and the various segments are thus reminded of their common origin and bonds. Thus, ritual

activities are the province of senior persons. The old heads belong with the peers of their own and linked bloods, while the young tend to emphasise the differentiation of their segments. In this way ritual dramatises the antithesis between successive generations as an antithesis between the segmentation and solidarity of the inclusive blood.

Although the L’Esterre segments descended from Blackie and Antoine by Frederick and Matherson respectively are now regarded as distinct bloods by their junior members, the senior males continually reaffirm their agnatic solidarity and equivalence in generation and age, while acting as leaders of the new units, and so serve to maintain the old group to which the new ones belong. The effect of generational segmentation is thus, paradoxically, to emphasise the continuity of the agnatic line within which the new co-ordinate bloods are emerging. With the relativistic generational range of blood kinship, the tendency is to assume agnation where paternal “titles” are the same and to identify such name-groups with the nearest blood segment whose genealogical connection is known. Thus it comes about that the descendants of Mitchell or of Edmund Joseph at Dover classify the issue of Daniel Joseph among the segment associated with Frederick at L’Esterre. The assumption is that local segments should know all others belonging to their immediate blood and should also know generally about the bloods with which their own is linked. But this tendency to classify agnatic ties inaccurately by family names, emphasises the distinctness of the communities within which these segments are located at the same time that it expresses the importance of agnatic kinship within the social organisation. A native of Carriacou discussing the Josephs will say that “the Josephs of L’Esterre and the Josephs of Six Roads belong to the same blood as the Josephs of Belmont, Hillsborough, and Dover.” They rarely distinguish the several bloods within this inclusive group but, instead, differentiate them by community reference. To the outsider the primary lineage segments are local divisions. Within the community the primary basis of segmentation is genealogical kinship. Communities form separate areas of interest within which specific relations and obligations are important to their members.
Genealogical revision and elision may be encouraged by the exogamic rule which provides a constant four-generation framework for separate bloods; but these revisions are difficult to identify fully, although some evidence of their occurrence is available. L'Esterre natives usually speak of Blackie Joseph's blood as Frederick Joseph's blood, and genealogically distant segments of this blood may be treated either as separate bloods or as subordinate divisions of Frederick's lineage. Likewise, L'Esterre folk commonly describe Matherson Joseph's blood as DeGale Joseph's blood, since DeGale's issue form the majority of its members at L'Esterre, and he is their living head. Such elisions are occasionally combined with generational shifts of the heads of collateral segments. If Mitchell Joseph, for instance, were shifted back one genealogical generation, his descendants would have an independent blood status within this four-generation framework and could then marry those of Matherson. If Mitchell were shifted forward one genealogical generation, his sons Shervington and Macdonald would then belong to the generation of DeGale's sons. They would thereby fall within the lineage of DeGale, and intermarriage between the two segments would be pushed forward two generations. Genealogical distance permits many possible revisions; but the framework of lineage obligations acts selectively upon them.

By telescoping links or by omitting intermediate ancestors, segmentary processes which affect lineage growth may be inhibited, and segments which could separate may be kept together. Since genealogical knowledge is the property of the old heads, who have an interest in maintaining the unity of their original blood, some such changes may occur. If Blackie and Antoine were forgotten, Matherson's segment and Frederick's would belong to the same blood. On the other hand, Blackie and Antoine may not have been full brothers; they may have been materterine or uterine kin, and their agnatic kinship may have developed posthumously. We have no way of determining whether this is true, since the Carriacou birth register only begins in 1866. In any case, the exact relations between ancestors are irrelevant to the lineage as such. Unilineal descent groups are ideological units, the constitution and continuity of which depend heavily on ideological
reinterpretations of genetic or other relations, and in the lineage structure the consistency of these interpretations is more important than their accuracy. The genealogy serves as an organisational charter of relations between its component groups, a myth of the way in which these groups developed, a framework for future change and development, and a guide to regulate mutual behaviour.

After Edmund's daughter Clarissa dies the connection between descendants of Edmund and Frederick will become more obscure, since none of Edmund's issue may live at L'Esterre. Similarly, in a few years Josiah and his segment may lapse from local memory if O'Donnell's son remains abroad. Perhaps the exact connections between the segments descended from Josiah and John-John are misrepresented in the genealogy as set out here. The genealogy can only tell us how these bloods and their segments express and regulate their interrelations. Even so it is unlikely to include biologically unrelated groups within the recent generations. Essentially, this means that the lineage composition varies in response to such structurally significant conditions as emigration, local dispersal, mating forms, generation span, the range of agnatic kinship, and differential population growth among its segments. To illustrate these conditions I have classified the living agnatic descendants of Blackie and Antoine Joseph by generation and local position in Table 21.

On the average each blood includes about 100 individuals, 17 of whom belong to the most senior generation, about 50 to the intermediate generations, while 33 are juniors. Of the blood members, about 40 per cent are likely to be overseas, and the remainder are usually distributed in two or more communities on the island. Even with these reductions, the bloods remain the largest social units of Carriacou, apart from the communities themselves. Their size ensures continuity, despite emigration and the extinction of certain lines within them; and dispersal only enhances their significance as the local groups between which inter-community kinship ties are most common, clearly defined, and enduring.

In Table 21 our territorial reference point is L'Esterre, and our genealogical reference point is the senior living generation within
each of the three major segments of either blood. These two coordinates indicate the relativity of lineage classifications. For example, from L'Esterre, the distribution of these bloods and segments, genealogically and locally, presents a picture different from that which would appear had we started from Dover or Belmont. Similarly, if we fixed the third generation of Old Joseph's descendants as the common genealogical reference point, our segment distinctions and generation totals would be different.

Table 21. Descendants of Antoine and Blackie Joseph alive in 1953, classified by lineage segment, generation level, sex, and territorial distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lineage segments</th>
<th>John-John</th>
<th>Edmund</th>
<th>Frederick</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Josiah</th>
<th>Mitchell</th>
<th>Matherson</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
<td>M F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2 3 5 4 2 4 9 11 1 3 5 3 1 2 7 10 16 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>— — 8 12 11 23 19 35 3 2 7 9 16 8 28 19 45 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>— — 7 4 16 8 23 12 — — 2 4 13 19 15 23 38 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment totals</td>
<td>2 3 20 20 29 35 51 58 4 5 14 18 30 29 48 52 99 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial distribution of members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At L'Esterre</td>
<td>1 1 46 48 — — 27 27 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Carriacou</td>
<td>4 17 8 25 2 18 7 27 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>22 10</td>
<td>36 7 14 25 46 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals, both sexes</td>
<td>5 40 64 109 9 32 59 100 209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M male
F female

In other words, the only constant elements in the lineage classification are agnation and sex. Localisation, generation seniority or equivalence, and the relative status of lineage segments are all variable. The flexibility of this lineage framework is essential for its development and continuity under Carriacou conditions; without this flexibility agnatic kinship units of this scale, generation span, ideology, and complex internal structure might not be able to flourish in the local society.

The differential growth rates of the various segments of a line-
age of equal genealogical status are illustrated in the genealogy, and also in Table 21. In 1953 John-John's segment contained five persons, and Josiah's nine; John-John's segment contained no members of the intermediate or junior generations and Josiah's also lacked juniors. Neither Josiah's nor Mitchell's segment then included any members of the most senior living generation. But Mitchell's segment contained the junior generation. Such varying generation depth may not affect the wider framework of lineage relations directly. Variation in the number of members is more likely to have such an effect. Each of the two leading segments descended from Matherson and Frederick respectively contains more than half the individuals in the bloods of which they are part. By comparison with Frederick's segment, John-John's is quite minor, and the same relation holds between Josiah's and Matherson's. In consequence there is a tendency to treat Josiah's and John-John's as genealogically junior to Matherson's and Frederick's. Whether the differing generation composition and size of these segments indicate genealogical revision or misplacement, it is not easy to say; but they do express differing rates of population growth, and these differences, though extreme, are not unique. Frederick's descendants outnumber those of Edmund by over 50 per cent; Matherson's issue are nearly twice as numerous as Mitchell's. Moreover, allowing for future omission of emigrant blood kin, at some later date Edmund's issue may be regarded at L'Esterre as genealogically junior to Frederick's.

Informants differed in placing Josiah; but the consensus made him a brother of Mitchell and Matherson, whose siblingship was never in doubt. John-John was also placed as Frederick's brother in Blackie's blood; but given the differences of generation range and segment size, these placements are open to doubt. However, to formulate or discuss these questions, we, like the Carriacou folk themselves, have to select one or another segment as a reference point, and like them we will normally take the largest segment of the locality with which we are familiar. But whether these segment differences express processes of growth or genealogical revision is perhaps less significant than are their structural implications for the lineages in which they obtain. John-John and Josiah could be quite easily forgotten or identified with some more
fertile ancestor, without thereby upsetting the framework of lineage relations. Such an accommodation would simply redefine the boundaries of present segments, but would not challenge the norms of lineage structure or obligations. Provided there has been no intermarriage, the original blood persists, although the functional differentiation of its segments varies as it proceeds. Tendencies towards village endogamy ensure that members of dispersed segments will rarely intermarry, and this encourages preservation of lineage ties between segments whose dispersal stimulates genealogical revisions.

