

E3-15

Woman, Culture, and Society

Contributors

Joan Bamberger
Nancy Chodorow
Jane Fishburne Collier
Bette S. Denich
Carol P. Hoffer
Louise Lamphere
Nancy B. Leis
Bridget O'Laughlin

Sherry B. Ortner
Lois Paul
Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo
Karen Sacks
Peggy R. Sanday
Carol B. Stack
Nancy Tanner
Margery Wolf

Woman, Culture, and Society

Edited by Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo
and Louise Lamphere



Stanford University Press, Stanford, California

G - 502 139 G (G) +
(Sex - G)

Stanford University Press, Stanford, California
© 1974 by the Board of Trustees of the
Leland Stanford Junior University
Printed in the United States of America
Cloth ISBN 0-8047-0850-9 Paper ISBN 0-8047-0851-7
Original edition 1974
Last figure below indicates year of this printing:
83 82 81 80 79 78 77 76

Preface

There is no question that the women's liberation movement has stimulated, in recent years, a good deal of interest in understanding and analyzing women's lives. At Stanford, in 1971, a collective of female graduate students in anthropology organized an undergraduate lecture course, "Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective." At more or less the same time anthropologists in other colleges and universities began to prepare similar courses, and to ask themselves what anthropologists might have to say about women and, conversely, how an interest in women might provide a new perspective in their field.

When Rosaldo (who taught that course, along with Jane Collier, Julia Howell, Kim Kramer, Janet Shepherd Fjellman, and Ellen Lewin) showed Lamphere a copy of the Stanford lectures, we both decided that the issues raised, the problems solved, and the questions that remained unasked (and so, unanswered) were of sufficient importance and interest to be shared. The difficulties of bringing an entirely new perspective to bear on anthropological materials had encouraged a good deal of creative thinking, suggestive questioning, and research. How, for example, in a field that had a long tradition of describing men's place in society, could we begin to characterize the interest of women's lives? And then, again, how were we to evaluate the great variation in female activities, roles, and powers that is found in different human groups? What were we to make of the popular claim that women are, biologically, men's inferiors? If we rejected that claim, how then could we begin to explain and understand the fact that women are treated, culturally and socially, as inferior, in virtually all societies in the world? Ultimately, of course, all of these questions revolve around a need to reexamine the ways in which we think about ourselves.

The impetus for this book lies in our conviction that the lack of interest in women in conventional anthropology constitutes a genuine

Vereinnahmt
m Inventar, / Bücherverzeichnis
unter Sign. 376 Nr. 11799/27
Münster, den 29.8.1977
H. B. ... R KL

deficiency, that it has led to distorted theories and impoverished ethnographic accounts. By focusing on women, and by addressing facts that have conventionally been ignored or taken for granted, we hope to re-appraise old theories and pave the way for future thought. In anthropology, it is clear that our conceptions of human social life will be broadened when they address women's lives and strategies along with those of men.

The problem, for us, was how to do it. The anthropological literature tells us relatively little about women, and provides almost no theoretical apparatus for understanding or describing culture from a woman's point of view. Because of our lack of both materials and theories, it seemed more reasonable to collect papers from a number of people working in this area than to attempt a book ourselves. In the last few years, we have found—all of us—that our own thinking about women has become increasingly sophisticated, and this leads us to believe that a number of the papers here will be superseded by later work. In a sense, then, these papers represent a first generation's attempt to integrate an interest in women into a general theory of society and culture. They outline a number of theoretical issues, and illustrate lines of thought that later studies might pursue. The authors vary in their theoretical commitments, their politics, and their methods. Some of the papers reflect research initiated long before the contemporary women's movement became relevant; others represent thinking undertaken specifically for this book. Most of the papers have not been published elsewhere. Taken together, all should serve, minimally, to correct a dominant bias that sees women's lives as lacking in order or in interest. And they illustrate ways in which anthropologists will have to begin to think about women if they are to understand our human world.

M.Z.R.

L.L.

November 1973

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	
MICHELLE ZIMBALIST ROSALDO AND LOUISE LAMPHERE	1
<i>Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview</i>	
MICHELLE ZIMBALIST ROSALDO	17
<i>Family Structure and Feminine Personality</i>	
NANCY CHODOROW	43
<i>Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?</i>	
SHERRY B. ORTNER	67
<i>Women in Politics</i>	
JANE FISHBURNE COLLIER	89
<i>Strategies, Cooperation, and Conflict Among Women in Domestic Groups</i>	
LOUISE LAMPHERE	97
<i>Sex Roles and Survival Strategies in an Urban Black Community</i>	
CAROL B. STACK	113
<i>Matrifocality in Indonesia and Africa and Among Black Americans</i>	
NANCY TANNER	129
<i>Chinese Women: Old Skills in a New Context</i>	
MARGERY WOLF	157
<i>Madam Yoko: Ruler of the Kpa Mende Confederacy</i>	
CAROL P. HOFFER	173

<i>Female Status in the Public Domain</i>	
PEGGY R. SANDAY	189
<i>Engels Revisited: Women, the Organization of Production, and Private Property</i>	
KAREN SACKS	207
<i>Women in Groups: Ijaw Women's Associations</i>	
NANCY B. LEIS	223
<i>Sex and Power in the Balkans</i>	
BETTE S. DENICH	243
<i>The Myth of Matriarchy: Why Men Rule in Primitive Society</i>	
JOAN BAMBERGER	263
<i>The Mastery of Work and the Mystery of Sex in a Guatemalan Village</i>	
LOIS PAUL	281
<i>Mediation of Contradiction: Why Mbum Women Do Not Eat Chicken</i>	
BRIDGET O'LAUGHLIN	301
<i>References Cited</i>	321
<i>Index</i>	343

Contributors

JOAN BAMBERGER received her Ph.D. in anthropology from Harvard University in 1967. Her field research has been among the Northern Kayapó of Central Brazil. A monograph on the subject is forthcoming. She is on the faculty of Brandeis University.

NANCY CHODOROW is Instructor at Wellesley College, with responsibilities concerning the study of women and women's education. She is currently completing a doctoral dissertation in the Department of Sociology at Brandeis University. She works in the fields of psychoanalytic personality theory and the comparative study of women and the family.

JANE FISHBURNE COLLIER received her Ph.D. from Tulane University in 1970 and is now Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Stanford University. Most of her research has been carried out in Zinacantan, a Maya community in southern Mexico, but she has also done limited fieldwork in an Andalusian village in Spain and in a Kpelle community in Liberia. She is the author of *Law and Social Change in Zinacantan*.

BETTE S. DENICH received her Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. She is now Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Barnard College and Columbia University. Her field research in Yugoslavia has focused on industrialization and rural-urban migration, but has also included more traditional ethnological interests. She is the author of several articles based on Yugoslavian research, and is presently completing a monograph on economic and political revolution in a Serbian town.

CAROL P. HOFFER received her Ph.D. from Bryn Mawr College and is presently Assistant Professor and Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Franklin and Marshall College. She has done fieldwork in the Mende/Sherbro ethnic area of Sierra Leone and ethnohistorical research in Freetown and London. Her previous publications are on West African women in high office.

Loosening her tie to her mother therefore does not entail the rejection of all women. The close tie that remains between mother and daughter is based not simply on mutual overinvolvement but often on mutual understanding of their oppression.

Conclusion

Women's universal mothering role has effects both on the development of masculine and feminine personality and on the relative status of the sexes. This paper has described the development of relational personality in women and of personalities preoccupied with the denial of relation in men. In its comparison of different societies, it has suggested that men, while guaranteeing to themselves sociocultural superiority over women, always remain psychologically defensive and insecure. Women, by contrast, although always of secondary social and cultural status, may in favorable circumstances gain psychological security and a firm sense of worth and importance in spite of this.

Social and psychological oppression, then, is perpetuated in the structure of personality. The paper enables us to suggest what social arrangements contribute (and could contribute) to social equality between men and women and their relative freedom from certain sorts of psychological conflict. Daughters and sons must be able to develop a personal identification with more than one adult, and preferably one embedded in a role relationship that gives it a social context of expression and provides some limitation upon it. Most important, boys need to grow up around men who take a major role in child care, and girls around women who, in addition to their child-care responsibilities, have a valued role and recognized spheres of legitimate control. These arrangements could help to ensure that children of both sexes develop a sufficiently individuated and strong sense of self, as well as a positively valued and secure gender identity, that does not bog down either in ego-boundary confusion, low self-esteem, and overwhelming relatedness to others, or in compulsive denial of any connection to others or dependence upon them.

SHERRY B. ORTNER

Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?

Much of the creativity of anthropology derives from the tension between two sets of demands: that we explain human universals, and that we explain cultural particulars. By this canon, woman provides us with one of the more challenging problems to be dealt with. The secondary status of woman in society is one of the true universals, a pan-cultural fact. Yet within that universal fact, the specific cultural conceptions and symbolizations of woman are extraordinarily diverse and even mutually contradictory. Further, the actual treatment of women and their relative power and contribution vary enormously from culture to culture, and over different periods in the history of particular cultural traditions. Both of these points—the universal fact and the cultural variation—constitute problems to be explained.

My interest in the problem is of course more than academic: I wish to see genuine change come about, the emergence of a social and cultural order in which as much of the range of human potential is open to women as is open to men. The universality of female subordination, the fact that it exists within every type of social and economic arrangement and in societies of every degree of complexity, indicates to me that we are up against something very profound, very stubborn, something

The first version of this paper was presented in October 1972 as a lecture in the course "Women: Myth and Reality" at Sarah Lawrence College. I received helpful comments from the students and from my co-teachers in the course: Joan Kelly Gadol, Eva Kollisch, and Gerda Lerner. A short account was delivered at the American Anthropological Association meetings in Toronto, November 1972. Meanwhile, I received excellent critical comments from Karen Blu, Robert Paul, Michelle Rosaldo, David Schneider, and Terence Turner, and the present version of the paper, in which the thrust of the argument has been rather significantly changed, was written in response to those comments. I, of course, retain responsibility for its final form. The paper is dedicated to Simone de Beauvoir, whose book *The Second Sex* (1953), first published in French in 1949, remains in my opinion the best single comprehensive understanding of "the woman problem."

we cannot rout out simply by rearranging a few tasks and roles in the social system, or even by reordering the whole economic structure. In this paper I try to expose the underlying logic of cultural thinking that assumes the inferiority of women; I try to show the highly persuasive nature of the logic, for if it were not so persuasive, people would not keep subscribing to it. But I also try to show the social and cultural sources of that logic, to indicate wherein lies the potential for change.

It is important to sort out the levels of the problem. The confusion can be staggering. For example, depending on which aspect of Chinese culture we look at, we might extrapolate any of several entirely different guesses concerning the status of women in China. In the ideology of Taoism, *yin*, the female principle, and *yang*, the male principle, are given equal weight; "the opposition, alternation, and interaction of these two forces give rise to all phenomena in the universe" (Siu, 1968: 2). Hence we might guess that maleness and femaleness are equally valued in the general ideology of Chinese culture.¹ Looking at the social structure, however, we see the strongly emphasized patrilineal descent principle, the importance of sons, and the absolute authority of the father in the family. Thus we might conclude that China is the archetypal patriarchal society. Next, looking at the actual roles played, power and influence wielded, and material contributions made by women in Chinese society—all of which are, upon observation, quite substantial—we would have to say that women are allotted a great deal of (unspoken) status in the system. Or again, we might focus on the fact that a goddess, Kuan Yin, is the central (most worshiped, most depicted) deity in Chinese Buddhism, and we might be tempted to say, as many have tried to say about goddess-worshipping cultures in prehistoric and early historical societies, that China is actually a sort of matriarchy. In short, we must be absolutely clear about *what* we are trying to explain before explaining it.

We may differentiate three levels of the problem:

1. The universal fact of culturally attributed second-class status of woman in every society. Two questions are important here. First, what do we mean by this; what is our evidence that this is a universal fact? And second, how are we to explain this fact, once having established it?
2. Specific ideologies, symbolizations, and socio-structural arrangements pertaining to women that vary widely from culture to culture. The problem at this level is to account for any particular cultural com-

¹ It is true of course that *yin*, the female principle, has a negative valence. Nonetheless, there is an absolute complementarity of *yin* and *yang* in Taoism, a recognition that the world requires the equal operation and interaction of both principles for its survival.

plex in terms of factors specific to that group—the standard level of anthropological analysis.

3. Observable on-the-ground details of women's activities, contributions, powers, influence, etc., often at variance with cultural ideology (although always constrained within the assumption that women may never be officially preeminent in the total system). This is the level of direct observation, often adopted now by feminist-oriented anthropologists.

