Hsu's theory is thus not universal, and its applicability depends on variables that should be possible to isolate. The contribution of the theory is precisely in that its explicitness makes it testable in a way that allows other variables to emerge, for the central problem here hinges on traditional anthropological concerns: How far can culture transcend biology? Is cultural cognition entirely arbitrary, or are there universal cultural tendencies related to certain objective features in the world that no cognitive system can ignore? We have, for example, always found it easy to accept the idea that sex and generation (or age) should always be culturally "noticed," but we hesitate to go much beyond this. Hsu's theory demands, for its verification, a comparative social psychology of kinship behavior in the same way that the newer "componential" methods of analyzing kinship terminologies demand a comparative psychology of cognition (cf. Wallace, 1965). It is in the eventual linkage between the two that the old problem of the relationship between kinship terminology and kinship behavior may begin to be resolved.

One final query: Are there cultural systems that demand greater integration among relationships, and others that minimize the need for consistency? And even when there is a consistency in the structure, how does it affect the actors in it? As a system, Suku kinship structure is rigidly integrated, but the people occupying the various slots in it can be shifted around. For example, a person can shift from the slot of patrilateral cross-cousin (with whom one jokes, and whom, if female, one can marry) to the slot of "father" or "father's sister" (whereupon one stops joking and starts respecting and marriage becomes forbidden). Such shifts reverberate throughout the system. Whole groups of relatives get reclassified terminologically and behavior toward them shifts accordingly, but the system itself remains rigidly consistent. It would seem that the culture here allows a kind of discontinuity of roles in specific persons that another culture would not (for example, from sexual joking to avoidance or *vice versa*). Do relationships in such systems influence each other in the same way as in systems emphasizing a different kind of integration? What happens in systems where relationships are essentially dyadic and treated atomistically? The questions concern something anthropologists have yet to tackle, namely the effect of the cultural conceptions of how it should work on the way an existing system works—in short, the influence of a people's own ethno-sociology on their "objective" sociology.

FIVE

FREDRIK BARTH

Role Dilemmas and Father-Son Dominance in Middle Eastern Kinship Systems

This paper attempts to show the way in which behavioral characteristics in one kinship relationship are in part constrained and determined by the existence of another, dominant kinship relationship. It seeks to explore the mechanism whereby this dominance is effected, through an analysis of role dilemmas. The main factors that are given explanatory precedence are the general values prevalent in the population concerned and the external circumstances that shape the situations in which kinship behavior takes place. In the latter part of the paper I illustrate and to some extent try to test my assertions with data from my own field work among Pathans—an agricultural people with a patrilineal and patriarchal family system—and from the literature on Cyrenaica Bedouins.

The paper thus takes up for discussion one of the many problems that arise from Hsu's stimulating development of the concept of a dominant kinship relationship. There can be no denying that this concept enables us to bring out certain regular patterns in the empirical material, and thus has great descriptive utility. But the concept of dominance entails no analytical framework for understanding and explaining these patterns. It would obviously be unsatisfactory to interpret dominance literally—that is, to give concrete behavior in one institutionalized relationship causal priority over concrete behavior in another such relationship. Hsu himself looks for sources of dominance variously in the value emphases of each

culture, in the requirements for maintenance of the social and cultural system, and especially in the developmental history of socialization that is common to the members of the society. I shall take a more limited and synchronic view, and concentrate on the question of the possible interactional mechanisms whereby characteristics of one social relationship can determine behavior in another social relationship. Since we are dealing with social behavior in stable institutionalized relationships, it further seems legitimate to require any explanation to be consistent with a general theory of social behavior, in this case the analysis of roles. The mechanisms we look for should thus be found among the general mechanisms of role formation.

Once this synchronic and structural framework is adopted, rather than the developmental one, there is no a priori basis for restricting the analysis to the kinship domain, and I shall need to consider the connections between kinship and extra-kinship behavior. More concretely, I shall try to show how general values regarding descent, masculinity, and sexuality are made relevant to the behavior of males in a variety of situations in Middle Eastern societies. Furthermore, I shall argue that these values are such as to give a prominence to the father-son relationship that may legitimately be characterized as dominance, while other relationships, such as that between husband and wife, become recessive so that behavior in them is strongly modified and in part suppressed. I find the mechanisms effecting this in the process whereby actors are led to select predominantly only a small range of behavioral elements within their present repertoire when shaping a social role.

To argue that behavior in a relationship is being modified or suppressed, one needs some canon by which to characterize its *un*modified form and judge that some distortion has taken place. Hsu's development of the concept of "intrinsic attributes" of relationships, most simply exemplified in the employer-employee relationship (Hsu, 1965: 640), serves him in this necessary purpose: "The intrinsic attributes of each relationship," he writes, "are the basic ingredients and determinants of the interactional patterns between parties to that relationship." As I understand them, then, these "intrinsic attributes" are the basic specifications of the relationship which no party to that relationship can deny in his behavior without repudiating the relationship as a whole; that is, they are the minimum specifications of the *statuses* involved in the relationship. Hsu's view of dominant kinship relationships depends on the view that some of these attributes are naturally determined, and thereby provide a primitive, cross-cultural canon for judging the extent of modification of behavior in kinship relationships.

However, the connection between such minimum specifications of statuses in dyads or larger sets, and empirical behavior, is more complex than this model indicates. Not only is actual behavior a great deal richer and more varied than these minimum specifications; the standardized

institutionalized behavior that emerges in the roles that an observer may record reflects these specifications only partially and imperfectly because, though it is constrained by them, it is simultaneously constrained and formed by other determinants. The following analysis depends on the recognition that a role is also constrained by the setting where behavior takes place: Some forms of behavior require physical props, others become necessary only as a response to characteristics or changes in the environment, including the presence of other persons. In other words, regularities of behavior—in the present case, kinship roles—can be understood in part from the constraints that status specification impose, in part from external or "ecological" constraints in the contexts where the behavior takes place and the role thus has to be consummated.

This view of the complex transformation from status to role derives mainly from Goffman (1959), and I have made use of it elsewhere (Barth, 1966). I wish to show here how some features of the phenomenon that Hsu describes as "dominance" between kinship relations may be understood by means of it. Most important, it implies that when seeking to understand how behavior in one relationship affects or is affected by the actor's relationships to third parties, we need to separate two different levels on which the interconnections may be found: the level of statuses, as a distribution of rights and resources on social positions, and the level of actual behavior in role play.