Mating and Lineage The Joseph genealogy illustrates how the patterns of plural mating already described affect lineage growth and differentiation. No women are included in the remoter generations of this genealogy, and distinctions of legitimacy or illegitimacy are not recorded at that level. Only in the third generation are the wives and unmarried mates of lineage males distinguished, and no daughters are included before the fourth. Beyond a certain generation depth or distance, differences or identities of maternal origin or birth status are irrelevant to the lineage system, since they contribute little towards the definition of its co-ordinate segments; but within the lower range these differences are important in distinguishing between and within segments, and are therefore incorporated in the genealogy. The range within which differences of matri-filiation are important for the definition of segments seems to be normally one generation less than that at which segmentation of the blood occurs.

The Joseph genealogy mentions the mates of Edmund, Frederick, and Matherson, who belong to its third generation. Edmund and Frederick had plural mates, and in both cases the lawful and unlawful lines are distinguished; but in Matherson’s case there is no record of plural mating or birth-status distinction. Although this does not mean that Matherson had no such mate, it is unlikely that any of his male issue are excluded from the genealogy. But daughters might be omitted; and in future generations it is quite possible that Frederick’s two unlawful daughters will also be omitted. In Frederick’s case both his lawful and unlawful issue were natives of L’Esterre. In Edmund’s case the
unlawful issue remained with their mother at Dover, while the lawful issue lived with their father in Grenada. Spatial separation has underlined the differences of maternal origin and birth status among Edmund’s issue.

Among adults of the fourth generation there are many references to mating, and the children of this generation are differentiated by birth status and matrifiliation, as well as by local distribution. It is at this level of the lineage genealogy that alternative mating patterns and careers are most significant. We may consider the case of DeGale Joseph, who had children by two women as well as by his wife. DeGale’s lawful children were born in his own village, while the others grew up with their mothers in other villages. Under such conditions the unlawful offspring live apart from their father and are brought up by their mother’s kin. Thus, through the pattern of plural mating, agnatic ties are centrifugally distributed; a man’s descendants who grow up with their mother’s kin in a separate village have less chance to participate in the affairs of his blood during their minority, than do those who grow up in his own home or village. Frederick Joseph’s sons—Krismus, Cedros, Solomon, Israel and Isaac—each had children by two or more mates, one of whom was their wife and most of whom were natives of L’Esterre. The unlawful children growing up in their father’s village have been fully incorporated in his blood; but the unlawful issue born and brought up in other Carriacou villages are differentiated sharply from these local segments. Such children can only become founders of segments when they have grandchildren; they cannot participate easily in the affairs of their father’s segment. They are isolates whose unlawful birth-status will generally be forgotten when their descendants constitute a segment. Carriacou patrilineages are subject to so many factors of internal differentiation derived from mating that unrestricted recognition of differential matrifiliation and birth status could easily destroy the equivalence of lineage members, and thereby the lineage.

Differences of matrifiliation are therefore perpetuated in the lineage genealogy as dispersion of segments which function independently, even though they belong to the same exogamous unit. Within the village, differences of matrifiliation serve to dis-
tinguish sibling and half-sibling groups competing for dominance in their father’s line. This competition develops among intermediate generations between maturing adults who will in a few years be lineage seniors. It is therefore at this intermediate level that the genealogy becomes specific about mating relations and differences of birth status. Although the unlawful child brought up in another village asserts his membership in his father’s blood to legitimise himself when mature, at a later date his segment settled there independently legitimises him. In our study of legitimacy rates and descent (see Appendix A) we shall meet such developments. The position of segments outside the community differs from those of similar derivation within it, since the latter are easily assimilated to the dominant line by omitting references to matrifiliation and birth status. Thus we find no mention of women in the two senior generations of this genealogy. Plural mating intensifies differentiation within lineage segments, as well as between them; but descent provides a principle by which these alternative modes of mating and family organisation can be integrated.

A man’s children belong to his lineage and within it to his segment; but his sisters’ children belong to the bloods of their respective genitors. These sisters’ children, brought up with their mother’s kin, are never incorporated into her lineage but have close relations with its members and are treated as “family” by them. However, when they are asked to give their parents’ genealogies, such persons reveal a detailed knowledge of their father’s segment and a fair knowledge of their mother’s patrikin. They know their mother’s mother by name; they know their mother’s siblings and their issue; they also know their mother’s father’s siblings and their issue. But they may not know their mother’s mother’s kin. Thus, the contrary pulls to which these unlawful issue resident with their mothers are subject are pulls between two agnatic groups, their mother’s and their father’s. Though they live with the former, they belong to the latter. They participate in the former’s affairs as family, outside the lineage but attached to it; they are obliged to participate in their father’s blood as lineage kin and are subject to his lineage obligations.

Spatial separation of a lineage segment is sometimes modified
by the presence within the same community of another co-ordinate segment derived from the same man by different mates of identical status. In these conditions, differences of matrifiliation may be perpetuated. Thus DeGale Joseph has two unlawful lines at Belmont, and these two Belmont lines remain distinct. In a sense, relations between the children of one man by two or three women resemble relations between the lawful descendants of two brothers more closely than siblingship, especially where the siblings are separated spatially. This condition is implicit when the grandchildren of siblings are described as “first cousins once removed” while those of paternal half-siblings are described as “second cousins.” If paternal half-siblings are in some senses more like first cousins than they are like siblings, then the designation of “first cousins once removed” may vary in correspondence. Where first cousins once removed trace connections through women, they are free to intermarry. However, within the lineage “first cousins once removed” whose grandfathers were siblings have obligations identical with those of “second cousins” whose grandfathers were half-siblings, marriage being taboo between their children. Siblings form the nuclear cells of this proliferating lineage structure. An unlawful only child by an extra-residential mate may either be assimilated to the dominant line, if a member of its community, or omitted from the lineage and genealogy if distance warrants; but a group of unlawful children, themselves siblings, forms a unit in contraposition to the lawful line and cannot be easily or immediately assimilated. Perhaps because of this, half-siblings are equated with first cousins and this difference of matrifiliation is sometimes expressed in generational terms.

Since lineage males normally have different mating careers, there is no uniform rate of differentiation within the lineage segment; and this variability sets structural limits to the size and span of agnatic groups. For men, the Carriacou mating forms are not only alternatives, they are often concurrent. Nonetheless, polygyny is not legal in this culture; from a strictly legal or official point of view, plural mating proceeds sub rosa, as do many other institutions of Carriacou society, including the ancestor cult and the lineages themselves. In consequence, although men mate plurally, the family lines derived therefrom are legally and resi-
dentially differentiated during their father’s life, and these differences affect the lineage composition thereafter. The variable rate and incidence of this differentiation determines the generation limits within which lineage obligations can apply exclusively. These limits coincide with the points at which the cumulative internal differentiation of lineage members and segments by reference to birth status, generation, matrifiliation, and locality deprive lineage obligations of force and consistency. Despite lack of reference to birth status and matrifiliation, and some telescoping of antecedent generations among remoter ancestors, the lineage kinship subject to these differentiations is limited to a four-generation range. Beyond this point, even without intermarriage, the varying rates of differentiation may confuse relations between co-ordinate segments by maximizing the generation depth of one and minimizing that of another. Consequently these segments and their relations cannot be articulated uniformly with one another.

An instance of this is at hand in the Joseph genealogy. Mitchell Joseph’s only grandson in Carriacou in 1953 belonged to a generation junior to DeGale Joseph, who was Mitchell’s brother’s son and the senior member of Antoine’s blood. Mitchell’s grandson was already three generations removed from DeGale’s children, and Mitchell’s grandson himself had children and grandchildren who were free to intermarry with Matherson’s descendants if they wished. In some contexts the descendants of Mitchell and Matherson are referred to as separate bloods, and their spatial and genealogical distance serves to support this; but differentiation of these two segments as bloods is not consistent with their membership in Antoine’s lineage, which is of a status co-ordinate with Blackie’s. In other contexts, Matherson’s and Mitchell’s segments are correctly described as collateral units in Antoine’s blood; in these circumstances, DeGale’s leadership of the inclusive unit is emphasised, together with the fact that Mitchell’s senior living descendants are his juniors by a generation. Such ambiguities are inevitable during the transition from membership of a common blood to independent blood status; to increase the generation depth of bloods formally would simply multiply them. In short, the varying rates at which lineage segments become differentiated in-
ternally express effects of the dual organisation of mating and family on agnatic kin groups and promote differing rates of segmentation and fission within and between lineage segments. These factors express themselves by differentiating as lineages units of dissimilar generation depth. The four-generation range linked with exogamy reduces the scope for such inconsistency and keeps it within limits, while the genealogical structure allows the manipulation necessary to preserve consistency and lineage norms.

The Organisation of Lineage Activities  Relations between members of lineage segments are defined by reference to their fathers’ position. Although paternity is stressed, the differences of matrifiliation linked with alternative forms of mating activate internal diversification of the lineage at rates which, beyond a span of four generations, give cousinship such variability that the solidarity of the inclusive unit becomes ideological. When a man has children by one woman only, their lineage position is defined solely by reference to his; if his children have two or more mothers, then the lineage position of either set is further qualified by reference to their mothers. The problem of lineage organisation, as distinct from lineage structure, consists in regulating relations between groups of siblings differentiated variously and in generalising these patterns to cousins of varying types.

