

N.J. ('NICK') ALLEN

INTRODUCTION

Robert Parkin

[T]he challenge for comparativism is not to cite or expound interesting material . . . but to be convincing. (Allen 1993a: 127)

To the general public especially, the usual image of the anthropologist is one of either a specialist in bones or someone who withdraws from civilization for long periods of time to live with exotic peoples in remote places on the other side of the world. The life and work of N.J. Allen, as he preferred to sign himself professionally, formerly of the Universities of Durham and Oxford, most nearly fits the second of these stereotypes, and emphatically not the first, despite his interest in human origins. In brief, not only did he do fairly conventional social-anthropological fieldwork in the Himalayas for his doctorate and some postdoctoral work, backing it up with other visits to South Asia later, he also reverted increasingly to the study and the library to develop not only insights but also whole models of social ideology and organization within increasingly wide geographical and chronological compasses.

Trained at the height of the structuralist wave in anthropology, Allen was unusual, if not virtually unique, in adding an evolutionist dimension to structuralism in his work on both the evolution of kinship systems (his notion of 'tetradic' kinship and society) and his suggested revisions to the work of Georges Dumézil, the historian (in the latter's own mind) of comparative studies of myth within the framework of the Indo-European (IE) language family. In adopting this particular twin perspective, Allen was very much influenced by evolutionism in the writings of Marcel Mauss, another figure from the past, whom, along with Dumézil, he also greatly admired. This formed the basis of his own intellectual originality, his fearlessness in suggesting novel

ideas and his exemplary scholarship, as well as his interest in potential currents and trajectories in ‘world history’ (again following Mauss). This was emphatically not a throwback to the evolutionism of the nineteenth century, which in anthropology was used to underpin the social and ethnic hierarchies and colonialist prejudices of that period. Although Allen himself may have stood out in the structuralist era for the idiosyncrasy of his chosen studies and his evolutionary approaches to them, he took on board completely the anti-discriminatory ethos that has come to characterize not just evolutionism, but the contemporary discipline as a whole.

It is in combining these two streams organically – structuralism and evolutionism – in novel ways that Allen commands our attention. Of course, the fullness of his ideas did not show itself immediately. The story of his scholarly journey is therefore also one of how ideas emerge, often singly, and of how they are combined, shaped and re-shaped – how they themselves ‘evolve’ – along the path to a coherent model, structural or otherwise. It is this that the present collection of some of his key papers is intended to document and to demonstrate.

‘Nick’ Allen: A Brief Account of His Life and Career

Nicholas Justin Allen, or ‘Nick’ to his family, friends, colleagues and students,¹ was born in London on 8 July 1939 and died in Oxford on 21 March 2020 aged eighty. Descended from army officers and officials in British India, and with a father interested in Celtic numismatics, his mother gave him a taste for mountaineering that eventually led him to choose the Himalayas as his doctoral fieldwork site, no doubt standing him in good stead when he finally got there. Before then, however, he was to accompany the rest of his natal family on a posting of his father’s to Hong Kong, and he also spent some time at Rugby School, where he was exposed to classics for the first time. This was of little importance to him then, but it became crucial to some of his later research.

Nick then began thinking of medicine as a career and duly acquired some medical training in a roundabout way courtesy of an undergraduate scholarship in Classics from New College, Oxford, which allowed him to transfer to medicine after his first term. Experience followed as a medical researcher (or research assistant) and then as a junior hospital doctor, which between them, though after much hesitation on his part, were enough to decide him against pursuing medicine as a career. Finally, while evidently feeling at a bit of a loose end,

he discovered anthropology courtesy of a copy of Haddon's *History of Anthropology* (1934) belonging to his mother's brother (whose son was the late anthropologist Alfred Gell, his matrilineal cross-cousin). After mulling over the significance of this discovery for himself and his future – including with the late Godfrey Lienhardt, a future colleague whom he visited in Oxford as a prospective student to the University – he decided to go up to read for the nine-month Diploma in Social Anthropology (which I took under his supervision eleven years later). He later recalled that his exam results were disappointing and that he did not find the transition from medicine easy. Nonetheless, after doing a BLitt degree and paying a visit to Paris, where he met Louis Dumont and Sandy Macdonald (a later mentor of his on Himalayan anthropology) and saw Dumézil lecture, he went off to Nepal for his doctorate on the Thulung Rai (awarded 1976), supervised initially by Rodney Needham.² He later had some supervision from Christoph von Fürer-Haimendorf at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London to fill in for Needham's frequent absences abroad. However, Fürer-Haimendorf's supervision was distinctly light-touch, and Nick finished writing up his doctoral thesis pretty much by himself.³ Then came marriage to his wife Sheila, whom he had met at Linacre College while doing the BLitt; they were to have two daughters. He then spent four years as a lecturer in Durham before being recruited to the Oxford Institute as a Lecturer, later Reader, in the Anthropology of South Asia in 1976 (also my first year as a student there). Thus he followed in the footsteps of such luminaries as Louis Dumont and Ravi Jain in teaching the anthropology of South Asia at Oxford.

In Oxford he had a difficult first year as a lecturer, due in the main to fraught relations between the new chair in the person of Needham (his own former supervisor who had just been appointed to the All Souls' professorship in anthropology) and most of the rest of the department, whom Nick supported at the cost of breaking with Needham irrevocably. Eventually the latter decamped permanently from the Institute to take up residence in All Souls', and for the rest of his tenure of the professorship the Institute was run by a committee with a rotating chair. Free from these pressures, except for having to do a stint as committee chair just before the next professor, John Davis, arrived in 1990, Nick then embarked on a long history of teaching, research and his share of academic administration. Having been at Linacre College for the Diploma, he transferred to Wolfson College as a lecturer, and later reader, where he did a stint as vice-gerent. In 2001 he finally retired into a long and fruitful period of continuing with his research and more generally 'enjoying what Oxford has to offer', as

he once put it in my hearing, which lasted practically until the end of his life.⁴

The Present Collection

In choosing papers, I have of necessity been guided partly by practical considerations concerning rights-holders being prepared, or not prepared, to allow their reproduction. With regard to the intellectual reasons for the choice of papers, I have chosen to concentrate mainly on Allen's lifelong interests in IE mythical comparison and in kinship, as these demonstrate definite courses of development with an explicit view to taking scholarship in them forward. Moreover, while they can be treated as separate topics, in Allen's research they do touch on each other at certain points, while one paper in the collection, Allen (2012a) (reproduced here as Chapter 11), makes a definite and explicit attempt at their rapprochement. As a result, I hope that this volume will seem less like a random selection of disparate papers and more like a body of work that can be shown to have enjoyed steady organic growth throughout the academic career of this remarkable scholar.

As these are the areas in which Allen's work has made and is still capable of making a strong contribution to scholarship, I have concentrated somewhat less on his other main body of work, arising out of his interest in the studies of the French school of anthropology and sociology of Émile Durkheim, which for Allen mostly meant the extensive and pioneering corpus of Marcel Mauss, Durkheim's nephew. Allen's choice of Mauss's works with which to engage involved a greater variety of topics than the other two areas of his scholarship, meaning there is no one theme or hypothesis that unites them all when compared with Dumézil's studies of IE myth or Allen's development of the tetradic idea, where in each case a single key argument acts as the focus for thematic treatment. However, two papers, Chapters 6 and 12, respectively on the category of substance and on the division of labour, both seen through Maussian eyes, do see Allen confronting Mauss's thoughts with his own ideas on IE comparison and the origins of kinship respectively. They therefore represent a third theme of this collection, namely Mauss's impact on Allen's own work.

The result of these considerations, therefore, is that, of the twelve published papers of Allen's in this volume, there are five each on the themes of first, IE mythical comparison (Part II) and second, the ori-

gins of kinship, in particular the tetradic idea (Part III). Before that, in Part I, come two semi-introductory papers, the first a brief item setting out his view on the notion of structure in anthropology in a nutshell – chosen because of Allen's own self-definition as a type of structuralist. The second of these papers, reproduced here as Chapter 2, is more expansive, consisting of Allen's partially revisionist commentary on the notion of hierarchical opposition associated with Louis Dumont. This was a different and later wave of structuralism based on a critique of the conventional and simpler binary opposition associated with the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss and, following him, Rodney Needham (see Parkin 2002).

Chapter 3 also requires a brief comment, being a review article published by Allen back in 1990 which adventitiously also contains a digestible account of Dumézil's ideas. The inclusion of these three papers is therefore intended to provide the reader with an initial basis for tackling the more detailed argumentative work of the subsequent chapters. Full bibliographic details of all twelve of Allen's papers can be found in the references to this Introduction, where they are marked with an asterisk.

Allen's Research: The Two Main Themes

As noted already, Allen wrote on a variety of themes, including the history and work of the Durkheim school of French sociology-cum-anthropology that was so critical to the genesis of social and cultural anthropology, especially in Europe. From the start he was interested in Himalayan myth and ritual, aspects of illness and shamanism, etc., as well as in the theme of the ritual journey, both in Nepalese folklore and in comparing the Greek story of the *Odyssey* with scenes from the Sanskrit *Mahabharata*.⁵ However, even in the 1970s two themes were beginning to stand out because of their potential to influence later developments and practitioners, themes that carried him throughout his research career to near the very end of his life: IE comparativism; and tetradic theory, a theory of kinship, but also a model of primordial human society. I will briefly describe the form and significance of both these bodies of work at this point in order to give the reader an initial orientation before proceeding to a more detailed examination of their genesis, history and formation, as to a large extent they implicate each other. Indeed, towards the end of his career, Allen sought to reconcile them explicitly (especially Allen 2012a).

IE Comparativism

This theme is associated above all with the name of Georges Dumézil, a French scholar who liked to be considered a historian, but whose work is also of interest to, among others, anthropologists, classicists and Indologists. Having studied IE materials for a number of years, in a breakthrough work of 1938 on the Roman *flamines* he suggested that conceptually (as ideas), ideologically (including ceremonially and mythologically) and formally (as social categories), IE society as far back as one can trace it recognized three groups, categories, distinctive features or what he called ‘functions’, a term used idiosyncratically in this particular scholarly milieu.

It should be made clear from the outset that these ‘functions’ are not to be confused with the notion of function in the schools of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown. In Dumézilian language, the word ‘function’ (French *fonction*) can be seen as connoting an area of action or activity, a task or role (see below), or a status that is socially valued or disvalued. Importantly, functions are not isolated from one another but are linked together in a hierarchical system that admits of no addition or omission in the context in question: that is, they, and only they, must all be present and identifiable in some form. In practice, however, they are often fragmentary and/or unclear, providing material for some key debates among Indo-Europeanists over their interpretation. Allen (1986a: 100) gives some tips for identifying genuine multi-functional schemas of this type: ‘the rules for Dumézilian interpretations are (i) that the three terms be solidary, distinct, homogenous [and] form an ensemble that is complete; [and] (ii) that the functional value of each term be immediately perceptible’. This formula helps exclude arbitrary pseudo-examples grouped into threes or fours. Elsewhere Allen gives a neat, hypothetical example of what is required, which *inter alia* evinces his long-term fascination for ritual journeys (Allen 1987: 38 note 7):

For instance, an IE story which happens to mention a priest, a sword and a god of wealth is not *ipso facto* trifunctional. However, if a hero on a journey meets with these three heterogenous entities one after another, and with nothing else, then they become a homogenous sequence of encounters, and one could argue for a ‘classificatory intention’ [a Dumézilian phrase here expressing purpose and not just casualness] and a trifunctional interpretation.

The contexts in which functions manifest themselves are potentially many: Allen himself sought them, *inter alia*, in relation to yoga (1998c), colours (1998e), time (2005a), asceticism (2005b) and cer-

tain Hindu rites and categories (1998d, 2012a). However, the most important context by far is the mythical narrative, which typically deals with the physically impossible, and in which various culture heroes play dramatic roles, sometimes helping one another, sometimes fighting one another, as well as marrying, having children, dying and being resurrected. In the IE world, these mythical narratives reappear as analogues of each other in at least some of that family's languages, and the same can be expected in other traditions. Thus, to mention only Allen's long-term interest in such narratives, he convincingly compares the Greek story of *Odysseus* with a section of the super-long Sanskrit epic, the *Mahabharata*, in both of which appears the notion of a ritual journey in which interruptions to that journey have to be dealt with ritually: indeed, the *Odyssey* is precisely about such a journey throughout. However, the comparison does not stop at the mere fact of similarity but extends to numerous incidents that the two myths narrate and have in common.

It is important to realize, however, that at the surface level such myths are rarely exact replicas of one another from case to case. While the structure of the myth, as revealed by the functions, should remain the same, the surface elements, like the characters, their settings, the activities they indulge in and the incidents that arise in the course of the myth, will differ in detail. Although in general they should be comparable to count as tri- or quadri-functional, 'a perfect fit is not essential to my argument' (Allen 2005b: 48), and indeed such a fit would be unlikely over the span of millennia that have elapsed since an undifferentiated and unified IE language existed. Comparison certainly reveals the analogues of a myth, but it is obvious that what is essentially the same myth is virtually never replicated exactly from case to case: it is enough if the functions and/or the values and mythemes associated with them can be identified, however faint the trace.

In the original, Dumézilian version of this schema, the first function had to do with religious authority (e.g. priests), the second variously with secular rule, authority and/or warfare (e.g. kings), and the third variously with the creation of wealth, including primary economic activities and trading, or simply indicating the mass of the population who were subject to the different forms of authority of the first two functions. Allen abbreviates the originally identified functions to F1, F2, F3, and as we shall see he adds a divided F4 (F4+ and F4-) as well. Dumézil built on this initial insight in a career spanning nearly fifty years, from his breakthrough publication of 1938 until his death in 1986. Along the way, a whole international industry of IE studies grew up, both critical and accepting of Dumézil's insights,

which is still thriving. Allen became a distinctive and somewhat adversarial voice within this industry, not rejecting Dumézil's hypotheses so much as seeking to modify them, while being fully prepared to criticize his fellow interpreters of Dumézil, sometimes quite sharply (see Allen 1993a, reproduced here as Chapter 3).