This paper is primarily concerned with the first of these levels, the problem of the universal devaluation of women. The analysis thus depends not upon specific cultural data but rather upon an analysis of "culture" taken generically as a special sort of process in the world. A discussion of the second level, the problem of cross-cultural variation in conceptions and relative valuations of women, will entail a great deal of cross-cultural research and must be postponed to another time. As for the third level, it will be obvious from my approach that I would consider it a misguided endeavor to focus only upon women's actual though culturally unrecognized and unvalued powers in any given society, without first understanding the overarching ideology and deeper assumptions of the culture that render such powers trivial.

The Universality of Female Subordination

What do I mean when I say that everywhere, in every known culture, women are considered in some degree inferior to men? First of all, I must stress that I am talking about *cultural* evaluations; I am saying that each culture, in its own way and on its own terms, makes this evaluation. But what would constitute evidence that a particular culture considers women inferior?

Three types of data would suffice: (1) elements of cultural ideology and informants' statements that *explicitly* devalue women, according them, their roles, their tasks, their products, and their social milieux less prestige than are accorded men and the male correlates; (2) symbolic devices, such as the attribution of defilement, which may be interpreted as *implicitly* making a statement of inferior valuation; and (3) social-structural arrangements that exclude women from participation in or contact with some realm in which the highest powers of the society are felt to reside.² These three types of data may all of course be interrelated

² Some anthropologists might consider this type of evidence (social-structural arrangements that exclude women, explicitly or de facto, from certain groups, roles, or statuses) to be a subtype of the second type of evidence (symbolic formulations of inferiority). I would not disagree with this view, although most social anthropologists would probably separate the two types.

in any particular system, though they need not necessarily be. Further, any one of them will usually be sufficient to make the point of female inferiority in a given culture. Certainly, female exclusion from the most sacred rite or the highest political council is sufficient evidence. Certainly, explicit cultural ideology devaluing women (and their tasks, roles, products, etc.) is sufficient evidence. Symbolic indicators such as defilement are usually sufficient, although in a few cases in which, say, men and women are equally polluting to one another, a further indicator is required—and is, as far as my investigations have ascertained, always available.

On any or all of these counts, then, I would flatly assert that we find women subordinated to men in every known society. The search for a genuinely egalitarian, let alone matriarchal, culture has proved fruitless. An example from one society that has traditionally been on the credit side of this ledger will suffice. Among the matrilineal Crow, as Lowie (1956) points out, "Women . . . had highly honorific offices in the Sun Dance; they could become directors of the Tobacco Ceremony and played, if anything, a more conspicuous part in it than the men; they sometimes played the hostess in the Cooked Meat Festival; they were not debarred from sweating or doctoring or from seeking a vision" (p. 61). Nonetheless, "Women [during menstruation] formerly rode inferior horses and evidently this loomed as a source of contamination, for they were not allowed to approach either a wounded man or men starting on a war party. A taboo still lingers against their coming near sacred objects at these times" (p. 44). Further, just before enumerating women's rights of participation in the various rituals noted above, Lowie mentions one particular Sun Dance Doll bundle that was not supposed to be unwrapped by a woman (p. 60). Pursuing this trail we find: "According to all Lodge Grass informants and most others, the doll owned by Wrinkled-face took precedence not only of other dolls but of all other Crow medicines whatsoever. . . . This particular doll was not supposed to be handled by a woman" (p. 229).³

In sum, the Crow are probably a fairly typical case. Yes, women have certain powers and rights, in this case some that place them in fairly high positions. Yet ultimately the line is drawn: menstruation is a threat to warfare, one of the most valued institutions of the tribe, one that is central to their self-definition; and the most sacred object of the tribe is taboo to the direct sight and touch of women.

³ While we are on the subject of injustices of various kinds, we might note that Lowie secretly bought this doll, the most sacred object in the tribal repertoire, from its custodian, the widow of Wrinkled-face. She asked \$400 for it, but this price was "far beyond [Lowie's] means," and he finally got it for \$80 (p. 300).

Similar examples could be multiplied ad infinitum, but I think the onus is no longer upon us to demonstrate that female subordination is a cultural universal; it is up to those who would argue against the point to bring forth counterexamples. I shall take the universal secondary status of women as a given, and proceed from there.

Nature and Culture⁴

How are we to explain the universal devaluation of women? We could of course rest the case on biological determinism. There is something genetically inherent in the male of the species, so the biological determinists would argue, that makes them the naturally dominant sex; that "something" is lacking in females, and as a result women are not only naturally subordinate but in general quite satisfied with their position, since it affords them protection and the opportunity to maximize maternal pleasures, which to them are the most satisfying experiences of life. Without going into a detailed refutation of this position, I think it fair to say that it has failed to be established to the satisfaction of almost anyone in academic anthropology. This is to say, not that biological facts are irrelevant, or that men and women are not different, but that these facts and differences only take on significance of superior/inferior within the framework of culturally defined value systems.

If we are unwilling to rest the case on genetic determinism, it seems to me that we have only one way to proceed. We must attempt to interpret female subordination in light of other universals, factors built into the structure of the most generalized situation in which all human beings, in whatever culture, find themselves. For example, every human being has a physical body and a sense of nonphysical mind, is part of a society of other individuals and an inheritor of a cultural tradition, and must engage in some relationship, however mediated, with "nature," or the nonhuman realm, in order to survive. Every human being is born (to a mother) and ultimately dies, all are assumed to have an interest in personal survival, and society/culture has its own interest in (or at least momentum toward) continuity and survival, which transcends the lives and deaths of particular individuals. And so forth. It is in the realm of such universals of the human condition that we must seek an explanation for the universal fact of female devaluation.

I translate the problem, in other words, into the following simple question. What could there be in the generalized structure and conditions of existence, common to every culture, that would lead every culture to place a lower value upon women? Specifically, my thesis is that

⁴ With all due respect to Lévi-Strauss (1969a,b, and *passim*).

woman is being identified with—or, if you will, seems to be a symbol of—something that every culture devalues, something that every culture defines as being of a lower order of existence than itself. Now it seems that there is only one thing that would fit that description, and that is “nature” in the most generalized sense. Every culture, or, generically, “culture,” is engaged in the process of generating and sustaining systems of meaningful forms (symbols, artifacts, etc.) by means of which humanity transcends the givens of natural existence, bends them to its purposes, controls them in its interest. We may thus broadly equate culture with the notion of human consciousness, or with the products of human consciousness (i.e., systems of thought and technology), by means of which humanity attempts to assert control over nature.

Now the categories of “nature” and “culture” are of course conceptual categories—one can find no boundary out in the actual world between the two states or realms of being. And there is no question that some cultures articulate a much stronger opposition between the two categories than others—it has even been argued that primitive peoples (some or all) do not see or intuit any distinction between the human cultural state and the state of nature at all. Yet I would maintain that the universality of ritual betokens an assertion in all human cultures of the specifically human ability to act upon and regulate, rather than passively move with and be moved by, the givens of natural existence. In ritual, the purposive manipulation of given forms toward regulating and sustaining order, every culture asserts that proper relations between human existence and natural forces depend upon culture’s employing its special powers to regulate the overall processes of the world and life.

One realm of cultural thought in which these points are often articulated is that of concepts of purity and pollution. Virtually every culture has some such beliefs, which seem in large part (though not, of course, entirely) to be concerned with the relationship between culture and nature (see Ortner, 1973, n.d.). A well-known aspect of purity/pollution beliefs cross-culturally is that of the natural “contagion” of pollution; left to its own devices, pollution (for these purposes grossly equated with the unregulated operation of natural energies) spreads and overpowers all that it comes in contact with. Thus a puzzle—if pollution is so strong, how can anything be purified? Why is the purifying agent not itself polluted? The answer, in keeping with the present line of argument, is that purification is effected in a ritual context; purification ritual, as a purposive activity that pits self-conscious (symbolic) action against natural energies, is more powerful than those energies.

In any case, my point is simply that every culture implicitly recognizes

and asserts a distinction between the operation of nature and the operation of culture (human consciousness and its products); and further, that the distinctiveness of culture rests precisely on the fact that it can under most circumstances transcend natural conditions and turn them to its purposes. Thus culture (i.e. every culture) at some level of awareness asserts itself to be not only distinct from but superior to nature, and that sense of distinctiveness and superiority rests precisely on the ability to transform—to “socialize” and “culturalize”—nature.

Returning now to the issue of women, their pan-cultural second-class status could be accounted for, quite simply, by postulating that women are being identified or symbolically associated with nature, as opposed to men, who are identified with culture. Since it is always culture’s project to subsume and transcend nature, if women were considered part of nature, then culture would find it “natural” to subordinate, not to say oppress, them. Yet although this argument can be shown to have considerable force, it seems to oversimplify the case. The formulation I would like to defend and elaborate on in the following section, then, is that women are seen “merely” as being *closer* to nature than men. That is, culture (still equated relatively unambiguously with men) recognizes that women are active participants in its special processes, but at the same time sees them as being more rooted in, or having more direct affinity with, nature.

The revision may seem minor or even trivial, but I think it is a more accurate rendering of cultural assumptions. Further, the argument cast in these terms has several analytic advantages over the simpler formulation; I shall discuss these later. It might simply be stressed here that the revised argument would still account for the pan-cultural devaluation of women, for even if women are not equated with nature, they are nonetheless seen as representing a lower order of being, as being less transcendental of nature than men are. The next task of the paper, then, is to consider why they might be viewed in that way.

Why Is Woman Seen as Closer to Nature?

It all begins of course with the body and the natural procreative functions specific to women alone. We can sort out for discussion three levels at which this absolute physiological fact has significance: (1) woman’s *body and its functions*, more involved more of the time with “species life,” seem to place her closer to nature, in contrast to man’s physiology, which frees him more completely to take up the projects of culture; (2) woman’s body and its functions place her in *social roles* that in turn are considered to be at a lower order of the cultural process than man’s;

and (3) woman's traditional social roles, imposed because of her body and its functions, in turn give her a different *psychic structure*, which, like her physiological nature and her social roles, is seen as being closer to nature. I shall discuss each of these points in turn, showing first how in each instance certain factors strongly tend to align woman with nature, then indicating other factors that demonstrate her full alignment with culture, the combined factors thus placing her in a problematic intermediate position. It will become clear in the course of the discussion why men seem by contrast less intermediate, more purely "cultural" than women. And I reiterate that I am dealing only at the level of cultural and human universals. These arguments are intended to apply to generalized humanity; they grow out of the human condition, as humanity has experienced and confronted it up to the present day.

1. *Woman's physiology seen as closer to nature.* This part of my argument has been anticipated, with subtlety, cogency, and a great deal of hard data, by de Beauvoir (1953). De Beauvoir reviews the physiological structure, development, and functions of the human female and concludes that "the female, to a greater extent than the male, is the prey of the species" (p. 60). She points out that many major areas and processes of the woman's body serve no apparent function for the health and stability of the individual; on the contrary, as they perform their specific organic functions, they are often sources of discomfort, pain, and danger. The breasts are irrelevant to personal health; they may be excised at any time of a woman's life. "Many of the ovarian secretions function for the benefit of the egg, promoting its maturation and adapting the uterus to its requirements; in respect to the organism as a whole, they make for disequilibrium rather than for regulation—the woman is adapted to the needs of the egg rather than to her own requirements" (p. 24). Menstruation is often uncomfortable, sometimes painful; it frequently has negative emotional correlates and in any case involves bothersome tasks of cleansing and waste disposal; and—a point that de Beauvoir does not mention—in many cultures it interrupts a woman's routine, putting her in a stigmatized state involving various restrictions on her activities and social contacts. In pregnancy many of the woman's vitamin and mineral resources are channeled into nourishing the fetus, depleting her own strength and energies. And finally, childbirth itself is painful and dangerous (pp. 24–27 *passim*). In sum, de Beauvoir concludes that the female "is more enslaved to the species than the male, her animality is more manifest" (p. 239).

While de Beauvoir's book is ideological, her survey of woman's physiological situation seems fair and accurate. It is simply a fact that pro-

portionately more of woman's body space, for a greater percentage of her lifetime, and at some—sometimes great—cost to her personal health, strength, and general stability, is taken up with the natural processes surrounding the reproduction of the species.

De Beauvoir goes on to discuss the negative implications of woman's "enslavement to the species" in relation to the projects in which humans engage, projects through which culture is generated and defined. She arrives thus at the crux of her argument (pp. 58–59):

Here we have the key to the whole mystery. On the biological level a species is maintained only by creating itself anew; but this creation results only in repeating the same Life in more individuals. But man assures the repetition of Life while transcending Life through Existence [i.e. goal-oriented, meaningful action]; by this transcendence he creates values that deprive pure repetition of all value. In the animal, the freedom and variety of male activities are vain because no project is involved. Except for his services to the species, what he does is immaterial. Whereas in serving the species, the human male also remodels the face of the earth, he creates new instruments, he invents, he shapes the future.