One type of consistency and interdependence between the forms of behavior in different kinship relations is clear: Where exclusive rights, *jus in rem* (Radcliffe-Brown, 1952) are vested in the encumbents of kinship statuses, behavior relative to these rights becomes systematized throughout the kinship system. Indeed, it follows from the very definition of such rights that they affect the behavior of third parties: They are rights as against the world to certain services from certain persons. Some of the features of "dominance" referred to by Hsu might therefore be interpreted as the expression of such rights.

Most kinship behavior, however, derives from *in personam* rights which do not entail the same degree of systematization on the level of statuses. However, I shall argue that the domestic setting in which these rights are consummated is one that produces some degree of consistency in role playing, even where *in personam* rights are involved. This follows from the intimacy and comprehensiveness of interaction within households: Alter in one relationship is audience and spectator to ego's interaction with others in other relationships. In shaping one's behavior towards one alter, one is constrained by the need to avoid repudiating that which is important in one's relationship to another, who is present though the relationship may be latent at the moment. Especially when several kinsfolk are interacting simultaneously, each person involved needs to find a pattern of behavior, and an adjustment of the various kinship roles that allows them to be pursued simultaneously.

This I feel is the main sense in which certain kin relations can become "dominant": They are important and clear enough to take precedence over other relations and to block the use of certain idioms and the expression of certain qualities in those relations which would challenge or repudiate the "intrinsic attributes," or status-defining characteristics, of the "dominant" relationship. I would argue that persons, in shaping their kinship roles, in many kinship systems do act in terms of some such priorities and avoid the behavioral forms and the embarrassing situations in which key relationships and obligations might seem to be challenged or repudiated, and that the patterning of behavior that Hsu notes and describes in terms of dominance and recessivity is generated by this fact.

One advantage of this view is that it distinguishes "strata" of determinants of behavior, and enables us to identify functional equivalents in related systems of kinship behavior. To illustrate the whole argument, including this last feature, let me discuss some material on the father-son relationship, and other kinship behavior, among tribal peoples in the Middle East.

If the criteria were clarified, I believe one could make a very good case for the father-son relationship as the dominant relationship in most Middle Eastern kinship systems. Especially in tribal areas, where political life is structured by patrilineal descent groups and productive resources are held collectively by patrilineal groups, the importance of the father-son relationship is overwhelming; and throughout the area the family system can be characterized as patrilocal and patriarchal. The attributes which Hsu lists as intrinsic to this relationship are descriptive of its form in these Middle Eastern societies. The attributes of continuity, inclusiveness, authority, and asexuality have institutional correlates in patrilineality, joint property and responsibility, paternal authority, and incest taboos embracing the spouses of close agnates. They are furthermore continually expressed and confirmed in etiquette summarized under the heading of respect behavior by the son towards the father.

This behavior is somewhat at variance with the general ideals of male behavior. Masculinity and virility are very highly valued, and are recognized and asserted in behavior that exhibits independence, aggressive courage, dominance, and the repudiation of superordinate authority in others. But in the case of father and son, this repudiation is not necessary —as agnates their masculinity and virility, their honor, is joint. The honor of the father is transmitted to the son, and the son's feats of courage and strength sustain the honor of the father, of the joint patriline.

The husband-wife relationship, on the other hand, has attributes that are discordant with those of the father-son relationship. Not only is it characterized by discontinuity and exclusiveness, creating a small realm into which a father's rights and authority do not reach; the Middle Eastern view of what is intrinsic in the relationship goes further, and particularly emphasizes sexuality in the form of male aggressiveness, dominance, enjoyment, and privilege. The husband's honor also demands that he should fully monopolize the woman; no one else should be allowed a share of the pleasures she gives by seeing her beauty or interacting with her as a woman. This aggressive monopolization of male rights over a woman is a virtue in a man; it epitomizes masculine dominance and autonomy, and no husband should repudiate it in his behavior towards his wife. Yet such behavior in its very essence is a repudiation of the virtues of obedience, discipline, and respect that are demanded from a son in the father-son relationship, and it goes against the sharing of honor, and particularly of the masculinitiy and aggressiveness that characterize their relationship. The "intrinsic attributes" of these two relations, in the form which they will take within a general Middle Eastern value system, are thus highly incompatible, and provide a convenient case for the analysis of dominance between kinship relations.

The incompatibility poses behavioral dilemmas in all Middle Eastern societies. Indeed, the highly unequal and complementary view of what is intrinsically male, or virile, and female, or feminine, makes for difficulties in all public interaction between male and female. There is hardly any adequate way of shaping roles so that they allow diversified interaction between a man and a woman without highly compromising the public image of both. This impasse has been created, or is resolved, by the seclusion of women: the systematic separation of two spheres of activity—one where men interact with each other and observe each other, in public; and the other the private sphere were interaction in the husband-wife relationship is consummated, and a role can be constructed between the two which may be at variance with the public image of themselves that they each individually wish to project. But to the extent that the "continuity" of the father-son relationship is realized, fathers and sons will be found inside the same compound walls, as potential observers of each others' interactions across the sex boundary. Thus the dilemma of the kinship roles remains.

Two forms of solution may be compared: that of sedentary, village dwelling Swat Pathans (Barth, 1959) and that of nomadic, tent dwelling Cyrenaica Bedouin (Peters, 1965).

The Swat Pathan solution depends in part on the men's house—an institution with a number of political and economic functions. Almost all men spend most of their free time in the men's house, and the man who spends much time at home is ridiculed. The institution thus provides a way of affirming publicly the priority of male life and one's relations to men over one's relations to women, no matter what the emotional realities may be. In some areas of Swat, all men sleep in the men's house; and in all of Swat, young unmarried men sleep in the men's house.

As marriage approaches, the prospective groom tries to avoid situations or behavior that confirm the impending event, but his juniors and equals try to discomfit him and he rarely avoids giving expression to his embar-

rassment. The father plays the active role and represents the groom in the preliminary negotiations and the legal marriage ceremony. When the marriage takes place, the groom plays no part in it at all and runs away and hides for days on end during the celebration, while heartless friends spend quite a bit of time looking for him. Consummation takes place in great secrecy, aided by female agnates. As soon as possible, the new couple establish an independent household, within the walls of which they can have privacy. Until such time, the son-and-husband spends an emphatically great deal of his time away from the home, and the newly wed spouses do not speak to each other and have no interaction when others are present. They especially avoid being simultaneously in the presence of his father (her father-in-law). In the powerful landowning families, where patrilineal extended households are the rule, rooms are allocated to the new couple into which the father would never conceive of entering, and the husband-wife relationship is in relative latency outside of these rooms, when others are present.