Allen came to this material with a background of doctoral studies in Tibeto-Burman mythology and its comparative potential, and mythology was always the focus of his later work on IE.⁶ His first attempted innovation was to suggest adding a fourth IE-wide function (F4) to the classic tripartite Dumézilian model (F1, F2, F3). This would cover the negative, depressed aspects of social life associated, for example, with the status of the servile classes, which were largely disregarded by Dumézilian orthodoxy. He later suggested dividing the fourth function to provide an additional sub-function to deal with the notion of the king as a transcendent, outside figure who was also positively valued (to be called F4+). This left the other half-function to cover low-status outsiders to the society, as well as the marginalized, the subordinated, the servile within it, all valued negatively (to be called F4-).⁷ Thus, from Dumézil's tripartite scheme, we end up with a model that is quadripartite, even pentadic, given the two divisions of the fourth function.⁸

The best attested version of the quadripartite model is the *varna* scheme in India, which, though it has antecedents, as a fixed schema goes back to the Rigveda of around 1000 BC. The *varnas* are divided into the castes for which India is so famous: Brahman priests, Kshatriya kings, Vaisya cultivators and traders (creators of wealth) and Shudra servants. The *varna* system therefore adds the last category to the tripartite Dumézilian schema of Brahman, Kshatriya and Vaishya, but it also excludes the Untouchables, even though most of them are craftsmen and religious specialists in their own right, as well as performing many duties for the clean castes, mostly duties that can be seen in religious terms. However, because of their consequent association with forms of pollution, they are placed outside the mainstream society, often literally by being forced to live in their own hamlets outside clean-caste villages. Later still, as already noted, Allen was to start thinking in terms of a divided fourth function, positive and negative, to add to Dumézil's original three, yielding a pentadic structure. Probably the Untouchables, like the Shudras, would be relegated to the negative half of the fourth function, labelled F-4 by Allen.

Allen took his ideas to Dumézil in Paris, but the great man evidently did not agree with them, though he surely would have been impressed by Allen's scholarly diligence. Allen took this rebuff and other criticisms in his stride, but it was proving these additions and

innovations to the Dumézilian corpus that occupied this side of his intellectual interests for the rest of his life, culminating in a late publication (2019) that fortuitously came out just before he died.

The Tetradic Theory of Kinship and Society

Allen's interest in kinship was also rooted in Himalayan materials, and it can be connected with his work on IE myth in the sense that to some extent the two themes share the same origins in his thought, namely the culture (especially mythology) and languages of India, Nepal and the latter's Bodic-speakers, with more than a nod to Tibet and literary Tibetan. Another influence on Allen here was his supervisor Rodney Needham, who had made himself a post-Lévi-Straussian expert in what he called 'prescriptive systems', but which up until then had mostly been called either elementary structures (Lévi-Strauss) or cross-cousin marriage (originating with Lewis Henry Morgan in the nineteenth century). Encouraged by Needham, Allen produced two outstanding papers on kinship terminologies and change among the Byansi and the Sherpa, two Tibeto-Burman-speaking groups of Nepal.⁹ In the next decade, drawing on these studies, he produced, first, one of the most imaginative papers of his or anyone else's career, 'A Dance of Relatives' (1982); and, second, what is best described as a 'treatise' (my term; cf. Allen 1986b) on the possible origin of all kinship systems in what he, following Mauss, called 'world history'. This treatise was set out in a similar fashion to Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, including a particular way of numbering paragraphs hierarchically (1., 1.1, 1.1.1, 1.2, etc.). Sparsely referenced, it reads like a series of theorems, or even one long theorem, clearly being inspired by the Byansi and Sherpa materials (above), among other examples of symmetric prescriptive terminologies in many parts of the world. Starting from this point, Allen stripped such terminologies down to their basic configuration consisting of just four sections and eight gender-marked or four gender-neutral terms, which formed a structure of their own. Although unattested in the ethnographic record, this model most closely resembled the four-section kinship system exemplified most famously by the Kariera of Australia and some other groups on that continent.¹⁰ However, as Allen realized, a similar system exists in the Peruvian Amazon among the Cashinahua,¹¹ studied by Kenneth Kensinger, according to whom they have 'two moieties . . . each . . . divided by sex' (Kensinger 1984: 231), that is, four sections, resembling the tetradic model, though with eight gendered categories. Much more recently, Marcela Coelho de Souza has mentioned in pass-

ing the Kaingang and Xokleng of the extreme south of the Southern Gê speech area in Brazil as having ‘Kariera’ patterns (2012: 205). The late Per Hage also construed the sixteenth-century Maya terminology of the Yucatan peninsula in Central America as ‘Kariera’ (2003).

Because of the focus on just four terms, Allen gave this archetypal system and the theory that underpinned it the name ‘tetradic’.¹² Though for a long time not attracting much notice, after being presented at various conferences and seminars, it began to be picked up by other kinship specialists, both approvingly and more lukewarmly, from the 1990s onwards. Along the way, Allen published revised and expanded versions of the tetradic model intended for the kinship expert, as well as one paper describing his theory for linguists, and simpler versions, often embedded in papers on other themes, directed more towards the general social-science reader. All this culminated in his contribution to the multidisciplinary volume *Early Human Kinship* of 2008, which he co-edited and in which he placed what was his last revision or extension (really his last significant statement) of the tetradic idea. After that, IE comparativism took over until his final attempt to reconcile the two main strands of his research in a publication of 2012 (Allen 2012a).

The Trajectory of Allen’s Research in Eight Easy Steps

1. Fieldwork with the Thulung of Nepal, coupled with the work of Dumézil, introduces him to the language family as a framework for comparison and to myth as a theme inviting such comparison.
2. Takes up Dumézil’s tripartite IE classification and develops his own hypothesis of an increase from three to four terms in both India and the Himalayas.
3. Prefers a substratum explanation uniting India with the Himalayas and Tibet in the primordial period to theories of IE and/or Indian influence moving north across the Himalayas to Tibet (though this occurred later).
4. Links what he sees as IE’s four-function scheme to kinship initially as moieties and dual organization, later replaced by tetradic sections; influence of Needham (on prescriptive systems), Granet (on simplicity of tetradic structures) and Mauss (on world history).
5. Refines the tetradic model of kinship and considers its possible origins in prehistory.
6. Advocates splitting the fourth IE function between positive and negative, generating two ‘half-functions’ and making the tripartite Dumézilian schema pentadic.

7. Postulates a historical transition from tribal society (exogamous clans exchanging spouses) to state society (endogamous classes or other strata exchanging services), especially in South Asia, but with the salience of the number four (later five) surviving the transition.
8. The two streams, IE comparativism and tetradic theory, are increasingly treated separately in his work, the former becoming dominant, though Allen (2012a) constitutes an attempt to reconcile them.

IE Myth: How Allen's Ideas on Historical Evolution Evolved

Allen's ideas on both of these themes can be found in embryo in quite early papers, especially two of 1978 (1978a, 1978b).¹³ The key aim of both papers is to establish the theory of the 'quadripartition' of society into four classes from India to Tibet via Bodic-speaking 'tribes' in the Himalayas (principally Nepal). In fieldwork with the Thulung, Allen had already been impressed by the potential of myth as a subject for comparison and of the language family (here of Bodic-speakers, subsequently of IE-speakers) as a framework for such comparison. However, here he goes further in linking different language families through the idea of a substratum, discussed later.

Allen 1978a

Broadly speaking, the first paper (1978a) addresses the phenomenon of fourfold classifications among certain Bodic-speakers in Nepal, namely the Thulung, Sherpa, Gurung, Thakali and Tamang, as well as Tibetans, with their specific literate and more urban history. In all of these examples, the four classes have indigenous names, testifying to their indigenous significance. These names are also linked to what, adopting Dumézilian language, Allen generally calls 'functions' (conventionally abbreviated 'F1, F2, F3. . .' in IE studies generally). In all cases, two of the functions are kings and priests, who are superior in status to the other two classes and themselves dichotomized between secular and sacred. The other two functions are also dichotomized, though inferior in status to the first two; but what their exact functions are is inconsistent and sometimes unclear in the sources. However, they variously include king's ministers and administrators, who are *ipso facto* inferior to the king, and priest's servants and

blacksmiths,¹⁴ inferior to the priests. This yields another horizontal dichotomization to go with that between kings and priests,¹⁵ as well as two vertical dichotomizations linking inferior to superior headed by kings and priests separately. Allen tends to call this second relation 'linear', though we might also call it 'hierarchical' in this context. Thus, among the Thulung, the priests are responsible for agricultural rites, while the name for their inferiors translates as 'cowherds'; the latter are also associated with the low-status practice of uxorilocal marriage, marking them off as outsiders (later an 'F4-' or low-status figure in Allen's thought) because of the in-marrying son-in-law. Also here, the kings and their ministers are opposed to the priests and their inferiors as Tekala is to Congkom (really the local names for two banks of a local river): that is, there is a moiety or dual structure here as well (not, in light of what comes later, a four-section kinship system, NB). Allen speculates that these moieties were once exogamous.

As for the Tamang and Thakali, the former are said to be descended from four 'families' and the latter to consist of four exogamous clans, though in neither case do the respective units have Dumézilian-like functions. A lengthy passage of some three and a half pages follows postulating the existence of a four-fold functional classification for the Sherpas. One main aim of choosing them here is to stress the known fact that they came south from Tibet in the relatively recent past and have thus been more immune to IE influence (e.g. the *varna* scheme) than some other Himalayan groups. The significance of this argument will appear a little later when we discuss Allen's notion of a substratum.

The three Tibetan forms of this model that Allen gives in his Table 1 (1978a: 16) are rather different from one another and the foregoing, and the last is clearly influenced by the Indian *varna* scheme. However, the first two are still recognizable, showing in embryo the first of Allen's suggested innovations to the Dumézilian model, i.e. the addition of a fourth function. In the very first model, taken from Aziz (1974), in place of kings we have the aristocracy (also typically involved with warfare and rule, like many kings); opposed to them are the priests, while the remaining two functions are commoners ('agriculturalists, nomads [herders?], labourers, traders' in Aziz (1974: 24) and outcastes. It is not difficult to see in these arrangements the ghosts not only of the Indian *varna* scheme, but also of Allen's future quadripartite model, while the presence of a category of 'outsider' can be related to the second of Allen's suggested changes to the Dumézilian IE model – the splitting of the fourth function into its positive and negative aspects to produce a pentadic schema.

Allen then proceeds to establish, over a further one and a half pages, ‘the view that the kinship systems of Tibeto-Burman speakers in general were at one time symmetrical prescriptive ones’ (1978a: 19), i.e. terminologically expressing bilateral cross-cousin marriage. This leads to an attempt to link this insight with the quadripartition of Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman-speaking societies he has already established, and also with IE influence from the south: ‘My suggestion . . . is that the *varna* scheme is an adaptation of an underlying splitting of society, first into moieties (labelled for convenience kings and priests) and second into superior and inferior’ (ibid.). This would yield four categories.

As already noted, Allen eschews the view of IE influence spreading from the south at this early period, preferring a ‘substratum’ view of a common classificatory ideology extending across India and the Himalayas to Tibet. This is also touched on in two other papers (1978c and 1981, the latter being an expanded version of the former) during the course of a comparison between myths of ritual journeys among the Thulung, a ‘tribe’ of Nepal, and the Hindu myth of Shiva and Sati, which he finds are structurally similar. In fact, however, the liking for a substratum theory clearly goes back to his BLitt thesis on Bodic-speaking tribes in Nepal (1969), where he has this to say about the Carjat (literally ‘four clans’, pronounced ‘Char-jaat’), a Gurung group divided into exogamous moieties as well as clans:

one Carjat moiety consists of clans called Ghale (= king) and Ghotane or Kon (probably once meaning court administrator), the other of Lamas [traditional Tibetan priests; RP] and Lamchane or Plon (perhaps originally functionary) . . . Thus although it appears that the four-fold terminology of the Carjat may have been influenced by the Hindu *varna* model, it may also be that the model itself was derived from pre-Aryan social forms. (Allen 1969: 149–50, after Pignède 1966: 173)

Once again, we see both the fourfold structure and the uncertainty regarding the identities of the subordinate sections. Also evident here, however, is a potentially controversial hypothesis that the *varna* organization was not brought to India with the Aryan invasions, but that it owes its existence to the ‘pre-Aryan social forms’ the invaders found in India, i.e. to a pre-Aryan substratum linking India with Tibet via the Nepalese Himalayas.

However, one feature that supports this substratum theory, which Allen himself points out, is that it is not only Bodic-speakers in the Himalayas who have symmetric prescriptive terminologies – so too do almost all Dravidian-speakers far away in south and central India. In this view, it was the intrusive IE invasions or migrations that upset this

substratum's unity by first, changing the names of the categories; second, adding new categories, namely the Shudras and Untouchables; third, replacing an exogamous structure of kinship groups exchanging spouses with an endogamous structure of castes exchanging services;¹⁶ and, fourth, reversing the status order of king above priest to place priest (Brahman) above king (Kshatriya), at least in India. But here Allen also mulls over the transition between the dichotomization of a kinship system of symmetric prescriptive alliance, whether or not into moieties or dual organization, and what he calls 'the linear [i.e. hierarchical] reorganization of the four components – for instance, the linear ordering of the three Indo-European functions' (1978a: 21). While he is probably at his most speculative here – and I am reading between the lines somewhat – his basic argument explicitly refers to matters of scale: kinship orders are characteristic of small-scale societies like Himalayan tribes; linear (or hierarchical) orders are found among stratified state societies like those into which India and Nepal were and are divided, as well as historical Tibet. When in the course of history these state societies absorbed the tribes and turned their power on them, the latter's structures of kinship and kinship-based categories were replaced by 'linear' (or hierarchical) social morphologies like the *varna* scheme. At this stage Allen was still influenced enough by Needhamite ideas of kinship to invoke the dichotomization inherent in symmetric prescriptive terminologies (here he cites the Byansi), which he links with dual organization and therefore binary opposition.¹⁷ He is evidently not yet thinking in terms of quadripartite kinship systems, at least not clearly.