Each man is separately responsible for the maintenance of his family. Men are also free to mate extra-residentially before, during, or after their cohabitation. An extra-residential mate, in consequence of her heavier economic responsibilities and separate residence, has more control of her children than does a wife. Thus, differences of status among a man’s mates are matched by the differing relations of their children with him and by their differing economic situations. Variations in maternal status have structural coefficients; and over two generations the diverse relations between siblings and their descendants rule out classificatory generalisations of address or behaviour among cousins. Hence the limited span and depth of Carriacou lineages.

Since males are individually responsible for their families, and these family responsibilities are further defined and differentiated by mating forms, lineage segments are internally differentiated
by economics as well as descent. In short, the lineage as a whole rarely if ever discharges common economic functions. Households remain the concrete units of economic co-operation, and economic co-operation between agnates is secondary, despite tenure of common property. “Family land” is the principal form of common property held by lineage members. This is land held under folk conventions of intestate inheritance or in some cases by wills which specify equal interests among co-heirs and which may prohibit subdivision. Family land is occupied under informal arrangements made between the co-heirs, who are usually the deceased holder’s issue. As already mentioned, lawful or household children have precedence over others in such inheritance, whether the land is partitioned or not. On the other hand, a woman’s unlawful issue inherit freely from her, and since women are the principal occupants of Carriacou land, they are quite likely to receive a larger portion from their mother than the lawful children do from their father. In addition, outside-children generally have usufructuary rights on their father’s land, especially on portions allotted to absent co-heirs. Purchased land reverts rapidly to this customary system of family tenure, although the owner has individual rights during his lifetime. Since most islanders die intestate, most of the locally owned land is inherited and held by “family” tenure. Where a descent line has common interests in family land, its identity is emphasised correspondingly.

If they are more than two generations deep, groups sharing family land, partitioned or other, include many who are not agnatic kin. Nonetheless, agnatic elements within such groups tend to dominate the others and to administer the common holding if the original owner was a man. Agnatic kin appoint others to caretake land for absent kin, and the senior male agnate acts as leader of the group of co-heirs. Land left by intestate females will be administered on behalf of their issue by their brothers until the children are old enough to inherit. Inheritance cumulatively transfers the majority of lineage held or purchased land to this category of family land and simultaneously vests the control of the land in the agnatic core of cognatic groups. In consequence, the different descent lines in a lineage are differentiated as property-holding groups, even though the rights to this property are
not solely theirs. If women press for subdivision of their father's holding, their brothers may seek to give them half portions only. The conditions of family tenure encourage control by agnatic kin, especially because a man's widow enjoys his estate during her lifetime and generally depends on the sons for support. Moreover, under folk convention, the relative size of subdivisions should correspond with contributions to the cost of the father's funeral, tomb, and stone feast—that is to say, to the fulfilment of agnatic obligations which mainly fall on men. Even so, this family land is worked individually, since each man is separately responsible for his household. Thus, while the family land perpetuates the identity of a descent group, its occupancy emphasises the differentiation of household responsibilities. Although women may occupy the majority of the farm land, its control is vested mainly in males, who are its principal purchasers and the normal executors of testate and intestate inheritance alike. For these reasons family land tends to be administered by agnatic cores of males and worked by females. A study of the land settlement established at Harvey Vale in 1904 showed that 13 patrilineal groups received 67 of the 92 original allotments and that during the next fifty years, of the 24 sales involving portions of this land, 21 were made to kinsfolk of the initial allottees. By 1953, 29 individuals held approximately one-third of the settlement in a total of 72 plots. All 29 holders of multiple occupancies at Harvey Vale belonged to one or other of these 13 initial patrilineages: 20 of these multiple occupancies were held by people “care-taking” for emigrants and another 9 were based on probable future inheritance. Thus, while domestic economy and the separate responsibilities of Carriacou males stress individual occupancies, and the cognatic idiom of inheritance prevents exclusive transmission of corporate lineage property, agnatic kin groups remain the effective land-holding units; but these agnatic cores have a maximum depth of three generations due to the conditions of inheritance. The blood as a whole is thus unlikely to have land in common, though its major segments will. Lack of corporate “blood” property reduces the scope for dispute between segments; but the property held

by segments rarely produces disputes since it vests in a cognatic group for which agnates exercise control.

The folk religion is an ancestor cult, the dominant interests of which are descent and lineage, while the most important lineage interests include the care and propitiation of ancestors. At the rites and sacrifices of birth, baptism, entering a new home, marriage, death, and entombment, the folk religion and the lineage system presume and support one another; and neither is intelligible without the other. By their frequent recurrence these kinship rituals ensure that lineage values are maintained in ancestor worship, and ancestral homes and cemeteries serve to symbolise both.

At rituals the spirits of the principal's paternal and maternal kin are invoked and all other spirits are invited. These are the old parents—the collectivity of local dead. The cognatic reference and invocation of other dead express community values in a form consistent with the lineage principle. Despite this, the sacrifice remains a lineage rite. The general invitation is rationalised by saying that uninvited spirits will be offended and will punish those holding the sacrifice; but this is not a complete explanation. Attendance at the rites held by a lineage member is a duty for others. The lineage is the custodian of the ancestor cult, and thus of the Big Drum or Nation Dance.

When a married woman has to hold a sacrifice, she first tells her husband, who will discuss it with her lineage kin, as they must approve. At the sacrifice the husband, as household head, has the principal role, but the woman's agnatic kin must attend and take part. Sometimes a group of men will ask an elder sister to lead an annual offering to their common parent, most likely for their mother, but within the limits of agnatic kinship, men have precedence, and will usually lead these rites themselves. While a general invitation to the spirits is always extended at a sacrifice, the people who hold these sacrifices are small groups of agnatic kin, and the specific appeal is made to their ancestors.

In a man's family his authority varies according to his own maturity and the mating pattern from which the family derives. For the extra-residential family, lineage affiliations are primarily expressed by ritual, kinship, and mating activities. As pointed out
before, men must inform their blood seniors of proposed betrothals involving their children. The blood seniors will state whether such associations contravene the exogamy rule. Similarly, a man should obtain the assent of his lineage seniors before holding a sacrifice, even a private one; but he is free to hold a Mass in church without it.

The senior male of the blood presides over the stone feast which a man holds for his parents and over the distribution of rum at wedding rites; he also has a leading role in sacrifices to mark the establishment of a new house in the lineage. He interprets the dreams of unrecognised ancestors. He must agree before anyone can be buried in the common cemetery, and he alone can arrange for a lineage member whose family cemetery is full to be buried in another cemetery belonging to the blood. His opinion may also be asked when house sites are being selected or when land is apportioned for inheritance. Disputes between siblings are rare and usually are settled among themselves or referred to some senior agnate, such as the father's brother or sister, for mediation. Disputes between blood kin other than siblings are generally referred to the senior men of the lineage segment to which the disputants belong. Their informal arbitration, which mainly consists of advice, is usually effective, since it is a heinous offence for blood kin, especially males, to take differences to law.

Economic distress among the members of a blood is dealt with by their siblings or by the seniors of their segment, who may offer accommodation in their homes or may provide house-spots, garden land, or beasts or land on the share, or try to arrange employment on a schooner or seine. Despite economic differentiation, the solidarities of agnatic kinship prevent social stratification. Moreover, the low occupational levels characteristic of this economy encourage prosperous lineage members to help their kinsfolk in distress rather than accumulate wealth for its own sake. "Is my people, is my blood. If you are a poor man, before you strangling all about I will make you eat bread by me, have you near me, that is the way in the blood."

The head of the blood is the living symbol of the group's unity and its focal point in the genealogical network. His authority is slight, as befits the polysegmentary organisation of the blood, and
the rule that each man is responsible for his family separately. But his influence is nonetheless real, because he is the ultimate authority within the lineage and his closeness to the old parents and the spirit world ensures attention to his wishes. In relations between bloods the head represents the unit and may attend the rites of linked lineages, inviting them in return. As a specially knowledgeable person, he is frequently consulted on various matters, from inheritance to kinship connections and ritual. He introduces the members of each segment in his blood to linked bloods in other communities. Since each member leads his own household rites, the lineage elder cannot become a priest, and the ancestor cult cannot be transformed into a priestly ritual; these proscriptions have obvious value for the survival of the cult and of the Nation Dance. Nonetheless, the senior living member of the lineage should attend the household rites of his blood kin and make the initial libations or prayers or supervise the distribution of rum on these occasions. Rituals that lack the support of senior kinsmen are not held at all. A man’s father may object to his marriage. If the father has the support of the lineage head and other elders, he may refuse to attend the saraca and flag-fight, and he may even make a formal curse. But if the lineage head and seniors oppose his objection, the father will generally accept their advice. The lineage head, as the senior living member, is the storehouse of precedent in lineage affairs, and is excellently placed to advise on these issues. Especially when a lineage member seeks to establish his own home, it is important that the head of his blood should participate in the sacrifice. These rites specify the links in agnatic descent as the sacrifice moves from the home of the grandfather and father to that of the new household head; they therefore require the participation of lineage seniors to initiate the sacrifice at the senior site.