The later phases of a man's life cycle give an opportunity to judge relative dominance of kinship relations more concretely than by the canon of intrinsic attributes. Especially in patrilineal extended families, it is instructive to compare behavior in the husband-wife relationship where the husband is senior male in his line and has no relationship to a living father, with that of husbands who are simultaneously involved as sons in a father-son relationship. The absence of the superordinate party in the father-son relationship gives opportunity for more assertive and more public behavior in the husband-wife relationship.[1]

One major difference is a freer dominance in the senior male's behavior, contrasted with the junior male's reluctance to assert authority over his wife in front of his father. A senior male will occasionally engage in loud, demonstrative assertion of such authority, both in the presence of kinsmen and within earshot of others. He also more freely interacts with his wife as an object of sexuality and affection. Senior males are far more indulgent in pampering a young attractive wife, in favoring her and protecting her as against other women in the household, while a junior undercommunicates his interest in his wife as a sexual object and supports general household views of "fairness" that are usually discriminatory against a young wife.

Finally, the senior male is freer to enjoy his wife at will. Though all areas of the house are open to a son, it is his responsibility not to disturb the father, and unmarried sons sleep in the men's house to avoid the shame of witnessing the intimate life of the parents. Where a married son

1. Inevitably, there are other variables that may be responsible for some of the contrasts. The husband's physiological age differs in the two situations; but I assume the "social age" of seniority to be the more significant variable. The wife's age need not differ, as the husband's behavior is frequently directed at younger, sexually more attractive later wives as well as at an original first wife. The existence of sons should have little effect in suppressing most aspects of the husband-wife relationship, since there is a harmonious authority regime of father and husband over both son and wife.

lives in the extended household of his father, the young couple are reserved private space, as noted above; but the son cannot withdraw at will to his wife, and his obligations to give his time to his father always prevail over his obligations or enjoyment in the husband-wife relationship.

The same privilege of the superordinate male, to enjoy sex himself but monopolize the subordinate males' time and the time available to them for cross-sex interaction, is seen in public life. In areas of Swat where all men sleep in the men's house, only the chief goes publicly to enjoy his wife, while other married men wait and slip off discreetly to visit their wives unnoticed, after the chief has left and the men's house has quieted down for the night.

Compare this to the situation in an entirely different technical-ecological regime, among the Bedouin pastoral nomads of Cyrenaica. Without the paraphernalia of houses and compound walls, and engaged in tasks that require women to move in public among the men, the Bedouin cannot achieve the same degree of privacy and segregation as the Swat Pathans. Peters (1965) gives a detailed and intriguing account of father-son and husband-wife roles in this system, and of their expression at ceremonial occasions. The pattern can be summarized as one of ritualized avoidance and fiction. At the wedding the groom tries to escape but is "caught" by the young men and brought to the nuptial tent, whereas his father is completely inactive and feigns ignorance of the whole affair. Having established his own tent, adjoining that of his father, the son continues to play-act the role of an unmarried boy, returning to his father's tent in the morning to "wake up" in his usual place there, eating with his father out of his father's bowl, etc. In the presence of the father, no statement or action is made that would force him to acknowledge the change in the son's position.

In other words, in the Bedouin setting where husband-wife interaction cannot be as effectively contained within a secluded, private sphere, the role dilemma is resolved by the relative latency of the husband-wife relationship, and by symbolic behavior which confirms the father-son relationship. The fictions and stereotypes of Bedouin kinship behavior provide a shelter for discrepant roles that is functionally equivalent to the compound walls of the Swat Pathans. But they do not have precisely the same effects. The complete dichotomization of secluded private life and public life that is possible in the village protects the senior male very adequately and allows him to play his different roles at the appropriate occasions; the dilemmas are concentrated in the son-and-husband combination. In the Bedouin ecology, on the other hand, the father-son dominant relationship needs to be protected by special behavior on the part both of father and son. There is no way for the senior party to prevent the intrusion of information that is discrepant with his own pose and interests; as a result he must develop a role solution that actively both over and undercommuni-

cates aspects of the situation and asserts the dominance of the father-son relationship.

My point of view could be summarized as follows: I believe that the empirical substance of Hsu's thesis of dominance in some kinship systems is valid and can be demonstrated. But I think that the pattern he has observed does not need to be cast in the descriptive and analytical mold that he has chosen. For the kind of data I have at my disposal, an explanatory model based on role theory appears to be both adequate and economical. It starts with the view that the distribution of rights on different statuses is never entirely integrated and harmonious. Where status sets and relevant social situations are clearly differentiated, this disharmony matters little to the actors, who can then pursue discrepant roles and project variant social personalities in different social situations. Routinized social life will in part be shaped by these considerations: Persons will seek the situations where successful role play can be consummated and avoid the situations where serious dilemmas keep arising—to the extent of grooms in Swat avoiding their own weddings. In general, difficulties can be resolved by avoiding simultaneous encounters with the parties toward whom one has discrepant relations—by patterns such as the seclusion of women, for example.

Where, as in the domestic unit, practically all role playing in one relationship takes place with the parties to other relationships present, problems arise for the actor in composing his behavior, his role, in such a way that activity in one relationship does not repudiate obligations or qualities important in the relationship to the others who are present. Here, one relationship may emerge as dominant over others; it takes precedence and is relatively little modified, whereas other relationships become latent and/or behavior in them is strongly modified, because tactical considerations of possible gains and losses are such as to make one relationship by far the most critical. In these cases it becomes important for the actor in shaping his role to avoid all idioms that are discrepant with his obligations in the dominant relationship. Thus, substantial sectors of the interaction appropriate between parties in non-dominant relationships may become suppressed, as between husband and wife in the presence of husband's father in Middle Eastern society. I would suggest that behavioral solutions to such dilemmas may go to the extent of imposing latency on the whole relationship—so that formal avoidance behavior may be analyzed from this perspective.

Which dilemmas will arise will depend not only on where the main discrepancies of status obligations occur, but also on the structure of coresident groups, and the other institutional forms that channelize and segment social life. Which solutions will be adopted, furthermore, depend on the "ecology" of the behavior in question: the setting, the technology, and the tasks required.

The perspective provided by Hsu, in conjunction with such a view of how role-patterned behavior is generated, thus seems to bear promise of

refinement in our analysis of kinship behavior. It allows us to relate more closely the different patterns of behavior between descriptively separable but functionally connected kinship dyads, especially within domestic units and other high-commitment living units, and may also give an improved perspective on such institutionalized forms of behavior as avoidance and joking relationships.

