

## A cross-cultural study of modesty

[ p1 ]

*This cross-cultural survey of sex customs treats sexual modesty in clothing and speech, privacy for intercourse, ceremonial license, and joking and avoidance. Sexual modesty is found to be uncorrelated with a number of sex taboos, but positively correlated with the attempt to confine sexual intercourse within marriage. This combination of sex restrictions, termed modesty-chastity, is very much the property of peasant societies, as opposed to primitive societies. The most sexually free cases in the sample tend to have a narrowly genital orientation to sex and to be preoccupied with sexual jokes and obscenity. The conclusion lists the full range of sex restrictions and sexual fears and proposes a germinal sex problem, best accounted for in Freudian terms.*

[Accepted for publication: May 1970.]

*William N. Stephens was a student of John Whiting at Harvard, has taught at the University of Kansas and at Florida Atlantic University, and has done field work in Spain and in the Bahamas. He is the author of The Oedipus Complex: Cross-Cultural Evidence, The Family in Cross-Cultural Perspective, Hypotheses and Evidence, and Reflections on Marriage. He is now Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at Dalhousie University, in Halifax, Nova Scotia.*

This survey, which was begun under the sponsorship of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography<sup>1</sup>, was intended to collate the writings of anthropologists on matters pertaining to obscenity and sexual modesty—modesty (or the lack of it) in talk and dress, privacy for the sex act, also ceremonial license, and joking and avoidance. Most of the generalizations that follow derive from the 92 societies listed in the ethnographic bibliography. At certain points I borrow from previous cross-cultural reviews. The discussion of ceremonial license owes much to Norbeck's "African rituals of conflict" (1963), Evans-Pritchard's "Some collective expressions of obscenity in Africa" (1929), and the *Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior* (Ellis and Abarbanel 1961), A few cases are cited from early compendia by Havelock Ellis (1905), W. I. Thomas (1937), and Sumner

[ p2 ]

(1906), and some data from my previous cross-cultural studies (1962, 1963) are occasionally brought into play.

Whereas modesty with respect to other body functions is not treated in the ensuing discussion, a word might be said about it here. Elimination is seldom mentioned in ethnographies; what few reports we have suggest a positive correlation between sexual and eliminative modesty. The Dobuans, Manus, Chiricahua Apache, and Hindu Indians, described as being especially prudish about urinating and defecating, are likewise sexually modest. Tikopians, Siriono, and Hopi, who urinate in public, would rate low on sexual modesty. Also, when obscenities are described, they sometimes include scatological jokes and epithets<sup>2</sup>. As in our own society, "dirty jokes" include, literally, joking about dirt.

A certain measure of privacy and taboo also attaches to eating and drinking. This may take the form of a generalized embarrassment or shame, so that people eat rather furtively, perhaps back to

<sup>1</sup> Appreciation is due to Dr. William Cody Wilson, Executive Director of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, who initiated the project.

<sup>2</sup> Alor, Baiga, Muria, Ojibwa, Samoa, Silwa, Thai, Tikopia, Trobriands, Ulithi.

back<sup>3</sup>. Or it may be a taboo upon—or shame connected with—eating in public, outside the privacy of one's home<sup>4</sup>; or sex-segregation for eating<sup>5</sup>. Eating taboos also figure in avoidance and deference relationships.

A final aspect of modesty customs which deserves mention here is their patchwork nature. Thus the Kurtatchi defecate in public and eat in private, the Balinese expose the breasts and hide the legs, Baganda men had to be fully clothed but women could go naked, and so on. A mosaic of taboo and license is further achieved by the interweaving of avoidance and joking relationships and by periodic relaxation of some rules of decorum on certain ceremonial occasions. Whereas this seems rather typical of tribal peoples, peasant societies tend strongly toward a comprehensive code of sexual repression and hence, one might say, are more consistent.

### Privacy for Sexual Intercourse

Copulation—at home—must seldom be in private, due to the prevalence of the one-room house. For 35 cases, it is reported that infants and young children sleep with their parents<sup>6</sup>. (For

[ p3 ]

no case in the sample was it said that young children did not sleep with their mothers. However, in many groups older children, in the 7 to 15 age range, move out of their mothers' homes<sup>7</sup>.) For 16 of these, there is explicit mention that children, occasionally at least, witness sex<sup>8</sup>. For 3 of these cases—Manus, Modjokuto, and Tepoztlan—informants deny that children have any sex knowledge, even though they are in the same room. In the polygynous compounds of Dahomey, it is customary for a wife to go to the husbands house for sex; and early-adolescent boys seem to be ignorant of the sex act (Herskovits 1938 : 277, 279). This arrangement may be common in other places where husband and wife live in separate huts, but in the present sample it is recorded only for Dahomey.

Aside from children in the room there may be other relatives, co-wives, or—for peoples who live in communal dwellings—an entire small community. Ordinarily, it seems, some attempt is made to achieve privacy of a sort: a couple waits until the others appear to be asleep, or they copulate quietly in the dark, or it is considered impolite to watch. Instances of deliberate copulation before witnesses are described for 21 cases: at home (Baiga, Copper Eskimo, Deoli, East Bay, Goulbourn Island, Hopi, Kamano, Marquesas, Mohave, Ojibwa, Samoa, Truk, Ulithi, Valle Caña); in bachelors' houses (Kipsigis, Muria, Marquesas); drunken orgies (Mohave, Ojibwa); group trysts (Samoa, Goulbourn Island, Mohave); group rape (Cheyenne, Kamano); ritual copulation for fertility (Goulbourn Island, Kiwai, Marquesas); also in Tahiti and Ontong Java. No account describes complete indifference to privacy. Some peoples seem rather careless (especially the Mohave, Marquesans, and Kamano); for some, observation is occasionally invited; in none, it seems do people copulate like the animals, innocent of any notion of *tabu*.

### Clothing and Nakedness

If a few complicating details might be overlooked, the cases in the sample could be placed along a clothing-modesty scale:

1. The people are entirely naked. (Australian aborigines—Murngin and Goulbourn Island; Kwoma, Munducuru\*, Nyaky-

<sup>3</sup> Kwoma, Kurtatchi, Bakairi. Bakairi and Warrau citations (note 5) are taken from Ellis 1905: 48.

<sup>4</sup> Bali, Kabyle, Trobriands.

<sup>5</sup> Carriacou, Guaymi, Warrau. Crawley's (1927) extensive review of eating taboos gives many more cases.

<sup>6</sup> Alor, Baiga, Chenchu, Chiricahua Apache, Copper Eskimo, East Bay, Goulbourn Island, Gusii, Hindus of Khalapur and Deoli, Hopi, Kamano, Kikuyu, Kwoma, Lepcha, Manus, Marquesas, Modjokuto, Mohave, Muria, Nyakyusa, Ojibwa, Plateau Tonga, Samoa, Semang, Shavante, Siriono, Taitou, Tepoztlan, Tikopia, Trobriands, Truk, Ulithi, Valle Caña, Yagua, and Kipsigis.

<sup>7</sup> In a previous study this was customary—for boys—in over half the sample; in 36 societies adolescent or preadolescent boys left home, in 27 they did not (Stephens 1962: 79).

<sup>8</sup> Alor, Baiga, Copper Eskimo, Deoli, East Bay, Goulbourn Island, Hopi, Kamano, Marquesas, Mohave, Ojibwa, Samoa, Trobriands, Truk, Ulithi, and Valle Caña.