Lineages are groups of dead and living agnates. Lineage leadership is defined by its role as mediator between these two worlds and these two categories of lineage kin. Among the living members of a lineage, leadership is widely distributed within the segments. Thus groups of siblings distinguish themselves from their ortho-cousins by leadership and ritual, as well as economic cooperation. As the kinship range contracts, kinship interests in-
crease in range and intensity. Siblingship among males provides the maximum solidarity, since wives come under their husbands' authority and live in their households. The inter-household cooperation common among brothers is less easy for sisters, who are usually limited to caring for each other's children and who are the usual parties to land inheritance disputes. Such disputes between sisters may reduce their ritual cooperation but cannot divide sibling groups which have male members. Disputes over inheritance cannot develop publicly until the stone feasts have been held for dead parents, and these delays generally limit the number of such disputes. The obligation of siblings to hold anniversary rites jointly for their parents also limits their tendencies towards separatism.

Disputes between siblings are rather rare. Siblings usually cooperate amicably in caring for their elderly parents, in controlling the inheritance, in accommodating one another's children, and in discharging their ritual obligations. Between households, cooperation is strongest and most common among brothers between 40 and 55 years of age: that is, during their period of greatest productivity. Such groups tend to have a common leader in their dealings with other lineage segments and with cognatic kin, although each member deals individually with his mates and affines. Group unity is expressed at funeral rites and other group ceremonies and at the weddings of their children. The leader of a group of siblings is normally the senior male resident in the community. He organises the parents' entombments, supervises the parental estate, and executes the parents' wills. These senior siblings generally belong to the dominant lawful line descended from the father, but they are expected to protect the interests of the unlawful issue in the parents' property. Because of emigration, there may only be one member of a sibling group within the community, and consequently many groups of siblings do not function as units or have leaders.

The leadership exercised by a senior sibling is informal and depends on the others' consent. He cannot independently initiate action affecting the group or act without its assent, thus repeating the pattern of lineage headship. Unwed elder sisters may occasionally be leaders in sibling groups, but in such a case the unit's deal-
ings with other segments will be carried out through a brother. However, unmarried women are often the sole members of their sibling group in the community, and they then control its resources. The few indigent unwed women in a Carriacou community are usually those living away from all their kin.

The continuous and varied co-operation of brothers identifies them as a separate group with high solidarity. Through such activity the children come to know their uncles and one another, and these agnatic first cousins consequently share many childhood experiences. In turn, these children may maintain co-operative relations with one another, thereby extending patterns learned from their fathers. Although each sibling group is distinct, brothers' children also hold joint rituals for their father's father, have joint interests in family land, care for the family cemetery together, and assist their kinswomen in various ways; but within these first-cousin units, the sibling groups form separate cells, except where ambiguity arises as regards paternal half-siblings whose relations are rather more like those between first cousins than those between siblings. Within each sibling group, women are free to claim children of dubious descent on behalf of their brothers or to adopt their full brothers' or sisters' children. After the father's death, the elder brother acts as substitute father in arranging his younger sisters' betrothals, and men assist unmarried sisters in maintaining their children. After their mother's death, women may show more interest in their brothers' children, and they tend to take over the mother's role in prayer-meetings.

In any segment and for the blood as a whole, leadership is exercised by the senior male of the dominant line in the community. The leader must remain in the community to discharge the functions of leadership; and the dominant line is usually the lawful one, since this is the most numerous and controls the family home and inheritance. However, the lineage senior may belong to an unlawful line, either because this is dominant or because of superior age.

*Family and Lineage* I began by pointing out the overlap between family and lineage in Carriacou and throughout this account have referred to it frequently. It is now necessary to discuss
these two units and their relations directly. In Carriacou the term "family" may denote one of four units. It may refer to a household group; or to a person’s children, wherever they are, and to the children’s other parent also, if the mating relation continues; or it may refer to a person’s cognatic kin—that is, the speaker’s issue and relatives through the father and mother; and, finally, to a patrilineal group, as in the saying already considered, “the day a girl get married, the family gone.” Generally the context indicates the sense in which the term is used. Though Carriacou folk describe agnatic groups as “bloods,” they also refer to “family” when speaking of segments within a blood, for which they have no special term. Thus the term family is used locally to denote an agnatic group as well as a more inclusive bilateral one.

Not everyone in Carriacou emphasises lineage ties more than kinship ties. We have already indicated several reasons for this in discussing the Joseph lineage. Emigration and other factors may so deplete an agnatic segment that its residue becomes dependent on their maternal kin. These matrikin themselves are usually organised patrilineally; but their relations with these cognates will be family ties and no transfers of lineage membership are involved. Children brought up with their matrikin away from their fathers are also more dependent on these ties than on their lineage. In consequence, their loyalties are divided between their father’s and mother’s patrikin. Occasionally, as our analysis of domestic organisation shows, these children live with their mother’s collateral kinswomen; in such cases their family relations may emphasise uterine or materterine kinship. However, this result is rather rare, since the mother and her parents retain an interest in the child, whose primary identification is through them. In effect, therefore, the usual alternative to agnatic kinship is an attachment to the mother’s agnatic kin.

It sometimes happens that a woman moves into a new community away from her kin, and later bears children by various men, without marrying any of them. If she keeps these children with her, although they belong to their fathers’ bloods, their family ties with one another are usually stronger. In consequence the woman’s daughters may continue to live with or near her, mating independently as they please, with the result that a group
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based on uterine ties three or more generations deep may in due course develop. A group of this kind occupied households 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 29 at L'Esterre in 1953. Such groups may also develop after the widowhood of a local woman whose husband had moved into the community. Households 60, 64, and 64a at L'Esterre provide one example of this, and households 5, 6, and 53 provide another. Although infrequent, such groups continually arise through migration.

Historically Carriacou has been dominated by Europeans and their culture. The islanders received Christianity from the Anglican and Roman Churches, their law is modelled on British law, and their government is an alien institution. They also received from Europe a bilateral kinship model based on monogamy. Religion and law assume and sanction this kinship pattern, as do the conventions of folk inheritance, which arose during the last century and used the bilateral principle for transmission of land rights. Thus church, law, and inheritance support the bilateral principle in Carriacou kinship organisation. However, the dual mating organisation is not fully consistent with bilateral kinship, since the unlawful and lawful children are distinguished residually, by inheritance, in church, at law, and by association with their father and his line. Despite the numerous supporting institutions, the bilateral kinship system of European provenience is thus ill-suited to the demographic and mating organisations of Carriacou, and has been displaced over the years by an emphasis on patriliney and plural mating for males.

In other West Indian societies males also mate plurally, and many women live alone with their children and children's children. But parallels between the Carriacou mating system and systems reported for other West Indian territories are hardly exact. Carriacou is probably unique in the British West Indies in having 92 per cent of its male population married, in its high rate of marital stability, in its exclusion of keeping unions, in its demographic structure, and in its systematic combination of marriage

and extra-residential mating. This dual mating organisation has undoubtedly encouraged the systematic development of patrilineal kinship, but it also maintains the cognatic family as an alternative reference group with a more variable form and function. Only if a man’s several mates lived permanently with him would the cognatic family lose its function. However, family names tend to denote lineages when applied to extended groups. Thus the Bedeaus and BIllys of Harvey Vale, the Gays and Gabriels of Belmont and Bellevue South, the Cudjoes of Six Roads, and the Quashies, Noels, and Macintoshes of Mount Pleasant, Bogles, and Grand Bay are lineage groups, like the Bristols and Josephs of L’Esterre.

The Functions of Lineage Lineages are important units of Carriacou society, despite the dispersal of their parts and members, the individual responsibilities of men for their own families, and their lack of official recognition and governmental role. They discharge a variety of social functions; and without the lineages, Carriacou society could not persist for long in its present form. It is useful here to distinguish clearly between the activities and functions of a social unit. The principal activities carried out collectively by Carriacou bloods are ritual; but perhaps their more important functions are social.

The islanders participate little in the affairs of their government or church except in passive, subordinate roles. The policies and operations of these two institutions express alien influence. Nonetheless, the islanders have to regulate relations among themselves, and as we have seen, they place special value on settling their differences amicably out of court. For this purpose they need agencies to limit the scope for disputes and settle them. Both these functions are more fully discharged by the lineage system than by any other social unit. The senior lineage males, through ritual, and especially by the power of the curse, control their juniors, and are thereby enabled to regulate their behaviour. The solidarity of senior generations vis-a-vis the juniors in a lineage has already been discussed in relation to lineage segmentation and continuity. This solidarity of seniors provides a basis for the dispersal of paternal control through ritual sanctions. Since women are gen-
erally more docile than men and do not often hold sacrifices on their own, the ritual sanctions wielded by lineage seniors apply mainly to the young men. These sanctions isolate the individuals to whom they are applied, ritually and socially. The paternal curse is the most extreme expression of this ostracism; the offender has either to submit or to emigrate, but unless the curse is withdrawn he remains without the protection of his ancestors or lineage. Lineage seniors are the natural arbitrators in this society because of the many kin who will support their decisions. Besides settling disputes, they are also often asked to supervise the property or kin of absent persons, as we have seen. By these means they discharge the necessary functions of social control in ways consistent with the norms of local society.