In other words, woman's body seems to doom her to mere reproduction of life; the male, in contrast, lacking natural creative functions, must (or has the opportunity to) assert his creativity externally, "artificially," through the medium of technology and symbols. In so doing, he creates relatively lasting, eternal, transcendent objects, while the woman creates only perishables—human beings.

This formulation opens up a number of important insights. It speaks, for example, to the great puzzle of why male activities involving the destruction of life (hunting and warfare) are often given more prestige than the female's ability to give birth, to create life. Within de Beauvoir's framework, we realize it is not the killing that is the relevant and valued aspect of hunting and warfare; rather, it is the transcendental (social, cultural) nature of these activities, as opposed to the naturalness of the process of birth: "For it is not in giving life but in risking life that man is raised above the animal; that is why superiority has been accorded in humanity not to the sex that brings forth but to that which kills" (*ibid.*).

Thus if male is, as I am suggesting, everywhere (unconsciously) associated with culture and female seems closer to nature, the rationale for these associations is not very difficult to grasp, merely from considering the implications of the physiological contrast between male and female. At the same time, however, woman cannot be consigned fully to the category of nature, for it is perfectly obvious that she is a full-fledged

human being endowed with human consciousness just as a man is; she is half of the human race, without whose cooperation the whole enterprise would collapse. She may seem more in the possession of nature than man, but having consciousness, she thinks and speaks; she generates, communicates, and manipulates symbols, categories, and values. She participates in human dialogues not only with other women but also with men. As Lévi-Strauss says, "Woman could never become just a sign and nothing more, since even in a man's world she is still a person, and since insofar as she is defined as a sign she must [still] be recognized as a generator of signs" (1969a: 496).

Indeed, the fact of woman's full human consciousness, her full involvement in and commitment to culture's project of transcendence over nature, may ironically explain another of the great puzzles of "the woman problem"—woman's nearly universal unquestioning acceptance of her own devaluation. For it would seem that, as a conscious human and member of culture, she has followed out the logic of culture's arguments and has reached culture's conclusions along with the men. As de Beauvoir puts it (p. 59):

For she, too, is an existent, she feels the urge to surpass, and her project is not mere repetition but transcendence towards a different future—in her heart of hearts she finds confirmation of the masculine pretensions. She joins the men in the festivals that celebrate the successes and victories of the males. Her misfortune is to have been biologically destined for the repetition of Life, when even in her own view Life does not carry within itself its reasons for being, reasons that are more important than life itself.

In other words, woman's consciousness—her membership, as it were, in culture—is evidenced in part by the very fact that she accepts her own devaluation and takes culture's point of view.

I have tried here to show one part of the logic of that view, the part that grows directly from the physiological differences between men and women. Because of woman's greater bodily involvement with the natural functions surrounding reproduction, she is seen as more a part of nature than man is. Yet in part because of her consciousness and participation in human social dialogue, she is recognized as a participant in culture. Thus she appears as something intermediate between culture and nature, lower on the scale of transcendence than man.

2. *Woman's social role seen as closer to nature.* Woman's physiological functions, I have just argued, may tend in themselves to motivate⁵ a view

⁵ Semantic theory uses the concept of motivation of meaning, which encompasses various ways in which a meaning may be assigned to a symbol because of certain objective properties of that symbol, rather than by arbitrary association. In a sense,

of woman as closer to nature, a view she herself, as an observer of herself and the world, would tend to agree with. Woman creates naturally from within her own being, whereas man is free to, or forced to, create artificially, that is, through cultural means, and in such a way as to sustain culture. In addition, I now wish to show how woman's physiological functions have tended universally to limit her social movement, and to confine her universally to certain social contexts which *in turn* are seen as closer to nature. That is, not only her bodily processes but the social situation in which her bodily processes locate her may carry this significance. And insofar as she is permanently associated (in the eyes of culture) with these social milieux, they add weight (perhaps the decisive part of the burden) to the view of woman as closer to nature. I refer here of course to woman's confinement to the domestic family context, a confinement motivated, no doubt, by her lactation processes.

Woman's body, like that of all female mammals, generates milk during and after pregnancy for the feeding of the newborn baby. The baby cannot survive without breast milk or some similar formula at this stage of life. Since the mother's body goes through its lactation processes in direct relation to a pregnancy with a particular child, the relationship of nursing between mother and child is seen as a natural bond, other feeding arrangements being seen in most cases as unnatural and makeshift. Mothers and their children, according to cultural reasoning, belong together. Further, children beyond infancy are not strong enough to engage in major work, yet are mobile and unruly and not capable of understanding various dangers; they thus require supervision and constant care. Mother is the obvious person for this task, as an extension of her natural nursing bond with the children, or because she has a new infant and is already involved with child-oriented activities. Her own activities are thus circumscribed by the limitations and low levels of her children's strengths and skills:⁶ she is confined to the domestic family group; "woman's place is in the home."

Woman's association with the domestic circle would contribute to the view of her as closer to nature in several ways. In the first place, the sheer fact of constant association with children plays a role in the issue; one can easily see how infants and children might themselves be considered part of nature. Infants are barely human and utterly unsocial-

this entire paper is an inquiry into the motivation of the meaning of woman as a symbol, asking why woman may be unconsciously assigned the significance of being closer to nature. For a concise statement on the various types of motivation of meaning, see Ullman (1963).

⁶ A situation that often serves to make her more childlike herself.

ized; like animals they are unable to walk upright, they excrete without control, they do not speak. Even slightly older children are clearly not yet fully under the sway of culture. They do not yet understand social duties, responsibilities, and morals; their vocabulary and their range of learned skills are small. One finds implicit recognition of an association between children and nature in many cultural practices. For example, most cultures have initiation rites for adolescents (primarily for boys; I shall return to this point below), the point of which is to move the child ritually from a less than fully human state into full participation in society and culture; many cultures do not hold funeral rites for children who die at early ages, explicitly because they are not yet fully social beings. Thus children are likely to be categorized with nature, and woman's close association with children may compound her potential for being seen as closer to nature herself. It is ironic that the rationale for boys' initiation rites in many cultures is that the boys must be purged of the defilement accrued from being around mother and other women so much of the time, when in fact much of the woman's defilement may derive from her being around children so much of the time.

The second major problematic implication of women's close association with the domestic context derives from certain structural conflicts between the family and society at large in any social system. The implications of the "domestic/public opposition" in relation to the position of women have been cogently developed by Rosaldo (this volume), and I simply wish to show its relevance to the present argument. The notion that the domestic unit—the biological family charged with reproducing and socializing new members of the society—is opposed to the public entity—the superimposed network of alliances and relationships that is the society—is also the basis of Lévi-Strauss's argument in the *Elementary Structures of Kinship* (1969a). Lévi-Strauss argues not only that this opposition is present in every social system, but further that it has the significance of the opposition between nature and culture. The universal incest prohibition⁷ and its ally, the rule of exogamy (marriage outside the group), ensure that "the risk of seeing a biological family become established as a closed system is definitely eliminated; the biological group can no longer stand apart, and the bond of alliance with another family ensures the dominance of the social over the biological, and of the cultural over the natural" (p. 479). And although not every culture articulates a radical opposition between the domestic

⁷ David M. Schneider (personal communication) is prepared to argue that the incest taboo is not universal, on the basis of material from Oceania. Let us say at this point, then, that it is virtually universal.

and the public as such, it is hardly contestable that the domestic is always subsumed by the public; domestic units are allied with one another through the enactment of rules that are logically at a higher level than the units themselves; this creates an emergent unit—society—that is logically at a higher level than the domestic units of which it is composed.

Now, since women are associated with, and indeed are more or less confined to, the domestic context, they are identified with this lower order of social/cultural organization. What are the implications of this for the way they are viewed? First, if the specifically biological (reproductive) function of the family is stressed, as in Lévi-Strauss's formulation, then the family (and hence woman) is identified with nature pure and simple, as opposed to culture. But this is obviously too simple; the point seems more adequately formulated as follows: the family (and hence woman) represents lower-level, socially fragmenting, particularistic sort of concerns, as opposed to interfamilial relations representing higher-level, integrative, universalistic sorts of concerns. Since men lack a "natural" basis (nursing, generalized to child care) for a familial orientation, their sphere of activity is defined at the level of interfamilial relations. And hence, so the cultural reasoning seems to go, men are the "natural" proprietors of religion, ritual, politics, and other realms of cultural thought and action in which universalistic statements of spiritual and social synthesis are made. Thus men are identified not only with culture, in the sense of all human creativity, as opposed to nature; they are identified in particular with culture in the old-fashioned sense of the finer and higher aspects of human thought—art, religion, law, etc.

Here again, the logic of cultural reasoning aligning woman with a lower order of culture than man is clear and, on the surface, quite compelling. At the same time, woman cannot be fully consigned to nature, for there are aspects of her situation, even within the domestic context, that undeniably demonstrate her participation in the cultural process. It goes without saying, of course, that except for nursing newborn infants (and artificial nursing devices can cut even this biological tie), there is no reason why it has to be mother—as opposed to father, or anyone else—who remains identified with child care. But even assuming that other practical and emotional reasons conspire to keep woman in this sphere, it is possible to show that her activities in the domestic context could as logically put her squarely in the category of culture.

In the first place, one must point out that woman not only feeds and cleans up after children in a simple caretaker operation; she in fact is the primary agent of their early socialization. It is she who transforms

newborn infants from mere organisms into cultured humans, teaching them manners and the proper ways to behave in order to become full-fledged members of the culture. On the basis of her socializing functions alone, she could not be more a representative of culture. Yet in virtually every society there is a point at which the socialization of boys is transferred to the hands of men. The boys are considered, in one set of terms or another, not yet "really" socialized; their entrée into the realm of fully human (social, cultural) status can be accomplished only by men. We still see this in our own schools, where there is a gradual inversion in the proportion of female to male teachers up through the grades: most kindergarten teachers are female; most university professors are male.⁸

Or again, take cooking. In the overwhelming majority of societies cooking is the woman's work. No doubt this stems from practical considerations—since the woman has to stay home with the baby, it is convenient for her to perform the chores centered in the home. But if it is true, as Lévi-Strauss has argued (1969b), that transforming the raw into the cooked may represent, in many systems of thought, the transition from nature to culture, then here we have woman aligned with this important culturalizing process, which could easily place her in the category of culture, triumphing over nature. Yet it is also interesting to note that when a culture (e.g. France or China) develops a tradition of *haute cuisine*—"real" cooking, as opposed to trivial ordinary domestic cooking—the high chefs are almost always men. Thus the pattern replicates that in the area of socialization—women perform lower-level conversions from nature to culture, but when the culture distinguishes a higher level of the same functions, the higher level is restricted to men.

In short, we see once again some sources of woman's appearing more intermediate than man with respect to the nature/culture dichotomy. Her "natural" association with the domestic context (motivated by her natural lactation functions) tends to compound her potential for being viewed as closer to nature, because of the animal-like nature of children, and because of the infrasocial connotation of the domestic group as against the rest of society. Yet at the same time her socializing and cooking functions within the domestic context show her to be a powerful agent of the cultural process, constantly transforming raw natural resources into cultural products. Belonging to culture, yet appearing to have stronger and more direct connections with nature, she is once again seen as situated between the two realms.

⁸ I remember having my first male teacher in the fifth grade, and I remember being excited about that—it was somehow more grown-up.

3. *Woman's psyche seen as closer to nature.* The suggestion that woman has not only a different body and a different social locus from man but also a different psychic structure is most controversial. I will argue that she probably *does* have a different psychic structure, but I will draw heavily on Chodorow's paper (this volume) to establish first that her psychic structure need not be assumed to be innate; it can be accounted for, as Chodorow convincingly shows, by the facts of the probably universal female socialization experience. Nonetheless, if we grant the empirical near universality of a "feminine psyche" with certain specific characteristics, these characteristics would add weight to the cultural view of woman as closer to nature.

It is important to specify what we see as the dominant and universal aspects of the feminine psyche. If we postulate emotionality or irrationality, we are confronted with those traditions in various parts of the world in which women functionally are, and are seen as, more practical, pragmatic, and this-worldly than men. One relevant dimension that does seem pan-culturally applicable is that of relative concreteness vs. relative abstractness: the feminine personality tends to be involved with concrete feelings, things, and people, rather than with abstract entities; it tends toward personalism and particularism. A second, closely related, dimension seems to be that of relative subjectivity vs. relative objectivity: Chodorow cites Carlson's study (1971), which concludes that "males represent experiences of self, others, space, and time in individualistic, objective, and distant ways, while females represent experiences in relatively interpersonal, subjective, immediate ways" (this volume, p. 56, quoting Carlson, p. 270). Although this and other studies were done in Western societies, Chodorow sees their findings on the differences between male and female personality—roughly, that men are more objective and inclined to relate in terms of relatively abstract categories, women more subjective and inclined to relate in terms of relatively concrete phenomena—as "general and nearly universal differences" (p. 43).