[ p4 ]

- usa, Siriono, Yahgan\*; Shavante and Uaupá\* women, Guaycuru\* men <sup>9</sup>.)
2. Only the glans of the penis is covered. (The foreskin ligature: Maori\* and Marquesas.)
  3. The penis is covered. (Penis sheath: Orokaiva, Shavante, New Hebrides\*, Thonga.)
  4. The entire genitals are covered, buttocks are more or less bare. (G-string, pubic leaf, loincloth or breechclout is worn by men. In most of these cases women wear grass skirts. Dobu, East Bay, Baiga, Gahuku, Hopi, Truk, Semang.)
  5. Genitals and buttocks covered, breasts bare. (Bali, Dahomey, Manus, Muria, Nayars of Malabar, Ontong Java, Samoa, Ulithi.)
  6. Women's breasts must be covered. Taitou, China (plus the entire body, including the feet). Hindu India—Deoli, Khalapur, excepting the Nayars (the woman's entire body must be covered, including her head, and she also covers her lower face on certain occasions). Muslim cases—Silwa in Egypt, Kabyle of Algeria, the Mossi and Swahili of Africa, the Arab villagers reviewed by Antoun (woman's entire body is covered, some veiling, head-cloth, use of padding to hide the contours of the breast). Christian peasants of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Mexico, and Puerto Rico.

Actually, clothing-modesty is not so neatly scalar. Even in some completely naked cases, people are trained not to look (Kwoma, Yahgan\*). In a particular locality, there is often some variability with respect to what must be worn:

- Body-covering rules may admit to sex differences, which are sometimes considerable. Havelock Ellis (1905: 17) cites numerous instances of genital modesty for one sex but not for the other.
- There are peoples who wear something in the way of clothes, yet seem to have little in the way of genital modesty. (Acholi\*, Chagga, Dinka\*, Kamano, Kavirondo\*, Luo <sup>10</sup>, Masai, Hopi, Zulu.)
- Clothing requirements may change with age. In all sample cases for which there is information, children can go naked.

[ p5 ]

(Exceptions: little girls in Taitou, Tepoztlan, and Valle Caña.) Nakedness may last until three, four, seven, ten, or puberty, and age differences are compounded by sex differences.

- Clothing may be put aside in special situations, as with the public baths of Japan, Bali, and Medieval Europe; athletic spectacles in classic Greece; in the home (Eskimo); when no women are present (Tikopia, Trobriands); or at times of ceremonial license.

In addition to breasts, buttocks, and genitals, other female body-parts have occasionally been sexualized, covered, and charged with erotic interest: the foot (China, and a few tribes north of China); the navel (Bemba); the hair (Yakuts, and some Arabs and Indians).

Many of the peoples cited above have now been Christianized, and wear more clothes than they did in precontact times <sup>11</sup>. Old collections of early travelers' tales refer to numerous "tribes" who were naked, or nearly so. (Ellis 1905, Crawley 1927, Sumner 1906, Thomas 1937, also C. K. Meek's tribal survey of Northern Nigeria.) Nakedness and genital exposure must have been widespread among primitive peoples living in warm climates in South America, Africa, Australia, and Oceania. The correlation between clothing-modesty and cultural evolution is striking. Nearly all peasant cases, located historically within one of the preindustrial civilizations, are excessively modest. Only these cover the breasts. (Exceptions: Bali, Dahomey, Nayars of Malabar; also Mohave and Ojibwa. In some tribes, the breasts were sometimes covered, or were casually and imperfectly covered.) None expose the genitals. It appears that notions of decent body-covering seldom extended beyond hiding the genitals, until sometime after the advent of the high civilizations.

<sup>9</sup> Asterisk citations here are taken from Ellis 1905: 8-32.

<sup>10</sup> Sumner 1906: 438.

<sup>11</sup> In citations throughout, where descriptions of customs are given for both before and after contact, the customs cited will be the old, precontact ones.

## Sex in Ceremonies

Ceremonial license may take the form of erotic song and dance <sup>12</sup>; sexual clowning and joking <sup>13</sup>; sexual taunts, threats or abuse <sup>14</sup>; pantomime copulation <sup>15</sup>; display of the genitals or complete nakedness <sup>16</sup>; representations of the genitals in costuming (artificial phalli), emblems or other art works used in

[ p6 ]

rituals <sup>17</sup>; or actual sexual intercourse outside ordinarily permitted relationships <sup>18</sup>, which is occasionally public <sup>19</sup>. As the footnotes suggest, it is very widespread—or was, at least, before primitive societies were Christianized and deculturated. It seems to have been particularly prominent in Africa and Australia, less well developed in the New World (Ellis and Abarbanel 1961: 95), and perhaps widespread in Oceania and among the aboriginal tribes of Asia, although here my evidence is scanty. The ceremonies most marked by sex-display appear to have been the great rites of passage—initiations for boys and girls <sup>20</sup>, marriages <sup>21</sup>, and funerals <sup>22</sup>. But it occurs in a variety of ceremonial occasions <sup>23</sup>; also, erotic songs and sexual joking may lighten the load of collective work, which may or may not be ceremonialized <sup>24</sup>.

On the large subject of sex expressions in ceremonies I would make just three summary points. (1) In many instances it is clearly "license," i.e. behavior that would be improper or shocking in normal life; while in other cases it is not; and in many more cases it is impossible to tell from the accounts. (2) Mapping the distribution of ceremonial license requires a bit of inference, since ethnographers rarely report it to be absent. Among peasant and aristocratic groups, historically Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, or Muslim, it appears to have been rare. Of 14 such cases in the sample for which there is some detailed description of sex and modesty codes <sup>25</sup>, ceremonial license is mentioned for only 2 (Suye Mura and Deoli). We know that throughout the history of each of the great religions it

<sup>12</sup> Azande, Bambala\*, Bambara, Basuto, Didinga\*\*, Ganda, Gusii, Iatmul, Ila, Ingassana\*\*, Lango\*\*, Lovedu, Kikuyu, Lugbwara\*\*, Manus, Marquesas, Nyakyusa, Orokaiva, Thonga, Tikopia, Ulithi, Wiko, Yao (Ellis 1905: 17), Yap, Zulu. Most of the citations here come from Africa, largely due to borrowing from previous reviews of ceremonial license in Africa by Norbeck 1963 (the single asterisk cases) and by Evans-Pritchard 1929 (double asterisks).

<sup>13</sup> Akamba\*\*, Gusii, Hopi, Iatmul, Ila, Kamano, Muria, Orokaiva, Suye Mura.

<sup>14</sup> Akamba\*\*, Gusii, Lau Fiji, Manus, Orokaiva, Thonga, Tikopia, Ulithi, Wiko.

<sup>15</sup> Akamba\*\*, Goulbourn Island, Hopi, Kamano, Orokaiva, Shavante.

<sup>16</sup> Gahuku, Ganda, Hopi, Iatmul, Kikuyu, Otoro, Thonga, Zulu.

<sup>17</sup> Dahomey, Goulbourn Island, Gusii, Manus, Muria, Lovedu. Representations of the phallus, as objects of veneration and of humor, appear in ancient Greece (fertility rites, cult of Dionysus, comic drama), Rome (marriage ceremony, cults of Venus and Priapus), early-Christian Europe (comic drama), in certain Hindu and Buddhist cults, and in Egypt (bridal procession). (Ellis and Abarbanel 1961: 119, 123-25, 129, 161, 412-20; Sumner 1906: 448.)

<sup>18</sup> Hindu cults of Deva Desis and laja dharm; Goulbourn Island, Lau Fiji, Ila, Kiwai, Kwoma, Kikuyu, Orokaiva, Marquesas, Thonga. Norbeck (1963) states: "Numerous writings on Africa describe certain ceremonies as Saturnalias, referring especially to the temporary suspension at these times of rules governing sexual behavior. Some measure of sexual license on prescribed ritual occasions appears to be so common among these African societies that it may be described as general. The latitude varies, however, from sanctioned sexual display through promiscuity and adultery, and it may extend as far as the violation of incest prohibitions."