By formalising and generalising distinctions between senior and junior kin and between men and women, the lineage system also provides the society with its major principles of status placement and with the means for regulating relations among persons of different status. Under this system men have precedence but have to protect and care for their women. Men may have plural mates, but they must not deliberately default on the obligations of paternity as these are defined within the alternative mating forms. So long as they remain on the island, men have little opportunity of evading these responsibilities; and if they seek to do so by leaving the island, they simply isolate themselves from their kin and the securities which Carriacou can offer. But Carriacou communities are not organised for this purpose, and the lineages are the only organs which can compel the young men, who most fully exploit the mating alternatives, to obey the rules of this social organisation. Without this lineage system the dual mating organisation could not operate satisfactorily, since men would not have to support their offspring and they would not enjoy one another's support in controlling their sons. Yet, lacking legal sanctions, this mating and family system depends on community regulation in order to persist. Likewise, women obey the rules of this family system under supervision of their lineage kin, who provide economic and other assistance. As we have seen, the rules about mating are quite specific: consensual cohabitation is forbidden except in certain marginal conditions; men must marry;
women must remain faithful to their mates; no couple within six
degrees of agnatic kinship may mate or marry; men must care
for their families; men must keep their lawful children in their
homes; these homes must be made of wood or concrete; and so on.
The primacy of patrilineal descent necessitates and legitimises
systematic control of the mating and parental activities of men.
Patrilineal values motivate the proper discharge of paternal roles
and make them obligatory. Without such emphasis this dual mat-
ing system of Carriacou would rapidly dissolve into a multiplicity
of *ad hoc* individual relations—a chaos in which paternity ac-
knowledgments or obligations were a matter of individual choice,
marriges unstable, and women as well as men free to mate plu-
 rally if they wished. Conditions like that have been reported from
other parts of the British West Indies. They are absent from
Carriacou because of the lineage system.

We can now understand why Carriacou rejects the practice of
house-rent and why those women who cohabit consensually with
unmarried men in board houses reserved for marriage are classed
as prostitutes. House-rent is inconsistent with this social system.
Men’s houses stand as fixed points in the lineage structure, and
house-building or ownership indicates male maturity and ritual
independence. House rental would reduce lineage control of of-
fenders and its power to force their emigration. In rented rooms,
women could easily upset the social order by mating with men
of the same blood, or by cohabiting consensually in the conditions
appropriate to marriage. But rooms are not rented, and such
behaviour is strongly discouraged by ostracism of the women con-
cerned. Here also, ostracism develops on lineage bases and in the
partners’ lineages.

The assimilation of emigrants who return after varying periods
and experiences abroad is also based on the lineage organisation
and carried out by lineages. The lineage system serves this pur-
pose in two ways. First, it provides the society with a general
framework for status placement which excludes the development
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of class differences on the basis of occupation or wealth at the same time that it emphasises seniority by age and sex. It also provides returning emigrants with clearly defined groups of male kin who have also been abroad and who are better able to control and assist them than would be possible without this patrilineal organisation. In addition to the ritual sanctions they wield, agnatic kin groups supervise the emigrant's rights to land, help or hinder his marriage, and offer the alternatives of ostracism from or assimilation to his due place in the status system in response to his conduct. In short, lineages reward as well as punish, and the effectiveness of their control is proven by the stability and equilibrium of the local society, the lack of economic and occupational differentiation, the adherence to ancestral values, and the tendency for unsettled young men to set out again on their travels rather quickly.

Meanwhile the continuing emigration depletes the island of its men, and although they are strongly motivated to return, many do not. Given the emphasis on marriage and formal monogamy, dual mating is the only way in which the surplus women could both remain in Carriacou and have children securely. Without such a system it is therefore probable that the island population would steadily decline. Yet for such a system to develop or continue, paternity obligations must be emphasised and enforced; and since the law offers little support, this can only be achieved by lineage control of both sexes, especially of men.

It is clear, then, that the patrilineages and the ancestor cult support on another and together embrace the system of cultural beliefs and values that underpin and distinguish Carriacou society. Lineages and their segments are local units, the principal kinship and ritual groups of the communities to which they belong. They accordingly regulate the communities' internal relations and also serve to relate different communities in which linked segments are localised. The lineage organisation is thus the pivot of the complex kinship system and of local society, which itself is based firmly on kinship. Concurrently the ancestor cult sanctifies descent and tradition, and through its rites de passage marks the place of individuals within their lineages and communities alike.
A Brief Speculation  In concluding this discussion of Carriacou lineages, it is tempting to speculate on their origin. No other lineage systems have yet been reported in British West Indian societies. Perhaps lineages exist in the nearby Grenadines, such as Union, which have histories similar to Carriacou. As regards the question of their initial development, we have suggestive data on which to base speculations.

The Carriacou ancestral cult has always been connected with the Big Drum or Nation Dance, which probably flourished under slavery. Many Big Drum songs indicate this; for example, a song about the Chamba tribesmen settled at Dumfries estate in Carriacou refers to slavery. Many people living near Dumfries today are said to be of Chamba origin. We have seen that for the Nation Dance, the people inherit their “nation” from both parents, but that the father’s nation has precedence over the mother’s: thus a man whose father was Chamba and mother Mandinka would describe himself as a Chamba and in Big Drum rituals he would open his dance to a Chamba song. In short, he would belong to his father’s agnatic line rather than to his mother’s.

We have also seen that even under slavery, the Carriacou labour organisation encouraged men to assume effective paternal roles. Here again, to my knowledge Carriacou was unique—first in being sufficiently small for one proprietor to influence the whole island, and second because this proprietor had the initiative to introduce the task system, thereby stimulating his slaves to increase production for their benefit as well as his.

After the abolition of slavery the islanders began to emigrate. Those who remained in the island strove to acquire property, especially land; but until the 1870s, when the masters withdrew, there was little real change in local land ownership. Land hunger encouraged emigration, but later acquisition of land reduced the outflow for a while. With emigration of the young men, the island population developed the sex disparities which have since characterised it. Given the prevalence of marriage reported in 1833 and again in 1867, the island’s surplus women had to mate extr résidentially or not at all.

In this combination of circumstances, patrilineages emerged.
The ancestor cult provided ritual sanctions for traditional observance, but it also had certain needs, chief among these the need for an enduring form of social unit which could maintain the cult. The dual mating organisation which developed with emigration also required some supra-familial kinship groupings to regulate and maintain it. Since children inherited their "nation" from their fathers, over the generations patrilineal descent lines emerged; and this mixture of belief, ritual, and kinship values probably motivated men who mated extra-residentially to care for their children as best they could. When land became available, these developing agnatic lines acquired further functions. Land was acquired by men in the first place and transmitted to their sons as heirs and trustees for their daughters. In the absence of many new influences coming into the island, it seems quite possible that this combination of conditions may have encouraged the emergence of agnatic groups; and in the absence of effective church control, a popular government, or a local elite of contrary culture, these agnatic groups developed along the lines illustrated above.
Our account of Carriacou life reveals a systematic duality in the local culture. In Carriacou, the subsistence and exchange economies interlock; Christianity and the ancestor cult flourish side by side; migrancy and conservatism are integrated; so are individualism and lineage obligations. Marriage and extra-residential mating produce alternative family forms, and these together encourage dual emphases on lineage and family; the domestic system has a dual organisation, and within either category there are a number of alternative and complementary forms. Throughout our analysis, we have been concerned with the systematic inter-relations of these institutional alternatives at various levels. We have found that, despite its economic and demographic disadvantages, or perhaps because of them, the island society maintains a delicate equilibrium, and its culture synthesises the several sets of alternatives institutionalised in it and integrates them with one another.
By these tokens, the Carriacou family system shows how erroneous and inadequate are "explanations" of West Indian family systems which simply characterise them as "matrixfocal," equating elementary families and household groups and explaining varieties of household groups by reference to the developmental cycle of a domestic elementary family.

We have found that the basic factor in the Carriacou family structure is the mating system. When men marry, their wives and children live with them, and however matrixfocal such households may be, the husband-father dominates them. When men mate extra-residentially, the children remain with their mothers, but however matrixfocal such units may be, these children belong to their father's blood, not to their mother's. In short, the differing forms of domestic group and the differing positions of women within them are both effects of alternative mating patterns; because this is so, many households under female heads have never contained elementary families and cannot therefore be "explained" by hypotheses about the developmental cycle of such units. The study of Carriacou kinship shows how important it is to begin with mating forms and regulations rather than with household organisation in studying West Indian family systems. Notably, we have had no need of theory on these points, since our analysis leaves nothing to theorise about.