But the thrust of Chodorow's elegantly argued paper is that these differences are not innate or genetically programmed; they arise from nearly universal features of family structure, namely that "women, universally, are largely responsible for early child care and for (at least) later female socialization" (p. 43) and that "the structural situation of child rearing, reinforced by female and male role training, produces these differences, which are replicated and reproduced in the sexual sociology of adult life" (p. 44). Chodorow argues that, because mother is the early socializer of both boys and girls, both develop "personal identification" with her, i.e. diffuse identification with her general per-

sonality, behavior traits, values, and attitudes (p. 51). A son, however, must ultimately shift to a masculine role identity, which involves building an identification with the father. Since father is almost always more remote than mother (he is rarely involved in child care, and perhaps works away from home much of the day), building an identification with father involves a "positional identification," i.e. identification with father's male role as a collection of abstract elements, rather than a personal identification with father as a real individual (p. 49). Further, as the boy enters the larger social world, he finds it in fact organized around more abstract and universalistic criteria (see Rosaldo, this volume, pp. 28-29; Chodorow, p. 58), as I have indicated in the previous section; thus his earlier socialization prepares him for, and is reinforced by, the type of adult social experience he will have.

For a young girl, in contrast, the personal identification with mother, which was created in early infancy, can persist into the process of learning female role identity. Because mother is immediate and present when the daughter is learning role identity, learning to be a woman involves the continuity and development of a girl's relationship to her mother, and sustains the identification with her as an individual; it does not involve the learning of externally defined role characteristics (Chodorow, p. 51). This pattern prepares the girl for, and is fully reinforced by, her social situation in later life; she will become involved in the world of women, which is characterized by few formal role differences (Rosaldo, p. 29), and which involves again, in motherhood, "personal identification" with *her* children. And so the cycle begins anew.

Chodorow demonstrates to my satisfaction at least that the feminine personality, characterized by personalism and particularism, can be explained as having been generated by social-structural arrangements rather than by innate biological factors. The point need not be belabored further. But insofar as the "feminine personality" has been a nearly universal fact, it can be argued that its characteristics may have contributed further to the view of women as being somehow less cultural than men. That is, women would tend to enter into relationships with the world that culture might see as being more "like nature"—immanent and embedded in things as given—than "like culture"—transcending and transforming things through the superimposition of abstract categories and transpersonal values. Woman's relationships tend to be, like nature, relatively unmediated, more direct, whereas man not only tends to relate in a more mediated way, but in fact ultimately often relates more consistently and strongly to the mediating categories and forms than to the persons or objects themselves.

It is thus not difficult to see how the feminine personality would lend

weight to a view of women as being "closer to nature." Yet at the same time, the modes of relating characteristic of women undeniably play a powerful and important role in the cultural process. For just as relatively unmediated relating is in some sense at the lower end of the spectrum of human spiritual functions, embedded and particularizing rather than transcending and synthesizing, yet that mode of relating also stands at the upper end of that spectrum. Consider the mother-child relationship. Mothers tend to be committed to their children as individuals, regardless of sex, age, beauty, clan affiliation, or other categories in which the child might participate. Now any relationship with this quality—not just mother and child but any sort of highly personal, relatively unmediated commitment—may be seen as a challenge to culture and society "from below," insofar as it represents the fragmentary potential of individual loyalties vis-à-vis the solidarity of the group. But it may also be seen as embodying the synthesizing agent for culture and society "from above," in that it represents generalized human values above and beyond loyalties to particular social categories. Every society must have social categories that transcend personal loyalties, but every society must also generate a sense of ultimate moral unity for all its members above and beyond those social categories. Thus that psychic mode seemingly typical of women, which tends to disregard categories and to seek "communion" (Chodorow, p. 55, following Bakan, 1966) directly and personally with others, although it may appear infracultural from one point of view, is at the same time associated with the highest levels of the cultural process.

The Implications of Intermediacy

My primary purpose in this paper has been to attempt to explain the universal secondary status of women. Intellectually and personally, I felt strongly challenged by this problem; I felt compelled to deal with it before undertaking an analysis of woman's position in any particular society. Local variables of economy, ecology, history, political and social structure, values, and world view—these could explain variations within this universal, but they could not explain the universal itself. And if we were not to accept the ideology of biological determinism, then explanation, it seemed to me, could only proceed by reference to other universals of the human cultural situation. Thus the general outlines of the approach—although not, of course the particular solution offered—were determined by the problem itself, and not by any predilection on my part for global abstract structural analysis.

I argued that the universal devaluation of women could be explained by postulating that women are seen as closer to nature than men, men

being seen as more unequivocally occupying the high ground of culture. The culture/nature distinction is itself a product of culture, culture being minimally defined as the transcendence, by means of systems of thought and technology, of the natural givens of existence. This of course is an analytic definition, but I argued that at some level every culture incorporates this notion in one form or other, if only through the performance of ritual as an assertion of the human ability to manipulate those givens. In any case, the core of the paper was concerned with showing why women might tend to be assumed, over and over, in the most diverse sorts of world views and in cultures of every degree of complexity, to be closer to nature than men. Woman's physiology, more involved more of the time with "species of life"; woman's association with the structurally subordinate domestic context, charged with the crucial function of transforming animal-like infants into cultured beings; "woman's psyche," appropriately molded to mothering functions by her own socialization and tending toward greater personalism and less mediated modes of relating—all these factors make woman appear to be rooted more directly and deeply in nature. At the same time, however, her "membership" and fully necessary participation in culture are recognized by culture and cannot be denied. Thus she is seen to occupy an intermediate position between culture and nature.

This intermediacy has several implications for analysis, depending upon how it is interpreted. First, of course, it answers my primary question of why woman is everywhere seen as lower than man, for even if she is not seen as nature pure and simple, she is still seen as achieving less transcendence of nature than man. Here intermediate simply means "middle status" on a hierarchy of being from culture to nature.

Second, intermediate may have the significance of "mediating," i.e. performing some sort of synthesizing or converting function between nature and culture, here seen (by culture) not as two ends of a continuum but as two radically different sorts of processes in the world. The domestic unit—and hence woman, who in virtually every case appears as its primary representative—is one of culture's crucial agencies for the conversion of nature into culture, especially with reference to the socialization of children. Any culture's continued viability depends upon properly socialized individuals who will see the world in that culture's terms and adhere more or less unquestioningly to its moral precepts. The functions of the domestic unit must be closely controlled in order to ensure this outcome; the stability of the domestic unit as an institution must be placed as far as possible beyond question. (We see some aspects of the protection of the integrity and stability of the

domestic group in the powerful taboos against incest, matricide, patricide, and fratricide.⁹) Insofar as woman is universally the primary agent of early socialization and is seen as virtually the embodiment of the functions of the domestic group, she will tend to come under the heavier restrictions and circumscriptions surrounding that unit. Her (culturally defined) intermediate position between nature and culture, here having the significance of her *mediation* (i.e. performing conversion functions) between nature and culture, would thus account not only for her lower status but for the greater restrictions placed upon her activities. In virtually every culture her permissible sexual activities are more closely circumscribed than man's, she is offered a much smaller range of role choices, and she is afforded direct access to a far more limited range of its social institutions. Further, she is almost universally socialized to have a narrower and generally more conservative set of attitudes and views than man, and the limited social contexts of her adult life reinforce this situation. This socially engendered conservatism and traditionalism of woman's thinking is another—perhaps the worst, certainly the most insidious—mode of social restriction, and would clearly be related to her traditional function of producing well-socialized members of the group.

Finally, woman's intermediate position may have the implication of greater symbolic ambiguity (see also Rosaldo, this volume). Shifting our image of the culture/nature relationship once again, we may envision culture in this case as a small clearing within the forest of the larger natural system. From this point of view, that which is intermediate between culture and nature is located on the continuous periphery of culture's clearing; and though it may thus appear to stand both above and below (and beside) culture, it is simply outside and around it. We can begin to understand then how a single system of cultural thought can often assign to woman completely polarized and apparently contradictory meanings, since extremes, as we say, meet. That she often represents both life and death is only the simplest example one could mention.

For another perspective on the same point, it will be recalled that the psychic mode associated with women seems to stand at both the bottom and the top of the scale of human modes of relating. The tendency in that mode is to get involved more directly with people as individuals and not as representatives of one social category or another; this mode can be seen as either "ignoring" (and thus subverting) or "transcending"

⁹ Nobody seems to care much about sororicide—a point that ought to be investigated.

(and thus achieving a higher synthesis of) those social categories, depending upon the cultural view for any given purpose. Thus we can account easily for both the subversive feminine symbols (witches, evil eye, menstrual pollution, castrating mothers) and the feminine symbols of transcendence (mother goddesses, merciful dispensers of salvation, female symbols of justice, and the strong presence of feminine symbolism in the realms of art, religion, ritual, and law). Feminine symbolism, far more often than masculine symbolism, manifests this propensity toward polarized ambiguity—sometimes utterly exalted, sometimes utterly debased, rarely within the normal range of human possibilities.

If woman's (culturally viewed) intermediacy between culture and nature has this implication of generalized ambiguity of meaning characteristic of marginal phenomena, then we are also in a better position to account for those cultural and historical "inversions" in which women are in some way or other symbolically aligned with culture and men with nature. A number of cases come to mind: the Sirionó of Brazil, among whom, according to Ingham (1971: 1098), "nature, the raw, and maleness" are opposed to "culture, the cooked, and femaleness";¹⁰ Nazi Germany, in which women were said to be the guardians of culture and morals; European courtly love, in which man considered himself the beast and woman the pristine exalted object—a pattern of thinking that persists, for example, among modern Spanish peasants (see Pitt-Rivers, 1961; Rosaldo, this volume). And there are no doubt other cases of this sort, including some aspects of our own culture's view of women. Each such instance of an alignment of women with culture rather than nature requires detailed analysis of specific historical and ethnographic data. But in indicating how nature in general, and the feminine mode of interpersonal relations in particular, can appear from certain points of view to stand both under and over (but really simply outside of) the sphere of culture's hegemony, we have at least laid the groundwork for such analyses.

In short, the postulate that woman is viewed as closer to nature than man has several implications for further analysis, and can be interpreted in several different ways. If it is viewed simply as a *middle* position on a scale from culture down to nature, then it is still seen as lower than culture and thus accounts for the pan-cultural assumption that woman is lower than man in the order of things. If it is read as a *mediating*

¹⁰ Ingham's discussion is rather ambiguous itself, since women are also associated with animals: "The contrasts man/animal and man/woman are evidently similar... hunting is the means of acquiring women as well as animals" (p. 1095). A careful reading of the data suggests that both women and animals are mediators between nature and culture in this tradition.

element in the culture-nature relationship, then it may account in part for the cultural tendency not merely to devalue woman but to circumscribe and restrict her functions, since culture must maintain control over its (pragmatic and symbolic) mechanisms for the conversion of nature into culture. And if it is read as an *ambiguous* status between culture and nature, it may help account for the fact that, in specific cultural ideologies and symbolizations, woman can occasionally be aligned with culture, and in any event is often assigned polarized and contradictory meanings within a single symbolic system. Middle status, mediating functions, ambiguous meaning—all are different readings, for different contextual purposes, of woman's being seen as intermediate between nature and culture.

Conclusions

Ultimately, it must be stressed again that the whole scheme is a construct of culture rather than a fact of nature. Woman is not "in reality" any closer to (or further from) nature than man—both have consciousness, both are mortal. But there are certainly reasons why she appears that way, which is what I have tried to show in this paper. The result is a (sadly) efficient feedback system: various aspects of woman's situation (physical, social, psychological) contribute to her being seen as closer to nature, while the view of her as closer to nature is in turn embodied in institutional forms that reproduce her situation. The implications for social change are similarly circular: a different cultural view can only grow out of a different social actuality; a different social actuality can only grow out of a different cultural view.

It is clear, then, that the situation must be attacked from both sides. Efforts directed solely at changing the social institutions—through setting quotas on hiring, for example, or through passing equal-pay-for-equal-work laws—cannot have far-reaching effects if cultural language and imagery continue to purvey a relatively devalued view of women. But at the same time efforts directed solely at changing cultural assumptions—through male and female consciousness-raising groups, for example, or through revision of educational materials and mass-media imagery—cannot be successful unless the institutional base of the society is changed to support and reinforce the changed cultural view. Ultimately, both men and women can and must be equally involved in projects of creativity and transcendence. Only then will women be seen as aligned with culture, in culture's ongoing dialectic with nature.