<sup>19</sup> Goulbourn Island, Kiwai, Marquesas. Possibly Lau Fiji, Orokaiva, and Trobriands.

<sup>20</sup> Akamba\*\*, Basuto, Becwana\*, Didinga\*\*, Ekoi\*, Lau Fiji, Iatmul, Ila, Ingassana\*\* Lovedu, Lango\*\*, Lugbwara\*\*, Otoro, Orokaiva, Kwoma, Goulbourn Island, Thembu\*, Thonga, Gusii, Kikuyu, Kiwai.

<sup>21</sup> Banyankole\*, Gusii, Kafir\*, Lango\*\*, Lotuko\*, Makhanya\*, Manus, Muria, Nuer\*, Nyakyusa, Swazi\*, Zulu, ancient Rome.

<sup>22</sup> Azande, Ba-Congo\*, Bondei\*, Chewa\*, Ila, Marquesas, Nuer, Nyakyusa, Tallensi\*, Thonga, Tonga, Yap.

<sup>23</sup> Memorial feasts, victory celebrations, rain-making ceremonies, initiation to secret societies, rites in honor of particular deities, generally rites with fertility emphases, New Year's Day, and so on.

<sup>24</sup> Bambala\*, Ila, Munguor, Suye Mura, Thonga, Tsonga\*, Zulu: wedding, planting, house-building, canoe-launching, smelting, feast-preparation.

<sup>25</sup> Christian: Dragaletsky, Ireland, Orasac, Tepoztlan, Valle Caña. Buddhist: Bang Chan, Suye Mura, Taitou, Yadaw. Hindu: Bali, Deoli, Rajputs of Khalapur, Modjokuto. Muslim: Silwa. In Muslim tribes of sub-Saharan Africa, some ceremonial license does appear. In my notes, it is mentioned for the Bambara and for Nupe.

has occurred; but it must have been very uncommon. (Ellis and Abarbanel 1961: 536, Campbell 1962, Taylor 1954, Sumner 1906: 447-49). (3) Much ceremonial license might be classed as obscenity: sexual clowning and joking, sex terms and gestures figuring in ritualized abuse and insult-contests. Again, generalizing is hazardous, because most accounts are lacking in detail. In a few cases, "erotic songs" are clearly enjoyed as dirty songs; and the "licensed" behavior brings laughter or has some sort of shock value. In a number of instances where there is some detailed description, obscene sentiments of the sort we are familiar with in our own culture do seem to come into play <sup>26</sup>.

[ p7 ]

## Sex Talk

Here again, intersocietal range is enormous, with peasants being much more modest than tribal peoples. Among the Muslim Kabyle, "May my wife be unlawful" is a powerful oath. The Muria of India use the term "motherfucker" so indiscriminately—by a woman to her little daughter, daughter to mother, and so on—that it is practically divested of any obscene potency. Doubtless no society is completely restrictive of sex talk. For what seem to be the most prudish cases in the sample, there is mention of occasional euphemistic references for some <sup>27</sup>, occasional obscenity for others <sup>28</sup>. Likewise, I suspect, no society permits perfect freedom. Of the 34 cases in which a great deal of open sex talk is said to occur, in 22 of these it is subject to some restriction; in certain social contexts, sex either is not discussed or the talk must be euphemistic <sup>29</sup>. For the other 12 cases, my guess is that the restrictions were there but were simply unreported <sup>30</sup>.

In the accounts, the emphasis on sexual humor is striking. In the 49 cases for which there is any mention of sex talk, sexual joking is mentioned for 36 <sup>31</sup>. In 16 of these, a great preoccupation with sexual humor is described <sup>32</sup>. The forms of the humor are familiar:

- Kidding (with the humor apparently being connected with embarrassment): "You've been to the women again"; "What a big penis you have!"
- Kidding with derogation, verging over into insults: "Copulate with your mother who is dead"; "What a small penis you have!" (Sexual epithets, used in kidding, as abuse, as "oaths" sworn to underline some assertion, or simply as exclamations addressed to no one in particular—as with the profane and scatological epithets in use in our own society—appear also to be very common around the world.)
- Double entendre, sex allusions from common words and phrases.
- Sexual storytelling.
- Horseplay and practical jokes.

[ p8 ]

Finally, for some peoples the mere mention of sex is apparently funny (Ireland, Lepcha, Marquesas, Mohave).

<sup>26</sup> Akamba\*\*, Bolewa\*, Gusii, Hopi, Iatmul, Kamano, Muria, Suye Mura, Thonga.

<sup>27</sup> Bemba, Chiricahua, Modjokuto, Nupe, Yawad.

<sup>28</sup> Deoli, Dobu, Semang, Silwa, Taitou. For the Chenchu, Kabyle, and Tepoztlan, there is no mention of lapses of verbal modesty.

<sup>29</sup> Alor, Araucanians, Baiga, East Bay, Goulbourn Island, Gusii, Kwoma, Lepcha, Marquesas, Muria, Nyakyusa, Ontong Java, Samoa, Shavante, Siuai, Thai, Tikopia, Trobriands, Truk, Ulithi, Valle Caña.

<sup>30</sup> Bali, Bambara, Copper Eskimo, Hopi, Ireland, Kamano, Kipsigis, Mohave, Monguor, Murngin, Ojibwa, Suye Mura, Thonga. If there is a case of complete verbal freedom, it may be the Mohave Indians. The subject is treated rather fully by Devereaux (1950), with no hint of euphemism, special respect relationships, or taboo topics.

<sup>31</sup> Mentioned: Baiga, Bali, Bambara, Chiricahua, Copper Eskimo, Dobu, East Bay, Gusii, Heiban, Hopi, Ireland, Kamano, Kipsigis, Kwoma, Lepcha, Manus, Marquesas, Modjokuto, Mohave, Monguor, Muria, Murngin, Ontong Java, Ojibwa, Rajputs of Khalapur, Samoa, Siriono, Siuai, Suye Mura, Taitou, Thai, Tikopia, Trobriands, Truk, Ulithi, Yawad. Not mentioned: Alor, Araucanians, Bemba, Deoli, Goulbourn Island, Kabyle, Otoro, Nupe, Nyakyusa, Semang, Shavante, Silwa, Tonga.

<sup>32</sup> Baiga, Bali, Bambara, Copper Eskimo, Heiban, Lepcha, Marquesas, Mohave, Muria, Ontong Java, Ojibwa, Suye Mura, Tikopia, Trobriands, Ulithi, Valle Caña.

As to why sex should be humorous—first of all, in some of the joking one can imagine extrinsic sources of interest: the playing with aggression, which appears to be involved in kidding; play on words with double entendre and other allusive talk; ridiculous and incongruous social situations in the sex stories. Firth, discussing the Tikopians, explains sexual humor as a rebellion against, and momentary "release" from, various restrictions on sexual activity—as with, particularly, incest jokes (1936: 314-15). A general interpretation of sexual humor and obscenity as abreaction—expressive of resentment at restrictions and guilt over tabooed impulses—collides with a curious fact. The peoples who seem most preoccupied with sexual joking and obscenity are not those who appear to have the most to abreact, but those who should have the least. They tend strongly to be the most sexually free, the least constrained by taboo and modesty rules.