It is commonly believed that West Indian family organisation represents a reinterpretation of African patterns. Unfortunately for this view, our Carriacou data show that there is little uniformity in West Indian family structure beyond the rejection of monogamy for men as a general rule. To my knowledge there is nothing specifically African about the extra-residential mating relation, which is widespread in other West Indian islands as well as in Carriacou; nor is it usual, in most African societies, for men to keep one family in their homes and another elsewhere, and to distinguish between the children of each family as is done in Carriacou. Given such variability in West Indian family systems, to assert a common African provenience for all these forms is untenable. The regularities and differences within these systems are rather to be explained by similarities or differences in the conditions of the populations which have developed and still practice them. It
would be extremely unfortunate if the Carriacou lineage system were also to be interpreted as an African culture trait, especially because it is perhaps unique in the British West Indies, and because the Kromanti (Akan) who dominate the Carriacou Nation Dance were a matrilineal rather than a patrilineal group. In short, to explain West Indian society we must make detailed comparative studies and seek to understand it, leaving theories of origin or focus aside until we have analysed the available data.
APPENDICES
We shall now examine the Carriacou mating organisation for its unity. If its various alternative relations of mating, parenthood, residence, and birth status do form a single system, then the chances that individuals of differing status may practise any of these alternatives should be approximately equal, except for "keeping," which is socially disapproved. Such equivalence would indicate a high degree of interdependence between the alternative mating relations and their frequencies. This interdependence would be significant on two levels. Statistically, it would mean that changes in the frequency of either mating alternative would involve changes in the frequency of others. Structurally it would mean that these mating alternatives are social institutions of equivalent validity, despite their differing prestige. Under such conditions, the alternative
modes of mating would seem to form a single common system. To
determine if this is so, I shall now explore the unity and closure of
this system in quantitative terms.

We have seen that both sexes practise extra-residential mating
before they marry, and that men continue to do so afterwards,
while women do not. Further, all men are expected to marry by
middle age, and the overwhelming majority do so. Approximately
40 per cent of women of reproductive age remain unwed; such
women may mate extra-residentially, in consensual domestic
unions, or not at all. In Carriacou men may have plural mates,
women may not. Men retain their legitimate offspring in their
homes, the illegitimate tend to remain in their mothers’ care.

Given these facts, we may ask whether there are any observable
differences in the mating practices of lawful and unlawful chil-
dren. If these mating alternatives belong to different systems,
then the children born of one type of union should rarely practise
the other. Essentially this would mean the bifurcation of Carri-
cou society into persisting legitimate and illegitimate descent
groups. Moreover, if bifurcation obtains, since legitimates remain
under their father’s control while illegitimates are placed with
their mothers, despite lineage norms we should expect to find
patrilineal legitimate lines and matrilineal illegitimate ones.

As shown in Diagram A, this mating organisation permits a
differentiation of children into four groups: lawful sons and law-
ful daughters, unlawful sons and unlawful daughters. Grand-
children are therefore differentiated into sixteen categories—law-
ful sons of lawful sons, lawful sons of lawful daughters, lawful
sons of unlawful sons, lawful sons of unlawful daughters, etc.

If the two alternative mating patterns represent separate sys-
tems, unlawful children should beget unlawful grandchildren,
while lawful ones beget lawful descendants. If the alternative
mating patterns are not fully integrated with one another to form
a common system, there should be a cumulative tendency for the
illegitimacy ratio among the descendants of illegitimate persons
to increase over the generations, while the corresponding ratio
among legitimates should decrease. If these legitimate and ille-
gitimate descent lines are fully or partly exclusive, then the island
should contain a population divided into two discrete groups dis-
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tinguished by different mating and family organisations. Women belonging to either of these sections would mate in the same fashion as their mothers, on the one hand by marriage and cohabitation, on the other without cohabitation or marriage. Since all men must marry, their mating forms would not be correspondingly differentiated according to their birth status; but they would be linked to these two sections by mating as well as birth. Thus, whatever section they were born into, in these conditions men would marry into the legitimate section and mate extra-residen-

---

A. Development of Linear Legitimacy and Illegitimacy

tially with the other. Granted continuing sexual imbalance in the island population, such a social organisation is theoretically possible, but requires a well-developed system of mating regulation.

We have already seen that the rules that govern mate selection in Carriacou entirely ignore differences of birth status. This suggests that Carriacou mating practise neither permits nor assumes the systematic differentiation of descent lines by birth status. However, to determine the exact correspondence between a person's birth status and that of his or her descendants, I have summarised my information on the aggregate resident issue of all
principals in the sample of 224 households of Carriacou in Diagram B. For present purposes the sex differences in the grandparent and grandchild generation are irrelevant and can be ignored; but differences of sex and birth-status among parents of the intermediate generation are equally important and these are accordingly represented. Age differences in the intermediate generation are also significant, since persons above the age of 24 usually live apart from their parents. Accordingly, adults of this age group who remain with their parents are probably not representative. For this reason such persons are entered in Diagram B as of unspecified birth status, although their resident issue are correctly allocated according to the parents’ sex and birth status.

Diagram B shows that 54 per cent of the resident children of the lawful daughters of the principals in these 224 households are themselves lawful, whereas only 17 per cent of the resident issue of their unlawful daughters are legitimate. However, it would be erroneous to interpret this difference as conclusive evidence of cumulative trends to reproduce parental birth statuses. The 337 resident children of these household principals below the age of 24 have been distinguished by sex and birth-status. Of these, 275 or 81 per cent are legitimate. In short, the principles of residential placement described in Chapter 8 operate to exclude illegitimate descendants of lawful children and of male principals, with a resulting over-representation of the unlawful issue of unlawful daughters of female principals. Accordingly, resident grandchildren of household principals do not provide a random sample and household samples cannot be used for the determination of linear legitimacy or illegitimacy. Diagram B, for example, contains no lawful issue of unlawful sons of these principals. Yet we know that 40 per cent of the married men are illegitimate. Moreover, children above the age of 24 rarely live with their parents; they either emigrate, marry, or move out on their own, and will therefore often appear as household principals whose birth statuses are irrelevant in this type of analysis. It follows that the examination of household data yields negative conclusions about linearity and birth status, because these samples are themselves inappropriate.

Fortunately we have other data suitable for this enquiry. These data consist of a genealogical census of the descendants of all
original allottees and subsequent holders of land on the Government settlement established at Harvey Vale in 1903. Since my studies at Harvey Vale were specially focussed on the transmission of rights in land, special care was taken with the collection of the holders’ genealogies. Inclusive of the initial landholders, these Harvey Vale genealogies have an average depth of four generations, and include all descendants, wherever situated. Thus they

![Genealogy Diagram]
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- **◊** Sex not specified
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- **\( \backslash \text{NK} \)** Birth status not specified

**B. Resident Descendants of Carriacou Household Principals, Classified by Birth Status and Sex of the Parent Descended from the Principal**

are not subject to the limitations of household composition data. Their increased average depth is a further advantage.

The landholders at Harvey Vale lived in the Negro villages of Harvey Vale, Belmont South, Six Roads, with a few folk from L’Esterre. The initial generation of occupants contained 121 principals, of whom only 11 were women. By 1953, descendants of these allottees numbered 1,595, of whom 1,057, or approximately two-thirds, were then resident in Carriacou. The sample is thus three generations deep and quite large.
The birth-status of the 121 initial occupants is not known. They were credited with 291 children, of whom 262 were said to be legitimate. The 10 per cent illegitimacy ratio among these people’s children is so low that we must infer selective recall. Either our informants “forgot” many of the unlawful issue of the initial allottees, or they legitimised themselves retrospectively by “marrying” their parents posthumously. Certainly this legitimacy ratio is not typical of Carriacou.

Of these 291 offspring, 134 were male, including 12 unlawful sons. Of the remaining 157 females, 17 were unlawful. Since inheritance is the most important mode of land transmission in Carriacou and is effectively bilateral, we were able to obtain very detailed information about the descendants of this second generation. Even so, it seems that birth status differences are subject to selective recall. Thus, of the 1,075 offspring of these 291 persons, 762 or 71 per cent were said to be legitimate. The illegitimacy ratio of 29 per cent in this generation is again below Carriacou norms. Although it is possible that the specially favoured position of this population may have promoted a high marriage incidence, it is also possible that some illegitimates were not recorded; however, few may have been misreported as legitimate, since land rights are affected by birth-status, and each of these genealogies was collected from three independent sources. In short, although the illegitimates may be under-represented at and below this generation, it is unlikely that many are included here as legitimate. The 1,075 members of this third generation are classified by their own and their parents’ sex and birth status in Table 22.

The descendants of legitimate and illegitimate parents have an identical illegitimacy ratio, namely 27 per cent. Moreover, the average number of children born to these two groups of parents are very similar. However, only 16 per cent of the issue of unlawful sons are illegitimate as compared with 36 per cent of the issue of unlawful daughters. These differing ratios probably reflect the differential interest of cognates in the unlawful issue of their male and female relatives, one consequence of which would be a fuller report of the illegitimate offspring of kinswomen. As a group, the legitimate and illegitimately born women of the second generation have a total of 530 children, of whom 153 or 29 per cent are un-
lawful; their legitimate and illegitimate brothers have a total of 535 children, of whom 140 or 26 per cent are unlawful. There is thus no significant difference between parents of differing sex or birth status who belong to this generation as regards the illegitimacy ratios among their descendants. However, the number of unlawfully born parents of the second generation is too small to be decisive, despite the fullness of the report on their children.