However that may be, right at the end, in the very last footnote, Allen mentions 'the fascinating work of Dumézil' (1978a: 22 note 10) as if he had just discovered it, though it had also been introduced to him by Needham (Allen 2003: 279). In the same long footnote (1978a: 22 note 10), he then proceeds to arrange the five Pandava brothers of the *Mahabharata* epic into a rudimentary Dumézilian functional order that anticipates how Allen himself was eventually to conceive it. Thus, one brother is defined as a warrior, another probably as his assistant or page because of his association with horses, while yet another is probably a creator of wealth (or perhaps a domestic servant) because of his association with cattle. As for Arjuna, who plays such a prominent role in the epic, although he must fight his cousins like all his brothers (as Krishna famously insists he must as a duty attached to his status), Allen interprets him as a rather untethered figure, the exemplification of all the Pandavas and of the Kshatriya function, but also being somewhat external to them and therefore

representing the outside, 'as it were, at the hub of a *mandala*' or ritual circle embracing the other four brothers. Although this account is not entirely clear, again one can see in it the embryonic outline of Allen's later innovations to the Dumézilian model in regarding the king as transcendent and unifying ('F4+'). He finishes the footnote by suggesting the possibility of merging the tripartite Dumézilian model with 'a more dualistic pre-Aryan one'. This, and a remark closing the main text 1978a: 22, again suggest that he is not yet prepared to take the further step of replacing 'dualistic' with 'tetradic', nor does he yet know precisely how to fit together 'social quadripartition and symmetrical prescriptive terminologies'.¹⁸

Allen 1978b

While the general theme of Allen (1978b) is similar to Allen (1978a), it concentrates more on Tibet and Tibetan, that is, on a society, polity and language that were quite removed from Sanskritic influence until the arrival of Buddhism in the seventh century AD. First Allen gives a summary of 1978a, in which his main argument was that 'a four-function ideology applying to clans pre-existed the appearance of the four-varna schema, not only within the Bodic-speaking area but also within India proper' (1978b: 342). In this later paper (1978b), virtually the entire focus shifts to Tibet, 'to show that Tibet possessed a four-function ideology at an early period' (*ibid.*), before any hint of IE or Indian influence. Although he proceeds to show this with examples, the notion of a state system taking over the original clan-based system clearly lacks firm historical evidence, though it is put forward as plausible, given especially the clear evidence of such state systems and fourfold structures across the whole region in the last 1,000–1,500 years or so.

Allen also suggests, somewhat speculatively, that the simplest four-functional ideology would consist in each clan having a function. Implicitly, he appears to think, if this occurred, each clan, of equal status, would become a class in a 'lineal' or hierarchical system like the *varna* scheme, the number four informing both. As for the tribes, however, there is a further difference. While the states would have adopted the linear scheme, in some cases they extended that scheme to embrace whole tribes into their domains: that is (my own suggestion here), a whole tribe like the Thulung might itself become a category (perhaps as untouchable) and occupy a position as such within the linear scheme. However, Allen makes it clear that such a development would not obliterate the significance, or collective memory, of the

fourfold clan system – only now it too would appear solely as a set of functions existing only in myth, not as part of contemporary social structure. In the case of his later innovative work on tetradic kinship, however, it is precisely the four units, or four sections, that constitute the social structure.

In the rest of this paper, Allen finds one fairly ancient Tibetan myth whose colour symbolism resembles that of the *varna* scheme in India and concludes that it was part of the substratum he mentions elsewhere, not an example of IE influence from the south. Also here, he credits the Rees brothers, in their work on the Celtic branch of IE, with the discovery of ‘a fourth function, associated with blackness and death, within the IE world’ (Allen 1978b.: 356 note 38; cf. Rees and Rees 1961), but he also expands on this by contrasting ‘the ordinary kings of a four-element schema and the divine kings of a five-element schema’, an early reference to his theory of a pentadic structure based on the splitting of the fourth function that is left largely undeveloped here (ibid.: 359). In a later paper (2007: 277 note 3), however, he credits the Rees brothers with this development too, in which ‘The four *varnas* plus king were already compared with the five provinces of Irish sacred geography.’¹⁹

Right at the end of Allen’s 1978b paper, for the first time we see a definite statement that a fourfold structure is simpler than a binary one like a moiety system or dual organization, citing Marcel Granet (without giving a reference),²⁰ who had first suggested this. And Allen then asks, clearly rhetorically: ‘Were the four functions originally performed for an ego by the four types of relative who together made up his society?’ (1987b: 359). As far as I can tell, this is the first embryonic mention in Allen’s work of the possibility of a kinship-based tetradic society of the sort that would feature in his ‘treatise’ on the subject (1986b) I mentioned earlier. However, the tetradic idea is a matter of sections equivalent in status that are also orders of kinship, not ‘lineal’ or hierarchical classes or castes, or Dumézilian functions.

At the end of a paper published in the same year as this treatise (1986a), on ritual journeys (and *ipso facto* mythical journeys) in Nepal, he has the following passage, which more clearly and confidently sums up where he stands at that moment, some eight years after publishing Allen (1978a) and (1978b):

there are many reasons for thinking that the Indo-European ideology included a fourth, *relatively* heterogeneous function, a complex of ideas concerned with the Other World of death and devils. Furthermore . . . a four-functional ideology may have existed among Tibeto-Burman speakers as well. (1986a: 100, original emphasis)

He then divides this fourth function into two with reference to the particular example of kingship he is dealing with, between a ‘fertility aspect’ and a ‘subterranean aspect’, while stating that this proposal regarding ‘quadri-functional frameworks’ is still rather ‘hypothetical’ (ibid.). Nonetheless, in this same paper he briefly mentions two other examples of quadripartite organization in Newar myths from central Nepal. One has the series priests, kings, porters and agents of the other world (i.e. gods, but also demons etc.; ibid.: 79). The other, taken from Gérard Toffin (1979: 67 note 19), has a triad of priest, king and porter, to which Allen suggests adding a category of demons and ghosts as a fourth function (ibid.: 100). That same year, however, quadripartite structures became much more concrete as an original feature of kinship in the ‘treatise’ (Allen 1986b).²¹

Mallory and Adams (2006: 430) point out that others have suggested a fourth function too, for example, to represent artisans.²² However, this suggested expansion of the three-function model to four functions in India, where artisans, despite their protestations, are generally considered untouchable by the clean castes, omits any mention of the Shudras. Another example is the quadripartite mythical landscape in Ireland (the latter an obvious nod to the Rees brothers, though as already noted they actually found the Irish mythical landscape to be pentadic; see below), or females in the work of Emily Lyle (1990).²³ With reference to Allen himself, Mallory and Adams say: ‘the Fourth Function is the one set outside the other three, an alien otherness that must be incorporated into the mythic scheme’ (ibid.). This sounds unduly instrumentalist, as in Allen’s thought all four functions existed at the beginning and, prospectively, in prehistory: none of them had to be ‘incorporated’ with earlier ones.

Allen 1987a

Another paper, published in a long defunct journal, should be noted at this point, as it is clearer and fuller than earlier efforts to explain Allen’s views on IE myth; indeed, it is the first joined-up, substantive and really confident statement of Allen’s ideas about the Indo-Europeans as they stood at the time of publication. In brief, it describes the classic Dumézilian model of IE ideology and sets out the first of Allen’s proposed changes here, again involving the addition of a fourth function. He is not firmly suggesting that it might be divided into positive and negative, and indeed he specifically rejects here the notion of a fifth function as lacking in both evidence and logical necessity (p. 33).²⁴ However, on pp. 36–37, he gives an example from Rome that looks

pentadic – the ‘*rex sacrificolus*’ (properly *rex sacrificulus*, i.e. a priest who performs sacrifices), the three *flamines* (a category of priests each dedicated to a particular deity) and the *pontifex* or high priest – but instead of rendering them as pentadic, he explicitly ignores the *rex* and argues that the *pontifex* is fourth function. Apart from replacing *rex sacrificolus* with *rex sacrorum*, this example occurs more prominently in a posthumous paper (Allen 2024) as pentadic, in the form ‘1-3-1’, i.e. ‘F4+ (F1, F2, F3) F4-’.²⁵ This later revision is a key step forward in his thinking about how to represent the four-/five-function schema.

More generally in the 1987a paper, we find him being more forthright than he had been thus far in stating that ‘the origins of the IE ideology are to be looked for in tribal social structures’ (p. 30), which are, of course, associated with kinship in tetradic theory. He also posited ‘three major types of segmentary structure’ (ibid.), useful for comparative purposes, as well as in setting out possible changes between forms of social morphology (though they are not explicitly put in any chronological or evolutionary order):

- (i) In a structure based on *sections* (such as are common in Australia), the individual is recruited to an exogamous section, to which neither of his parents belong [cf. tetradic structure].
- (ii) In a structure based on unilineal descent groups (or more briefly, *clans*), the individual is recruited to the exogamous descent group which contains one of his parents but not the other. [cf. societies like the Thulung Rai]
- (iii) In a structure based on *endogamous* groups (e.g. castes) the individual is recruited to the group which contains both parents. . . (1987a: 30, original emphases)

Clans we have already met as forming the basis of the kinship structure of tribes like the Thulung and other Bodic-speakers. Castes we have met in the context of the *varna* scheme. Sections we shall meet when we discuss Allen’s ‘treatise’, below.

Allen also sets out (at 1987b: 31) more concretely and clearly his then position with regard to the transition from the structure of clans to the linear or hierarchical form of organization already discussed above. What is more, he does so from the perspective of the early Indo-Europeans:

In the ethnographic record as a whole, [by] far the commonest form of tribal segmentation is into clans, and it seems certain that the Indo-Europeans had them. It would therefore seem reasonable to envisage their segmentary ideology developing as the projection of a clan-based social structure.

As one would expect by now, the question of how many clans there were is tentatively answered as four rather than three. Allen continues:

So far we have been envisaging a segmentary ideology deriving from a clan-based social structure but surviving the transformation which changes the maximal unit of social structure from exogamous clan to endogamous stratum. [But] why assume that it originated with clans [rather than] an even earlier transformation which gave rise to clans[?]

This transformation is revealed as having as its starting point tetradic social structure, which is indifferent to the unilinearity of clans and even to their very existence.²⁶ And he has already shown how such structures were the original form of social organization from which all others are derived, having published the ‘treatise’ and the ‘dance’ article mentioned earlier. I shall return to his tetradic idea after considering some more of his later work on IE comparativism, where his arguments grew stronger and his whole approach still more confident.

Allen’s Later Work on IE

Not only is Allen (1987a) one of the best summary accounts of both the fourth function idea and the place of kinship in Allen’s work: a paper published in India in 2007 (2007) does a similar job for his later pentadic theory as applied to IE social and mythical classifications. Parts of Chapter 7 of Allen (2000, especially pp. 129–40) are also useful here, being focused on the *Mahabharata*, the famous Hindu epic, therefore repeating some of his earlier work, but also bringing in Roman comparisons. Another good account of his position in the 2000s can be found in an article on time (2005a). Here the model is described as consisting of two ‘half-classes’ (as above) bracketing the traditional three functions respectively denoting spiritual authority, secular power and wealth-creators/ordinary population: the 1-3-1 or F4+ (F1, F2, F3) F4- model again. On p. 174, last paragraph, he tries to account for having half-classes instead of full ones, but the explanation is an obscure one, which it is hard to disentangle:

I suspect the deepest and most meaningful models of the old primitive classification are cyclical, so that beginning and end are juxtaposed across an articulation that is more emphatic than any of the others . . .
If so, the linear structures are secondary and derivative.

This quote might contain a reference to the circularity of tetradic systems becoming linear, though what Allen means by ‘articulation’ here is not clear to me. It may also be that the beginning and end are related in some way like the two halves of the fourth function. More

clearly, the lineal or hierarchical structures are seen as secondary presumably in developmental terms and hence 'derivative'.

However that may be, and despite the doubts alluded to above, Allen is still thinking in terms of what he is elsewhere already calling a pentadic structure. In another paper published in the same year, he states this (2005b, p. 48): 'Pentadic patterns with a one/three/one rhythm are just what four-function theory looks for. . .' The two 'ones' at the beginning and end (F4+ and F4) bracketing the 'three' original functions (F1, F2 and F3) clearly express the idea of the divided fourth function, while the bracketed 'three' represent functions 1–3 (F1, F2 and F3) in the classic Dumézilian model. Here F2 stands for kingship as concerned with what might be called the day-to-day activities of secular rule and warfare; what Allen adds as an aspect of his interpolated fourth function (F4+) is the king as a transcendent figure more associated with sacredness and uniting the whole. The following quote states clearly the situation he envisaged:

. . . two further functions can be added to those in Dumézil's trifunctional structure to reflect more fully the structures found in Indo-European sources. One is higher in the hierarchy than F1, called [by Allen] F4+. This function relates to things that are valued above all others or transcendent. Another can be placed below F3, called [by Allen] F4-. This function relates to things that are devalued, taboo, or feared. These share the F4 marker because they share an 'outsider' quality. To continue the example of social roles, F4+ could be applied to monarchs and F4- to slaves. (2024: ms. p. 4)

Although F2 is not explicitly mentioned here, in the same paper Allen has just associated it with 'physical force and war', the other aspect of kingship that is more mundane and potentially divisive (*ibid.*). He thus separates out the classic Dumézilian attributes of F2 between force and war on the one hand (F2) and political rule and unity on the other (F4+), attributes that have often seemed unclear or inconsistently applied in earlier work on this theme. Moreover, the second of these attributes of kingship, namely rule as opposed to fighting, is placed outside the old Dumézilian core as F4+, i.e. kingship associated with transcendence and unity, as well as outsideness. F3 can be assumed to retain its original association with fecundity and prosperity, while F1 is still responsible for religion and the priesthood.

