

these articles became wholly ceremonial in use, they became surrounded by so many ritual restrictions that they have recently become obsolete, or at least obsolescent.

In concluding, it may be stated that here we appear to be dealing with a peculiar phenomenon; namely, that crafts, surviving today solely in ritual context, have declined to the point of extinction principally, it would seem, because they do survive solely in a ritual context.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY  
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

## ETIQUETTE AND SOCIAL SANCTION IN THE FIJI ISLANDS<sup>1</sup>

By DOROTHY M. SPENCER

A USEFUL definition of etiquette is that given by Hogbin:

Etiquette consists in the rules which regulate the behaviour of members of a society towards one another, but which have no further sanction than public opinion. The violation of these rules calls forth disapproval or ridicule, but the offender is not punished by any form of social machinery. On the other hand, a person who observes the rules with more than ordinary care is rewarded by public approval.<sup>2</sup>

Others who have dealt with the subject have usually agreed that the essential points in any definition of the term are first that etiquette is concerned with relations between people, and second that rules of etiquette have no sanction beyond that of public opinion. Rules of etiquette are thus set off on the one hand from conventions<sup>3</sup> in general, and on the other from moral or legal regulations. These distinctions are of value and importance; however, while it is useful to have a term which is more narrow in its connotation than convention, it may be doubted, it seems to me, whether, in many societies where etiquette is of importance, it is possible to draw definite lines between rules of etiquette and customs or mores<sup>4</sup> the violation of which calls forth more than mere "disapproval or ridicule." In any case the Fijian material does not lend itself well to such a classification.

Polite and courteous acts in general are termed in Fijian *tovo vaturana*, "chiefly ways," and are thus distinguished from rude, boorish manners,

<sup>1</sup> Since Fiji is not uniform culturally it is necessary to state that I am dealing, unless otherwise noted, with customs prevailing today in the district of Namataku, Tholo West, on the island of Viti Levu, in which region I spent about ten months as a pre-doctoral fellow of the Social Science Research Council for 1935-36.

<sup>2</sup> H. Ian Hogbin, *Man*, Vol. 31, 1931, p. 76. This was in answer to a request made by A. M. Hocart (*op. cit.*, p. 32) for a definition of the term. Hocart himself defined etiquette in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (Vol. 5, p. 615) as "the body of forms of conventional decorum into which one's behavior is cast." This is not, it seems to me, sufficiently specific to be useful; furthermore it introduces into the definition the word conventional, and convention as usually defined is a very broad term which refers to a wide range of behavior patterns.

<sup>3</sup> Morris Ginsberg in his article on "Social Conventions" in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (Vol. 4, pp. 351-52) has defined this term as the "rules or standards of conduct or behavior prescribing what is to be done or not to be done by the members of a given group or community. . . . Conventions are best understood as habits of thought or behavior which have become generalized and almost automatic in their operation. . . . Language is a system of conventionalized signs."

<sup>4</sup> I am here using the term as defined by E. Sapir in his article on "Custom" (*Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, p. 658): "The term mores is best reserved for those customs which connote fairly strong feelings of the rightness or wrongness of modes of behavior."

tovo vakaisi, or "ways of the low-born." On the surface these linguistic terms might be interpreted as evidence that social classes were of significance in the study of etiquette in Fiji<sup>5</sup> but as a matter of fact the distinction between chiefs and others is comparatively slight, at least in that part of Fiji with which we are dealing. With few exceptions chiefs are not accorded marks of respect which set them apart from the rest of the population nor are they distinguished by their polite ways. Tovo vaturana are expected of everyone.<sup>6</sup> Actually the word kaisi, far from being a term of reference for members of society who are not of chiefly rank, is used to express anything from disapproval and contempt to strong opprobrium and its application is considered uncomplimentary in the extreme.

Fijian etiquette regulates the behavior of individuals towards one another in various situations. Certain forms should be observed by persons participating on such occasions as arrival and departure, at meal times, and in connection with many of the economic and ceremonial institutions. In addition social intercourse of a general sort is facilitated and directed by a number of rules which prescribe the mode of behavior proper between individuals, especially those of different age or sex, and the conduct of relatives to one another. The etiquette connected with a few of these situations may be discussed in some detail.

Rules of etiquette observed in connection with meals and eating are of interest. The principal meal of the day is in the evening shortly after dark. It is important to be cleanly and neatly attired for this occasion, and since everyone bathes and dresses in clean clothes at the end of the day's work, this involves no special effort. An amusing story that illustrates very nicely the attitude toward this rule of etiquette was told to me by one of the natives, an inhabitant of the southern coastal region where the incident occurred. The people of his village extended a dinner invitation to the European district commissioner and his assistant. With the best of intentions, probably, they attended the dinner party attired in shorts, a costume which the Fijians well knew to be an informal one, reserved for working hours, field excursions, and the like. The men were furious and the women too felt

<sup>5</sup> In her *Questionnaire on Etiquette* in the *Journal of Social Psychology* (Vol. 7, 1936), E. G. Herzog says (p. 260) "Etiquette tends to define, emphasize and preserve social distinctions, using social here in both the narrower and broader sense, . . . it may easily implement and foster snobbery."