Bibliography

Ackerman, Nathan. 1958. *The Psychodynamics of Family Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Alexander, Franz. 1952. Development of the fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis, in Franz Alexander and Helen Ross (eds.), *Dynamic Psychiatry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Aramoni, Aniceto. 1961. *Psicoanalisis de la Dinamica de un Pueblo*. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autonomo de Mexico.

Bales, Robert F. 1950. *Interaction Process Analysis, A Method for the Study of Small Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press.

———. 1953. The equilibrium problem in small groups, in Talcott Parsons, Robert F. Bales, and E. A. Shils, *Working Papers*. New York: Free Press.

Bales, R. F., and P. E. Slater. 1955. Role differentiation in small decision-making groups, in Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales (eds.), *Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process*. New York: Free Press. Pp. 259–306.

Bandura, A. 1962. Social learning through imitation, in M. R. Jones (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: 1962*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press. Pp. 211–269.

Barth, F. 1959. *Political Leadership among Swat Pathans*. London: Humanities Press.

———. 1966. Models of social organization. *Royal Anthropological Institute: Occasional Paper No. 23*.

Bateson, Gregory. 1936. *Naven*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press (2nd ed., 1958).

———. 1943. Cultural and thematic analysis of fictional films. *Trans., New York Academy of Sciences* II, 5:72–78.

———. 1952. End linkage, in Margaret Mead and Rhoda Metraux (eds.), *The Study of Culture at a Distance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bateson, Gregory, and Margaret Mead. 1942. *Balinese Character*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

Batt, Carl. 1965. *Mexican National Character and the Inferiority Complex*. Unpublished Ms.

Beauvoir, Simone de. 1953. *The Second Sex*. New York: Bantam.

Befu, Harumi. 1966. Duolocal residence in Shirakawa, Central Japan. Paper read at the Pacific Science Congress, Tokyo.
Belshaw, C. B. 1965. *Traditional Exchange and Modern Markets.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
Benedict, Ruth. 1934. *Patterns of Culture.* New York: New American Library.
Bermudez, Maria Elvira. 1955. La vida familiar del Mexicano. *Mexico y lo Mexicano,* No. 20. Mexico: Antigua Libreria Robredo.
Berndt, C. H. (forthcoming). *Marriage and Family Life in Western Arnhem Land.* (ms. volume.)
———. 1970. Prolegomena to a study of genealogies in north-eastern Arnhem Land, in R. M. Berndt (ed.), *Australian Aboriginal Anthropology.* Perth: University of Western Australia Press.
Berndt, R. M. 1951. *Kunapipi.* Melbourne: Cheshire.
———. 1952. *Djanggawul.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
———. 1955. "Murngin" (Wulamba) social organization. *Amer. Anthro.* 57:84–106.
———. 1959. The Concept of "the Tribe" in the Western Desert of Australia. *Oceania* 30, No. 2. (Also in I. Hogbin and L. R. Hiatt (eds.), *Readings in Australian and Pacific Anthropology.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1966.)
———. 1964. The Gove Dispute: the Question of Australian Aboriginal Land and the Preservation of Sacred Sites. *Anthropological Forum* I, No. 2.
———. 1965. Marriage and the family in north-eastern Arnhem Land, in M. F. Nimkoff (ed.), *Comparative Family Systems.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Chapter 5.
———, ed. 1970. *Australian Aboriginal Anthropology.* Perth: University of Western Australia Press.
Berndt, R. M., and C. H. Berndt. 1951. *Sexual Behaviour in Western Arnhem Land.* New York: Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 16.
———. 1964/68. *The World of the First Australians.* Sydney: Ure Smith; Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
———. 1970. *Man, Land and Myth in North Australia: the Gunwinggu People.* Sydney: Ure Smith.
Berreman, Gerald D. 1965. *Himalayan Village.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Bettelheim, Bruno. 1965. Lecture, Child therapy: the hiers of little Hans. The University of Chicago.
Blanchard, W. H. 1959. The group process in gang rape. *J. Soc. Psych.* 49: 259–266.
Blau, P. M., and W. R. Scott. 1962. *Formal Organizations.* San Francisco: Chandler.
Bloch, M. 1961. *Feudal Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Bohannan, Laura, and Paul Bohannan. 1954. *The Tiv of Central Nigeria.* London: International African Institute.
———. 1968. *Tiv Economy.* Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
Bohannan, P. J. 1963. *Social Anthropology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Brown, Roger. 1965. *Social Psychology.* New York: Free Press.
Bryant, A. T. 1929. *Olden Times in Zululand and Natal.* London: Longmans, Green.
Burton, Roger V., and John W. M. Whiting. 1961. The absent father and cross-sex identity. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 7:85–95.
Carstairs, G. M. 1959. *The Twice Born.* London: Hogarth.