Much of this also appeared in an earlier paper (Allen 1998e) on colours and functions, but because of the uncertain nature of some of his examples, there he had to find an alternative explanation for how the IE model might have developed. There are really two possibilities. First, the fourth and fifth half-functions or half-classes were added to

the other three in the course of history. Or alternatively, in some cases an original pentadic structure was reduced by omission or compressed in complexity, yielding fewer functions. This is a process that Allen normally calls ‘contraction’, which he suggests may account for what might initially appear to be negative examples. The second possibility is really Allen’s way of fitting his own pentadic version of the IE ideology to examples where not all the five functions are present, or they are present but not aligned as expected. Although suitably cautious in making this suggestion, which in itself is perfectly plausible, this is one point where he does leave himself open to a charge of special pleading. At least here he recognizes that how classifications are applied in practice is subject to the vagaries of history.

In his later work, Allen tended to pick on a whole range of specific topics from throughout the IE-speaking world and its history, but increasingly he gravitated towards large-scale, detailed comparisons of ancient Greece with ancient India, and more specifically with proving a common structure to the *Odyssey* and the *Mahabharata*, especially between the figures of Odysseus and Arjuna.²⁷ This work, initially presented in papers (e.g. Allen (1997) on the place of the horse in both heroes’ mythical careers), culminated in a book (2019), published by Routledge just before his death.

After 1990, for the remaining thirty years of his life, Allen continued to work on both kinship and IE comparativism, though he definitely worked more in this period on the latter. This is perhaps due to the scope it offered, with a large corpus of sources going back millennia, and with a plethora of modern debates to match. The tetradic model, by contrast, though subject to later revision, was a single idea about a hypothetical type of society that did not actually exist and therefore was not represented in the pre-existing literature.

Indeed, by now tetradic theory was definitely taking a back seat, with new papers apparently only coming from his pen when someone asked him for them. With the IE papers, the initiative more usually came from himself. It is nonetheless time to take a step back in his career and explain in more detail what the tetradic idea was all about.

Tetradic Theory and Society

Fundamentally, tetradic theory asks what the original form of human kinship system might have looked like, its answer being a four-section system divided vertically into two exogamous moieties and horizontally into two endogamous generation moieties consisting of alternat-

ing generations.²⁸ Its progression over time is therefore cyclical, not lineal.

As already noted, the 'treatise' on the tetradic idea (Allen 1986b) was preceded by a most imaginative article (perhaps 'essay' in the Montaignian sense is more appropriate for it, or even 'tale') to which Allen gave the title 'A Dance of Relatives' (Allen 1982).²⁹ In form it envisages a tribal native everyman describing his society's social structure to an even more obscure group of anthropologists, who are kept off-stage and make no contribution themselves beyond acting as a silent audience for the native. The latter holds the floor throughout, evidently permitting no questions, apparently fully expecting his visitors not to understand what is going on, but finally asking them what they think about it all (without a response). What the native describes is an orderly dance in which the dancers' quadripartite distribution in space replicates the imagined space of their kinship system, in which each of them is paired with another person of the opposite sex, a classificatory opposite-sex sibling; moreover, together, they occupy one section. That system, of course, turns out to be tetradic. Also, in this tale, the paired dancers locate themselves at the four main cardinal points. The question of origins also enters the tale at one point. What is envisaged is something like a state of nature in which there is no social organization to begin with, but where people come together periodically in a state of excitement and what might, following Durkheim (1995 [1912]), be called 'effervescence' (on which see more below). In the course of these events, the organization of the dance, and with it of the kinship system, is worked out over time. It should also be added that these events are attended by or end in copulation as a presumably much anticipated end goal.

As already noted, the later 'treatise' (Allen 1986b) is very different in tone, an austere academic text that pulls no punches. A sketch of the system has already been given above, which I fill out here. The numbers relate to generations, or what are preferably called '(genealogical) levels', which are defined genealogically (and therefore more accurately) rather than by age.³⁰ '0' is ego's generation, the plus sign indicates the generations above ego's and the minus sign those below it.

Allen repeatedly stresses in his work on this theme that, as tetradic society is a reduced form of a four-section system, there are not only two exogamous vertical moieties exchanging spouses, but also two endogamous horizontal or generation moieties exchanging children. Ego marries into his or her own horizontal or generation moiety (combining the +2, 0 and -2 levels) and into the other vertical moiety, which contains his cross-cousins and some grand-kin.³¹ Ego's

children will belong to the opposite generation moiety to ego, which combines the +1 and -1 levels, but to their own vertical moiety along with their parallel cousins and other grand-kin. This depends partly on gender, in that by birth ego's children will belong in either their father's vertical moiety (the patrilineal case) or their mother's (the matrilineal case). However, this does not affect the structure of the system overall, the diagram for which can be drawn either way, as well as to show relative sex, not absolute sex, by using nongenealogical symbols.³² Moreover, ego also has generational and affinal relations in the generation moiety that combines the alternate generational levels (+2 and -2, i.e. the next level but one in both directions) with ego's own level (numbered 0). In addition, although this structure could be extended in either direction to infinity, in fact it is cyclical. It is this that has the effect of merging alternating levels into the same two horizontal or generational moieties (+2, 0, -2, as opposed to +1 and -1), who, importantly, perpetually exchange children. Allen emphasizes the fact that not only is ego obviously born of his or her parents, who are in the opposite, +1/-1 generation moiety, he or she 'pays back' that generation moiety by producing children as new members for it. It is in this sense that children are 'exchanged' between generation moieties. Thus, by combining the vertical with the horizontal or generational moieties, we end up with four sections. This too depends crucially on the circularity of the system and the limitation to just two horizontal moieties. It also explains the origin of the word 'tetradic', as well as being the basis of its difference from attested four-section systems like the *Kariera*.

Three further points must be made here. First, due to the circularity of the system, numbers for generational levels beyond the second are folded back into the system: thus, +3 and -3 are placed with +1 and -1, while +4 and -4 belong with ego's level like +2 and -2 (or odd versus even, level 0 being in the latter). In practice, of course, such levels will not often need to be referred to, as we are now talking about great- and great-great-grandparents, who may now be deceased, as well as great- and great-great-grandchildren, who may not yet be born, though they may be seen as reincarnations of previous relatives and therefore as identical to them. Second, the circularity of the system makes the idea of descent unfolding down the generations unfeasible, and Allen clearly rejects it, especially as it ultimately encourages a gender bias he steadfastly wanted to avoid, namely between patrilineal and matrilineal, given that tetradic diagrams can be drawn to show either. As a result, Allen repeatedly and emphatically talks about recruitment rather than descent. Third, in talking about moieties

exchanging children, what he really means is their attribution to particular sections as members, i.e. to categories in what is a universal classification of society: this does not mean children actually being fostered between different groups of adults, though this does occur and the tetradic model could quite easily accommodate it. It is for this reason too that 'recruitment' is Allen's preferred term, not 'descent' (1986b: 94).

Another aspect of the tetradic system that Allen emphasizes frequently is that it can be seen as either egocentric (what the system looks like from the privileged perspective of an individual within it) or sociocentric (lacking this privileged perspective). The sociocentric view Allen sees as more holistic, an idea derived no doubt from Mauss. One thing it suggests is that in this case the kinship system is coordinate with the society; indeed, the kinship system *is* the society. One way of seeing the difference is to compare affinal alliance between sections (sociocentric) to marriage between relatives (egocentric).

Allen also expresses the marriage rule more simply in this same paper: "The marriage rule is now "own [genealogical] level, other section"" or half-moiety (1986b: 89). Moreover, '[t]he focal tetradic model prescribes marriage within a section which includes cross-cousins and excludes primary relatives' (i.e. parents, siblings and children; *ibid.*: 91); that is, it copes seamlessly with both marriage and the avoidance of incest. Then there is the kinship terminology: the four-section structure we ended up with above only needs four terms – one for each section, assuming the terms are gender-neutral. There are also no specifically affinal terms, as this is a prescriptive system; ego already has a term for those he or she is marrying. In fact, it does not necessarily even need terms; Allen imagines a situation in which the system existed before the emergence of human language, the sections being identified by, for example, different colours, spatial locations or directions, or types of bodily decoration.

Allen also considers how a tetradic kinship system might change. He observes that such systems have three types of equation: alternate generation, prescriptive and classificatory, which are seen as logically disappearing in that order during evolution. Among other things, this means that, in changing, terminologies will normally retain the later stages after they have disposed of the earlier ones – that is, there are certainly terminologies with only classificatory equations left from this process, but far fewer with only alternate generation or prescriptive ones left (Witowski 1972).

In fact, the breach of alternate generation equations is fundamental, as it would unfold the horizontal moieties into a stack of genea-

logical levels stretching into infinity, and likewise the vertical moieties become an intermarrying pair of clans or lineages also stretching to infinity and very likely to be unilineal.³³ And as Allen says, each generation now dies out, rather than being envisaged as continuing to be recruited round a circuit forever. In addition, there is now nothing to exchange between horizontal levels: children owe their existence to their parents, but how can they now reciprocate, since their own children will unambiguously be in a succeeding genealogical level? One possibility is worship, such as ancestor worship, which we know is extremely common globally. However, even with these changes this is still a prescriptive system, and this is where Allen places – suitably modified, presumably – both conventional symmetric and asymmetric prescriptive alliance, as well as the eight-section Aranda or Arunta system of Australia enjoining marriage with a second cross-cousin.

If the prescriptive equations are breached, this has the effect that the terminology is no longer coordinate with the society and that not all alters are classed as relatives (though they may be put in a category of potential relatives, e.g. possible future affines). This therefore corresponds to the appearance of nonrelatives in the society as a definite category, but it is also where Allen places Crow-Omaha terminologies, which are nonprescriptive but still classificatory.

If the classificatory equations are broken, ego's circle of relatives tends to shrink further, and more alters cease to be classed as relatives. An example is the English terminology, which has what Allen calls 'counter-tetradic equations', i.e. it does not distinguish cross and parallel kin, or side (patrikin = matrikin). However, there are also proportionally far fewer alters who are classed as kin, especially in a complex state society like Britain, where other sorts of relationship have intruded into kinship and taken away many of its functions (friends, employers, the state, etc.). Also here go terminologies that are expressed more or less in genealogical terms, i.e. with one term per genealogical position or kin type, as in many Bantu languages in Africa (hence often called Sudanese, though Allen calls them 'zero-equation'), but also parts of the typical north Indian and some European terminologies. Allen mentions as an exception the Hawaiian or generational type, in which all consanguines in a genealogical level have the same term, but he does not suggest a place for it – presumably it would go alongside English, having lost its classificatory equations and assuming that the generational equations were applied uniformly, which is not always the case. At all events: 'The general trend is *from* focus on the totality *towards* focus on the individual ego' (1986b: 102, original emphasis). As I have suggested elsewhere (Parkin 2021: 43), the En-

glish terminology seems like an evolutionary end point due to all other terminological possibilities that it might evolve into already having emerged in world history.

Allen also addresses the question of whether changes in the *direction* of tetradic are possible – i.e. by starting from what typologically are the remotest terminologies from tetradic like the English one and some others in Europe, would one end up with a tetradic system? Allen points out frequently the general assumption of kinship specialists, including myself, that the original *attested* form from which all terminologies have sprung is likely to have been the symmetric prescriptive one, only one step away from the unattested tetradic model, though others have suggested, for example, asymmetric prescriptive (Blust 1980) and cognatic (Guermonprez 1998) as alternatives, both with reference to kinship in Indonesia. As Allen says, any such move would involve the contraction of terminologies through the deletion of terms as one strives to reach the tetradic four-term minimum, whereas all the systems he mentions above involve expansion away from tetradism. For him, contraction is less likely and less feasible than finding additional terms and other strategies to serve the system's expansion. I would agree that this is often the case, but I have also tried to show recently (Parkin 2021: Chapter 6) that many terminologies of Northern and Western Europe, at or close to the far end of Allen's evolutionary paradigm, evolved or are evolving from the Sudanese type or what he would call 'zero equation' into something resembling 'cognatic'³⁴ terminologies like English and French. This is in fact a transition that would involve a process of contraction with the shedding of some terms, as category–terms with only one genealogically defined alter combine such that, for example, father's brother and mother's brother both become 'uncle',³⁵ while all cousins, though in different generations, are also subsumed under a single term. To return to the idea of the expansion of the tetradic model, therefore, although Allen points out that the hypothetical successor terminologies would need extra terms as the tetradic equations began to split, some of its remoter successors would likely end up losing terms as they contract.³⁶

Towards the end of the treatise, Allen brings in evolutionism in a more general sense. Although he has suggested many ways in which terminologies may move away from the tetradic model, he realizes that there is no unilinear progression, that multiple shifts can be envisaged and that much depends on individuals acting in society to modify their kinship systems, though he does not think that this is a matter of deliberate choice. No doubt much change of this sort is slow, accumulative rather than sudden, barely conscious to those who are

at once bringing about change and are affected by it; yet, his position here does mean ignoring examples from various parts of the world of a social group debating its kinship system, deciding to change it, or even deciding to replace it with that of another community or group.³⁷ And more widely too, my assumption would be that people are more aware of their kinship systems than Allen suggests, otherwise they would not be able to explain them to us.

Later Tetradic Developments

Allen's treatise in particular not only sets out tetradic theory as above, it also makes a whole lot of other theoretical observations of consequence that make the latter part of his 'treatise' quite complex and hard to follow in just one read-through. I therefore will not follow him here, but will leave it to the interested reader to follow them up. In addition, a number of later articles extend the model by finding new and different ways of depicting it in a diagram; in fact, even in the treatise, Allen generally took the view that there were other tetradic models than the one he had so far described in such detail, one of which suggests the figure of a double helix (1986b: 95). Indeed, in these more complicated texts the modelling appears to have taken over from the anthropology to some extent, but what a good many of Allen's suggested variants do is bring out the cyclicity of the system and show how there are different ways of depicting this.