## Avoidance

In most societies for which there is information, modesty and decorum are particularized by relationship. With some persons one may be relatively free, talk obscenely, and so on; while with others one feels "respect" and "shame." The relationship-break may be sex (less restraint on sex talk and body contact for same-sex persons than among opposite-sex persons), or generation ("respect" toward the parental generation, relative license with persons of the same generation and, perhaps, with grandparents), or broad kinship categories (avoidance of all in-laws). Degree of avoidance may be mild (no touching, no sex talk) or extreme (do not look at each other, do not talk to each other, do not eat together, do not mention the others name, do not sleep in the same house, converse through an intermediary, cannot be alone together, etc.). Extreme avoidance characterizes three particular kin relationships: a male Ego to his mother-in-law; to his daughter-in-law; to his sister. If the culture enjoins avoidance of one of these relatives, then Ego usually avoids other persons, who are socially similar, to

[ p9 ]

an equal or less degree: female cousins are frequently included in the brother-sister avoidance; for the mother-in-law avoidance, perhaps the mother-in-laws sister, her mother, the father-in-law; for daughter-in-law avoidance, various of the daughter-in-laws family may also be included.

In a previous survey of kin avoidances, 38 tribes were scored as having at least one extreme avoidance relationship <sup>33</sup>, 12 had mild avoidance <sup>34</sup>, 13 apparently had none (Stephens 1962: 222-25). This may overestimate the prevalence of kin avoidance, due to the probable tendency for "absent" cases to go unreported and hence be excluded from a cross-cultural sample. Nevertheless, the phenomenon must have been very widespread among primitive societies.

In most avoiding societies, it seems, certain relationships are characterized by avoidance, while in others the opposite code prevails—obscene joking and sexual abuse is customary. The old study turned up a positive correlation between presence of avoidance relationships and joking relationships. (See Table 1.)

In the present sample, I found one case—the Chiricahua Apache—in which extreme kin avoidance is unrelieved by sexual joking in some other relationship; 15 societies with marked kin avoidance did allow or expect considerable sexual talk and joking in some relationships <sup>35</sup>.

The joking-avoiding pattern looks like an acting out of sexual shame: exaggerated modesty in some relationships, obscenity (the obverse side of the coin) in other relationships. In a number of the accounts, embarrassment, shyness, or shame are said to be the sentiments appropriate to avoidance.

<sup>33</sup> Score of 3 or higher on a five-point cumulative scale. Point #3 on the scale was "can't converse directly."

<sup>34</sup> Score no higher than 2 on the scale: "can't talk about sex."

<sup>35</sup> Baiga, East Bay, Goulbourn Island, Gusii, Kamano, Kwoma, Manus, Nyakyusa, Ojibwa, Ontong Java, Siuai, Tikopia, Trobriands, Truk, Ulithi. Peasant societies, lacking the classic kin avoidances, in which avoidance takes the form of segregation of the sexes, guarding of females, and sweeping modesty rules, and also colors deference behavior, do seem to lack anything approaching the joking relationships of primitive societies.

Husband-wife avoidance never, needless to say, reaches the extremes of mother-in-law avoidance or brother-sister avoidance, but it appears to be the most common of the special avoidance relationships. Frequently, when other persons are

**Table 1.** The Joking-Avoiding Pattern

Societies in which an extreme avoidance relationship is:	Societies in which a licentious joking relationship is:	
	<i>present</i>	<i>absent</i>
<i>present</i>	12	2
<i>absent</i>	5	3

[ p10 ]

present, spouses may not be allowed to touch each other<sup>36</sup>, to show affection toward each other or use endearing terms of address<sup>37</sup>, or address each other by name<sup>38</sup>. In a few societies the avoidance is more extreme than this<sup>39</sup>. The husband-wife avoidance would seem particularly to be an expression of sexual shame, being as it is a sort of public disavowal of a known sex relationship. (It could be alternatively interpreted as a reaction to jealousy on the part of parents and other kin.) As a public disavowal it is odd, in the light of the limitation on privacy among so many of these peoples. Margaret Mead says of the Samoans: "A couple whose wedding night might have been spent in a room with ten other people will never the less shrink in shame from even touching hands in public" (1928: 134).

### Correlates of Modesty

Table 2 presents a modesty scale. Actually it is an immodesty scale, which for purposes of final scoring is simply turned upside down. Scale points are as follows:

- Instances of public intercourse, and genitals exposed (includes penis sheath and pubic fringe), both of these scored "present."
- One of these scored "present."
- Sex talk: free before children; and much of it direct, not euphemistic—either of these scored "present." (If either is scored "absent," the case gets a minus score for this scale point.)
- Sex display in ceremonies (erotic songs, dances, costuming, or art objects associated with some ceremony; sexual joking or abuse; public coitus).
- Breasts exposed.

A case was included if it could be scored for at least three of the six categories. A "—" entry indicates that the practice was reported to be absent, an "X" means "present." A blank means either no information or no code because reports were conflicting or unclear. The highest (most immodest) point that can be scored "present" determines a case's scale score. In other words it is a crude cumulative scale, with five scale errors (Deoli, Suye Mura, Lepcha, Ojibwa, and Mohave, who cover the breasts but

[ p11 ]

**Table 2.** Data Sheet: Modesty Scale, Women's Sex Restrictions, Political Development, and Religion

Column Headings:

1. Modesty scale score: 6 (breasts covered) through 1 (genitals exposed and instances of public intercourse).
2. Breasts exposed (— = no, X = yes, a blank means no code).
3. Sex display in ceremony.
4. Sex talk: free before children.
5. Sex talk: much direct, not euphemistic.
6. Genitals exposed (includes penis sheath and pubic fringe).
7. Instances of public intercourse (outside the home).
8. Premarital sex restrictions for girls: 3, strict sanctions, fairly effective; 2, ineffective rule against: 1, premarital intercourse permitted—includes ceremonial license and permissive sex relationships.
9. Restrictions on adultery for women: same code as for #8.
10. Political development: 4, part of a civilization (kingdom with cities); 3, petty kingdom (no cities); 2, chiefdom; 1, no state.
11. Religion: B, Buddhist; C, Christian; H, Hindu; I, Muslim; —, none of these.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
6 Chirichua		—		—	—					1	—
Dragaletvtsy		—		—				3		4	C
Kabyle				—	—			3	3	4	I
Silwa				—	—			3	3	4	I
Tepoztlan				—				2		4	C
Taitou				—				3	3	4	B
Valle Caña				—						4	C
Yadaw				—				2		4	B
5 Bemba		X			—				3	3	—
Dobu		X			—			1	2	1	—
Modjokuto				—					2	4	H-B-I
Nupe				—				2	2	4	I
Semang		X			—					1	—
4 Dahomey		X	X					3		4	—
Deoli			X	—				3	3	4	H
Ganda		X	X							3	—
Gusii		X	X					2		2	—
Suye Mura			X					3		4	B
3 Alor		X		X	X	—		2	2		—
Baiga		X		X	X	—		1	1	1	—
Bali		X		X		—		1	3	4	H-B
Bambara			X	X		—		2	2	2	I
Hopi		X	X	X		—		1	2	2	—
Lepcha				X	X	—		1	1	(4)	(B)
Manus		X	X		X	—		2	2	1	—
Tikopia		X	X		X	—		2	2	2	—
Trobriands		X		X	X	—				2	—

<sup>36</sup> Present sample: Deoli, Dobu, Dragaletvtsy, East Bay, Samoa, Kwoma. From a previous sample gathered by interviewing ethnographers about their field work (Stephens 1963: 408-24): cant touch each other, 25 cases; may touch each other, 14 cases.

<sup>37</sup> Present sample: Alor, Bemba ("young couple"), Deoli, Dragaletvtsy, Kabyle, Kwoma, Kurtatchi, Rajputs of Khalapur, Taitou ("young couple"), Trobriands, Yagua; Semang-may flirt and display affection in public. Ethnographer-interview sample: taboo on public affection-display present, 27 cases; taboo absent, 11 cases.

<sup>38</sup> Present sample: Alor, Baiga, Kabyle, Manus, Silwa, Eastern Timbira. Ethnographer-interview sample: personal name taboo present, 15 cases; taboo absent, 29 cases.