Caudill, William. 1963. Sibling rank and style of life among Japanese psychiatric patients. *Proceedings of the Joint Meeting of the Japanese Society of Psychiatry and Neurology and the American Psychiatric Association,* 35–40.
Caudill, William, and David Plath. 1966. Who sleeps by whom? Parent-child involvement in urban Japanese families. *Psychiatry* 29 (4):344–366.
Chapple, E. D., and C. M. Arensberg. 1940. Measuring human relations: an introduction to the study of the interaction of individuals. *Genetic Psychology* Monograph 22:3–147.
Ch'en, Kung lu. 1935. *Chung Kuo Chin Tai Shih (Recent History of China).* Shanghai: Commercial Press (2 vols.).
Cohen, Yehudi. 1964. The establishment of identity in a social nexus: the special case of initiation ceremonies and their relation to value and legal systems. *Amer. Anthro.* 66:529–552.
Collis, Maurice. 1943. *The Land of the Great Image (Being Experiences of Friar Maurique in Arakan).* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Count, Earl. 1967. The lactation complex. *Homo* 18:38–54.
Creel, Herlee G. 1953. *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Davenport, William. 1965. Sexual patterns and their regulation in a society of the southwest Pacific, in Frank A. Beach (ed.), *Sex and Behavior.* New York: Wiley.
Diaz, May. 1965. *Tonala.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Diaz-Guerrero, Rogelio. 1955. Neurosis and the Mexican family structure. *Amer. J. Psychiat.* 112:411–417.
———. 1961. *Estudios de Psicologia del Mexicano.* Mexico: Ed. Porrua y Obregon.
Doi, Takeo. 1956. Japanese language as an expression of Japanese psychology. *Western Speech* 20:90–96.
———. 1960. Jibun to amae no seischinbyori (Psychopathology of jibun andamae). *Psychiatria et Neurologia Japonica* 60:733–744
———. 1962. Amae: a key concept for understanding Japanese personality structure, in R. J. Smith and R. K. Beardsley (eds.), *Japanese Culture: Its Development and Characteristics.* Chicago: Aldine.
———. 1963. Some thoughts on helplessness and the desire to be loved. *Psychiatry* 26:266–272.
Doke, C. M. 1954. *The Southern Bantu Languages.* London: Dawson's of Pall Mall.
Durkheim, E. 1933. *The Division of Labor in Society.* New York: Macmillan.
———. 1966. *The Division of Labor in Society,* 2nd ed. New York: Free Press.
Easton, David. 1958. The perception of authority and political change, in Carl Friedrich (ed.), *Authority.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. 170–196.
Eberhard, Wolfram. 1952. *Chinese Festivals.* New York: Henry Schuman.
Edgerton, R., and F. Conant. 1964. Kilapat: the shaming party among the Pokot of East Africa. *Southwestern J. Anthro.* 20:404–418.
Eggan, Fred. 1950. *Social Organization of the Western Pueblos.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ehrenberg, V. 1964. *The Greek State.* New York: W. W. Norton.
Eissenstadt, S. N. 1965. *Essays on Comparative Institutions.* New York: Wiley.
Elkin, A. P. 1950. The complexity of social organization in Arnhem Land. *Southwestern J. Anthro.* 6 (1):1–20.

Elkin, A. P. 1954/64. *The Australian Aborigines: How to Understand Them.* Sydney: Angus and Robertson (1st ed. 1938).
Elkin, A. P., R. Berndt, and C. H. Berndt. 1951. Social organization of Arnhem Land, I. Western Arnhem Land, *Oceania* 21 (4):253–301.
Ema, Myeko. 1940. *Hida no onna-tachi (Women in Hida area, Central Japan).* Tokyo: Miluni-Shobo.
Erikson, E. H. 1950. *Childhood and Society.* New York: W. W. Norton.
Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1957a. The origins of the ruling clan of the Azande. *Southwestern J. Anthro.* 13:322–343.
———. 1957b. The Zandé royal court. *Zaire* 11:361 ff., 713.
———. 1957c. Zandé kings and princes. *Anthro. Quarterly* 30:61–90.
———. 1960. The organization of a Zandé kingdom. *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines* 1:5–37.
———. 1963. The Zandé state. *J. Royal Anthro. Inst.* 43:134–154.
Fernandez, J. W. 1962a. Folklore as an agent of nationalism. *African Studies Bulletin* V (2):3–8.
———. 1962b. Fang witchcraft and Christian acculturation. *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines* I (6): 244–270.
———. 1966. Principles of opposition and vitality in Fang aesthetics. *J. of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 33 (4): 53–63.
Firth, Raymond. 1940. *The Work of the Gods in Tikopia.* London: The London School of Economics and Political Science Monographs on Social Anthropology No. 2.
———. 1954. The sociology of "magic" in Tikopia. *Sociologus* 4:97–116.
———. 1955a. Privilege ceremonials in Tikopia: a further note. *Oceania* 26 (1): 1–13.
———. 1955b. The fate of the soul, in Charles Leske (ed.), *Anthropology of Folk Religion.* New York: Vintage.
———. 1957. *We, the Tikopia,* 2nd ed., abridged. Boston: Beacon.
———. 1959a. *Social Change in Tikopia.* London: George Allen and Unwin.
———. 1959b. *Economics of the New Zealand Maori.* Wellington, New Zealand: R. Owen.
Fortes, M. 1959. *Oedipus and Job in West African Religion.* Cambridge: The University Press.
Fortune, Reo. 1935. *Manus Religion.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
Foster, G. M. 1963. The dyadic contract. *Amer. Anthro.* 65:1280–1295.
Fowler, W. W. 1921. *The City-State of the Greeks and the Romans.* London: Macmillan.
Franck, K., and E. A. Rosen. 1945. A projective test of masculinity-femininity. *J. Consulting Psych.* 13:247–256.
Freedman, Maurice. 1966. *Chinese Lineage and Society.* L. S. E. Monograph No. 33. London: Athlone.
Freud, Sigmund. 1943. *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis.* Authorized English translation by Joan Riviere of the revised edition. Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing.
———. 1952. *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis.* New York: Washington Square Press.
Friedrich, Carl (ed.). 1958. *Authority.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Fromm, Erich. 1941. *Escape from Freedom.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
———. 1951. *The Forgotten Language.* New York: Evergreen Press.