**Table 22. The third generation of Harvey Vale, classified by sex and birth status of themselves and their parents.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth status of parents</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Total lawful</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>Total unlawful</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawful sons</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawful daughters</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total lawful</strong></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful sons</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful daughters</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total unlawful</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generation totals</strong></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average issue per parent</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent unlawful</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 1,075 members of the third generation, only 137 had had children by 1953, and despite their relative seniority, very few of these 137 persons had then completed their reproductive cycle. Together, these 137 parents had a total of 399 children, of whom 120, or 30 per cent were illegitimate. The illegitimacy ratios of the third and fourth generations are thus very alike. However, among parents belonging to the third generation, lawful issue of lawful issue have a low illegitimacy ratio of 24.2 per cent, while unlawful children of illegitimate parents have a ratio of 50 per cent. Information about the third generation and their offspring is set out in Table 23 below.

Of the 137 parents belonging to the third generation, only 22
are themselves of unlawful birth, and these 22 persons are distributed among seven categories. This distribution reduces the number of persons from each category to an insignificant figure. Such insignificant figures can hardly be representative. However, we can add together the issue of all unlawfully born mothers of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent’s status</th>
<th>Number of parents</th>
<th>Total lawful</th>
<th>Total unlawful</th>
<th>Per cent unlawful</th>
<th>Children per parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS of LS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of LD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of LP</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of LD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of LS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of LP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of US</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of UD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of US</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of UD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of LS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of LD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of LS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of LD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of UD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of US</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of UD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LS lawful son
LD lawful daughter
US unlawful son
UD unlawful daughter
LP lawful-born parent

this generation, and compare the illegitimacy ratio among their descendants with that of the descendants of lawfully born mothers. There are 9 illegitimates among the 23 children of illegitimate women in this generation, a ratio of 39 per cent. There are 53 illegitimate issue among the 185 children of lawfully born mothers,
giving an illegitimacy ratio of 28.6 per cent. However, despite these differences in gross, no cumulative trends are observable in the proportions of illegitimates born to women of specific birth status categories. Thus the illegitimacy ratios among the descendants of unlawful daughters of unlawful daughters, on the one hand, and of lawful daughters of lawful sons on the other, are 45 per cent and 46.5 per cent respectively. Only one-third of the children of unlawful daughters of lawful sons are themselves illegitimate. On these data, the distribution of illegitimacy is erratic, and neither patterned nor cumulative.

Of the 137 parents in the third generation, 75, or 55 per cent, are lawful issue of lawful children of the original allottees. Another 40, or 29 per cent, are lawful issue of unlawful children of these allottees. There are 16 unlawful children of lawful issue, making 11.5 per cent of this total; and there are 6 unlawful issue of unlawful issue, forming 4.5 per cent of the total. These differing ratios probably represent the degrees of interest shown in different categories of descendants. On such a scale, the lawful issue of lawful issue are the dominant line, while the unlawful issue of unlawful issue are the most marginal group. Selective recall should thus be structured by these differences of interest. One implication of this is that genealogical censuses may also under-represent the illegitimate lines, since they are open to selective recall governed by property interests. In consequence illegitimate issue of lawful as well as unlawful persons may be understated, and the illegitimacy ratios extracted from these data may be selective and inaccurate. Given these defects of our genealogical material, it seems that the actual incidence of marriage among different categories of descendants may provide the most satisfactory guide on linear differences of mating pattern. The relevant data on this are presented in Table 24.

The two generations represented in Table 24 have differing average ages. Many members of the second generation had died by 1953, but no members of the third generation are included in this table unless they had already married or had children. The age differences of these two generations are reflected in their differing marriage incidence. Of the 291 members of the second generation, 74 per cent had married by 1953, whereas only 57 per
cent of their 137 children had done so. We have already observed some tendencies towards late marriage in Carriacou, and it is quite likely that these 137 individuals of the junior generation will have an equally high marriage rate later on.

Table 24. Adults of Harvey Vale by generation, birth-status and sex, parents’ birth status and own marital condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth status</th>
<th>Number of adults</th>
<th>Number wed</th>
<th>Number unwed</th>
<th>Percentage married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of LS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of LD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of LD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of LS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of US</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS of UD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of US</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD of UD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of LS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of LD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of LS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of LD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of US</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US of UD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of US</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD of UD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LS lawful son
LD lawful daughter
US unlawful son
UD unlawful daughter

Taking these generation differences into account, the senior generation provides a better sample for our purpose. In this generation, 82 per cent of the lawful sons and 92 per cent of the unlawful ones had married, as against 69 per cent of the lawful daughters and 55 per cent of the unlawful ones. Thus differences in marriage ratio between the sexes in this sample correspond closely with those already observed at L’Estéerre. The marriage
incidence among lawful daughters is 14 per cent higher than among the unlawful ones; but as more than half of the unlawful daughters themselves marry, they cannot be regarded as repeating their mothers’ mating patterns.

The numbers of individuals in most of the categories of the third generation are too small to warrant analysis. We may, however, treat the lawful sons of lawfully born parents as one group for comparison with others of parallel status. Thus, the lawful sons of lawful parents have a marriage incidence of 67 per cent, the lawful sons of unlawful parents have a marriage ratio of 31 per cent; the unlawful sons of lawful parents have a marriage ratio of 62.5 per cent, and the unlawful sons of unlawful parents have a ratio of 33 per cent. Correspondence in the incidence of marriage among groups of the same birth status is thus very much lower than among groups whose parents were of the same birth status. This condition is exactly the reverse of those cumulative trends which would indicate two separate mating systems.

If we repeat this comparison among women of the third generation, we find that 62 per cent of the lawful daughters of lawful parents, 55 per cent of the lawful daughters of unlawful parents, 50 per cent of the unlawful daughters of lawful parents, and 66 per cent of the unlawful daughters of unlawful parents, are married. Here again, the marriage incidence seems to be purely random.

We have now made a careful search for those cumulative linear differences of birth status and mating patterns which would indicate division of the mating system into two distinct segments, within either of which persons repeated the mating pattern of their parents. We have found that the distribution of these mating relations is random with regard to birth status, and that the distribution of illegitimacy among descendants of persons of differing sex and birth status is also random. This randomness itself indicates the unity of the mating organisation, since it shows that differences of mating pattern among parents are not matched among their children. Moreover, the alternative mating patterns which the parents practise are also practised by the children, who inherit this dual system and enter into relations of differing type in much the same way as did their parents. We must therefore
conclude that the alternative relations within this mating order are elements of a single system, and thus that their frequencies are functionally related. This means that changes in the incidence of marriage would be accompanied by other changes in the frequencies of extra-domestic unions and illegitimate births, provided that current adult sex ratios and cultural conditions persist. In short, we can now relate fluctuations in the annual marriage and legitimacy ratios of Carriacou to changes in the emigration rate, or to the number of returning migrants. Given the interdependence of these alternative mating forms within a single system, shifts in their relative frequencies will reflect corresponding movements in the sex proportions of the island's population, or wider processes of social and cultural change.
APPENDIX B: THE DOMESTIC DISTRIBUTION OF LINEAL AND COLLATERAL DEPENDANTS

To determine the connection between birth status and the sex of the parent through whom resident collaterals trace kinship to the female principals with whom they live we must pursue further the analysis begun in Chapter 10. Ignoring full siblings and members of generations senior to that of the principals themselves, there are 23 collaterals of female principals in homes with male heads, and 65 collaterals of female household heads, giving a total of 88. Of the 23 persons in homes with male heads, 3 are connected to the female principals through their father, and 2 of them are lawful. Of the remaining 20 who trace relationship to these principals through their mothers, 3 are of unspecified birth status, and 17 are unlawful. Of the 59 female and 6 male collaterals resident
with female household heads, 16 trace relationship with these heads through their fathers; of these, 5 are lawful, 7 are unlawful, 4 are of unspecified birth status. Of the 49 collaterals connected through their mothers with the female household heads with whom they live, 6 are of unknown birth status, 11 are lawful, and 32 are illegitimate. Of the total 88 collaterals living with female principals, 19—namely, 6 males and 13 females—are connected to these women through their fathers, 7 of these 19 collaterals being legitimate. Of the remaining 69 connected to these female principals through their mothers, 47 are females; and of these 69 matrikin, 12 are legitimate, 9 are of unspecified birth status, and 48 are unlawful. Thus among collaterals living with their kinswomen in homes of which the latter are heads or the wives of household heads, one-third are males, less than a quarter are lawful-born, and about one-fifth trace their relationship to these women through their fathers. In short, resident collaterals of female principals are normally the unlawful children of the principals’ kinswomen, and by far the majority of them are females. Maternal rather than uterine kinship provides the basis for the residential placement of these collaterals; but illegitimacy influences their selection profoundly. Female principals generally accommodate the illegitimate offspring of their kinswomen rather than the legitimate; but they will also accommodate the legitimate issue of these kinswomen rather than any children of their kinsmen. In short, maternal kinship is an important basis for the domestic placement of illegitimate children in the homes of which their collateral kinswomen are heads or principals. These ties are traced mainly by women through women to women, and since women are the custodians of the unlawful children begotten in extra-residential unions, the majority of the resident collaterals of female principals will be their kinswomen’s illegitimate issue.

The structural opposite of this maternal dependence of illegitimates is the combination of agnation and legitimacy. We have already seen that male household heads do not accommodate many collateral kin in their homes, while women do, whether as wives of household heads or household heads themselves. The tendency for men to exclude illegitimate issue of their kin from the homes of which they are heads is balanced by the tendency
for women to receive many such individuals who trace connections with them through their mothers. In general, these polar tendencies should be expressed among the lineally descended members of households with heads of different sex, as well as among the collaterals. To permit this analysis, in the following table I have classified the resident lineal issue of these household heads by their sex, birth-status, generation, and sex of parent through whom descent is traced.