<sup>6</sup> But A. M. Hocart (*Lau Islands, Fiji*, Bulletin, Bishop Museum, No. 62, 1929, p. 43) says of the Lau Islanders, "Politeness (*vakarokoko*) is the sign of a nobleman; 'a nobleman is known by his manner.' A man who is not polite is known immediately as a low-born fellow. From my experience I should say that the higher the man, the better his manners."

themselves insulted that they should be forced to serve such unmannerly foreigners.

When the food is spread out on the mat anyone who happens to be present is invited to eat, and during the course of a meal any passer-by is called in and urged to sit down and help himself. If persons of chiefly rank are present they eat by themselves, and when they have finished the rest of the company claps with the hands cupped to show respect. Ordinarily the men of the household eat first; they are waited upon by the women who do not eat until the men have finished. During the course of the meal young girls fan the flies away from the food, and when the men have finished eating a bowl of water is passed around with a piece of cloth and the mouth and fingers are washed and dried.

The custom of kerekere or begging, important in the economic organization of these people, has its prescribed rules which to ignore would be impolite and even unwise. The individual making the request sits with head bent and eyes lowered before the one from whom he is begging and speaks slowly in a low voice. It is difficult to imitate the tone of humility in which the opening phrase, *ngi kerekere*, "I am begging," is uttered. If his request is for something valuable, such as a pig or a sum of money, he has come provided with a root of *yanqona*<sup>7</sup> which he now presents with the proper formula before stating his desires. To one acting in accordance with Fijian etiquette it is not possible to refuse to give that which has been asked for, and the object requested is placed on the floor in front of the beggar who does not touch the gift until he has expressed his gratitude with the proper phrases, at the same time clapping with cupped hands, slowly and at length. Likewise when receiving a gift which has been unsolicited it is polite to make use of this means of expressing thanks.

There are many rules of etiquette to guide the individual in his casual everyday contacts with his fellows. A Fijian, for example, must be careful to enter any house not his own in the proper manner. In the rectangular dwelling house there are two doors, one of which, placed in the middle of the long axis and facing the village green, is the *mata sau*, or "doorway of chiefs." The other, in the short side of the house is the *mata kaisi*, or "commoner's door." It is bad form for anyone not of high rank to enter of his own accord by the *mata sau*. It not infrequently happens, however, that the owner will bid his visitor to use this door in entering or leaving; it may be because of a mud puddle outside of the other door or merely as an act of courtesy to his guest. To take food into the house through this door is a very grave breach of etiquette and I have never seen anyone offend in this way.

<sup>7</sup> The Fijian word for the *Piper methysticum*.

The mata kaisi is the door in general use, but even here one must be careful to vakalawathia, to step over rather than on the door-sill. Within the house, the section close to the commoner's door is regarded as the most humble part of the room; as one advances towards the opposite wall the dignity and honor of one's position increases. A stranger in the village, upon entering the house, will sit down as unobtrusively as possible against the wall close to the lower door. The owner of the house says to him, "Come up here, and sit on the mat." The guest, however, will politely protest several times; then urged repeatedly by his host he moves to a position higher up in the house. If anyone of chiefly rank enters the house he seats himself in the upper part of the room without any preliminaries and those of lesser importance are careful to remain lower down.

It is very rude to walk behind an individual who is seated. Properly one walks in front of him, and this was rationalized by the observation that "a hostile-minded person would be in a good position to deliver the man a blow when he passed behind his back." When others are seated in the room it is polite when moving about to yato vasewa, or to "walk small," that is, in a stooping position. Women, if they wish to move around when men are seated in the house, do so by crawling on their hands and knees. This custom is, of course, based on the idea of the sacredness of the head; it is undesirable to place one's self in a position higher in a literal sense than that of others and the practice of "walking small" is at least a gesture towards removing that condition. There are other rules of etiquette based on the same principle. It is not only rude but insulting to reach above a person's head. If, however, as is frequently the case, it is necessary for an individual to do this, perhaps to hang up or to take down an object from the wall, he must first ask permission, which is always granted, and then, when the act is completed he squats or sits on the floor and claps with hands cupped. To neglect to do this after directly touching the head of another is to offer a deadly insult.