Another paper from this period is Allen (1989b), partly a reply to a slightly earlier paper of my own (Parkin 1988). In it, I engaged with an aspect of Thomas Trautman's work on Dravidian kinship in south and central India (Trautmann 1981; also Tyler 1984), and more specifically with the question of which branches of Dravidian represent the original form of terminologies in those languages – the southern (literate, urban) branch, with few if any alternate generation equations, or the more 'tribal' branch in central India, which have them in some abundance? Although for Trautmann the answer was equivocal, I decided in favour of the central branch having the historical or evolutionary priority on the basis of not only the terminologies, but also the marriage rules, expected behaviour patterns between joking and avoidance, and theories of the inheritance of one's soul substance by alters two generations down from one's own in what I saw as a 'tribal' version of reincarnation. This variation was clearly closer to the tetradic model, and of course Allen realized that it fitted with the tetradic characteristic of alternating generation equations. One of Allen's main criticisms regarding my paper was that it showed an ex-

aggregated concern with ideas: 'kinship . . . cannot be limited to ideas. It is also the mode of production of new members of society, and in that sense is as material and behavioural as a plough' (Allen 1989b: 46–47). One might counter by pointing out that a plough also involves ideas – about what it's for, how to make it and how to use it. He also objected to my use of the phrase 'the human mind' as unaccountably suggesting 'independent invention in . . . different places' (ibid.: 46). This is less likely, because less 'economical' than the hypothesis of a one-off invention in, say, Africa before the Great Dispersal, when what then counted as humanity was located in one place or small area.³⁸ Allen then raises a third issue, namely whether alternation has a 'privileged' place in interpretations of the tetradic model. Deciding that it does, he cautions against making it the sole basis of such interpretations, given the variety of representations of the system. He also takes issue with my invoking the cross-parallel distinction in this context, as it introduces an unnecessary gender bias (cf. 1986b: 93–94, # 6.1). Here, 'it is more economical to regard alternation as underlying both features' (ibid.). Allen then goes on to delve into some of the variations in how alternation might be diagrammed, hinted at above in what again progresses as an increasingly recondite text. In brief, alongside the double helix already mentioned (1986a: 95), he suggests as appropriate the torus (preferably flattened), the cone (though seen as less satisfactory) and the kernmantel rope as possible spatial representations of tetradism, as well as the caduceus, the winged rod of Hermes adopted by the medical profession as a symbol.³⁹ Another paper that discusses how the tetradic model might be diagrammed is Allen (1998b), written for a conference held in Paris in 1993 on the relationship between Dravidian and Iroquois terminologies. In his own paper, Allen's concern is to use the tetradic idea to contemplate the origin of Dravidian terminologies specifically,⁴⁰ and he goes into detail, with copious diagrams, regarding how this might happen.

Fortunately Allen also wrote some easier, more accessible accounts of the tetradic idea for linguists (1989a), Durkheimians (1998a), and human biologists, palaeontologists and archaeologists (2008; see further below) respectively. In the first of these, the description of the tetradic model is at its simplest, with just a single genealogical diagram. There follows a detailed assessment of the significance of the three sorts of equation found in the model: classificatory, prescriptive and alternating generation, as well as an account of why cognatic, generational (Hawaiian) and Crow-Omaha terminologies are not tetradic and are even 'counter-tetradic' (1989a: 178). He also engages at some length with extensionism of a sort associated with Harold Scheffler

and Floyd Lounsbury, though he does not mention them as such. This reinforces his principle, in line with structuralist theory, that the tetradic idea should be approached from the position of the whole society and not that of the individual calculating his or her relationships by extending the meaning of kin terms genealogically.

One issue Allen refers to here but considers ‘inconsequential’ is the known fact that hunter-gatherers have ‘a great variety of types of terminology’ (1989a: 179). In fact this is ethnographically something of a problem for his tetradic idea. As tetradism is supposed to constitute the earliest form of kinship system and human society, before hunting and gathering had been supplemented or supplanted by herding and agriculture, one would expect present-day hunter-gatherers to have tetradic terminologies or something very similar in abundance, but outside Australia this is quite rare, and even that continent lacks evidence of tetradic systems as such in its postcontact history. Moreover, elsewhere, hunter-gatherers tend to adopt the terminologies of the settled populations with which they are in contact (a good example are the Birhor of east-central India; see Williams 1968), which did not apply to Australia before colonialism, and there is also the possibility that some present-day hunter-gatherers were formerly pastoralists or agriculturalists. Towards the end of the paper, Allen cites other domains than kinship for which evolutionary models have been developed and that have influenced him, namely colour (Berlin and Kay 1969)⁴¹ and biological classification (Brown 1984). Another such study that was clearly even more influential with Allen is Witowski’s (1972) on kinship terminologies and their evolution.

Allen also saw his tetradic ideas as foreshadowed in the work of Marcel Mauss and before him that of the latter’s uncle Émile Durkheim. This theme was closely linked to Allen’s interest in the origins of human society (e.g. Allen 1995), which clearly informed his tetradic ideas, though he did not always make this explicit. In his first major work, *The Division of Labour* (1893), Durkheim was concerned to establish the origins of human social solidarity, or what Mauss preferred to call ‘cohesion’, with reference to different types of social morphology. Durkheim especially had in mind the dichotomy between amorphous but endogamous hordes formed by the accretion or agglomeration of initially separate groups and individuals, and the segmentation of the horde into subgroups – e.g. clans or moieties – through exogamy. Although he recognized both situations as theoretically plausible, for Mauss (and following him Allen), he emphasized the horde too much and segmentation too little. This was partly, Allen speculates, because he saw society in general as producing solidarity between individu-

als in the first instance, not between internal social groups. Moreover, the concept of a horde generally suggests a pre-human state of nature whose amorphousness is not fully exhibited even by our closest primate relatives, the chimpanzees, with their dispersed matrilineages and group-oriented, generally co-residential patrilineages. Allen therefore sees Mauss as evening up the balance between the two emphases. In principle the horde as well as the clan might exhibit social solidarity, perhaps through internal generation or in opposition to other hordes or both. However, unlike hordes, for which there is little place in post-Durkheimian anthropology, accounts of opposition and even rivalry between clans, some of it violent, are deeply engrained in the ethnographic record. Allen also approves of Mauss's recognition of the importance of exogamy, which Allen calls 'fundamental' (1995: 52): even hostile clans have to exchange women in marriage, and without it segmentation is impossible because it is exogamy that defines the segments structurally⁴² in relation to one another.

However, Allen also claims that although Mauss came close to realizing that tetradic society was the simplest form of human society, he failed to take the final step, stopping at Australian four-section systems like that of the Kariera. To recap, it is clear that for Allen the weakness of conventional theories situating Kariera-type terminologies at the start of evolution, or seeing them as the simplest form of kinship system, is their neglect of the vertical dimension of exchange. In other words, in these theories the presence of generation moieties uniting sets of alternating generations and their reciprocal exchange of children are ignored in favour of too heavy a concentration on vertical moieties (patri- or matri-) exchanging spouses. Taking both dimensions equally into account produces four social groups or units (the 'sections'), all of which are required for the society – which is 'tetradic' and not merely 'Kariera' – to function.

Another way of viewing this for Allen is the fact that ego has to produce children and needs a spouse from another group (e.g. another section, through exogamy) to do so, but ego does not then go on to produce grandchildren. Another, chronologically later section or unit must do that, together its own exogamous partner, to whom ego's grandchildren are of course their children. Again, therefore, four social groups are needed for a society to function in terms of both marriage (or affinal alliance) and the recruitment of children by exchange between generation moieties.⁴³ Allen sums it all up as follows:

We do indeed need to start, not from individuals who are linked, but from society as an endogamous totality which is segmented. By enriching Durkheim's exclusive emphasis on affiliation-based segmen-

tation with Mauss's interest in generations, we can produce a model of primitive society which accords with the simplest possible mode of classifying relatives, and which is not world-historically implausible. (1995: 58)

Finally, a kinship system on Ambrym (Vanuatu), reported by Mary Patterson (2005: 104-5) apparently in ignorance of Allen's work, as he was of hers, has distinctly tetradic-like features. In particular there are two alternate generation moieties consisting of two reciprocal categories of sibling sets 'in a parent-child relationship, each . . . of which has the responsibility of providing the other with "life"'. The moieties are likened by Ambrymese to 'the two bunches of bananas (or coconuts) that hang from a single stalk, a divided unity.'

Reconciling Comparative IE Mythology with the Tetradic Model

Another paper with a lot of difficult text is Allen (2012a), in which he seeks to draw together the threads of his work in both IE comparison and tetradic systems: as a late paper, in certain senses it is therefore key to his whole body of research. In this case he is again concerned with a transformation away from the tetradic model, this time to Crow-Omaha (the topic of the collection in which his paper appears). One notable feature of his argument is that, in an archetypal Crow-Omaha system (assuming there is such an archetype), five descent groups are needed. This assumes that in such cases ego is banned from marrying into the descent groups of any of his or her four grandparents; therefore, a fifth descent group is required for ego to marry into. In practice, most societies with Crow-Omaha terminologies appear to have many more descent groups than five, and they may allow ego to choose a spouse from among at least some of ego's grandparental lines, but not those of either parent.⁴⁴ Nonetheless, despite admitting that 'exactly how the model relates to any real Omaha-type society is debatable' (ibid.: 58), Allen models this hypothetical situation with a diagram in five lines oriented symmetrically over time, though alternating the direction of spouse exchange with each second generation; it is also closed like a prescriptive system, but prohibits ego from marrying into the line of any grandparent. As Allen realizes (ibid.: 66), North Indian kinship has a similar rule, enshrined in the so-called 'four-*got*' rule (*got* for *gotra* or 'patriclan'), namely those of the four grandparents, which ego must avoid in marriage, though the typical North Indian terminology is not an Omaha one.

Allen then brings in IE comparativism, exploiting the number five in both the IE and tetradic-cum-Omaha models. In brief, he postulates that early IE society was composed of patrilineal clans, specifically five, associated respectively with the five pentadic functions or half-functions he has discussed so frequently in his work to date. This suggestion is bolstered, in his mind, by the fact that – on pretty thin grounds, in truth – a number of authors from different disciplines have suggested that the early IE terminology had some Omaha features.⁴⁵ Another alleged piece of evidence is the Hindu *śrāddha* rite, a mortuary rite incorporating the deceased into the totality of his ancestors, involving his male successor (canonically the eldest son), three rice balls representing his father (the deceased person on whom the rite focuses), father's father and father's father's father respectively, and the collectivity of previous ancestors, i.e. five categories or a pentad arranged hierarchically by generation, and also by unity subsuming difference. In the rite the rice balls are physically combined, emphasizing unity of the *gotra*. As Romila Thapar points out (1990: 48 and n. 133), the number five often signals unity in India. She gives examples from the classical literature, but another that is still very much alive in India is the *panchayat*, the village or caste council whose name contains the element *panch* 'five'. This is found even in the modern *grampanchayat*, literally 'village council', a democratic invention of the modern republic. In neither case is there a restriction to five members in practice, though the '*panch*' is commonly treated as a main expression of caste or village unity.

Returning to Allen, not only is the IE ideology internally ranked, so is Allen's tetradic-cum-Omaha five-line kinship diagram, by seniority within each line. The one problem with this scheme, Allen says, is that the kinship diagram is relative (as ego can be moved around it), while the values of the pentadic IE ideology are absolute and fixed, being clearly bounded from one another, and with no ambiguities between them. Allen resolves this dilemma by pointing out that the kinship diagram belongs to a post-tetradic stage when, first, the egocentric and sociocentric perspectives have separated, and, second, 'the sections were no doubt accorded some absolute properties' (2012a: 65). But would they have been hierarchical, like the Proto-Indo-European ideology, at that early stage? If so, this contradicts the principle that all the tetradic sections were of equal status. A connected, later development in his thought on this issue (Allen 2024) was his realization that, if the tetradic 'dance' (see above) of four social categories – each at a different cardinal point, perhaps – were to be given a central focus like a leader or something inanimate like a post (or, I suggest,

a sacred effigy or a sacrificial victim), then we would have five points of orientation, making the scheme pentadic and no longer tetradic. Thus, Allen ultimately arrived at the position of making both IE myth and 'tetradic' kinship pentadic, though whether he saw this in terms of an underlying substratum linking the two, in line with his much earlier theories, is not so certain; indeed, at this point in time he appears to have long since abandoned it. Nonetheless, writing of other Indian material elsewhere, as well as more generally, he had already remarked that 'the cardinal points imply a centre' (1993b: 7) and that Purusha, the primordial man in the famous myth of creation in the Rigveda, represents a unifying fifth function to be added to the four hierarchized functions – the *varnas* – that the sundering of his body gave rise to (ibid.: 9; a suggestion prefigured in Allen 1998d: 185).

Responses to IE Pentadism and Tetradism from Social Anthropology and History

Criticisms of Allen's work are not particularly numerous, and although he was not afraid to criticize others, especially where IE comparativism is concerned, I have only been able to find one criticism of his own work on the latter,⁴⁶ which occurs in an unpublished paper written by Allen himself (Allen n.d.). I cite his own summary of these critics' position:

The idea that Dumézil's theory needed to be expanded to include a fourth function was taken up by P. and A. Sauzeau (2012), but the two brothers reject the view I hold that the fourth function needs to be dichotomized into valued and devalued aspects. Instead they argue for a fourth function defined by alterity (otherness) or marginality, but one whose polarization is not common enough to justify postulating five functions or 'super-categories'. (Allen n.d... p. 8)

The situation is somewhat different as far as tetradic theory is concerned, which has elicited a degree of scepticism from other kinship experts, without any of them really suggesting an alternative, as well as approval from some. I myself, being interested in historical changes to kinship terminologies, have used Allen's basic ideas as a launch pad for some of the trajectories of change to such terminologies I have suggested. We have already seen this in Parkin (1988), which Allen responded to in his 1989 article (Allen 1989b; see also Parkin 2021), and I have already made some mildly critical comments on his tetradic work above.