Geddes, W. R. 1959. Fijian social structure in a period of transition, in J. D. Freeman and W. R. Geddes (eds.), *Anthropology in the South Seas.* New Plymouth, New Zealand: Thomas Avery & Sons.
Giele, J. 1961. *Social Change in the Feminine Role: A Comparison of Woman's Suffrage and Woman's Temperance, 1870–1920.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Radcliffe College.
Gluckman, Max. 1950. Kinship and marriage among the Lozi of Rhodesia and the Zulu of Natal, in A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and D. Fortes, (eds.), *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage.* London: Oxford University Press.
———. 1955. *Custom and Conflict in Africa.* New York: Free Press.
———. 1960. The rise of the Zulu empire. *Scientific American* 202 (4):152–169.
———. 1964. *Custom and Conflict in Africa.* New York: Free Press (2nd ed.).
Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Doubleday.
Goldschmidt, W. 1960. *Understanding Human Society.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Goode, W. J. 1963. *World Revolution and Family Patterns.* New York: Free Press.
Gough, Harrison. 1952. Identifying psychological femininity. *Ed. Psych. Measurement* 12:427–439.
Gouldner, A. W., and H. P. Gouldner. 1963. *Modern Sociology.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
Guthrie, Malcolm. 1953. *The Bantu Languages of Western Equatorial Africa.* London: William Dawson.
Guttman, David. 1965. Women and the concept of ego strength. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 11 (3):229–240.
Hagen, Everett. 1962. *On the Theory of Social Change.* Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey.
Heesterman, J. C. 1964. Brahmin, ritual and renouncer. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-und Ostasiens* VII:1–31.
Herskovits, Melville. 1948. *Man and His Work.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Herskovits, Melville, and Frances Herskovits. 1959. Sibling rivalry, the Oedipus complex and myth. *J. Amer. Folklore* 72:1–15.
Heston, J. C. 1948. A comparison of four masculinity-femininity scales. *Ed. Psych. Measurement* 7:375–387.
Hetherington, E. Mavis. 1965. A developmental study of the effects of sex of the dominant parent on sex-role preference, identification, and imitation in children. *J. Personality and Soc. Psych.* 2 (2):188–194.
Hetherington, E. Mavis, and Yvonne Brackbill. 1963. Etiology and covariation of obstinacy, orderliness, and parsimony in young children. *Child Development* 34:919–944.
Hewes, Gordon W. 1954. Mexicans in search of the "Mexican": notes on Mexican national character studies. *Amer. J. Econ. Soc.* 13:209–223.
Hiatt, L. R. 1965. *Kinship and Conflict: A Study of an Aboriginal Community in Northern Arnhem Land.* Canberra: The Australian National University.
Hitchcock, J. T. and Leigh Minturn Triandis. 1963. The Rajputs of Khalapur, India, in Beatrice Whiting (ed.), *Six Cultures.* New York: Wiley. Pp. 202–362.
Ho, Ping-ti. 1966. *Chung Kuo Hui Kuan Shih Lueh (An Historical Survey of Landsmannschaften in China).* Taipei, Taiwan: Student Publishing.
Hoebel, E. Adamson. 1966. *Anthropology: The Study of Man.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Holy Bible. 1946. New Testament Section. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
———. 1952. Old Testament Section. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
Homans, G. C. 1962. *Sentiments and Activities*. New York: Free Press.
Howard, Alan. 1966. Plasticity, achievement, and adaptation in developing economies. *Human Organization* 25:265–272.
Hsu, Francis L. K. 1943. Myth of Chinese family size. *Amer. J. Soc.* 18 (2): 555–562.
———. 1948. *Under the Ancestors' Shadow*. New York: Columbia University Press.
———. 1949. Suppression versus repression. *Psychiatry* 12:223–42.
———. 1953. *Americans and Chinese: Two Ways of Life*. New York: Henry Schuman.
———. 1959. Structure, function, content and process. *Amer. Anthro.* 61:790–805.
———. 1961. Kinship and ways of life: an exploration, in Francis L. K. Hsu (ed.), *Psychological Anthropology: Approaches to Culture and Personality*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.
———. 1963. *Clan, Caste, and Club*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.
———. 1964. Rethinking the concept "primitive." *Current Anthro.* 5 (3): 169–178.
———. 1965. The effect of dominant kinship relationships on kin and non-kin behavior: a hypothesis. *Amer. Anthro.* 67:638–61.
———. 1966. Rejoinder: a link between kinship structure and psychological anthropology. *Amer. Anthro.* (Brief communication) 68:999–1004.
———. 1968. Chinese kinship and Chinese behavior, in Ping-ti Ho and Tang Tsou (eds.), *China in Crisis: China's Heritage and the Communist Political System* Vol. 1, 579–608. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
———. 1969. Japanese Kinship and Iemoto. Chapters XI, XII, and XIII in the Japanese translation of *Clan, Caste, and Club* (1963). Tokyo: Baifukan.
Hucker, Charles O. 1957. The Tung-lin movement of the late Ming dynasty, in John K. Fairbank (ed.), *Chinese Thought and Institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 132–162.
Hunt, Eva. 1969. Kinship in San Juan: genealogical and social models. *Ethnology* 8:37–53.
Hunt, Robert. 1965a. *A History of the British and American Anthropological Study of National Character*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University.
———. 1965b. The developmental cycle of the family business in rural Mexico, in June Helm (ed.), *Essays in Economic Anthropology*. Proc. 1965 Annual Spring Meeting, American Ethnological Society. Seattle: University of Washington Press. Pp. 54–79.
———. 1967a. Introduction, in R. Hunt (ed.), *Personalities and Cultures*. New York: Natural History Press. Pp. ix-xxi.
———. 1967b. *Toward a Componential Analysis of Interaction*. Paper presented to Annual Meeting. Central States Anthropological Society, Chicago, Illinois.
———. 1968. Agentes culturales mestizos: estabilidad y cambio en Oaxaca. *America Indigena* 28:595–609.
Ibbetson, Sir Denzil C. J. 1883. *Report on the Revision of the Panipat Taksil and Karnal Parganah of the Karnal District 1872–80*. Allahabad: Government Printing Office.

Institute for Research, Indiana University. 1953. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
Iturriaga, Jose E. 1951. *La Estructura Social y Cultural de Mexico*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
Kahn, R. L., and D. Katz. 1960. Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale, in D. Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.), *Group Dynamics*. Evanston, Ill.: Harper & Row.
Kelman, H. C. 1961. Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25:57–78.
Kenny, H. 1960. Patterns of patronage in Spain. *Anthro. Quarterly* 33:14–23.
Kinsey, Alfred, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin. 1948. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
Kirk, H. David. 1964. *Shared Fate: A Theory of Adoption and Mental Health*. New York: Free Press.
Klineberg, O. 1954. *Social Psychology*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Kopytoff, Igor. 1961. Extension of conflict as a method of conflict resolution among the Suku of the Congo. *J. Conflict Resolution* 5:61–69.
———. 1964. Family and lineage among the Suku of the Congo, in R. F. Gray and P. H. Gulliver (eds.), *The Family Estate in Africa*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
———. 1965. The Suku of southwestern Congo, in James L. Gibbs, Jr. (ed.), *Peoples of Africa*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Koyama, Takashi. 1954. Daikazokusei (Extended family system), in Japanese Society of Ethnology (eds.), *Nippon shakaiminzoku jiten (Dictionary of Japanese Folk-Society and Culture)* Vol. 2. Tokyo: Seibundo-Shinkosha Co.
———. 1960. *Study of the Contemporary Family* (in Japanese). Tokyo: Kobundo.
Lawrence, W. E., and G. P. Murdock. 1949. Murngin social organization. *Amer. Anthro.* 51 (1): 58–65.
Leach, E. R. 1951. The structural implications of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. *J. Royal Anthro. Inst.* 81:23–55.
LeBarre, Weston. 1954. *The Human Animal*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lévi-Strauss, C. 1949. Les structures élémentaires de la parenté. Paris: Presses Universitaires.
———. 1953. Social structure, in A. L. Kroeber (ed.), *Anthropology Today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
———. 1958. *Anthropologie Structurale*. Paris: Libraire Plon.
Lewis, Oscar. 1951. *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlan Restudied*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
———. 1959. *Five Families*. New York: Basic Books.
———. 1961. *The Children of Sánchez*. New York: Random House.
Lipsitt, P. D. 1965. *Defensiveness in Decision Making as a Function of Sex Role Identification*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.
Liu, James T. C. 1957. An early Sung reformer: Fan Chung Yen, in John K. Fairbank (ed.), *Chinese Thought and Institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 105–131.
Lounsbury, Floyd. 1964. The structural analysis of kinship semantics, in Horace G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*. The Hague: Mouton. Pp. 1073–1093.
Maccoby, Michael. 1964. Love and authority: a study of Mexican villagers. *The Atlantic* 213:121–126.