References Cited

Rosaldo and Lamphere: Introduction

- Ardener, Edwin. 1971. "Belief and the Problem of Women," in J. S. La Fontaine, ed., *The Interpretation of Ritual, Essays in Honour of A. I. Richards*. London.
- Bachofen, J. J. 1861. *Das Mutterrecht*. Stuttgart.
- Bailey, F. G. 1969. *Stratagems and Spoils*. New York.
- Bardwick, Judith M. 1971. *The Psychology of Women: A Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts*. New York.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1959. *Political Leadership Among Swat Pathans*. London School of Economics, Monograph 19.
- Chiñas, Beverly L. 1973. *The Isthmus Zapotecs: Women's Roles in Cultural Context*. New York.
- Davis, Elizabeth Gould. 1972. *The First Sex*. Baltimore.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. 1953. *The Second Sex*. New York. Originally published in French in 1949.
- Ferne, Elizabeth Warnock. 1965. *Guests of the Sheik: An Ethnography of an Iraqi Village*. Garden City, N.Y.
- Firth, Raymond. 1962. *Essays in Social Organization and Values*. London School of Economics, Monograph 28.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1962. "The Growth of Culture and the Evolution of Mind," in J. Scher, ed., *Theories of Mind*. New York.
- Goodale, Jane C. 1971. *Tiwi Wives*. Seattle.
- Hutt, Corinne. 1972. *Males and Females*. Middlesex, Eng.
- Kaberry, Phyllis M. 1939. *Aboriginal Women, Sacred and Profane*. London.
- . 1952. *Women of the Grassfields*. London.
- Kreuz, Leo, Robert Rose, and J. Richard Jennings. 1972. "Psychological Stress Results in Suppression of Androgen Activity," *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 26: 479-82.
- Landes, Ruth. 1938. *The Ojibwa Woman. Part I: Youth*. New York: Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology, vol. 31.
- . 1947. *The City of Women: Negro Women Cult Leaders of Bahia, Brazil*. New York.
- Leach, Edmund. 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. Boston.
- Leacock, Eleanor B. 1972. "Introduction" to *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, by F. Engels. New York.

- Leith-Ross, Sylvia. 1965. *African Women*. New York.
- Linton, Sally. 1973. "Woman the Gatherer: Male Bias in Anthropology," in Sue-Ellen Jacobs, *Women in Perspective: A Guide for Cross-Cultural Studies*. Urbana, Ill.
- Maccoby, Eleanor, ed. 1966. *The Development of Sex Differences*. Stanford, Calif.
- Maccoby, Eleanor, and Carol N. Jacklin. 1974. *The Psychology of Sex Differences*. Stanford, Calif., forthcoming.
- Money, John, and Anke A. Ehrhardt. 1972. *Man and Woman, Boy and Girl*. Baltimore.
- Morgan, Elaine. 1972. *The Descent of Woman*. New York.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1851. *League of the Hodenosaunee, Iroquois*. Rochester, N.Y.
- . 1877. *Ancient Society*. New York.
- Paulme, Denise, ed. 1963. *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Rowell, Thelma. 1972. *The Social Behavior of Monkeys*. Middlesex, Eng.
- Schlegel, Alice. 1972. *Male Dominance and Female Autonomy: Domestic Authority in Matrilineal Societies*. New Haven.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1972. *Women in Between: Female Roles in a Male World: Mount Hagen, New Guinea*. New York.
- Sweet, Louise. 1967. "Appearance and Reality: Status and Roles of Women in Mediterranean Societies," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 40 (entire issue).
- Tanner, Nancy, and Adrienne Zihlman. n.d. "Becoming Human: A Model for the Reconstruction of Early Human Social Life." Unpublished manuscript.
- Washburn, Sherwood L., and C. S. Lancaster. 1968. "The Evolution of Hunting," in Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., *Man the Hunter*. Chicago.
- Webster, Paula, and Esther Newton. 1972. "Matriarchy: Puzzle and Paradigm." Paper presented at the 71st Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Toronto.
- Wolf, Margery. 1972. *Women and the Family in Rural Taiwan*. Stanford, Calif.

Rosaldo: A Theoretical Overview

- Bachofen, J. J. 1967. *Myth, Religion and Mother Right*. Selected Writings. Ralph Mannheim, trans. Bollingen Series, 84. Princeton, N.J.
- Bardwick, Judith M. 1971. *Psychology of Women: A Study of Bio-Cultural Conflicts*. New York.
- Barry, Herbert, M. K. Bacon, and I. L. Child. 1957. "A Cross-Cultural Survey of Some Sex Differences in Socialization," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55: 327-32.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1958. *Naven*. Stanford, Calif.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. 1954. *Symbolic Wounds: Puberty Rites and the Envious Male*. New York.
- Bloch, Maurice. 1971. *Placing the Dead*. London.
- Brown, Judith K. 1970a. "Economic Organization and the Position of Women Among the Iroquois," *Ethnohistory*, 17 (3-4): 151-67.
- . 1970b. "A Note on the Division of Labor by Sex," *American Anthropologist*, 72: 1073-78.
- Campbell, J. K. 1964. *Honor, Family and Patronage*. Oxford.
- Cancian, Francesca. n.d. *What Are Norms?* Chicago. Forthcoming.

- Chodorow, Nancy. 1971. "Being and Doing," in Vivian Gornick and B. K. Moran, eds., *Women in Sexist Society*. New York.
- Collier, Jane F. 1973. *Law and Social Change in Zinacantan*. Stanford, Calif.
- Davis, Elizabeth Gould. 1972. *The First Sex*. Baltimore.
- Deacon, A. Bernard. 1934. *Malekula: A Vanishing People*. London.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. 1953. *The Second Sex*. New York. Originally published in French in 1949.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger*. New York.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1964. *The Division of Labor in Society*, trans. George Simpson. New York. Originally published in French in 1911.
- Ellman, Mary. 1968. *Thinking About Women*. New York.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1891. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, 4th ed. Moscow.
- Felstiner, Mary. 1973. Personal communication.
- Ferne, Elizabeth. 1965. *Guests of the Sheikh: An Ethnography of an Iraqi Village*. Garden City, N.Y.
- Fortune, Rio. 1932. *Sorcerers of Dobu*. London.
- Harper, E. B. 1969. "Fear and the Status of Women," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 25: 81-95.
- Hogbin, Ian. 1970. *The Island of Menstruating Men*. Scranton, Pa.
- Kaberry, Phyllis. 1939. *Aboriginal Women, Sacred and Profane*. London.
- Keenan, Elinor. 1974. "Norm-Makers, Norm-Breakers: Uses of Speech by Men and Women in a Malagasy Community," in R. Bauman and J. Sherzer, eds., *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. Cambridge, Eng. (In press.)
- Krige, E. Jenson, and J. D. Krige. 1943. *The Realm of a Rain Queen*. London.
- Landes, Ruth. 1971. *The Ojibwa Woman*. New York.
- Lebeuf, Annie. 1963. "The Role of Women in the Political Organization of African Societies," in Denise Paulme, ed., *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif. Originally published in French in 1960.
- Lee, Richard B. 1968. "What Hunters Do for a Living, or How to Make Out on Scarce Resources," in Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., *Man the Hunter*, pp. 30-48. Chicago.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1949. *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*. Paris.
- Lewin, Ellen, J. Collier, M. Rosaldo, and J. Fjellman. 1971. "Power Strategies and Sex Roles." Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. New York.
- Lewis, I. M. 1971. *Ecstatic Religion*. London.
- Liebow, Elliot. 1967. *Tally's Corner*. Boston.
- Linton, Sally. 1973. "Woman the Gatherer: Male Bias in Anthropology," in Sue-Ellen Jacobs, *Women in Perspective: A Guide for Cross-Cultural Studies*. Urbana, Ill.
- Little, Kenneth. 1951. *The Mende of Sierra Leone—A West African People in Transition*. London.
- Lloyd, P. C. 1965. "The Yoruba of Nigeria," in James L. Gibbs, ed., *Peoples of Africa*, pp. 547-82. New York.
- Mead, Margaret. 1935. *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*. London.
- . 1949. *Male and Female*. New York.
- . 1971. *The Mountain Arapesh*. New York. Originally published in 1938.

- Meggitt, M. J. 1964. "Male-Female Relationships in the Highlands of Australian New Guinea," *American Anthropologist*, 66 (4, part II): 204-24.
- . 1965. "The Mae Enga of the Western Highlands," in Lawrence P. and M. J. Meggitt, eds., *Gods, Ghosts and Men in Melanesia*. Oxford.
- Murdock, George P. 1934. *Our Primitive Contemporaries*. New York.
- Murphy, Robert. 1959. "Social Structure and Sex Antagonism," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 15.
- . 1964. "Social Distance and the Weil," *American Anthropologist*, 66: 1257-74.
- Nadel, S. F. 1952. "Witchcraft in Four Societies: An Essay in Comparison," *American Anthropologist*, 54.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1964. *Social Structure and Personality*. New York.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Edward Shils, eds. 1951. *Toward a General Theory of Social Action*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Paulme, Denise. 1963. "Introduction," in Denise Paulme, ed., *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif. Originally published in French in 1960.
- Schneider, David. 1968. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Shapiro, Judith. 1970. "Yamomamo Women: How the Other Half Lives." Paper presented at the 69th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Diego.
- Simmel, Georg. 1955. *Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations*, trans. Kurt Wolff and Reinhard Bendix. New York. Originally published in German in 1922-23.
- Smith, Michael G. 1960. *Government in Zazau*. London.
- Tiger, Lionel. 1969. *Men in Groups*. New York.
- Turnbull, Colin. 1961. *The Forest People*. New York.
- Weber, Max. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. and ed. Talcott Parsons. New York.
- Wolf, Margery. 1972. *Women and the Family in Rural Taiwan*. Stanford, Calif.
- Zborowski, Mary, and Elizabeth Herzog. 1955. *Life Is with People*. New York.
- Zelditch, Morris. 1955. "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family," in T. Parsons and R. Bales, eds., *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, pp. 307-52. New York.
- . 1964. "Cross-Cultural Analysis of Family Structure," in H. T. Christensen, ed., *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, pp. 462-500. Chicago.
- Chodorow: Family Structure and Feminine Personality*
- Ariès, Philippe. 1962. *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. New York.
- Bakan, David. 1966. *The Duality of Human Existence: Isolation and Communion in Western Man*. Boston.
- . 1968. *Disease, Pain, and Sacrifice: Toward a Psychology of Suffering*. Boston.
- Balint, Alice. 1954. *The Early Years of Life: A Psychoanalytic Study*. New York.
- Barry, Herbert, M. K. Bacon, and I. L. Child. 1957. "A Cross-Cultural Survey of Some Sex Differences in Socialization," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55: 327-32.

- Bettelheim, Bruno. 1954. *Symbolic Wounds: Puberty Rites and the Envious Male*. New York.
- Bibring, Grete. 1953. "On the 'Passing of the Oedipus Complex' in a Matriarchal Family Setting," in Rudolph M. Lowenstein, ed., *Drives, Affects and Behavior: Essays in Honor of Marie Bonaparte*. New York, pp. 278-84.
- Brunswick, Ruth Mack. 1940. "The Preoedipal Phase of the Libido Development," in Robert Fliess, ed., pp. 231-53.
- Burton, Roger V., and John W. M. Whiting. 1961. "The Absent Father and Cross-Sex Identity," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, 7, no. 2: 85-95.
- Carlson, Rae. 1971. "Sex Differences in Ego Functioning: Exploratory Studies of Agency and Communion," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 37: 267-77.
- Chodorow, Nancy. 1971. "Being and Doing. A Cross-Cultural Examination of the Socialization of Males and Females," in Vivian Gornick and B. K. Moran, eds., *Woman in Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness*. New York.
- Cohen, Rosalie A. 1969. "Conceptual Styles, Culture Conflict, and Nonverbal Tests of Intelligence," *American Anthropologist*, 71: 828-56.
- Deutsch, Helene. 1925. "The Psychology of Woman in Relation to the Functions of Reproduction," in Robert Fliess, ed., pp. 165-79.
- . 1930. "The Significance of Masochism in the Mental Life of Women," in Robert Fliess, ed., pp. 195-207.
- . 1932. "On Female Homosexuality," in Robert Fliess, ed., pp. 208-30.
- . 1944, 1945. *Psychology of Women*, Vols. I, II. New York.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1897. *Suicide*. New York, 1968.
- Erikson, Erik H. 1964. *Insight and Responsibility*. New York.
- . 1965. "Womanhood and the Inner Space," in Robert Jay Lifton, ed., *The Woman in America*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Fairbairn, W. Ronald D. 1952. *An Object-Relations Theory of the Personality*. New York.
- Fliess, Robert. 1948. "Female and Preoedipal Sexuality: A Historical Survey," in Robert Fliess, ed., pp. 159-64.
- . 1961. *Ego and Body Ego: Contributions to Their Psychoanalytic Psychology*. New York, 1970.
- Fliess, Robert, ed. 1969. *The Psychoanalytic Reader: An Anthology of Essential Papers with Critical Introductions*. New York. Originally published in 1948.
- Freedman, David. 1961. "On Women Who Hate Their Husbands," in Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek, ed., pp. 221-37.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1925. "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes," in James Strachey, ed., *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XIX. London, pp. 248-58.
- . 1931. "Female Sexuality," in Ruitenbeek, ed., pp. 88-105.
- . 1933. "Femininity," in *New Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis*. New York, 1961, pp. 112-35.
- Geertz, Hildred. 1961. *The Javanese Family: A Study of Kinship and Socialization*. New York.