Another anthropologist who dealt generally sympathetically with Allen's tetradic ideas was the late Per Hage, who used them as a basis for his own reconstructions in Africa and Central America (Hage 2002, 2006; cf. Jones and Milicic 2011). In a paper (Hage 1999) on alternate generation equations and David Aberle's famous plea for a theory to explain them (Aberle 1967), Hage spends a lot of time describing Allen's tetradic theory without much in the way of criticism, like a number of authors responding to Allen, as we shall see. However, towards the end of the paper, and citing 'Amerind' ethnography, Hage argues that, contrary to Allen's hypothesis that alternate generation terminologies initially co-exist with prescriptive ones before both eventually dissolve, there are cases where they are found with 'cognatic' (1999: 521) or 'lineal' (ibid.: 533) terminologies:

This suggests a revision of Allen's counter-tetradic sequence. Alternate generation (+2/-2) equations may in fact persist long after the disappearance of prescriptive and classificatory equations [postulated by Allen to disappear after alternate generation equations in that order]. They are not incompatible with complex [i.e. nonprescriptive] marriage systems . . . nor do they reflect any particular rule of descent.⁴⁷

In another paper (Hage 2003a) on the possible existence in early human history of a Nostratic super-language family, Hage frequently mentions symmetric prescription as the most common suggestion for the starting point in the evolution of kinship systems. He adds references to Allen as well as to other kinship specialists, but does not mention Allen's idea of a tetradic system at all here. In fact it was this, not symmetric prescription, that Allen envisaged for this role as the foundation of all terminological evolutions.

The late Wendy James, similarly sympathetic, summarizes Allen's 'Dance' article (1982) in her introduction to social anthropology (James 2003: 84–85, 159–60) and in another paper (James 2008a) seeks to bring in the idea of female coalitions in early human history in this context (though they are an aspect, often implicit, of most if not all human societies). In a third text (James 2008b), she revives the topic of alternating generations in Africa and identifies two peoples in Kenya, the Meru and Kuria, whose use of this device recalls to her some of the principles of tetradic alternation without being examples of tetradism as Allen defined it. And a few years later, she stated: 'I have come to see the Kunama case [of a matrilineal people in Eritrea] as a distinctive contribution to my main argument about the relevance of the tetradic model to African ethnography' (James 2012: 150, citing Lussier 2000). This does not mean there are tetradic societies in Africa, only that certain African kinship systems have features

compatible with tetradic principles. Somewhat obscurely, Trautmann and Whiteley sum up her position as follows in the same volume on the Crow-Omaha phenomenon:

Rejecting the Lévi-Straussian apparatus that locates Crow-Omaha, denominated semi-complex, as a halfway house between elementary and complex systems of marital exchange, she resorts instead to Allen's tetradic theory to speak of the crossing of gender and generation as operators that combine and are selectively suppressed in different ways to produce different patterns of social reproduction. (Trautmann and Whiteley 2012: 24)

For the late Alan Barnard (2008: 240), who worked for decades with hunter-gatherers in Namibia and Botswana, the tetradic model is a possible suggestion for the earliest kinship system, but not the only option. Robert Layton has been a somewhat more forthright critic of Allen's (e.g. Layton 2008: 119–22). He asks rhetorically whether the simplest system is necessarily the oldest. Cross-cousin marriage could have been 'discovered' more than once, a fact aided by its logical simplicity, as Lévi-Strauss pointed out, though Allen was more wedded to a theory of one-off invention followed by global human dispersal. Layton also notes, as I have already done, that hunter-gatherer groups do not always have cross-cousin marriage as might be expected, citing the !Kung, Mbuti and Inuit as examples (the first two in Africa, the last in the Arctic). Most have 'bilateral kinship systems' (ibid.: 121). On the other hand, the Pitjantjatjara system of central Australia has:

the 'double' dichotomy required by Allen's hypothesis: it distinguishes 'siblings' from 'in-laws' and it distinguishes adjacent from alternate generations. In this sense it is a tetradic system, but it does not have the neat, elegant structures of a four-section system in which the four categories are given sociocentric labels that remain the same regardless of where ego's clan [*sic*] is positioned. (Ibid.: 120–21, original emphasis)

For Layton, it seems, it is *Kariera* in type rather than tetradic, as it lacks the distinctions and separations of the latter, which cannot be traced further back in either time or logic; this is reinforced by Layton's mention of clans, which for Allen, as we have seen, are nontetradic.

In his monumental work on kinship (Godelier 2004: 548–51), Maurice Godelier also engages critically with Allen's work. After a lengthy, criticism-free summary, he rejects tetradism on the basis that a system that was simultaneously egocentric and sociocentric would not form a suitable evolutionary starting point for anything. He also claims that Native Australian societies could not have been the basis for the tetradic model because they are less concerned with regulating marriage than with the division of society into religious

groups concerned with the origin of the universe and power relations between men and women; in fact, there is nothing to prevent these 'groups' from intermarrying in tetradic fashion. Godelier also takes issue with the idea of counter-tetradic equations to explain the position of cognatic, generational/Hawaiian and Crow-Omaha in evolutions away from tetradism, which he calls an ad hoc explanation; as we saw above, Allen excludes both Hawaiian and Crow-Omaha terminologies from having counter-tetradic equations. Here Godelier seems to be mixing up counter-tetradic equations (i.e. merger of side and of cross and parallel) with the 'zero-equation' phenomenon of terminologies such as those classified as Sudanese. 'Zero-equation' is another term coined by Allen to categorize terminologies in which every or nearly every genealogical position has its own term, which does not account for the structure of any of the terminological types just mentioned. North Indian IE terminologies have this feature in part, as do many African ('Bantu') terminologies. As already noted, I have shown that many European terminologies have or have had this feature, though in some cases they are moving away from it in the direction of a cognatic terminology like English (Parkin 2021: Chapter 6). Godelier concludes his review of Allen's work by correctly showing at some length that the Latin terminology is 'zero-equation', and therefore as remote as it is possible to be from Allen's tetradic model. Godelier's observations, although interesting, are all open to further debate.

Finally in this list of criticisms by social anthropologists, the late Robert Barnes, an erstwhile colleague of Allen's for many years in the Oxford Institute, said the following about the fate of evolutionary theses generally, without mentioning either tetradic models or Allen as such: 'the history of evolutionary speculation in anthropology has never produced anything like certainty in our understanding of how and why such patterns [in kinship] change' (Barnes 2012: 203). This appears to have been a long-held view of his, judging from some remarks in a paper he published in the 1970s doubting the veracity of previously suggested changes between symmetric and asymmetric prescriptive terminologies in the domains of Alor and Pantar in eastern Indonesia (Barnes 1977: 153).

Perspectives from Evolutionary Anthropology

Given their own concerns with the origins of human kinship, it is not surprising that evolutionary anthropologists⁴⁸ and their colleagues in allied disciplines have also weighed in with their own takes on the

tetradic idea. For example, Clive Gamble states: ‘I would suggest that Allen’s tetradic model with its rules that govern recruitment and marriage is in fact primarily a material than linguistically based metaphor’ (Gamble 2008.: 38–39).⁴⁹

Kit Opie and Camilla Power (2008: 185), like Wendy James (see above), try to situate tetradism within matrilineal coalitions, despite Allen’s strictures against gender bias in his model. They hypothesize a situation with father and son in different coalitions, while mother and daughter are in the same coalition but in different ‘age-classes’, which keeps the daughters safe from the sexual depredations of the fathers (who are also the mother’s husbands, of course), as the daughters are needed to attract outside males to strengthen the group. Therefore, exogamous vertical moieties are generated along with different ‘age-classes’: ‘combining these two principles generates Allen’s tetradic structure’ (ibid.).⁵⁰ One principle is the way parents and same-sex children are related, across genealogical levels; the other principle they are thinking of is presumably the placing of classificatory husbands in the same level but opposite moiety as the classificatory wives (and mothers of the children).

Robin Dunbar, addressing the storytelling aspect of Allen’s ‘Dance’ article (Allen 1982; cf. Dunbar 2008: 149), agrees that it may be a useful way of sorting out explicitly who is related to whom and how, and it obviously distinguishes us from our primate relatives. Moreover: ‘This might also explain why kinship is both shallow and limited in its sideways extent [i.e. laterally] in most animal species, including the great apes.’ This tends to confirm Julia Lehmann (2008: 160) in her opinion, reasonably enough, that tetradic models are not likely to be useful for studying apes.

Tetradic Theory and Human Origins

This brings us to the matter of human origins, which feature particularly strongly in two texts of Allen’s previously mentioned as ‘easier’ (Allen 1998a and 2008). The first of these texts engages extensively with Emile Durkheim’s *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1995 [1912]), especially Durkheim’s interest in Native Australian kinship and ritual in which the clan totems are the units of religious worship. What Allen especially focuses on here, however, is the notion of effervescence that, according to Durkheim, is said to draw people together in a ritual event that gives them a sense of themselves as a group and of an existence beyond themselves to which they are nonetheless connected. Allen not only speculates that it could have

been this that brought people together at an event or a series of events that led to their creating tetradism, but also that the origins of this inducement to assemble could be pre-human, as indicated by the existence of 'chimp carnivals' (Allen 1998a: 158) in the modern world, when chimpanzee groups show noisy excitement upon encountering another group – during foraging, for example. The later paper (Allen 2008) also gives a simpler account of tetradism and engages with the origins of such a society, again by speculating (and here in a bit more detail) how human groups could originally have come together to work out a model for a tetradic society, but now without the emphasis on effervescence and chimpanzees partying.⁵¹

Nonetheless, Clive Gamble liked the effervescence argument as an explanation for social gatherings, while suggesting that 'Neanderthals might have been social in the sense of marriage and descent according to the tetradic model but pre-social, in Allen's terms, when apart from each other' (Gamble 2008: 40). Logically, in fact, the group or society might only need a single initial event to start effervescing. Memory or some other trigger, such as a life-crisis event, would then provide a reason for holding repeat events of the same type, perhaps partly in line with the astronomical year. An event of the latter type might be a birth or a death requiring a ritual: one might imagine the newborn or the corpse, or a sacrificial object of some sort, being the focus for the ritual dance, perhaps placed in the middle of the four dancing groups, as already suggested (see above on the cardinal points implying a centre). Although humans may have acted less socially when apart,⁵² they are no less social when apart than when effervescing in a social gathering at which their presence was both expected by their society and anticipated by themselves. And 'apart' need not mean 'on their own' as individuals, but rather their acting in smaller groups for day-to-day hunting and foraging purposes.

One further question is when and where tetradic systems might have emerged from or in the dawn of prehistory. For Allen, it must have been before the arrival of humans in Australia, as this is one region of the world that is quite rich, kinship-wise, in immediate post-tetradic successors, namely various types of still extant prescriptive system,⁵³ and Native Australians, in this view, brought the system with them. This takes us back some 60,000 years (the usual date for the arrival of humans in Australia). However, Allen also felt that the origins of tetradic systems could lie even further back, in humanity's cradle in East Africa, from which humans took the system away with them when migrating. Timewise in this case there are a number of possibilities, but the timescale for *Homo sapiens* leaving Africa has been put at be-

tween 130,000 to 60,000 Before Present (Gowlett and Dunbar 2008: 24).⁵⁴ Moreover, to the extent that the future migrants may have lived in close proximity to one another, though not necessarily in the same camp, they might well have spoken the same language and have acknowledged each other as socially connected (though probably not as a specific named society beyond a word for ‘men’ or ‘human’, as is frequently attested in the contemporary ethnographic record), both of which could be conceived as helping tetradic society to form.⁵⁵ At all events, I think we can take it as read that for Allen the tetradic kinship system was a feature of cognitively modern humans, i.e. *Homo sapiens*, not of any earlier hominins. Moreover, he claimed it was invented just once, possibly in that cradle of humanity that is East Africa.

However, we must be aware of propagating Rousseau-esque ‘state of nature’ theories here, in which the state of nature ends with the Big Bang of socialization. As with all Big Bang theories, of which I suggest tetradic theory is certainly a specimen, one problem is knowing what came before the Big Bang. In the human case, state-of-nature theories are compromised by the insight that, in all probability, we evolved from our primate origins as social animals and not as free-floating individuals only coming together to mate. I therefore prefer a picture of a degree of social kinship among many hominins, which the tetradic model would have tidied up and made more regular and logical, presumably on the transition to, or emergence of, *Homo sapiens*. And what this tidying-up process needed is not just behaviour, but also rules that are agreed, discussed but also broken, therefore introducing the need for sanctions, which will increasingly be proclaimed and justified rather than just enforced. Meyer Fortes’ (1983) suggestion that the formulation of rules was one of the preconditions for human social life is pertinent here. Finally, social categories are also needed to frame the rules, such as those in the tetradic model. All this suggests a use of logic that presupposes the high levels of intelligence that are characteristically human.

One feature of the tetradic model that is potentially problematic to the question of origins and evolution is that it assumes monogamy. The fact that at least some anatomically modern humans and their primate cousins are polygynous in practice suggests that earlier hominins and primates were too, as many nonhuman primates are in the present day. This could have survived the transition to humanity, and although it is a practice the tetradic model ignores, it could be accommodated by it and is not in conflict with it. Added to this is the fact that many primates, not to mention other species, only allow one alpha male to mate with the group’s females, though subordinate males will do so if they can get away with it.

However, according to Korstjens (2008: 155) and Lehmann (2008: 162), biological kinship is not the only basis of primate social organization, as in some species there are coalitions of unrelated males (cf. work on female coalitions, addressed earlier). An evolutionist interested in human society and its origins might see in this the origin of the practice of two human males allying with one another by one giving the other his sister or daughter as a wife or by their swapping their sisters or daughters as their respective spouses. In this way, a male ego obtains a brother-in-law or son-in-law for the sister or daughter he gives away. Here again, it is what tetradic (and therefore human) society would have modified by regularizing mating by means of category, as well as through rules concerning what we call marriage and the performative rituals we call weddings. In the process, with tetradic society, the unrelated male coalitions of our primate relatives would have become cognitive categories of opposed males and females potentially becoming related through intermarriage.