Maccoby, Michael. 1967. On Mexican national culture, in Martindale (ed.), *National Character in the Perspective of the Social Sciences. Annals Amer. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.* 370:63–130.
Maccoby, Michael, N. Modiano, and P. Lander. 1964. Games and social character in a Mexican village. *Psychiatry* 27:150–162.
Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
———. 1927. *Sex and Repression in Savage Society.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
———. 1929. *The Sexual Life of Savages.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Manu, The Laws of. 1886. *The Laws of Manu,* in F. Max Miller (ed.), *The Sacred Books of the East,* Vol. XXV. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Maquet, J. J. 1961. *The Premise of Inequality in Ruanda.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Marcus, P. M. 1960. Expressive and instrumental groups: toward a theory of group structure. *Amer. J. Soc.* 66:54–59.
Mauss, Marcel. 1923–24. Essai sur le don, forme archaïque de l'echange. *Année Sociologique* Vol. 1.
———. 1954. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies.* English translation by I. Cunnison. New York: Free Press; London: Cohen and West.
McClelland, D. C. 1961. *The Achieving Society.* Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand.
McDavid, J. W. 1959. Imitative behavior in pre-school children. *Psychological Monographs* 73 (16, whole number, 486).
Mead, Margaret. 1930. *Growing Up in New Guinea.* New York: William Morrow.
———. 1942. The comparative study of culture and the purposive cultivation of democratic values, in Bryson and Finklestein (eds.), *Science, Philosophy and Religion,* 2nd symposium. New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. Pp. 56–69.
Meggitt, M. J. 1962. *Desert People.* Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
———. 1965. Indigenous forms of government among the Australian aborigines. *Bijdragen tot de Taal, Land- en Volkenkunde* 120:163–181.
Middleton, Russell. 1962. Brother-sister and father-daughter marriage in ancient Egypt. *Amer. Soc. Rev.* 27:603–611.
Miller, D., and G. E. Swanson (eds.). 1960. *Inner Conflict and Defense.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Minturn, Leigh and W. W. Lambert. 1964. *Mothers of Six Cultures.* New York: Wiley.
Mofolo, Thomas. 1931. *Chaka—An Historical Romance.* London: Oxford University Press.
Morgan, Lewis H. 1871. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family.* Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, Vol. XVII. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
Mulder, Mauk. 1959. Power and satisfaction in task oriented groups. *Acta Psychologica* 16:178–225.
———. 1960. The power variable in communication experiments. *Human Relations* 13:241–57.
Mulder, Mauk, Rob van Dijk, et al. 1965. Non-instrumental liking tendencies toward powerful group members. *Acta Psychologica* 22:367–386.
Mussen, P., and L. Distler. 1959. Masculinity, identification and father-son relationships. *J. Abnormal Social Psych.* 59:350–356.

Murdock, G. P. 1949. *Social Structure.* New York: Macmillan.
———. 1957. World ethnographic sample. *Amer. Anthro.* 59:664–687.
———. 1959. *Africa: Its People and Their Cultural History.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
———. 1962. Ethnographic Atlas. *Ethnology* 1:113–134.
Nakane, Chie. 1965. Towards a theory of Japanese social structure. *Economic Weekly,* Bombay (February). Pp. 197–215.
Naroll, Raoul. 1956. Social development index. *Amer. Anthro.* 58:687–715.
Needham, R. 1960. *Structure and Sentiment.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Nelson, B. 1949. *The Idea of Usury, from Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
Newell, W. H. 1952. Gaddi kinship and affinal terms. *Man in India* (April).
———. 1960. A Himalayan village, in M. N. Srinivas (ed.), *India's Villages.* London: Asia Publishing House.
———. 1962. Submerged descent line among the Gaddi people of North India. *J. Royal Anthro. Inst.* 92 (1):13–21.
———. 1963. Inter-caste marriage in Kugti village, Note 59. *Man,* London (April). Pp. 55–56.
———. 1966. Scheduled tribes and castes of Himachel Pradesh, Census of India. Also published in Ishwaran (ed.), *Social Change in India.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, in press.
Nimkoff, M. F. (ed.). 1965. *Comparative Family Systems.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Nkrumah, K. 1956. *Ghana: The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah.* Edinburgh: Nelson.
Parker, Arthur C. 1913. *The Code of Handsome Lake, The Seneca Prophet.* Albany: New York State Museum Bulletin No. 163.
Parkman, Margaret A. 1965. *Identity, Role and Family Functioning.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago.
Parsons, Anne. 1964. Is the Oedipus complex universal? The Jones-Malinowski debate revisited and a South Italian "Nuclear Complex," in Muensterberger and Axelrad (eds.), *The Psychoanalytic Study of Society,* Vol. III, 278–328. New York: International Universities Press.
Parsons, Talcott. 1952. *The Social System.* New York: Free Press.
———. 1960. *Structure and Process in Modern Societies.* New York: Free Press.
———. 1964a. *The Social System.* New York: Free Press.
———. 1964b. The incest taboo in relation to the social structure and the socialization of the child, in *Social Structure and Personality.* New York: Free Press.
———. 1968. Professions, in David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.* New York: Macmillan.
———. 1970. *System of Modern Societies.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
Parsons, T. and R. F. Bales. 1955. *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process.* New York: Free Press.
———. 1956. *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Paz, Octavio. 1959. *El Labertino de la Soledad.* Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
Peter, Prince of Greece and Denmark. 1963. *A Study of Polyandry.* The Hague: Mouton.
Peters, E. 1965. Aspects of the family among the Bedouin of Cyrenaica, in M. F. Nimkoff (ed.), *Comparative Family Systems.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Pike, K. L. 1964. Towards a theory of the structure of human behavior, in Dell Hymes (ed.), *Language in Culture and Society*. New York: Harper & Row. Pp. 54–62.
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1924. The mother's brother in South Africa. *South African J. Science* 21:542–555. Reprinted in *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*. New York: Free Press, 1952.
———. 1951. Murngin social organization. *Amer. Anthro.* 53 (1):37–55.
———. 1952. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*. London: Macmillan.
Ramirez, Santiago. 1966. El Mexicano—psicologia de sus motivaciones. Cuarto, Ed. Mexico: Editorial Pax-Mexico.
Ramirez, Santiago, and R. Parres. 1957. Some dynamic patterns in the organization of the Mexican family. *Int. J. Soc. Psychiat.* 3:18–21.
Ramos, Samuel. 1934. *El Perfil de Hombre y la Cultura en Mexico*. Mexico: Imprenta Mundial.
Rapaport, Anatol. 1964. *Strategy and Conscience*. New York: Harper & Row.
Raven, B. H., and J. R. French Jr. 1958. Legitimate power, coercive power, and observability in social influence. *J. Personality* 26:400–409.
Richards, I. A. 1932. *Mencius on the Mind: Experiments in Multiple Definition*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
Ritter, E. A. 1955. *Shaka Zulu*. London: Panther.
Roheim, Geza. 1932. Psycho-analysis of primitive cultural types. *Int. J. Psychoanalysis* 13:1–224.
Romney, K., and R. D'Andrade. 1964. Cognitive aspects of English kin terms. *Amer. Anthro.* 66 (3):146–70.
Rubel, Arthur. 1965. The Mexican-American palomilla. *Anthro. Ling.* 7:92–97.
Sahlins, M. D. 1958. *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
———. 1962. *Moala*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
———. 1965. On the sociology of primitive exchange, in *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. A. S. A. Monographs 1. London: Tavistock; New York: Praeger.
Schneider, David M. 1961. Introduction: the distinctive features of matrilineal descent groups, in David M. Schneider and Kathleen Gough (eds.), *Matrilineal Kinship*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
———. 1968. *American Kinship: A Cultural Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
Schooler, Carmi and William Caudill. 1964. Sympatology in Japanese and American schizophrenia. *Ethnology* 3:172–178.
Sears, R. R. 1957. Identification as a form of behavioral development, in *The Concept of Development*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Seeley, John R., Alexander Sim, and Elizabeth W. Loosely. 1956. Differentiation of values in a modern community, in *Crestwood Heights*. New York: Basic Books. Reprinted in Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), *A Modern Introduction to the Family*. New York: Free Press, 1964. Pp. 453–464.
———. 1965. *Crestwood Heights*. New York: Science Editions.
Shepler, B. 1951. A comparison of masculinity-femininity measures. *J. Consulting Psych.* 15:484–486.
Simon, Anne W. 1964. *Stepchild in the Family: A View of Children in Remarriage*. New York: Odyssey.
Slater, P. E. 1961. Toward a dualistic theory of identification. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 7 (2):113–126.