<sup>39</sup> Deoli, Heiban, Kwoma, Kabyle, Manus, Taitou.

Truk	X			X	—	2	1	2	—
Ulithi	X	X		X	—	1	1	2	—
East Bay	X		X	X	—				—

[ p12 ]

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1										
2	Kiwai	X	X			X	1	1	1	—
	Kikuyu	X	X			X	1		2	—
	Kwoma	X	X		X		2	2	1	—
	Kipsigis	X	X			X	1		2	—
	Mohave	—			X	—	X	1	1	—
	Muria	X	X	X	X	—	X	1	3	2
	Nyakyusa	X	X			X	1	1	2	—
	Ojibwa	—		X	X	—	X	2	2	1
	Ontong Java	X		X			X	2	3	2
	Orokaiva	X	X			X	2	1	1	—
	Samoa	X				—	X	1	2	2
	Shavante	X	X			X	3	3	1	—
	Tahiti	X	X			X			2	—
	Thonga	X	X			X	1	3	3	—
	Zulu	X	X			X			3	—
1	Goulbourn Island	X	X	X	X	X	1	1	1	—
	Kamano	X	X	X	X	X		2	1	—
	Marquesas	X	X		X	X	1	1	2	—

do something else), and of course the numerous blank entries.

Early in the study, I concluded that modesty was but one facet of a general sex-restriction syndrome or, to put it differently, that it was positively correlated with other sex-connected restrictions, part of a sex-restriction factor. This expectation was not borne out. On small samples, the modesty scale showed no significant relationship to kin avoidances, menstrual taboos, or length of the postpartum sex taboo<sup>40</sup>. Modesty does go with sex restrictions of a more familiar sort: the insistence that, for women at least, sexual intercourse be confined to the marriage relationship. Turning to Table 2 again: rules against extramarital intercourse for women are represented by a three-point rating scale adapted from Murdock (1964). An entry of 3 means "strict sanctions, fairly effective"; 2, "ineffective rule against"; 1, "extramarital intercourse permitted." The trend is strongest for unmarried girls, weaker for married women (some immodest tribes demand fidelity). The trend would hold for men too, I believe, but it would be weaker still; the sexual double standard is very widespread (Stephens 1963: 290).

In advance of a proper statistical sorting out, done on samples with more overlap (if this is possible), it now looks as though there are two sex-restriction factors. One of these might be

[ p13 ]

termed "taboo." It would include the kin avoidances, taboos associated with menstruation and birth, and the many occasional sex taboos (Stephens 1962). Modesty, as represented by the scale, goes in the second factor, along with rules against extramarital sex. I believe that severity of sex training

<sup>40</sup> Scales and scores given in Stephens 1962: 206-24, 245.

belongs here too, but that cannot be demonstrated at this time<sup>41</sup>. This factor might be called modesty-chastity.

Modesty-chastity reached its apogee in the preindustrial civilizations. (See Table 2. Also Murdock [1964] and Cohen [1969] find sex restrictions tightening with political development.) Table 2 does not begin to do justice to the extreme prudery and generalized cross-sex avoidance recorded for many peasant groups; they go far off the modesty scale. In recent times, as the agrarian-based kingdoms have given way, the effort to keep sex (and woman) in a closet seems to be relaxing also. As to why this style of sex restriction developed with civilization, a number of partial explanations could be offered: one, the independent influence of the four great world religions, with their ascetic emphases<sup>42</sup>; another, the effect on sex mores of hierarchically organized society. A previous study showed a positive correlation—unusually strong as cross-cultural correlations go—between elaboration of deference customs (wife to husband, child to father and to other older male kin, also commoner to nobleman) and historic presence of a kingdom. If formalized deference is taken as an index of patriarchy within the family—and I think this is proper, making allowance for a certain percentage of "errors"—this implies that autocratic social orders spawned autocratic family relationships. (See Stephens 1963: 326-34. Theoretically, the causal relationship could have been in another direction, but this is rather hard to imagine.) Family deference, patriarchy, hierarchy, or what have you was not scored for the present sample—the state of the data would have made the results rather unsatisfactory<sup>43</sup>—so deference and modesty cannot be intercorrelated. Perhaps a future study can formally show the association between family deference or patriarchy and modesty-chastity; I am convinced that the relationship is a strong one.

At any rate, we have some basis for believing that modesty-

[ p14 ]

chastity is somehow an outcome of patriarchal family organization, set in a broader context of hierarchic, coercive relationships—peasantry and gentry, state and subjects—perhaps, in part, an expression of authoritarian character<sup>44</sup>. Modesty-chastity suggests Oedipal problems of the classically Freudian, father-fearing type. Practices in the "taboo" group—menstrual taboos, kin avoidances, etc.—have been interpreted as expressing Oedipal problems of the mother-fixation type, as they are associated with a relatively exclusive, and perhaps an especially eroticized, mother-child relationship—i.e. high percentage of polygyny, mother-child households, long postpartum sex taboo (Stephens 1962, Whiting, Kluckhohn, and Anthony 1958).

Whatever the connection between kingdom, patriarchy, deference, modesty, and sex repression, we now seem to be in a period in which the old pattern is breaking up—to return eventually, perhaps, to a state of affairs reminiscent of a majority of tribal peoples, sans the primitive taboos. Pivotal in the change, I would guess, is the class system. The kings have now departed. Communities that are most "traditional" tend to be those where a thoroughgoing social revolution has been quite recent or is yet to come—where, in other words, feudalism hangs on at the local level. This seems to be true for women's sex restrictions<sup>45</sup>, modesty customs<sup>46</sup>, patriarchy and deference<sup>47</sup>. More democratized

<sup>41</sup> The modesty scale is unrelated to [Whiting and Child's \(1953\) ratings of severity of sex training](#). However, the Whiting and Child sample is composed almost entirely of primitive societies, with very few civilized cases.

<sup>42</sup> Historic and archeological records for pagan civilizations, prior to the era of the ascetic religions, hint at a style of sexual expression reminiscent of the primitive societies: fertility cults, some ceremonial license, some body-exposure, erotic art. (Sumner 1906: 386, 447, 449; Ellis and Abarbanel 1961: 528-29; Campbell 1962, 1964; Sachs 1937: 105.)

<sup>43</sup> In the previous study, after first trying to score family power relations from already-published ethnographies and concluding that the written accounts were too vague and fragmentary to support a good measure, I got the family deference material by interviewing ethnographers and asking them a standard list of questions about their field work (Stephens 1963: 408-24).

<sup>44</sup> G. Rattray Taylor's (1954) "patrist" and "matrist" syndromes, which he applies to historic trends in Europe, would seem to fit the cross-cultural data fairly well.

<sup>45</sup> Dragaletvsky (Bulgaria), Orasac (Serbia), County Clare (Ireland), San Pedro la Laguna (Guatemala), Valle Cana (Puerto Rico of the 1940s), Tepoztlan (Mexico), Sarakatsani (Greece) and Andalusia (Spain) both from Peristiany (1966), Deoli and Khalapur (India), Yadaw (Burma), Suye Mura (Japan of the 1930s).

countries appear to have more equalitarian family relations, as well as more relaxed sex restrictions<sup>48</sup>. Also, we have some indications that traditional family and sex customs may quickly disintegrate when peasants move to the city<sup>49</sup>.