Moreover, the practice of exchanging one's siblings for spouses lies at the heart of the incest taboo, which is frequently claimed to be another classic human characteristic, adoption of it, for Lévi-Strauss, being one of the things that makes 'natural' humans cultural. As for Allen, he saw the prevention of incest with primary relatives as another property of tetradic society. This was another reason for his seeing it as simpler than any dichotomous kinship system, as it clearly marks the section from which male ego should take his wife, the only one of the four not containing any of his primary relatives, especially mother and daughter, with whom he cannot mate – and *mutatis mutandis* for female egos (Allen 1986a: 91; 1998a: 154–55).

Notes

1. I have decided to call him 'Nick' in this more intimate biographical sketch and 'Allen' in the more academic part of the introduction (including references).
2. See Allen (2000: 39–40) for a sketch of a tutorial with Needham.
3. Published nearly forty years later as Allen (2012b).
4. Apart from assorted personal recollections, the main source for this biographical sketch is Allen (2003). See also my obituary in the *Journal of the Anthropology Society of Oxford* (Parkin 2020). For other obituaries, see Gellner (2020); Vukovic (2020). Nick now also has his own Wikipedia page (not written by myself, NB!).
5. See, e.g., Allen 1981, 1986a and (despite its title) 1998c. Many of these ritual journeys experience obstacles, which need to be overcome before

- the voyagers can travel further. Perhaps the most famous for the Western reader is the story of the *Odyssey*, addressed by Allen in later work (culminating in Allen 2019), but there are other examples, including one among French-speaking mountain-dwellers in northeast Italy (Hertz 1983 [1913]; Parkin 1996: 159).
6. Through the auspices of Führer-Haimendorf, he received a grant to support his doctoral studies from the UK's Social Science Research Council (predecessor of the present-day Economic and Social Research Council) as part of a larger project on social change. Allen (1972) is his contribution to the report on that project.
 7. In this discussion, this '- ' is to be read as a minus sign (connoting low status), not a hyphen.
 8. Here I am forced to mix Greek forms with Latin ones, as I know of no Latin-derived equivalent to 'quadripartite' that is based on the number 5.
 9. Respectively Allen 1975 and 1976a. Both were originally analysed in his BLitt thesis, along with a treasure trove of other Bodic materials. I have come to know both papers intimately over the years and consider the second paper on the Sherpa to be the more surefooted of the two, though judging from his references to them, Allen himself seemed to prefer the Byansi article.
 10. It is not clear whether the *Kariera* still exist in their original form, as for decades past they have mostly been working on sheep stations in Western Australia and have intermarried with non-*Kariera*, becoming a community of mixed descent.
 11. The people call themselves *Huni Kuin* or 'real men', rather than *Cashinahua*, a pejorative outsiders' term still current in scholarship (Kensinger 1984: 245–46).
 12. Clearly from the Greek. As we have seen, earlier he had used the Latinate 'quadripartite' to describe social morphology in four terms, though related not to kinship but to something akin to class, like the Indian *varna* scheme.
 13. They were clearly written in that order, as Allen (1978b) makes reference to Allen (1978a), but not vice versa. In the first footnote of Allen (1978b), he complains that Allen (1978a) has been in press for five years and now needs updating.
 14. Blacksmiths may seem like artisans pure and simple, but in many societies, including these ones, they are seen as having ritual powers that are potentially dangerous in their effects. Thus they are sacred like the priests, but bad sacred rather than good sacred.
 15. In fact, at least in some cases, kings and priests are also hierarchized, and not necessarily with kings at the top. See further below.
 16. Cf. Lévi-Strauss (1963), a paper entitled 'The Bear and the Barber', in which the author compares the exchange of spouses by totemic, exogamous descent groups such as the 'bears' (and, among some Indian tribes especially, the cobras or fish) and the exchange of services by endogamous castes exemplified by the barber, a classic 'service' caste who are untouchable in some parts of India, though not all.

17. Binary opposition, or 'dual symbolic classification' (Needham 1973) was a fascination of Needham's for many years, though it derives from the Durkheimian Robert Hertz and was revised, as part of a critique of Needham's work, by Dumont. See Parkin 2002: Chapter 4.
18. The reader reading the original paper is warned that Allen's footnote 10 does not end, as it seems to, on p. 22, but carries on to the foot of p. 23.
19. The Irish for province, *cúige*, means literally 'a fifth'. The common view that there were only four traditional Irish provinces therefore only applies to certain later periods. Cf. Rees and Rees 1961.
20. However, he gives it in Allen (1998a: 160 n. 4) as 'Granet 1939: 170f.'
21. The 'porters' in these examples are unusual for the F3 function, as they are not clearly creators of wealth or representatives of the general population, but are more a species of servant, which may suggest F4-. However, at least they are inferior to priests and kings.
22. Not the authors' own suggestion, NB, though they give no source for it.
23. Allen was not very appreciative of Lyle, as can be seen from his brief remark that he found her work 'unpersuasive' (Allen 1993a: 129 note 3). However, it is true that none of the Dumézilian functions was specifically female, though this does depend on social stratum to some extent: thus, queens are virtually entirely absent and priests almost invariably male, while servants' wives will often provide services as much as their husbands, by whom they tend to be subsumed.
24. Cf. Allen 1993b: 3: 'the fourth function is so often radically bifurcated that one even has to resist a temptation to recognize a fifth function'.
25. Cf. Allen 1998d: 185: 'Dumézilian triads are substructures within pentadic wholes.' The word *sacrorum* appears to be an error, as I could not find the word in my Latin dictionaries.
26. Because of its four-section structure with alternating generations, in a tetradic structure the unending 'ladder' shape of most clan systems is impossible. The transmission of generations is cyclical, not linear.
27. There is also an interesting paper in French in which Allen compares the Greek deity Penelope with the Sanskrit figure of Draupadi (Allen 2002). Another paper on yoga and whether something similar can be found in ancient Greece gives a good and persuasive account of his method of comparison (Allen 1998c).
28. Cf. Allen 1998b: 329: 'no one supposes humanity started off by inventing Aranda- or Omaha-type terminologies'.
29. See the relevant papers in Part III for diagrams.
30. Thus, an uncle may occasionally be younger than his nephew by age and generation, but will always belong to a senior genealogical level.
31. If the system is oriented patrilineally, father's mother and mother's father will be in ego's vertical moiety, and father's father and mother's mother in the opposite moiety. This is reversed in the matrilineal case, but the underlying structure is the same. The same goes, *mutatis mutandis*, for the reciprocal grand-kin of the descending, -2 generation.

32. The see examples at Allen 1998b: 320, 325; Allen 2008: 101.
33. Judging from 1986b: 94, # 6.2, Allen belongs to a long line of anthropologists who have declined to see cognatic or bilateral descent as true descent; certainly it has no place in the tetradic model and would not be easy to accommodate.
34. Needham's phrase, which he uses in preference to Robert Lowie's better-established 'lineal', which Needham applies instead to terminologies that map out descent lines, like prescriptive and Crow-Omaha. I follow Needham's paradigm here as being more logical, though it cannot be said to have caught on generally.
35. For example, both English *eam* and German *Oheim*, the respective terms for mother's brother, fell out of use by the late Middle Ages and early modern history respectively (i.e. were 'deleted'), and both languages borrowed French *oncle* for both mother's brother and father's brother. Conversely, Dutch has retained *oom* to the present day, standing for both uncles in preference to borrowing *oncle*, so here the term for father's brother was presumably 'deleted' (Parkin 2021: 183–84).
36. Not mentioned by Allen is another situation of changes typically taking place in a certain order, that is, the way some classificatory (bifurcate merging and bifurcate collateral) terminologies Hawaiian-ize ego's and the -1 level before the +1 level. See Parkin 2021: 30.
37. One such example is the Anavil Brahmins of Gujarat (van der Veen 1972: 123). A more recent example is in Laurent Dousset's citation of an unpublished paper by Robert Tomkinson on the Mardu of the Western Australian Desert (Dousset 2012: 261).
38. I had taken the phrase 'the human mind' from Needham, which may have jarred with Allen, given their estrangement.
39. Recall that Allen spent some of his early years in medical training and employment before turning to anthropology.
40. Iroquois is generally seen as a development of Dravidian and therefore as coming later in the evolutionary sequence. Allen practically ignores it in his paper, apart from a reference to it at 1998b: 331 note 5.
41. Berlin and Kay's work was concerned to see regularities in the emergence of different colour terms through evolution. In one paper (1998e) Allen tested his own post-Dumézilian hypotheses on colour terms organized hierarchically.
42. This form of boundary seems more fundamental than what might be called 'cultural' markers, like names, bodily decoration or location, which are secondary.
43. This is also a possible explanation for the frequently found ritual association between grandparents and grandchildren.
44. One way of viewing the difference is that prescriptive systems are modelled on the assumption that ego will repeat the marriage of his or her same-sex parent, whereas in the Crow-Omaha case the assumption is that the closest ego can go in repeating a previous marriage is to copy that of a grandparent.

45. Mostly, this theory relies on the obvious etymological link between Latin *avus* 'mother's father' and *avunculus* ('little *avus*') 'mother's brother'. See Friedrich (1966) and Lounsbury (1964) for views of anthropologists. Although Wallis gives *amitini* as 'father's sister's children', presumably derived from *amita* 'father's sister' (literally 'little *amita*'?), it may be spurious, as it does not appear in my Latin dictionaries (Parkin 2021: 177; Wallis 1918: 3). Moreover, if it were valid, it would form a Crow equation, not an Omaha one, which would be most unusual, though not unprecedented, as it would mean Crow and Omaha features both appearing in the same terminology. The conflation of grandchildren with nephews and nieces in Italian and Romanian, though neutralized as to line and therefore cognatic in the modern languages, could in theory derive from Omaha equations linking sister's child with sister's son's child, but there is no real evidence for it. The whole question of Omaha in (P)IE is also discussed by two linguists of PIE, Mallory and Adams (2006: 212, 214), their conclusion being careful but ultimately non-committal (among other things, they wrongly treat equations which are merely classificatory as Omaha). My own position is one of scepticism, but there is one more datum in support of the theory: in the depths of his monumental study of the *Mahabharata*, the famous Hindu epic, G.J. Held speculates that Krishna is related to his maternal relative and enemy Kamsa now as mother's brother, now as mother's brother's son, giving us a key Omaha equation (Held 1935: 161, 177–78, 177 n. 3, 178 n. 2, 188).
46. Which probably reflects my relatively greater lack of familiarity with this area of his scholarship rather than the actual facts of the matter. It also ignores the fact that Dumézil did not accept Allen's suggested changes to his work when Allen presented them to him in person in Paris.
47. Hage sees the solution to Aberle's dilemma (Aberle 1967) in a marking effect. He also engages with my work on alternate generation equations (Parkin 1988), already discussed in the context of Allen's critique of it (Allen 1989b).
48. This now appears to have become the accepted term in place of 'physical' or 'biological anthropologist'.
49. Recall the passage above where I cite Allen as seeing kinship as at least partly material, as akin to a plough (1989b: 46–47).
50. Cf. Allen 1998a: 154: 'To rule out both horizontal [i.e. sibling] and vertical [i.e. parent-child] forms of incest one needs two dichotomies', i.e. between generation or horizontal moieties, and between vertical moieties. This produces four sections as the simplest form of social organization known (regarding this latter point, Allen is following Granet; see above).
51. One new variation is that whereas Allen has previously tended to treat the ego in his models as male, here she is explicitly female.
52. Of which there is evidence in the ethnographic record of only a century or so ago, e.g. Mauss and Beuchat (1906) on the Inuit, and Evans-Pritchard (1940) on the Nuer.

53. Though no longer exclusively so; cf. recent work by, among others, Patrick McConvell (2012) and Laurent Dousset (2003, 2012) on Omaha and Iroquois patterns in north and southwest Australia respectively.
54. The later date would hardly have given those who became Native Australians the time to reach the continent, suggesting an earlier date and a different location for the emergence of tetradism. If this hypothesis is correct, another must be that those human groups that occupied the Americas from about 11,000 years ago would have had more time to acquire such systems and take them with them across the Bering Strait (then probably a land bridge). This would suggest a pre-dispersal date for the emergence of tetradic systems, given that Allen ruled out independent invention in more than one place. Recall that a very few Amerindian societies in Latin America appear to have a Kariëra-type kinship system (Kensinger 1984; de Souza 2012). In his reasoning here, Allen implicitly relies on diffusionist methodology.
55. By the same token, migration clearly led to the separation of groups and presumably the development of different languages or, to start with, dialects, and also cultures, which such groups would presumably have tended to retain on migrating. The work of Chris Ehret in reconstructing ancient kinship terminologies in Africa is relevant here; see especially Ehret (2011).

References

Note: Entries marked with an asterisk are reproduced in this volume.

- Aberle, D. 1967. 'A Scale of Alternate Generation Terminology: A Finding in Search of a Theory', *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 23: 261–76.
- Allen, N.J. 1972. 'Social and Economic Change among the Thulung Rai', in C. von Fürer-Haimendorf (ed.), *A Study of Social Change in Nepal*. Swindon: Social Science Research Council.
- . 1969. 'Some Problems in the Ethnography of the Peoples of Nepal and Their Neighbours'. Oxford: BLitt thesis.
- . 1975. 'Byansi Kinship Terminology: A Study in Symmetry', *Man* (n.s.) 10: 80–94.
- . 1976a. 'Sherpa Kinship in Diachronic Perspective', *Man* (n.s.) 11: 569–87.
- . 1976b. 'Studies in the Myths and Oral Traditions of the Thulung Rai of East Nepal', Oxford: DPhil thesis.
- . 1978a. 'Fourfold Classification of Society in the Himalayas', in J.F. Fisher (ed.), *Himalayan Anthropology: The Indo-Tibetan Interface*. The Hague: Mouton.
- *———. 1978b. 'Quadripartition of Society in Early Tibetan Sources', *Journal Asiatique* 266: 341–60. Reproduced here as Chapter 4.