Smith, William Carlson. 1953. *The Stepchild*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Sofue, Takao. 1964. Tokyo no daigakusei ni okeru tekio no ichi bunseki (An analysis of the degree of adjustment in Tokyo college students). *Japanese Annals of Social Psychology* 5:133–160.
———. 1965. *Regional Variations of Japanese Personality: An Analysis by the Aid of the Sentence Completion Test (Preliminary Report)*. Paper read at the Annual Joint Meeting of the Anthropological Society of Nippon and the Japanese Society of Ethnology, Sendai.
Spencer, P. 1965. *The Samburu: A Study of Gerontocracy in a Nomadic Tribe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Srinivas, M. N. 1966. *Social Change in Modern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Stephens, W. 1962. *The Oedipus Complex: Cross Cultural Evidence*. New York: Free Press.
Strathern, Andrew and Marilyn Strathern. 1966. Dominant kin relationships and ideas. *Amer. Anthro.* (Brief Communication) 68:997–999.
Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. London: Oxford University Press.
Tannenbaum, Frank. 1950. *Mexico, The Struggle for Peace and Bread*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Tatje, Terrence A., and Francis L. K. Hsu. 1969. "Variations in Ancestor Worship Beliefs and Their Relation to Kinship." *Southwestern J. of Anthro.* 25:153–172.
Troeltsch, E. 1960. *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
Turner, V. W. 1957. *Schism and Continuity in an African Society: A Study of Ndembu Village Life*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Vogel, Ezra. 1963. *Japan's New Middle Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Wallace, A. F. C. 1958. Dreams and the wishes of the soul: a type of psychoanalytic theory among the seventeenth century Iroquois. *Amer. Anthro.* 60:234–248.
———. 1965. The problem of the psychological validity of componential analyses, in E. A. Hammel (ed.), *Formal Semantic Analysis. Amer. Anthro.* (Special Publication) 67 (5,2): 229–248.
Wallace, Anthony, and John Atkins. 1960. The meaning of kinship terms. *Amer. Anthro.* 62:58–79.
Warner, W. L. 1937–58. *A Black Civilization*. New York: Harper & Row.
Weber, M. 1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's Paperback.
———. 1964. *The Sociology of Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press.
White, Harrison C. 1963. *An Anatomy of Kinship, Mathematical Models for Structures of Cumulated Roles*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
Whiting, John W. M. 1959. Sorcery, sin and the superego, in M. R. Jones (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: 1959*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press. Pp. 174–195.
———. 1960. Resource mediation and learning by identification, in I. Iscoe and H. W. Stevensen (eds.), *Personality Development in Children*. Austin: University of Texas Press. Pp. 112–126.
Whiting, John, and I. L. Child. 1953. *Child Training and Personality*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
Whiting, John, Richard Kluckhohn and Albert Anthony. 1958. The function of male initiation ceremonies at puberty, in E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and

E. L. Hartley (eds.), *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. Pp. 359–370.

Wolf, Erik. 1959. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1966. Kinship, friendship and patron-client relations in complex societies, in *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*. A. S. A. Monographs 4. London: Tavistock; New York: Praeger.

Yang, Lien-sheng. 1957. The concept of Pao as a basis for social relations in China, in John K. Fairbank (ed.), *Chinese Thought and Institutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. 291–309.

Young, Frank. 1962. The function of male initiation ceremonies: a cross cultural test of an alternative hypothesis. *Amer. J. Soc.* 67:380.

Zelditch, Morris. 1955. Role differentiation in the nuclear family—a comparative study, in Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales (eds.), *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*. New York: Free Press. Pp. 307–351.

Index