Since young people in Carriacou begin to assume household headship shortly after their 24th year, those remaining with their parents beyond that age are not a completely random sample. I have accordingly classified resident issue above the age of 24 as of unspecified birth status in the preceding table. To simplify presentation, I have also included one legitimate and four illegitimate great-grandchildren of female household heads among daughters’ and sons’ issue, as also the only resident great-grandchild of a male household head.

There are over three times as many such adult children living in homes of which their mothers are heads as live in their fathers’ homes. Moreover, in this group there are twice as many females as males.

Of the 273 resident issue of male household heads below the age of 24, 85 per cent are children of the heads themselves; 5 per cent are their sons’ children, and 10 per cent are their daughters’ issue. Of the 232 resident children of these male household heads, 95 per cent are legitimate. Of their sons’ 13 resident children, 77 per cent are legitimate, and an equal proportion are males; but of the 28 resident issue of these men’s daughters, half are unlawful and as many are females. Men will not take their sons’ issue into their homes as readily as their daughters’. They also prefer a son’s legitimate son to his other children. Of the daughters’ legitimate issue, sons are preferred; of the daughters’ illegitimate issue, girls are preferred.

Of the 288 resident issue of female household heads, 229, or 79.5 per cent, are less than 24 years of age, and of these only 89, or 39 per cent, are children of the heads themselves. A further 42, or 18 per cent, are their sons’ issue, and the remaining 98, or 43 per cent, are their daughters’. Of these 229 resident issue of female
Table 25. Resident issue of household heads, classified by sex, birth-status, generation, sex of parent through whom descent is traced and sex of household head.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Households with male heads</th>
<th>Households with female heads</th>
<th>All households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Sons'</td>
<td>Daughters'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males L</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females L</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals L</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total L and U</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L: lawful  
U: unlawful  
NK: not known
household heads, 104, or 45 per cent, are legitimate. Of the 42 resident issue of these women's sons, 18, or 43 per cent, are legitimate, while only 30 of the 98 daughters' issue are legitimate. Of all 146 resident children of female household heads, 88, or 60 per cent, are females, as against 52.5 per cent of the 249 resident children of male household heads.

These data amply demonstrate our inferences about the implications of descent and illegitimacy for the placement of dependants in households having heads of different sex. Almost four times as many daughters' children live with their mothers' mothers as with their mothers' fathers, and while the legitimate issue of daughters in homes with female heads is only double that found in those under males, there are nearly five times as many resident unlawful issue of the daughters of female heads. Similarly, although less than twice as many lawful issue of sons live with their fathers' mothers as with their fathers' fathers, there are eight times as many unlawful issue in the paternal grandmothers' homes. Even so, in homes with female heads, illegitimate issue of the head's daughters outnumber those of her sons by almost three to one. Clearly women accommodate their daughters' unlawful children in their own homes more readily than any other category of grandchildren. But only 11 per cent of the resident issue of male household heads are illegitimate, daughters' children forming just under half of this group.

Since male household heads are mainly responsible for their own legitimate issue, their legitimate collaterals will usually be living in the homes of their fathers. Since illegitimate issue rarely live in homes with male heads, the illegitimate offspring of a man's collaterals can rarely find a place in their father's home or in his own. In consequence, they will either live on their own or with some senior kinswoman. Many of these illegitimates live with their mothers' mothers, and others with their mothers' kinswomen, married or unmarried. The only groups of kin in homes with male heads among whom illegitimacy is normal are the resident collaterals of wives, and the latters' issue by other men. The kinship links which accommodate these illegitimates are either materterine or uterine.

Given the rule that women care for illegitimate offspring and
men for the legitimate, there is nothing surprising either in the relative numbers of resident collateral dependants of male and female principals, or in the high incidence of illegitimacy and materterine kinship among these collaterals, or in the low incidence of illegitimate issue living with their fathers or grandfathers as compared with those living with their mothers or grandmothers. If the facts were other than we have found them, an explanation would indeed be necessary. As it is, they merely demonstrate a rule and its implications.

Excluding household heads and their resident mates, the overwhelming majority of our sample population are persons with one or other parent alive. In view of the preceding discussion, it is useful to examine the residential situation of these children, especially regarding co-residence with or separation from either or both of their parents, as this is correlated with differences of birth status. A summation of my data on these points is presented in Table 26.

Of the 331 children below the age of 24 in households with male heads, 252, or 76 per cent, are legitimate, and 73, or 22 per cent, are not. Of the 291 juniors in households with female heads, 160, or 59.4 per cent, are legitimate, while 173, or 59 per cent, are not. Of the 622 juniors in all the households, 368, or 59 per cent are legitimate, a ratio which corresponds very closely indeed with that already mentioned for the island population as a whole. Whereas only 21 children above 24 years of age live in homes with male heads, 67 are in homes with female heads, and of these 47 are females. These adult women who live in homes with female heads are likely to have children with them, thereby extending the depth of these groups by one generation at least.

Of the total 711 juniors in all these households, 34.6 per cent live with both their parents, 29.2 per cent apart from both parents, 33.1 per cent with their mothers, widowed or other, apart from their fathers, and only 3 per cent with their fathers apart from their mothers. Of the 277 illegitimate juniors in these 224 households, 196, or 73 per cent, live in homes with female heads. Of the 359 children living in homes with female heads, 128, or 36 per cent, are absent from both parents, while a further 250, or 59.6 per cent, live with their mothers only, 66 of these being the lawful
Table 26. Children in the sample households, classified by sex, birth-status, sex of household head, and presence or absence of their parents in the home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households with</th>
<th>Male heads</th>
<th>Female heads</th>
<th>All households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both present</td>
<td>107 114 2 7</td>
<td>230 5 8 1</td>
<td>24 112 122 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both absent</td>
<td>18 15 17 28 1 5</td>
<td>84 16 21 42 47 2</td>
<td>128 34 36 59 75 1 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With father only *</td>
<td>1 2 6 6</td>
<td>15 2 1 3 1 2 8 7 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mother only *</td>
<td>2 5 10</td>
<td>17 21 23 46 57 1 148 21 25 51 68 1 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With widowed father</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With widowed mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>128 137 30 51 1 5</td>
<td>352 68 92 90 106 3</td>
<td>359 196 229 129 157 1 8 711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 24</td>
<td>123 129 27 46 1 5</td>
<td>331 52 64 85 88 2</td>
<td>291 175 193 112 134 1 7 622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LS lawful sons
LD lawful daughters
US unlawful sons
UD unlawful daughters
NKS sons, birth status unspecified
NKD daughters, birth status unspecified
* Exclusive of children living with their widowed parents
children of widowed mothers. Of the 212 children separated from both parents, 134, or 63 per cent, are unlawful, and of these 45, or one-third, live in homes with male heads. Of the 277 illegitimate juniors in this sample, only 10, or 3.6 per cent, live with both their parents, while another 139, or 50 per cent, live with their mothers away from their fathers, and 134, or 47 per cent live apart from both parents. Excluding the 72 lawful children who live with their widowed parents, there are 353, of whom 244, or 69 per cent, live with both their parents, 230 of these being in homes of which their fathers are heads. Only 13 per cent are to be found with their mothers apart from their fathers, and in almost all cases the fathers are abroad working.

Of 189 children under 24 years of age who live apart from their parents, 119 live with their mothers’ kin and 58 with their fathers; 9 live with unrelated persons, and 3 are not classifiable in this way. Of the 119 living with their mothers’ kin, 49 live with their mother’s mother alone, 22 with both their mother’s parents, 13 with their mother’s full sister, 12 with their mother’s mother’s sister, and 6 with their mother’s father’s sister. 76, or 65 per cent, of these 119 children living with their matrikin apart from their parents are illegitimate. Of the 58 children living with their father’s kin apart from both parents, 34 live with their father’s mother only, 10 with their father’s parents, 5 with their father’s full sister. Of these 58 individuals, 37, or 64 per cent, were illegitimate. In short, twice as many children live with their matrikin apart from both parents as live with their patrikin, but the ratio of illegitimacy in both groups is much the same, and perhaps for this reason the guardians in both groups are mainly women.

Of those 13 children below the age of 24 who live with their father apart from their mother, only 3 are to be found with their father only. Of the 170 who live with their mother apart from their father, 78 are to be found with their mother only, the majority of these being the legitimate issue of married or widowed mothers. Of the remaining 92 who live apart from their father with their mother and mother’s kin, 38 live with their mother and mother’s mother, and 79 are unlawful. Of the 170 young people living with their mother apart from their father, 109, or 64 per cent, are illegitimate; 62 per cent of the 13 who live with their father away
from their mother are also illegitimate. In other words, two-thirds of the children who live with one parent apart from the other are illegitimate, and over 90 per cent of these live with their mother apart from their father. These distributions illustrate the principles already formulated, and show how the definitions of parental roles associated with differing mating forms control the constitution of domestic units having heads of different sex, explaining their differences as well as their similarities.
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