### Cases of Sexual Freedom

There are six primitive societies in the sample that I would rate the most permissive of extramarital sex, of immodest behavior and sexual expressiveness, and of the sexuality of children: the Australian aborigines of the Goulbourn Island region; the Kamano of the New Guinea highlands; the Polynesian natives of the Marquesas; the Mohave Indians; the Lepchas of Sikkim; and the Muria of India, more or less in that order. A number of other tribes, I am sure, would go into this group if their sex

[ p15 ]

practices were described in detail; especially I suspect that the Eskimo should be here, and the Siriono of Bolivia. A short step behind, I would put the Baiga, also of India, and a number of Oceanic peoples—Trobriand Islanders, Trukese, Samoans, Tikopians. (Note the absence of African societies from this group, despite their high development of ceremonial license.)

Some of these groups have been touched by the great religions. The Baiga and Muria are Hindu-influenced, although they remained (at the time of Elwins writing) defiantly non-Hindu, even anti-Hindu, in matters of sex relations. The Lepchas have been converted to Lamaist Buddhism within the past two centuries, and the Australians, Marquesans, Mohave, Samoans, and Trukese have become Christians of a sort. They wear more clothes than they once did, but it appears that the Christian sex code has not taken with them. Thus the modern-day Marquesans now "recognize" a formal rule against extramarital intercourse, but it cannot be said that they observe it, and they remain avid sexual exhibitionists.

The only group to approach peasant status are the Lepchas; but the Lepchas of whom Gorer wrote lived on a tribal preserve and paid small taxes, but were free of anything smacking of landlordism or nobleman-commoner relations. The Oceanic peoples had Polynesian-style chiefdoms, with some emphasis on rank and associated deference, which to some extent crept into family relations. In all groups, however, the status of women appears to have been relatively high, and family relations fairly equalitarian. (Possible exceptions might be the Lepchas and the Kamano.)

All of these peoples observe the incest taboo. Various of them have other sex restrictions and fears, although generally these seem of a relatively mild and rudimentary nature. With the possible exception of the Samoans, they all fear menstrual blood<sup>50</sup>. Some observe avoidance relationships<sup>51</sup>. Some public intercourse occurs, but sex is usually in private<sup>52</sup>. For the better-described cases, idiosyncratic fears are mentioned. The Baiga were shocked by queries about sexual perversions, the Marquesans by incest jokes; among the Mohave, the man must be on top during coitus; and so on. In a few tribes, sexual inter-

<sup>46</sup> The above, with the Irish and Japanese being possible exceptions for verbal modesty.

<sup>47</sup> The above, plus Modjokuto (Java) and the following cases from the ethnographer-interview sample: Spain (village of Villafranca and Madrid aristocrats), Spanish-Americans of Atrisco in New Mexico, Brno (Czechoslovakia), Cuchumatán Mam (Guatemalan Mayans), Lasko (Yugoslavia), San Juan Juquilla and Zinacantan (Mexico).

<sup>48</sup> From the ethnographer-interview sample: two French villages, Peyrane and Chanzeaux, described by Laurence Wylie. Wylie was told of remnants of family deference customs which were no longer observed. Also two Italian cases: Chiaromonte (Laura Banfield) and a lower-class neighborhood in Naples (Anne Parsons). Then there is our "sexual revolution" of recent times, the "emancipation of women," which has proceeded rapidly during the last century, and a like phenomenon among "progressive" strata in other countries—for example postwar Japan.

<sup>49</sup> For Mexico, Oscar Lewis' Tepoztlán peasants (1951, 1959, 1964), as compared with the people in Five Families, who lived in Mexico City. For Puerto Rico, the city dwellers in La Vida (Lewis 1965), as contrasted with the peasants of Valle Cana (Landy 1959).

<sup>50</sup> This must be inferred from indirect evidence for Kamano and Goulbourn Islanders.

<sup>51</sup> Avoidance is very weakly developed among the Lepchas and Marquesans, and there is no information for Kamano and Mohave.

<sup>52</sup> In several cases of coitus in a communal setting, as with the Muria ghotul and the Trobriand bachelors' house, it is ordinarily considered bad manners to watch.

[ p16 ]

course is freely permitted outside tabooed kin relationships (Siriono, Australians, Lepchas, Eskimo). Usually there is less latitude than this. In precontact Marquesas, boys had to wait until after they were subincised (between 7 and 12); in Truk, until after puberty. The Muria encourage sexual freedom until marriage, but they are strict about adultery.

In the cases of maximal freedom, sexuality apparently tends to be of a simple genital type, with little aestheticism or interest in the body's beauty, foreplay rudimentary at best, slight development of erotic arts, weak connection between sex and love, and rather little possessiveness or sexual jealousy. ("For the Lepchas of Zongu sexual activity is practically divorced from emotion; it is a pleasant and amusing experience, and as much a necessity as food and drink; and like food and drink it does not matter from whom you receive it, as long as you get it," Gorer 1938: 170). The Muria ghotuls, with their sexual games and beautiful eroticism, would stand as an exception to this rule. Some of the Oceanic peoples, too, have developed some eroticism, but from all accounts they have achieved some degree of separation between sex and love. For the Australians, Mohave, Lepcha, Marquesans, Kamano, and Baiga, sexual intercourse, sex talk, and sexual art appear to be narrowly genital.

A final characteristic of the sexually free tribes—previously mentioned—is enormous sexual preoccupation and what looks like strong obscene sentiment. People are constantly talking about sex, making sexual jokes, and—this is especially remarked for the Mohave, Lepchas, and Marquesans—sex is intrinsically funny. This has puzzled more observers than one. Margaret Mead says, for the Samoans: "It seems difficult to account for a salacious attitude among a people where so little is mysterious, so little forbidden" (1928: 127). And Gorer says: "I found this continual harping on the humorous aspects of sexual physiology puzzling, since most Lepchas have a full and adequate sex life, and face sex extremely simply, without guilt or secrecy" (1938: 262). Which brings us back to the question previously raised: if obscenity signifies guilt, shame, fear, resentment, i.e. some manner of sex-related "trouble," why do the least restricted peoples tend to be the most obscene?

[ p17 ]

### Conclusion

Sex restrictions in their full array include;

- The universal rule against incest, extended beyond the nuclear family to embrace a fairly large group of kin.
- Kin avoidances.
- The near-universal menstrual taboo, associated with the notion of malignant power residing in the menstruating woman and her menstrual discharge; especially the belief that she is dangerous to men (Stephens 1962: 95-97).
- Other occasional sex taboos, taboos associated with sex and reproductive functions, and related beliefs about dangers adhering to sex.
- Attempts to limit sex activity outside the marriage relationship.
- Sexual modesty in clothing and speech and the preference for privacy.

Add to this: the human penchant for obscenity (coming out most strongly when sex restrictions recede) and the bizarre sexual imagery in much ceremony and myth (cf., to take a single example, Bettelheims *Symbolic Wounds* [1954]). Whatever is involved in the cultural efflorescence surrounding sex—various parts of it have been, and could be, interpreted in a variety of ways—a case can be made for a germinal sex problem, distinctive of humans, deriving from more than the use of language and the making of oral traditions and verbal rules. To my knowledge, the only general accounting for this full range of sexual oddities is afforded by Freudian psychology. It is not a complete accounting, nor is it an especially satisfactory one. Particular sex customs can be explained, with greater economy and rigor, from other viewpoints and by means of other theories. But the entire phenomenon—unless I am mistaken—can only, at present, be comprehended in the language of primary process, retribution fantasies, defensive reactions, and Oedipus complex.