- . 1978c. 'A Thulung Myth and Some Problems of Comparison', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 9(2): 157–66.
- . 1981. 'The Thulung Myth of the *Bhume* Sites and Some Indo-Tibetan Comparisons', in C. von Fürer-Haimendorf (ed.), *Asian Highland Societies in Anthropological Perspective*. New Delhi: Stirling.
- *———. 1982. 'A Dance of Relatives', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 13(2): 139–46. Reproduced here as Chapter 8.
- *———. 1985. 'Hierarchical Opposition and Some Other Types of Relation', in R.H. Barnes, D. de Coppet and R.J. Parkin (ed.), *Contexts and Levels: Anthropological Essays on Hierarchy*, Oxford: JASO Occasional Papers, no. 4. Reproduced here as Chapter 2.
- . 1986a. 'The Coming of Macchendranath to Nepal: Comments from a Comparative Point of View', in N.J. Allen, R. Gombrich, T. Raychauduri and G. Rizvi (eds), *Oxford University Papers on India*, 1(1): 75–102. Oxford University Press.
- *———. 1986b. 'Tetradic Theory: An Approach to Kinship', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 17(2): 87–109. Reproduced here as Chapter 9.
- *———. 1987. 'The Ideology of the Indo-Europeans: Dumézil's Theory and the Idea of a Fourth Function', *International Journal of Moral and Legal Studies* 2(1): 23–39. Reproduced here as Chapter 5.
- . 1989a. 'The Evolution of Kinship Terminologies', *Lingua* 77(2): 173–85.
- *———. 1989b. 'Assimilation of Alternate Generations', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 20(1): 45–55. Reproduced here as Chapter 10.
- *———. 1990. 'On the Notion of Structure', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 21(3): 279–82. Reproduced here as Chapter 1.
- *———. 1993a. 'Debating Dumézil', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 24(2): 119–31. Reproduced here as Chapter 3.
- . 1993b. *Hinduism, Structuralism and Dumézil and The Prehistory of Dravidian-type Terminologies* [Department of Special Assistance, Anthropology, Utkal University, Occasional Papers 2 and 3 (bound together)]. Bhubaneswar: Utkal University.
- *———. 1995. 'The Division of Labour and the Notion of Primitive Society: A Maussian Approach', *Social Anthropology* 5(1): 49–59. Reproduced here as Chapter 12.
- *———. 1997. 'Why Did Odysseus Become a Horse?', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 26(2): 143–54. Reproduced here as Chapter 7.
- . 1998a. 'Effervescence and the Origins of Human Society', in N.J. Allen, W.S.F. Pickering and W. Watts Miller (eds), *On Durkheim's Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. London: Routledge. Reprinted with revisions as Chapter 4 in Allen 2000.
- . 1998b. 'The Prehistory of Dravidian-type Terminologies', in M. Godelier, T. Trautmann and F. Tjon Sie Fat (eds), *Transformations of Kinship*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

- . 1998c. 'The Indo-European Prehistory of Yoga', *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 2: 1–20.
- *———. 1998d. 'The Category of Substance: A Maussian Theme Revisited', in W. James and N.J. Allen (eds), *Marcel Mauss: A Centenary Tribute*. Oxford: Berghahn Books. Reproduced here as Chapter 6.
- . 1998e. 'Varnas, Colours and Functions: Expanding Dumézil's Schema', *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 6: 163–77.
- . 2000. *Categories and Classifications: Maussian Reflections on the Social*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- . 2002. 'Pénélope et Draupadi: la validité de la comparaison', in A. Hurst and F. Létoublon (eds), *La mythologie et l'Odyssee: Hommage à Gabriel Germain*. Geneva: Droz.
- . 2003. 'From Mountains to Mythologies', *Ethnos* 68(2): 271–84.
- . 2005a. 'The Articulation of Time: Some Indo-European Comparisons', *Cosmos* 17(2): 163–78.
- . 2005b. 'Asceticism in Some Indo-European Traditions', *Studia Indo-Europaea* 2: 37–51.
- . 2007. 'The Close and the Distant: A Long-Term Perspective', in Georg Pfeffer (ed.), *Periphery and Centre: Studies in Orissan History, Religion and Anthropology*. Delhi: Manohar.
- . 2008. 'Tetradic Theory and the Origins of Human Kinship Systems', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- *———. 2012a. 'Tetradic Theory and Omaha Systems', in T.R. Trautmann and P.M. Whiteley (eds), *Crow-Omaha: New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. Reproduced here as Chapter 11.
- . 2012b. *Miyapma: Traditional Narratives of the Thulung Rai*, Kathmandu: Vajra Publications (revised version of Allen 1976b).
- . 2019. *Arjuna–Odysseus: Shared Heritage in Indian and Greek Epic*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2024. 'Rotation and Morality in Some Indo-European Mythologies', in S. Kilgallon and F. Mitchell (eds), *Time and Chronology in Creation Narratives*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- . n.d. 'Durkheimian Thinking and the Category of the Totality'. Unpublished paper in the author's possession.
- . H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds) 2008. *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Aziz, B. 1974. 'Some Notes about Descent and Residence in Tibetan Society', in C. von Fürer-Haimendorf (ed.), *Contributions to the Anthropology of Nepal*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Barnard, A. 2008. 'The Co-evolution of Language and Kinship', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex*

- to *Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Barnes, R.H. 1977. 'Alliance and Categories in Wailolong, East Flores', *Sociologus* 23(1): 71–89.
- . 2012. 'What Is Left Out in Kinship', in L. Dousset and S. Tcherkézoff (eds), *The Scope of Anthropology: Maurice Godelier's Work in Context*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Berlin, B., and P. Kay 1969. *Basic Color Terms: Their Universality and Evolution*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Blust, R.A. 1980. 'Early Austronesian Social Organization: The Evidence of Language', *Current Anthropology* 21: 205–47.
- Brown, C. 1984. *Language and Living Things: Uniformities in Folk Classification and Naming*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- De Souza, M.C. 2012. 'The Making and Unmaking of "Crow-Omaha" Kinship in Central Brazil (ian Ethnology)', in T.R. Trautmann and P.M. Whiteley (eds), *Crow-Omaha: New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Dousset, L. 2003. 'On the Misinterpretation of the Aluridja Kinship System Type (Australian Western Desert)', *Social Anthropology* 1(1): 43–61.
- . 2012. "'Horizontal" and "Vertical" Skewing: Similar Objectives, Two Solutions?', in T. R. Trautmann and P.M. Whiteley (eds), *Crow-Omaha: New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Dumézil, G. 1938. 'La Préhistoire des Flamines Majeurs', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 118: 188–200.
- Dunbar, R. 2008. 'Kinship in Biological Perspective', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Durkheim, É. 1991 [1893]. *De la division du travail social*, Paris: Quadrige/Presses Universitaires de Paris.
- . 1995 [1912]. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (trans. K.E. Fields). New York: The Free Press.
- Ehret, C. 2011. 'Reconstructing Ancient Kinship: Practice and Theory in an African Case Study', in D. Jones and B. Mililic (eds), *Kinship, Language and Prehistory: Per Hage and the Renaissance in Kinship Studies*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fortes, M. 1983. *Rules and the Emergence of Society*. London: Royal Anthropological Institute (Occasional Paper no. 39).
- Friedrich, P. 1966. 'Proto-Indo-European Kinship', *Ethnology* 5(1): 1–36.
- Gamble, C. 2008. 'Kinship and Material Culture: Archaeological Implications of the Human Global Diaspora', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Mal-

- den MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Gellner, D. 2020. 'N.J. Allen (1939–2020), Indo-European Comparativist', *Anthropology Today* 36(4): 27.
- Godelier, M. 2004. *Metamorphoses de la Parenté*. Paris: Fayard.
- Gowlett, A.J., and R. Dunbar 2008. 'A Brief Overview of Human Evolution', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Granet, M. 1939. 'Catégories Matrimoniales et Relations de Proximité dans la Chine Ancienne', *Annales Sociologiques* 1939: 1–254.
- Guernonprez, J.-F. 1998. 'Transformations of Kinship Systems in Eastern Indonesia', in M. Godelier, T. Trautmann and F. Tjon Sie Fat (eds), *Transformations of Kinship*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Haddon, A. C. 1934. *History of Anthropology*. London: Watts.
- Hage, P. 1999. 'Alternate Generation Terminology: A Theory for a Finding', *Journal of Anthropological Research* 55: 521–39.
- . 2003a. 'On the Reconstruction of the Proto-Nostratic Kinship System', *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 128, 311–25.
- . 2003b. 'The Ancient Maya Kinship System', *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 59: 5–21.
- Held, G.J. 1935. *The Mahabharata: An Ethnological Study*. Amsterdam: Uitgeversmattschappij.
- Hertz, R. 1983 [1913]. 'St Besse: A Study of an Alpine Cult', in S. Wilson (ed.), *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, W. 2003. *The Ceremonial Animal: A New Portrait of Anthropology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2008a. 'Why "Kinship?" New Questions on an Old Topic', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- . 2008b. 'Alternating Birth Classes: A Note from Eastern Africa', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- . 2012. 'A Tetradic Starting Point for Skewing? Marriage as a Generational Contract: Reflections on Sister-Exchange in Africa', in T.R. Trautmann and P.M. Whiteley (eds), *Crow-Omaha: New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Jones, D., and B. Millicic (eds) 2011. *Kinship, Language and Prehistory: Per Hage and the Renaissance in Kinship Studies*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Kensinger, K.M. 1984. 'An Emic Model of Cashinahua Kinship', in K.M. Kensinger (ed.), *Marriage Practices in Lowland South America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Korstjens, A.H. 2008. 'The Importance of Kinship in Monkey Society', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Layton, R. 2008. 'What Can Ethnography Tell Us about Human Social Evolution?', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Lehmann, J. 2008. 'Meaning and Relevance of Kinship in Great Apes', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1963. 'The Bear and the Barber', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 93(1): 1–11.
- Lounsbury, E.G. 1964. 'A Formal Account of the Crow- and Omaha-Type Kinship Terminologies', in W.H. Goodenough (ed.), *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology: Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lussier, D. 2000. 'The Interpretation of Moral Inequality among the Kuna-Speaking Communities of Western Eritrea'. Oxford: unpublished DPhil thesis.
- Lyle, E. 1990. *Archaic Cosmos: Polarity, Space and Time*. Edinburgh: Polygon.
- Mallory, J.P., and D.Q. Adams. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mauss, M., and H. Beuchat. 1906. 'Essai sur les Variations Saissonnières des Sociétés Eskimos: Étude de Morphologie Sociale', *Année Sociologique* 9: 39–132.
- McConvell, P. 2012. 'Omaha Skewing in Australia: Overlays, Dynamism, and Change', in T.R. Trautmann and P.M. Whiteley (eds), *Crow-Omaha: New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Needham, R. (ed.). 1973. *Right & Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Opie, K., and C. Power 2008. 'Grandmothering and Female Coalitions: A Basis for Matrilineal Priority?', in N.J. Allen, H. Callan, R. Dunbar and W. James (eds), *Early Human Kinship: From Sex to Social Reproduction*. Malden MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing and the Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Parkin, R. 1988. 'Reincarnation and Alternating Generation Equivalence in Middle India', *Journal of Anthropological Research* 44(1): 1–20 (reprinted in Parkin 2022).
- . 1996. *The Dark Side of Humanity: The Work of Robert Hertz and its Legacy*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- . 2002. *Louis Dumont and Hierarchical Opposition*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

- . 2020. 'Nicholas Justin "Nick" Allen 1939–2020', *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 12(1): 1–13.
- . 2021. *How Kinship Systems Change: On the Dialectics of Practice and Classification*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- . 2022. 'Reincarnation and Alternating Generation Equivalence in Middle India', in Robert Parkin, *Conceptualizing India's Tribes: Papers on Identity, Kinship and General Ethnography*. Chandrasekharapur: Lavanya Institute of Indian Studies, and Bhubaneswar: Shikhasandhan (reprint of Parkin 1988).
- Patterson, M. 2005. Coming too close, going too far: theoretical and cross-cultural approaches to incest and its prohibitions, *Australian Journal of Anthropology* 16(1): 95–115.
- Pignède, B. 1966. *Les Gurungs: Une Population Himalayenne du Népal*. Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Rees, A., and B. Rees 1961. *Celtic Heritage*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Sauzeau, P., and A. Sauzeau 2012. *La Quatrième Fonction: Marginalité et Alterité dans l'Idéologie Indo-européenne*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Thapar, R. 1990. *From Lineage to State: Social Formations in the Mid-First Century in the Ganga Valley*. Oxford: Oxford India Paperbacks.
- Toffin, G. 1979. 'Les Aspects Religieux de la Royauté Néwar au Népal', *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions* 49(1): 53–82.
- Trautmann, T.R. 1981. *Dravidian Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trautmann, T.R., and P.M. Whiteley 2012. 'A Classic Problem', in T.R. Trautmann and P.M. Whiteley (eds), *Crow-Omaha: New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Tyler, S. 1984. 'Change in Dravidian Kinship', in J. Galey (ed.), *Différences, Valeurs, Hierarchy: Textes Offerts à Louis Dumont*. Paris: Editions de l'EHESS.
- Van der Veen, K. 1972. *I Give Thee My Daughter: A Study of Marriage and Hierarchy Among the Anavil Brahmans of South Gujarat*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Co.
- Vukovic, K. 2020. 'In Memoriam Nicholas Justin Allen', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 48(1–2): 240–42.
- Wallis, W.D. 1918. 'Indo-Germanic Relationship Terms as Historical Evidence', *American Anthropologist* 20(4): 419–31.
- Williams, B.J. 1968. 'The Birth of India and Some Comments on Band Organization', in R.B. Lee and I. de Vore (eds), *Man the Hunter*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Witowski, S. 1972. 'Guttman Scaling of Semantic Distinctions', in P. Reining (ed.), *Kinship Studies in the Morgan Centennial Year*. Washington DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.