- Guntrip, Harry. 1961. *Personality Structure and Human Interaction: The Developing Synthesis of Psycho-Dynamic Theory*. New York.
- Gutmann, David. 1965. "Women and the Conception of Ego Strength," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, 2: 229-40.
- Harper, Edward B. 1969. "Fear and the Status of Women," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 25: 81-95.
- Jay, Robert R. 1969. *Javanese Villagers: Social Relations in Rural Modjokuto*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Jones, Ernest. 1927. "The Early Development of Female Sexuality," in Ruitenbeek, ed., pp. 21-35.
- Klein, Melanie, and Joan Rivière. 1937. *Love, Hate and Reparation*. New York, 1964.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1966. "A Cognitive-Developmental Analysis of Children's Sex-Role Concepts and Attitudes," in Eleanor E. Maccoby, ed., *The Development of Sex Differences*. Stanford, Calif., pp. 82-173.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. 1962. *Blue-Collar Marriage*. New York, 1967.
- Lampl-de Groot, J. 1927. "The Evolution of the Oedipus Complex in Women," in Robert Fliess, ed., pp. 180-94.
- LeVine, Robert A. 1971a. "The Psychoanalytic Study of Lives in Natural Social Settings," *Human Development*, 14: 100-109.
- . 1971b. "Re-thinking Psychoanalytic Anthropology." Paper presented at the Institute on Psychoanalytic Anthropology, 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New York.
- Mead, Margaret. 1935. *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*. New York, 1963.
- . 1949. *Male and Female: A Study of Sexes in a Changing World*. New York, 1968.
- Millman, Marcia. 1972. "Tragedy and Exchange: Metaphoric Understandings of Interpersonal Relationships." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Brandeis University.
- Minturn, Leigh, and John T. Hitchcock. 1963. "The Rajputs of Khalapur, India," in Beatrice B. Whiting, ed., *Six Cultures: Studies in Child Rearing*. New York.
- Mitscherlich, Alexander. 1963. *Society Without the Father*. New York, 1970.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1964. *Social Structure and Personality*. New York.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Robert F. Bales. 1955. *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*. New York.
- Ruitenbeek, Hendrik M., ed. 1966. *Psychoanalysis and Female Sexuality*. New Haven.
- Siegel, James T. 1969. *The Rope of God*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Slater, Philip E. 1961. "Toward a Dualistic Theory of Identification," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development*, 7: 113-26.
- . 1968. *The Glory of Hera: Greek Mythology and the Greek Family*. Boston.
- . 1970. *The Pursuit of Loneliness: American Culture at the Breaking Point*. Boston.
- Tanner, Nancy. 1971. "Matrifocality in Indonesia and Among Black Americans." Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New York.

- Tax, Meredith. 1970. *Woman and Her Mind: The Story of Daily Life*. Boston.
- Thompson, Clara. 1943. "'Penis Envy' in Women," in Ruitenbeek, ed., pp. 246-51.
- Whiting, John W. M. 1959. "Sorcery, Sin, and the Superego: A Cross-Cultural Study of Some Mechanisms of Social Control," in Clellan S. Ford, ed., *Cross-Cultural Approaches: Readings in Comparative Research*. New Haven, 1967, pp. 147-68.
- Whiting, John W. M., Richard Kluckhohn, and Albert Anthony. 1958. "The Function of Male Initiation Rites at Puberty," in Eleanor E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, eds., *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York, pp. 359-70.
- Winch, Robert F. 1962. *Identification and Its Familial Determinants*. New York.
- Young, Michael, and Peter Willmott. 1957. *Family and Kinship in East London*. London, 1966.

Ortner: Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?

- Bakan, David. 1966. *The Duality of Human Existence*. Boston.
- Carlson, Rae. 1971. "Sex Differences in Ego Functioning: Exploratory Studies of Agency and Communion," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 37: 267-77.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. 1953. *The Second Sex*. New York. Originally published in French in 1949.
- Ingham, John M. 1971. "Are the Sirionó Raw or Cooked?" *American Anthropologist*, 73: 1092-99.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969a. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Trans. J. H. Bell and J. R. von Sturmer; ed. R. Needham. Boston.
- . 1969b. *The Raw and the Cooked*. Trans. J. and D. Weightman. New York.
- Lowie, Robert. 1956. *The Crow Indians*. New York. Originally published in 1935.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1973. "Sherpa Purity," *American Anthropologist*, 75: 49-63.
- . n.d. "Purification Beliefs and Practices," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, forthcoming.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian. 1961. *People of the Sierra*. Chicago.
- Siu, R. G. H. 1968. *The Man of Many Qualities*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Ullman, Stephen. 1963. "Semantic Universals," in Joseph H. Greenberg, ed., *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.

Collier: Women in Politics

- Bailey, Frederick G. 1969. *Stratagems and Spoils*. New York.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1959. *Political Leadership Among Swat Pathans*. London School of Economics, Monograph 19.
- . 1966. *Models of Social Organization*. Royal Anthropological Institute, Occasional Papers 23.
- Buchler, Ira, and Hugu Nutini, eds. 1970. *Game Theory in the Behavioral Sciences*. Pittsburgh, Pa.
- Campbell, John K. 1964. *Honour, Family and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. London.

- Clark, Terry N. 1968. "The Concept of Power," in T. Clark, ed., *Community Structure and Decision-Making: Comparative Analyses*. San Francisco.
- Cohen, Ronald. 1971. *Dominance and Defiance, a Study of Marital Instability in an Islamic Society*. Anthropological Studies No. 6, American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Collier, Jane F. 1973. *Law and Social Change in Zinacantan*. Stanford, California.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1968. "On the Origin of Inequality among Men," in R. Dahrendorf, *Essays in the Theory of Society*. Stanford, California.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1963. *The Position of Women in Primitive Societies and Other Essays in Social Anthropology*. New York.
- Fallers, Lloyd A. 1969. *Law Without Precedent: Legal Ideas in Action in the Courts of Colonial Busoga*. Chicago.
- Firth, Raymond. 1951. *Elements of Social Organization*. London.
- Fox, Robin. 1967. *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective*. Baltimore.
- Gibbs, James L., Jr. 1963. "Marital Instability among the Kpelle: Towards a Theory of Epainogamy," *American Anthropologist*, 65: 552-73.
- Gluckman, Max. 1965. *Politics, Law and Ritual in Tribal Society*. Chicago.
- Gough, Kathleen. 1971. "Nuer Kinship: A Re-examination," in T. O. Beidelman, ed., *The Translation of Culture*. London.
- Michaelson, Evalyn Jacobson, and Walter Goldschmidt. 1971. "Female Roles and Male Dominance Among Peasants," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 27: 330-53.
- Runciman, W. G. 1968. "Class, Status and Power" in J. A. Jackson, ed., *Social Stratification*. London.
- Schneider, David. 1961. Introductory essay in D. M. Schneider and Kathleen Gough, eds., *Matrilineal Kinship*. Berkeley, California.
- Turner, Victor. 1957. *Schism and Continuity in an African Society: A Study of Ndembu Village Life*. Manchester, Eng.
- Whitten, Norman E., Jr., and Dorothea S. Whitten. 1972. "Social Strategies and Social Relationships," *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 1973.
- Wolf, Margery. 1972. *Women and the Family in Rural Taiwan*. Stanford, California.

Lamphere: Women in Domestic Groups

- Aberle, D. F. 1961. "The Navaho," in David Schneider and Kathleen Gough, eds., *Matrilineal Kinship*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Bailey, F. G. 1969. *Stratagems and Spoils*. New York.
- Barth, Fredrik. 1959. *Political Leadership Among Swat Pathans*. London School of Economics, Monograph 19.
- Billingsley, Andrew. 1968. *Black Families in White America*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Bott, Elizabeth, ed. 1968. *Family and Social Network*. London.
- Briggs, Jean. 1970. *Never in Anger*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Clignet, Remi. 1970. *Many Wives, Many Powers*. Evanston, Ill.
- Cohen, Ronald. 1971. *Dominance and Defiance, a Study of Marital Instability in an Islamic Society*. Anthropological Studies no. 6, American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C.

- Damas, D. 1968. "The Diversity of Eskimo Societies," in Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., *Man the Hunter*. Chicago.
- Fortes, Meyer, ed. 1949. *Social Structure: Studies Presented to A. R. Radcliffe-Brown*. New York.
- . 1950. "Kinship and Marriage Among the Ashanti," in A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Daryll Forde, eds., *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*. New York.
- Fortes, Meyer, and E. E. Evans-Pritchard, eds. 1940. *African Political Systems*. New York.
- Friedl, Ernestine. 1967. "The Position of Women: Appearance and Reality," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 40: 97-108.
- Gluckman, Max. 1950. "Kinship and Marriage Among the Lozi of Northern Rhodesia and the Zulu of Natal," in A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Daryll Forde, eds., *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*. New York.
- Goldschmidt, Walter, and Evalyn Jacobson Kunkel. 1971. "The Structure of the Peasant Family," *American Anthropologist*, 73: 1058-76.
- Goody, J., ed. 1958. *The Developmental Cycle of Domestic Groups*. Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology no. 1. London.
- Hoebel, E. A. 1954. *The Law of Primitive Man*. New York.
- Ladner, Joyce. 1971. *Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman*. New York.
- Ladner, Joyce, ed. 1973. *The Death of White Sociology*. New York.
- Lamphere, Louise. 1971. "The Navajo Cultural System: An Analysis of Concepts of Cooperation and Autonomy and Their Relation to Gossip and Witchcraft," in Keith Basso and Morris Opler, eds., *Apachean Culture History and Ethnology*. Tucson, Ariz.
- . 1974. *To Run After Them: Cultural and Social Bases of Cooperation in a Navajo Community*. Tucson, Ariz., forthcoming.
- Leach, Edmund. 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. Reprinted Boston, 1964.
- . 1955. "Polyandry, Inheritance, and the Definition of Marriage," *Man* 55: 182-86.
- Lee, Richard. 1968. "What Hunters Do for a Living or How to Make Out on Scarce Resources," in Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., *Man the Hunter*. Chicago.
- . 1972. "IKung Spatial Organization: An Ecological and Historical Perspective," *Human Ecology*, 1, no. 2: 125-47.
- Liebow, Elliot. 1967. *Tally's Corner*. Boston.
- Marshall, Gloria. 1964. "Women, Trade, and the Yoruba Family." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.
- Marshall, Lorna. 1959. "Marriage among the !Kung Bushman," *Africa*, 29, no. 4: 335-65.
- . 1960. "IKung Bushman Bands," *Africa*, 30, no. 4: 325-54. Reprinted in R. Cohen and J. Middleton, eds., *Comparative Political Systems*. New York.
- Michaelson, Evalyn Jacobson, and Walter Goldschmidt. 1971. "Female Roles and Male Dominance Among Peasants," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 27: 330-52.
- Minturn, Leigh, and John T. Hitchcock. 1966. *The Rajputs of Khalapur, India*. Six Cultures Series, Vol. III. New York.

- Parsons, Talcott. 1963a. "On the Concept of Power," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 107: 232-62.
- . 1963b. "On the Concept of Influence," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 27: 37-62.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1950. "Introduction," in A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Daryll Forde, eds., *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*. New York.
- Rainwater, Lee, and William Yancey, eds. 1967. *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Schneider, David, and Kathleen Gough. 1961. *Matrilineal Kinship*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Spencer, Robert F., Jesse D. Jennings, et al. 1965. *The Native Americans*. New York.
- Stack, Carol. 1972. "Kindred and Exchange Networks in a Black Community." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Tiger, Lionel. 1969. *Men in Groups*. New York.
- Weber, Max. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Trans. by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York.
- Witherspoon, Gary. 1970. "A New Look at Navajo Social Organization," *American Anthropologist*, 70: 55-65.
- Wolf, Margery. 1968. *The House of Lim*. New York.
- . 1972. *Women and the Family in Rural Taiwan*. Stanford, Calif.
- Young, Michael, and Peter Willmott. 1957. *Family and Kinship in East London*. London.