## Notes

[ pages 17 to 21 ]

## References

- Antoun, Richard. 1968. "On the modesty of women in Arab villages: a study in the accommodation of traditions," *American Anthropologist* 70: 671-97.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. 1954. *Symbolic wounds*, Glencoe, 111., The Free Press.
- Campbell, Joseph. 1962. *The masks of God: Oriental mythology*, New York, Viking Press.
- Campbell, Joseph. 1964. *The masks of God: Occidental mythology*, New York, Viking Press.
- Cohen, Yehudi. 1969. "Ends and means in political control: state organization and the punishment of adultery, incest and violation of celibacy," *American Anthropologist* 71: 658-87.
- Crawley, Ernest. 1927. *The mystic rose*, New York, Boni and Liveright.
- Ellis, Albert, and Albert Abarbanel. 1961. *Encyclopedia of sexual behavior*, New York, Hawthorne Books.
- Ellis, Havelock. 1905. *Studies in the psychology of sex* (vol 1), New York, Random House.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1929. "Some collective expressions of obscenity in Africa," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 59: 76-101.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1959. *Five families*, New York, Basic Books.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1964. *Pedro Martinez*, New York, Random House.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1965. *La vida*, New York, Random House.
- Meek, C. K. 1950. *Tribal studies in Northern Nigeria*, New York, Humanities Press.

[ p22 ]

- Murdock, George Peter. 1964. "Cultural correlates of the regulation of premarital sexual behavior," in *Process and Pattern in Culture: Essays in Honor of Julian H. Steward*, Robert H. Manners, ed., Chicago, Aldine Press: 399-410.
- Norbeck, Edward. 1963. "African rituals of conflict," *American Anthropologist* 65: 1254-79.
- Peristiany, J. G. 1966. *Honour and shame: the values of Mediterranean society*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Sachs, Curt. 1937. *World history of the dance*, New York, W. W. Norton.
- Stephens, William. 1962. *The Oedipus complex: cross-cultural evidence*, New York, The Free Press.
- Stephens, William. 1963. *The family in cross-cultural perspective*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sumner, William Grant. 1906 *Folkways*, Boston, Ginn.
- Taylor, G. Rattray. 1954. *Sex in history*, New York, Ballantine Books.
- Thomas, William I. 1937. *Primitive behavior*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Whiting, John, and Irvin Child. 1953. *Child training and personality*, New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Whiting, John, Richard Kluckhohn, and Albert Anthony. 1958. "The function of male initiation ceremonies at puberty," in *Readings in Social Psychology*, Eleanor Maccoby, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley, eds., New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston: 359-70.

## Ethnographic references

\* Sources in the Human Relations Area Files that were used in this study.

### *Alor (Indonesia)*

Corra DuBois, *The people of Alor*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1944.

### *Araucanians (Chile) \**

Louis G. Faron, *The Mapuche Indians of Chile*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Louis G. Faron, *Hawks of the sun*, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Mischa Titiev, *Araucanian culture in transition*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1951.

### *Ashanti (West Africa) \**

R. S. Rattray, *Ashanti*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1923.

[ p23 ]

R. S. Rattray, *Ashanti Law and Constitution*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1929.

### *Aymara (Peru) \**

Harry Tschopik, "The Aymaras of Chucuito, Peru: 1. Magic," *Anthropological Papers of the Museum of Natural History* 44, 1951: 133-308.

### *Azande (Sudan) \**

E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Witchcraft, oracles and magic among the Azande*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1937.

### *Baiga (India)*

Verrier Elwin, *The Baiga*, London, John Murray, 1939.

### *Bali (Indonesia)*

Miguel Covarrubias, *Island of Bali*, New York, Knopf, 1936.

### *Bambara (Sudan) \**

Fr. Joseph Henry, *The Bambara: their psychic, ethical, religious and social life*, 1910 (HRAF translation).

### *Bang Chan (Thailand)*

Herbert F. Phillips, *Thai peasant personality*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1965.

### *Basuto (South Africa)*

Hugh Ashton, *The Basuto*, London, Oxford University Press, 1952.

### *Bechuana (South Africa)*

Tom Brown, "Circumcision rites of the Becwana tribes," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 51, 1921: 419-27.

### *Bemba (Northern Rhodesia) \**

Audrey Richards, *Chisungu*, London, Faber and Faber, 1956.

### *Carriacou (West Indies)*

M. G. Smith, *Kinship and community in Carriacou*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1962.

### *Chagga (Kenya) \**

B. Gutmann, *Tribal teachings of the Chagga*, Munich, C. H. Beck'sche, 1932 (HRAF translation).

### *Chenchu (India)*

Christoph von Furer-Haimendorf, *The Chenchus*, London, Macmillan, 1943.

### *Cheyenne (Wyoming-Nebraska-Kansas)*

K. N. Llewellyn and E. A. Hoebel, *The Cheyenne way*, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1941.

### *Chiricahua Apache (Arizona)*

Morris Opler, *An Apache life way*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Morris Opler, "Chiricahua Apache social organization," in *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes*, Fred Eggan, ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937.

### *Copper Eskimo \**

Diamond Jenness, "The Life of the Copper Eskimos," *Report of the Canadian Arctic Expedition, 1913-1918* (vol 12), 1922.

### *Dahomey (West Africa)*

Melville Herskovits, *Dahomey: an ancient West African Kingdom* (vol 1), Locust Valley, N.Y., J. J. Augustin, 1938.

[ p24 ]

### *Deoli (India)*

Morris Carstairs, *The twice-born*, Bloomington, University of Indiana Press, 1958.

### *Dobu (Melanesia)*

Reo Fortune, *Sorcerers of Dobu*, New York, E. P. Dutton, 1932.

### *Dragalevtsy (Bulgaria)*

Irwin T. Sanders, *Balkan village*, Lexington, University of Kentucky Press, 1949.

### *East Bay (Melanesia)*

William Davenport, "Sexual patterns and their regulation in a society of the southwest Pacific," in *Sex and Behavior*, Frank Beach, ed., New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

**Eastern Timbira (Brazil) \***

Curt Nimenaju, "The Eastern Timbira," R. H. Lowie, tr. and ed.. University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology 16, 1946.

**Gahuku (New Guinea)**

Kenneth Read, The high valley, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

**Ganda (Uganda) \***

Ernest Kalibala, The social structure of the Baganda tribe of East Africa, doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1946.

Lucy Mair, An African people of the twentieth century, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1934.

John Roscoe, The Baganda, New York, Macmillan, 1911.

**Goutbourn Island (Australia)**

Ronald Berndt and Catherine Berndt, "Sexual behavior in Western Arnhem Land," Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 16, 1951.

**Guaymi (Panama)**

Olga Linares, 1961 interview, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University.

**Gusii (Kenya)**

Robert LeVine and Barbara LeVine, "Nyansongo: a Gusii community in Kenya," in Six Cultures: Studies in Child Rearing, Beatrice Whiting, ed., New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1963.

**Hausa (Nigeria) \* Heiban (Sudan)**

S. F. Nadel, "Two Nuba religions: an essay in comparison," American Anthropologist 57, 1955: 661-79.

**Hopi (Arizona)**

Mischa Titiev, "Old Oraibi," Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 22, 1944.

**Iatmul (New Guinea)**

Gregory Bateson, Naven, Cambridge University Press, 1936.

**Ila (Northern Rhodesia)**

Edwin Smith and Andrew Dale, The Ila-speaking peoples of Northern Rhodesia, London, Macmillan, 1920.

**Ireland (County Clare)**

Conrad Arensberg and Solon Kimball, Family and community in Ireland, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1940.

[ p25 ]

**Kabyle (Algeria)**

Pierre Bourdieu, "The sentiment of honor in Kabyle society," in Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society, J. G. Peristiany, ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1966.

**Kamano (New Guinea)**

Ronald Berndt, Excess and restraint: social control among a New Guinea mountain people, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

**Kikuyu (Kenya) \***

Charles Dundas, "The organization and laws of some Bantu tribes in East Africa," Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 45, 1915.

Jomo Kenyatta, Facing Mount Kenya: the tribal life of the Gikuyu, London, Seeker and Warburg, 1953.