Stack: Sex Roles and Survival Strategies

- Abrahams, Roger. 1963. *Deep Down in the Jungle*. Hatboro, Pa.
- Bernard, Jessie. 1966. *Marriage and Family Among Negroes*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Buchler, Ira R., and Henry A. Selby. 1968. *Kinship and Social Organization: An Introduction to Theory and Method*. New York.
- Fortes, Meyer. 1958. "Introduction," in Jack Goody, ed., *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups*. Cambridge, Eng.
- Gonzalez, Nancie. 1965. "The Consanguineal Household and Matrilocality," *American Anthropologist*, 67: 1541-49.
- . 1969. *Black Carib Household Structure: A Study of Migration and Modernization*. Seattle.
- . 1970. "Toward a Definition of Matrilocality," in N. E. Whitten and J. F. Szwed, eds., *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*. New York.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1969. *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York.
- Ladner, Joyce. 1971. *Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman*. Garden City, N.Y.
- Liebow, Elliot. 1967. *Tally's Corner*. Boston.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. Prepared for the Office of Policy Planning and Research of the Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
- Otterbein, Keith F. 1970. "The Developmental Cycle of the Andros Household: A Diachronic Analysis," *American Anthropologist*, 72: 1412-19.

- Rainwater, Lee. 1966. "Crucible of Identity: The Negro Lower-Class Family," *Daedalus*, 95 (2): 172-216.
- Smith, Raymond. 1970. "The Nuclear Family in Afro-American Kinship," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 1 (1): 55-70.
- Stack, Carol B. 1970. "The Kindred of Viola Jackson: Residence and Family Organization of an Urban Black American Family," in N. E. Whitten and J. F. Szwed, eds., *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*. New York.
- . 1972. "Black Kindreds: Parenthood and Personal Kindreds Among Blacks Supported by Welfare," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 3 (2): 194-206.
- . 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York.
- Valentine, Charles. 1970. "Blackston: Progress Report on a Community Study in Urban Afro-America." Mimeo. Washington University, St. Louis.

Tanner: Matrilocality

- Bell, Carol. 1971. "A Re-evaluation of the Matrilocality Family in Latin America and the Caribbean." Unpublished manuscript.
- Dewey, Alice. 1962. *Peasant Marketing in Java*. New York.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1973. "Black and Female: The Double Whammy," *Psychology Today*, August.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1963. *Agricultural Involvement: The Processes of Ecological Change in Indonesia*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Geertz, Hildred. 1961. *The Javanese Family: A Study of Kinship and Socialization*. New York.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel P. Moynihan. 1963. *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Gonzalez, Nancie L. 1969. *Black Carib Household Structure: A Study of Migration and Modernization*. Seattle.
- . 1970. "Toward a Definition of Matrilocality," in Norman E. Whitten, Jr., and John F. Szwed, eds., *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*. New York.
- Green, M. M. 1947. *Ibo Village Affairs*. New York.
- Henderson, Helen. 1969. "Ritual Roles of Women in Onitsha Ibo Society." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Henderson, Richard N. 1967. "Onitsha Ibo Kinship Terminology: A Formal Analysis and Its Functional Applications," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 23: 15-51.
- . 1972. *The King in Every Man: Evolutionary Trends in Onitsha Ibo Society and Culture*. New Haven.
- Herskovits, Melville J. 1941. *The Myth of the Negro Past*. New York.
- . 1967. *Dahomey, An Ancient West African Kingdom*. 2 vols. (Originally published in 1938.) Evanston, Ill.
- Iljas Pajakumbuh. n.d. *Hikajat si Umbuk Mudo dengan Puti Galang Banjak*. C.V. Pustaka Indonesia. Bukittinggi.
- Jack, Lenus, Jr. 1973. "Kinship and Residential Propinquity: A Study of the Black Extended Family in New Orleans." IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Chicago.

- Johns, Anthony H., ed. and trans. 1958. *Rantjak di Labueh: A Minangkabau Kaba*. Cornell Modern Indonesia Project. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Kunstadter, Peter. 1963. "A Survey of the Consanguine or Matrifocal Family," *American Anthropologist*, 65: 56-66.
- Ladner, Joyce A. 1971. *Tomorrow's Tomorrow: The Black Woman*. Garden City, N.Y.
- Lebeuf, Annie M. D. 1963. "The Role of Women in the Political Organization of African Societies," in Denise Paulme, ed., *Women in Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Lewis, Diane K. 1973. "The Black Family: Socialization and Sex Roles." Unpublished manuscript.
- Moynihan, Daniel P. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
- Ottenberg, Simon. 1959. "Ibo Receptivity to Change," in William R. Bascom and Melville J. Herskovits, eds., *Continuity and Change in African Cultures*. Chicago.
- Randolph, Richard R. 1964. "The 'Matrifocal Family' as a Comparative Category," *American Anthropologist*, 66: 628-31.
- Schneider, David. 1968. Review of the Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy, by Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, March.
- Schneider, David M., and Raymond T. Smith. 1973. *Class Differences and Sex Roles in American Kinship and Family Structure*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Shimkin, Demetri B., Gloria J. Louie, and Dennis A. Frate. 1973. "The Black Extended Family: A Basic Rural Institution and a Mechanism of Urban Adaptation." Unpublished manuscript.
- Siegel, James. 1969. *The Rope of God*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Smith, Raymond T. 1956. *The Negro Family in British Guiana*. London.
- . 1970. "The Nuclear Family in Afro-American Kinship," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 1: 55-70.
- . 1973. "The Matrifocal Family," in Jack Goody, ed., *The Character of Kinship*. Cambridge, Eng.
- Snouck-Hurgronje, C. 1906. *The Achenese*. Trans. A. W. S. O'Sullivan. 2 vols. Leiden.
- Stack, Carol B. 1970. "The Kindred of Viola Jackson: Residence and Family Organization of an Urban Black American Family," in Norman E. Whitten, Jr., and John F. Szwed, eds., *Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives*. New York.
- . 1971. "Parenthood and Personal Kinship Networks Among Blacks 'On Aid.'" Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. New York.
- . 1973. "Who Raises Black Children: Transactions of Child Givers and Child Receivers." IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Chicago.
- Tanner, Nancy. 1969. "Disputing and Dispute Settlement Among the Minangkabau of Indonesia," *Indonesia*, 8: 21-67.
- . 1970. "Disputes and the Genesis of Legal Principles: Examples from Minangkabau," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 23: 375-401.
- . 1971. "Matrifocality in Indonesia and Among Black Americans." Paper

- presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. New York.
- . 1972. "Minangkabau," in Frank Le Barr, ed., *Ethnic Groups of Insular Southeast Asia*, Human Relations Area Files Press. New Haven.
- Tulis St. Sati, ed. 1963. *Tjerita si Umbut Muda*. Djakarta.
- Uchendu, Victor C. 1965. *The Igbo of Southeast Nigeria*. New York.
- Valentine, Charles A. 1968. *Culture and Poverty*. Chicago.
- Young, Virginia Heyer. 1970. "Family and Childhood in a Southern Negro Community," *American Anthropologist*, 72: 269-88.

Wolf: Chinese Women

- Crook, Isabel, and David Crook. 1959. *Revolution in a Chinese Village: Ten Mile Inn*. London.
- Elliott, Alan J. A. 1955. *Chinese Spirit Medium Cults in Singapore*. Monographs on Social Anthropology, No. 14 (new series), Department of Anthropology, London School of Economics. London.
- Hinton, William. 1968. *Fanshen: A Documentary of Revolution in a Chinese Village*. New York.
- Hsu, Francis L. K. 1948. *Under the Ancestors' Shadow: Chinese Culture and Personality*. New York.
- Johnston, R. F. 1910. *Lion and Dragon in Northern China*. New York.
- Levy, Marion J., Jr. 1949. *The Family Revolution in Modern China*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Myrdal, Jan. 1964. *Report from a Chinese Village*. London.
- Smith, Arthur H. 1899. *Village Life in China*. New York.
- Wolf, Arthur P. 1973. *Marriage and Adoption in Northern Taiwan*. (In press.)
- Yang, C. K. 1959. *The Chinese Family in the Communist Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Yang, Martin C. 1945. *A Chinese Village: Taitou, Shantung Province*. New York.
- Zen, Sophia H. Chen. 1931. "China's Changing Culture," *Pacific Affairs*, 4: 1072-78.

Hoffer: Madam Yoko

- Abraham, Arthur. 1971. "The Rise of Traditional Leadership Among the Mende: A Study in the Acquisition of Political Power." M.A. thesis, Fourah Bay College, Freetown, Sierra Leone.
- Alldridge, T. J. 1901. *The Sherbro and Its Hinterland*. London.
- Great Britain. 1875. *Parliamentary Papers*. Continuation of Command Paper 1343 of 1875, part I, nos. 51 and 52. London.
- Caulker Manuscript. 1908. *Sierra Leone Studies*, o.s. nos. 4, 6, 7. Original copy in Sierra Leone Government Archives, Freetown.
- Denzer, LaRay. 1971. "Sierra Leone—Bai Bureh," in Michael Crowder, ed., *West African Resistance: The Military Response to Colonial Occupation*. New York.
- Dow, Thomas E., Jr. 1971. "Fertility and Family Planning in Sierra Leone," *Studies in Family Planning*, 8: 153-65.
- Easmon, M. C. F. 1958. "Madam Yoko: Ruler of the Mendi Confederacy," *Sierra Leone Studies*, n.s. no. 11: 165-68.

- Fyfe, Christopher. 1962. *A History of Sierra Leone*. London.
- . 1964. *Sierra Leone Inheritance*. London.
- Hoffer, Carol P. 1971. "Acquisition and Exercise of Political Power by a Woman Paramount Chief of the Sherbro People." Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- . 1972. "Mende and Sherbro Women in High Office," *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 6 (2): 151-64.
- . 1973. "Bundu Society: Female Solidarity in a Political Context." Paper presented at the Ninth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago.
- Jaiiah, David. 1970. Personal communication. Moyamba, Sierra Leone.
- Jambai, A. E. 1970. Personal communication. District Officer, Moyamba District, Sierra Leone.
- Kandeh, Hannah. 1969. Personal communication. Moyamba, Sierra Leone.
- Kup, Peter. 1962. *A History of Sierra Leone, 1400-1787*. London.
- Leigh, W. W. 1969. Personal communication. Moyamba, Sierra Leone.
- Little, Kenneth. 1967. *The Mende of Sierra Leone*. London.
- Luke, Sir Harry. 1953. *Cities and Men: An Autobiography*, vol. I. London.
- Mannah-Kpaka, J. K. 1953. "Memoirs of the 1898 Rising," *Sierra Leone Studies*, m.s., no. 1: 28-39.
- Margai, Milton, A. S. 1948. "Welfare Work in a Secret Society," *African Affairs*, 47: 227-30.
- Ranson, Brian H. A. 1968. *A Sociological Study of Moyamba Town, Sierra Leone*. Zaria.
- Sierra Leone, Government Archives, Freetown (unless otherwise indicated):
- 1878-82. Governor's Aborigines Letterbook.
 - 1882-86. Aborigines Department Letterbook.
 - 1886-87. Aborigines Department Letterbook.
 - 1887-89. Aborigines Department Letterbook.
 - 1889-98. (Confidential) Native Affairs Department Letterbook.
 - 1890. Aborigines Department Letterbook.
 - 1895-96. Native Affairs Department Letterbook.
 - 1914. List of Paramount Chiefs, Their Chiefdoms, Characters, and Sub-Chiefs. Sierra Leone Collection, Fourah Bay College, Typescript.
 - 1970. Provinces Handbook, 1969/70. Ministry of Interior. Mimeo.
- Sierra Leone. 1899. Report by Her Majesty's Commissioner and Correspondence on the Subject of the Insurrection in the Sierra Leone Protectorate, 1898 (Chalmers Report). London.
- Yoko MS. n.d. Original with D. L. Sumner, Shenge, Sierra Leone.

Sanday: Female Status in the Public Domain

- Boserup, Ester. 1970. *Women's Role in Economic Development*. New York.
- Brown, Judith K. 1970. "Economic Organization and the Position of Women Among the Iroquois," *Ethnohistory*, 17 (3-4): 151-67.
- Coppinger, Robert M., and Paul C. Rosenblatt. 1968. "Romantic Love and Subsistence Dependence of Spouses," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 24: 310-19.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. 1953. *The Second Sex*. New York. Originally published in French in 1949.

- De Schlippe, Pierre. 1956. *Shifting Cultivation in Africa: Azande System of Agriculture*. London.
- Drake-Brockman, Ralph E. 1912. *British Somaliland*. London.
- Ember, Melvin, and Carol R. Ember. 1971. "The Conditions Favoring Matrilocal Versus Patrilocal Residence," *American Anthropologist*, 73: 571-94.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1971. *Woman's Place*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1937. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande*. New York.
- Firth, Raymond. 1939. *Primitive Polynesian Economy*. London.
- Hoffer, Carol. 1972. "Mende and Sherbro Women in High Office," *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 6: 151-64.
- Keesing, Felix M. 1934. *Modern Samoa: Its Government and Changing Life*. London.
- . 1937. "The Taupo System of Samoa," *Oceania*, 8: 1-14.
- Lebeuf, Annie M. D. 1963. "The Role of Women in the Political Organization of African Societies," in Denise Paulme, ed., *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif.
- LeVine, Robert A. 1970. "Sex Roles and Economic Change in Africa," in John Middleton, ed., *Black Africa*. London.
- Lipman-Blumen, Jean. 1972. "Role De-Differentiation as a System Response to Crisis: Occupational and Political Roles of Women," *Sociological Inquiry*, 43: 105-29.
- Mead, Margaret. 1928. *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization*. New York.
- . 1930. "Social Organization of Manua," Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 76, Hawaii.
- Murdoch, George P. 1971. "Anthropology's Mythology: The Huxley Memorial Lecture 1971," *Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland for 1971*, pp. 17-24.
- Nadel, S. F. 1960. "Witchcraft in Four African Societies: An Essay in Comparison," in S. Ottenberg and P. Ottenberg, eds., *Cultures and Societies of Africa*. New York.
- Noon, John A. 1949. "Law and Government of the Grand River Iroquois," Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 12, New York.
- Ottenberg, P. V. 1959. "The Changing Economic Position of Women Among the Afikpo Ibo," in W. R. Bascom and M. J. Herskovits, eds., *Continuity and Change in African Cultures*. Chicago.
- Randle, M. C. 1951. "Iroquois Women, Then—Now," in *Symposium on Local Diversity in Iroquois Culture*, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 149, Washington, D.C.
- Sanday, Peggy R. 1973. "Toward a Theory of the Status of Women," *American Anthropologist*, 75: 1682-1700.
- Schlegel, Alice. 1972. *Male Dominance and Female Autonomy: Domestic Authority in Matrilineal Societies*. New Haven.
- Smith, Michael G. 1960. *Government in Zazau*. London.

Sacks: Engels Revisited

- Benston, Margaret. 1969. "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation," *Monthly Review*, 21: 13-27.

- Boserup, Ester. 1970. *Women's Role in Economic Development*. New York.
- Clark, Alice. 1968. *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*. London.
- Cohen, Yehudi. 1969. "Ends and Means in Political Control: State Organization and the Punishment of Adultery, Incest and the Violation of Celibacy," *American Anthropologist*, 71: 658-88.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1891. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, 4th ed. Moscow.
- Friedl, Ernestine. 1967. "The Position of Women: Appearance and Reality," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 40: 97-108.
- Hunter, Monica. 1936. *Reaction to Conquest*. London.
- Krige, E. J., and J. D. Krige. 1943. *Realm of a Rain Queen*. London.
- Roscoe, John. 1966. *The Baganda*. New York.
- Sacks, Karen. 1971. "Economic Bases of Sexual Equality: A Comparative Study of Four African Societies." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1971. *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago.
- Turnbull, Colin. 1965. *Wayward Servants*. New York.

Leis: Women in Groups

- Eggan, Fred. 1954. "Social Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Comparison," *American Anthropologist*, 56: 743-63.
- Forde, Daryll. 1951. "The Yoruba-speaking Peoples of South-Western Nigeria," in D. Forde, ed., *Ethnographic Survey of Africa*. London.
- Green, M. M. 1947. *Ibo Village Affairs*. London.
- Hodder, B. W. 1962. "The Yoruba Rural Market," in Paul Bohannan and George Dalton, *Markets in Africa*. Evanston, Ill.
- Lebeuf, Annie M. D. 1963. "The Role of Women in the Political Organization of African Societies," in Denise Paulme, ed., *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Leis, Nancy B. 1964. "Economic Independence and Ijaw Women: a Comparative Study of Two Communities in the Niger Delta." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Leith-Ross, Sylvia. 1965. *African Women*. New York.
- Little, Kenneth. 1951. *The Mende of Sierra Leone*. London.
- Montagu, Ashley. 1953. *The Natural Superiority of Women*. New York.
- Paulme, Denise, ed. 1963. *Women of Tropical Africa*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Perham, Margery. 1937. *Native Administration in Nigeria*. London.
- Shapiro, Judith. 1971. Review of *The Imperial Animal*, by Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox. *Natural History*, October.
- Tiger, Lionel. 1969. *Men in Groups*. New York.
- Williamson, Kay. 1962. "Changes in the Marriage System of the Okrika Ijo," *Africa*, 32: 53-61.

Denich: Sex and Power in the Balkans

- Campbell, J. K. 1964. *Honour, Family, and Patronage*. New York.
- Denich, Bette S. 1970. "Social Mobility and Industrialization in a Yugoslav Town." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Djilas, Milovan. 1958. *Land Without Justice*. New York.
- Durham, M. E. 1928. *Some Tribal Origins, Laws and Customs of the Balkans*. London.

- Engels, Friedrich. 1891. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, 4th ed. Moscow.
- Erlich, Vera S. 1966. *Family in Transition: A Study of Three Hundred Yugoslav Villages*. Princeton, N.J.
- Fox, Robin. 1967. *Kinship and Marriage*. London.
- Friedl, Ernestine. 1962. *Vasilika: A Village in Modern Greece*. New York.
- Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. 1873. *The Ancient City*. Garden City, N.Y.
- Goldschmidt, Walter, and Evalyn J. Kunkel. 1971. "The Structure of the Peasant Family," *American Anthropologist*, 73: 1058-76.
- Halpern, Joel. 1956. *A Serbian Village*. New York.
- Hammel, Eugene A. 1968. *Alternate Social Structures and Ritual Relations in the Balkans*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- . 1972. "The Zadruga as Process," in Peter Laslett, ed., *Household and Family in Past Time*. Cambridge, Eng.
- Hasluck, Margaret. 1954. *The Unwritten Law in Albania*. Cambridge, Eng.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Structural Anthropology*. New York.
- Lockwood, William. 1972. "Converts and Consanguinity: The Social Organization of Moslem Slavs in Western Bosnia," *Ethnology*, 11: 55-79.
- Michaelson, Evalyn J., and Walter Goldschmidt. 1971. "Female Roles and Male Dominance Among Peasants," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 27: 330-52.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1877. *Ancient Society*. New York.
- Murphy, Robert F. 1971. *The Dialectics of Social Life*. New York.
- Richards, Audrey. 1950. "Some Types of Family Structure Among the Central Bantu," in A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and D. Forde, eds., *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*. London.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1961. "The Segmentary Lineage: An Organization of Predatory Expansion," *American Anthropologist*, 63: 322-43.
- Sanders, Irwin. 1949. *Balkan Village*. Lexington, Ky.
- Schein, Muriel. 1971. "Only on Sundays," *Natural History*, 80, 4: 52-61.
- Schneider, David, and Kathleen Gough. 1961. *Matrilineal Kinship*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Schneider, Jane. 1971. "Of Vigilance and Virgins: Honor, Shame, and Access to Resources in Mediterranean Society," *Ethnology*, 10: 1-24.
- Simic, Andrei. 1969. "Management of the Male Image in Yugoslavia," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 42: 89-101.
- Winner, Irene. 1971. *A Slovenian Village*. Providence, R.I.

Bamberger: The Myth of Matriarchy

- Bachofen, J. J. 1967. *Myth, Religion and Mother Right*. Selected Writings. Ralph Mannheim, trans. Bollingen Series, 84. Princeton, N.J.
- Bridges, E. Lucas. 1948. *Uttermost Part of the Earth*. New York.
- Fulop, Marcos. 1956. Aspectos de la cultura Tukana: Mitología. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología* (Bogotá), 5: 337-73.
- Goldman, Irving. 1963. *The Cubeo. Indians of the Northwest Amazon*. Illinois Studies in Anthropology, 2. Urbana.
- Gusinde, Martin. 1961. *The Yamana. The Life and Thought of the Water Nomads of Cape Horn*. 5 vols. Originally published in 1937. Frieda Schütze, trans. Human Relations Area File. New Haven.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1973. *From Honey to Ashes*. Introduction to a Science

- of Mythology, vol. 2. Originally published in 1966. John and Doreen Weightman, trans. New York.
- Maine, Henry Sumner. 1861. *Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and Its Relation to Modern Ideas*. Boston.
- McLennan, John F. 1970. *Primitive Marriage: An Inquiry into the Origin of the Form of Capture in Marriage Ceremonies*. Peter Rivière, ed. Originally published in 1865. Chicago.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1926. *Myth in Primitive Psychology*. New York.
- Métraux, Alfred. 1943. "A Myth of the Chamoco Indians and Its Social Significance," *Journal of American Folklore*, 56: 113-19.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1877. *Ancient Society*. New York.
- Murphy, Robert F. 1958. *Mundurucú Religion*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, 49. Berkeley.
- Nimuendajú, Curt. 1952. *The Tukuna*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, 45. Berkeley.
- Pembroke, Simon. 1967. "Women in Charge: The Function of Alternatives in Early Greek Tradition and the Ancient Idea of Matriarchy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 30: 1-35.
- Reichel-Dolmatoff, Gerardo. 1971. *Amazonian Cosmos: The Sexual and Religious Symbolism of the Tukano Indians*. Chicago.
- Scanlon, Leone. 1973. "Essays on the Effect of Feminism and Socialism upon the Literature of 1880-1914." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University.
- Schaden, Egon. 1959. *A Mitologia Heróica de Tribos Indígenas do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro.
- Stradelli, Ermanno. 1964. *La Leggenda del Jurupary*. Caderno 4, Instituto Cultural Italo-Brasileiro. Originally published in 1890. São Paulo.
- Tylor, E. B. 1899. "On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions, Applied to Laws of Marriage and Descent," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 18: 245-69.
- Wallace, Anthony F. C. 1971. "Handsome Lake and the Decline of the Iroquois Matriarchate," in F. L. K. Hsu, ed., *Kinship and Culture*. Chicago.
- Westermarck, Edward A. 1891. *The History of Human Marriage*. 3 vols. 5th ed. London.

Paul: Work and Sex in a Guatemalan Village

- Bateson, Gregory, and Margaret Mead. 1942. *Balinese Character*. New York.
- Colby, Benjamin J. 1967. "Psychological Orientations," in *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, pp. 416-31. Vol. 6, *Social Anthropology*, ed. M. Nash. Austin, Tex.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger*. New York.
- . 1970. *Natural Symbols*. London.
- Goffman, Erving. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N.Y.
- Mendelson, Michael E. 1967. "Ritual and Mythology," in *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, pp. 392-415. Vol. 6, *Social Anthropology*, ed. M. Nash. Austin, Tex.
- Michaelson, Evalyn Jacobson, and Walter Goldschmidt. 1971. "Female Roles and Male Dominance Among Peasants," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 27: 330-52.

- Paul, Benjamin D. 1950. "Symbolic Sibling Rivalry in a Guatemalan Indian Village," *American Anthropologist*, 52: 205-18. (Reprinted in C. K. Kluckhohn and H. A. Murray, eds., *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture*, pp. 321-33. New York, 1953.)
- . 1968. "San Pedro la Laguna [a case of culture change, in Spanish]. Los Pueblos del Lago Atitlán," *Seminario de Integración Social Guatemalteca*, 23: 93-158.
- Paul, Lois, and Benjamin D. Paul. 1963. "Changing Marriage Patterns in a Highland Guatemalan Community," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 19: 131-48.
- Slater, Philip E. 1968. *The Glory of Hera*. Boston.
- Tax, Sol. 1937. "The Municipios of the Midwestern Highlands of Guatemala," *American Anthropologist*, 39: 423-44.
- White, Robert W. 1959. "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence," *Psychological Review*, 66: 297-333.
- Wolf, Eric R. 1966. *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

O'Laughlin: Mediation of Contradiction

- Althusser, L. 1971. *Lenin and Philosophy*. Translated from the French by Ben Brewster. New York and London.
- Berthoud, G. 1969-70. "La validité des concepts de multicentricité et de sphères d'échanges," *Archives suisses d'anthropologie générale*, 34: 35-64.
- Conklin, Harold. 1954. "An Ethnoecological Approach to Shifting Agriculture," *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 17: 133-42.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger*. London.
- Dupré, G., and P-Ph. Rey. 1969. "Reflexions sur la pertinence d'une théorie de l'histoire des échanges," *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, 46: 133-62.
- Gough, Kathleen. 1971. "Nuer Kinship: A Re-examination," in T. O. Beidelman, ed., *The Translation of Culture*. London.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963a. *Structural Anthropology*. Translated from the French by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York.
- . 1963b. *Totemism*. Translated from the French by Rodney Needham. Boston.
- Marx, Karl. 1964. *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*. Translated from the German (1953 edition) by Jack Cohen. New York.
- . 1970. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Translated from the German by S. W. Ryazanskaya and edited by Maurice Dobb. New York.
- Terray, Emmanuel. 1969. *Le Marxisme devant les sociétés primitives*. Paris.
- Willame, J-C. 1971. "Recherches sur les modes de production cynégétique et lignager," *L'Homme et la société*, 19: 101-19.