**Kipsigis (Kenya)**

J. G. Peristiany, The social institutions of the Kipsigis, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1939.

**Kiwai (New Guinea)**

Gunnar Landtman, The Kiwai Papuans of British New Guinea, New York, Macmillan, 1927.

**Kurtatchi (Solomon Islands) \***

Beatrice Blackwood, Both sides of Buka Passage, New York, Oxford University Press, 1935.

**Kwoma (New Guinea)**

John Whiting, Becoming a Kwoma, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941.

**Lau Fiji (Melanesia) \***

A. M. Hocart, "Lau Islands, Fiji," Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Bulletin 62, 1929.

Laura Thompson, "Southern Lau, Fiji: an ethnography," Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Bulletin 162, 1940.

W. I. Thomas, Primitive behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1937.

**Lepcha (Sikkim)**

Geoffrey Gorer, Himalayan village, London, Michael Joseph, 1938.

**Lesu (New Ireland)**

Hortense Powdermaker, Life in Lesu, New York, W. W. Norton, 1933.

**Lovedu (South Africa)**

E. J. Krige and J. D. Krige, The realm of a rain-queen, New York, Oxford University Press, 1943.

**Manus (Admiralty Islands)**

Margaret Mead, Growing up in New Guinea, New York, New American Library, 1930.

Margaret Mead, "Kinship in the Admiralty Islands," Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History 34, 1934.

**Marquesas (Polynesia) \***

E. S. C. Handy, "The native culture of the Marquesas," Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Bulletin 9, 1923.

Robert C. Suggs, Marquesan sexual behavior, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1966.

[ p26 ]

**Masai (Kenya)**

A.C. Hollis, The Masai: their language and folklore, Oxford, Clarendon Press 1905.

L. S. B. Leakey, "Some notes on the Masai of Kenya Colony," Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 60, 1930.

**Micmac (Nova Scotia)**

Wilson Wallis and Ruth Wallis, The Micmac Indians of Eastern Canada, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1955.

**Modjokuto (Java)**

Hildred Geertz, The Javanese family, New York, The Free Press, 1961.

**Mohave (California)**

George Devereaux, "Heterosexual behavior of the Mohave Indians, in Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences (vol 2), Geza Roheim, ed., New York, International Universities Press, 1950.

**Monguor (China) \***

Fr. Louis Schram, "The Monguors of the Kansu-Tibetan Frontier: their origin, history, and social organization," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 44, 1954: 1-138.

**Mossi (Sudan)**

Elliot P. Skinner, "Christianity and Islam among the Mossi," American Anthropologist 60, 1958: 1102-19.

**Muria (India)**

Verrier Elwin, The Muria and their ghotul, London, Oxford University Press, 1947.

**Murngin (Australia)**

W. Lloyd Warner, A black civilization, New York, Harper, 1937.

**Nayars of Malabar (India)**

E. Kathleen Gough, "The Nayars and the definition of marriage,"

Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 89, 1959. E. Kathleen Gough, "The traditional kinship system of the Nayars of Malabar," unpublished manuscript, SSRC Summer Seminar on Kinship, Harvard University, 1954.

**Nupe (Nigeria) \***

S. F. Nadel, A black Byzantium, London, Oxford University Press, 1942.

**Nyakyusa (Africa) \***

Monica Wilson, Good company, New York, Oxford University Press, 1951.

**Ojibwa (Ontario) \***

A. Irving Hallowell, Culture and experience, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.



Ruth Landes, "Ojibwa sociology," Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 29, 1937.

***Ontong Java (Solomon Islands)***

H. Ian Hogbin, "The sexual life of the natives of Ontong Java," Journal of the Polynesian Society 40, 1931- 23-34

***Orasac (Serbia)***

Joel M. Halpern, A Serbian village, New York, Columbia University Press, 1958.

[ p27 ]

***Orokaiva (New Guinea)***

F. E. Williams, Orokaivan society, London, Oxford University Press, 1930.

***Otoro (Sudan)***

S. F. Nadel, "Two Nuba religions: an essay in comparison," American Anthropologist 57, 1955: 661-79.

***Peyrane (France)***

Laurence Wylie, Village in the Vaucluse, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1957.

***Plateau Tonga (Southern Rhodesia)***

Elizabeth Colson, Marriage and the family among the Plateau Tonga, Manchester University Press, 1958.

***Rajputs of Khalapur (India)***

Leigh Minturn Triandis and John Hitchcock, "The Rajputs of Khalapur," in Six Cultures: Studies in Child Rearing, Beatrice Whiting, ed., New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1963.

***Rwala Bedouin \****

A. Musil, The manners and customs of the Rwala Bedouin, New York, Charles A. Crane, 1928.

***Samoa (Polynesia) \****

Margaret Mead, Coming of age in Samoa, New York, William Morrow, 1928.

Margaret Mead, "Social organization of Manua," Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Bulletin 76, 1930.

***San Pedro la Laguna (Guatemala)***

Benjamin Paul, Life in a Guatemalan village, Chicago, Delphian Society, 1950.

***Semang (Malaya) \****

Fr. Paul Schebesta, Die Negrito Asiens (HRAF translation, 1954).

***Shavante (Brazil)***

David Maybury-Lewis, The savage and the innocent, New York,

World Publishers, 1965. David Maybury-Lewis, Akwe-Shavante society, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1967.

***Silwa (Egypt)***

Hamed Ammar, Growing up in an Egyptian village, London, Rout- ledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.

***Siriono (Bolivia) \****

Allan Holmberg, Nomads of the long how, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1950.

***Siuai (Bougainville)***

Douglas Oliver, A Solomon Island society, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1955.

***Suye Mura (Japan)***

John Embree, Suye Mura: a Japanese village, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939.

***Swahili (Somalia and Kenya)***

J. Spencer Trimingham, Islam in East Africa, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1964.

[ p28 ]

***Tahiti (Polynesia)***

Havelock Ellis, Studies in the psychology of sex (vol 1), New York, Random House, 1905.

***Taitou (China)***

Martin Yang, A Chinese village: Taitou, Shantung Province, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945.

***Tepoztlán (Mexico)***

Oscar Lewis, Life in a Mexican village: Tepoztlán revisited, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1951.

***Terutenne (Ceylon)***

Nur Yalman, Under the bo tree, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1967.

***Thonga (South Africa) \****

Henri A. Junod, The life of a South African tribe, Hyde Park, N.Y., University Books, 1962.

***Tibet***

Sir Charles Bell, The people of Tibet, London, Oxford University Press, 1928.

***Tikopia (Polynesia) \****

Raymond Firth, Tikopia ritual and belief, Boston, Beacon Press, 1967.

Raymond Firth, We, the Tikopia, New York, American Book Co., 1936.

***Trobriand Islands (Melanesia) \****

Bronislaw Malinowski, The sexual life of savages in Northwest Melanesia, New York, Liveright, 1929.

***Truk (Micronesia)***

Thomas Gladwin and Seymour Sarason, "Truk: man in paradise," Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 20, 1953.

***Ulithi (Micronesia)***

William Lessa, Ulithi: A Micronesian design for living, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

***Valle Cana (Puerto Rico)***

David Landy, Tropical childhood, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

***Wiko (South Africa)***

Max Gluckman, "The role of the sexes in Wiko circumcision ceremonies," in Social Structure, Meyer Fortes, ed., New York. Russell and Russell, 1963.

***Yadaw (Burma)***

Manning Nash, The golden road to modernity, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

***Yakut (Siberia)***

William G. Sumner "The Yakuts" (abridged from the Russian of Sieroshevski) Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 31, JL9U1: 65-110.

***Zulu (South Africa)***

A.T. Bryant, The Zulu People, Pietermaritzburg, Shuter and Shooter,