Besides such courtesies as those mentioned above, certain relationships within the social order are marked by additional forms of etiquette. Children should show respect to their parents by carefully observing those rules which we have already discussed. The use of relationship terms rather than personal names by younger members of the family to their elders is thought proper, though at the present time it must be admitted that children occasionally make use of the personal name even for their fathers, as well as for more distant relatives and this is a matter for disapproving comment on the part of the elders. A brother and sister do not talk freely in each other's presence; they are careful not to swear or to use obscene language. A man would not mention, in any connection, marriage to a girl in the presence of

her brother. A blood brother and sister may talk together, but in the classificatory relationship no conversation is permitted. Similarly two blood brothers, while they are supposed to treat one another with courtesy and respect, may talk together, but according to Fijian etiquette it is not proper for two classificatory brothers to converse. I once requested one of my informants, when he was about to make a visit to a neighboring village, to learn some stories from a native of that region who had a great reputation as a story-teller. My informant refused on the ground that the man was a "brother" of his, and in this instance the relationship was too distant to trace. Cross-cousins, on the other hand, are permitted to joke freely. The use of obscenity between them is considered quite proper and correct. They greet each other with the words, m'ta, m'mi, "your excrement, your urine," and they ask, "Where are you going, you lunatic?" Other relationships have their own appropriate behavior.

According to the definition, rules of etiquette have "no further sanction than public opinion. The violation of these rules calls forth disapproval or ridicule but the offender is not punished by any form of social machinery."<sup>8</sup> It is therefore on the basis of sanctions that rules of etiquette are to be set off from such other social usages as are concerned with relations between people. In his discussion of social sanctions<sup>9</sup> Radcliffe-Brown distinguishes between diffuse sanctions "comprising reactions toward the particular or general behavior of a member of the community which constitute judgments of disapproval;" and organized sanctions, "definite recognized procedures directed against persons whose behavior is subject to social disapproval." Fines, exile, imprisonment, etc., are examples of organized sanctions. Since according to the definition of etiquette "the offender is not punished by any form of social machinery" it is obvious that it is here a question of diffuse sanction. It was suggested in the beginning of this paper that in Fiji at least forms of etiquette could not be clearly distinguished from mores, the violation of which calls forth more than mere disapproval or ridicule. One reason for this is, it seems to me, the fact that in Fijian society there is a lack of organized sanctions such as fines or exile by which certain customs are to be distinguished from others which are not sanctioned in this way. A number of social usages depend for sanction only upon public opinion and they can be set apart from the rules of etiquette which I have been discussing only by the strength of the feeling of approval or disapproval which their violation calls forth in the minds of members of so-

<sup>8</sup> Hogbin, *loc. cit.*

<sup>9</sup> A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, "Sanction, Social" (in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 13, pp. 531-34).

ciety. Since, as I hope to show by citing a few examples, the violation of many of these rules of etiquette may, on occasion, evoke strong reactions on the part of individuals, it is necessary to call attention to the fact that such types of behavior cannot well be fitted into any narrow classification of etiquette; yet due to the fact that a breach of etiquette only rarely, and depending on individual temperament and circumstances, calls forth a strong reaction, it would be equally difficult as well as misleading to fit the regulations which I have been discussing into any classification of mores which depended for its limits on a narrow definition in terms of the strength of the sanction.

A few illustrations will serve to clarify the point. The strength of feeling with regard to committing a breach of etiquette was brought home to me quite clearly one evening. The Fijian girl who was in charge of my domestic arrangements wanted to hang up a towel on a line directly beneath which a venerable old man, a stranger in the village, was seated. She hesitated and looked around to discover some way by which she could avoid doing so and finally asked me to hang it up, feeling no doubt that it would be less rude for me to offend in this way. Her hesitation and final rejection seemed especially significant in view of the fact that Fijian etiquette does provide for such emergencies by means of the custom of asking for permission and the propitiatory gesture of clapping. When these measures are ignored the insult to the head may not be taken lightly, as the following anecdote, related to me by Kitcioni, will indicate. One evening a man by the name of Kavunikoro went to visit Kitcioni; another man, Naulunisau, was also present. The men lounged on the mats, smoking and chatting by the fire. Presently Naulunisau reached up and took a stick of firewood from the rack above the fireplace; but he neglected to ask permission to do this. While Naulunisau was sleeping that night, Kavunikoro, incensed at the insult to his person, collected from the fireplace some ashes mixed with the spit of Naulunisau, and using one of the methods of sorcery, brought about his death. Another individual died because he had thrown a stone, accidentally hitting the head of a man who took his revenge by means of sorcery. The famous story of the fate of the Reverend Baker comes to mind in this connection. Brewster concludes his account of the episode with the following remarks:

He sealed his own fate by what his host considered a gross breach of good manners. . . . When Mr. Baker arrived in the village he was hospitably received, and spent the night there. In the morning he produced a comb and used it in his toilet, and then laid it down on the mats. His host, the leading chief, picked it up and stuck it in his own fuzzy locks. He did it quite innocently, as property was, as regards ordinary people, in communal use, and the upper classes could certainly take any-

thing they fancied. Native combs, too, were worn stuck into their owners' hair. They were very necessary appanages from the verminous state of the big-heads, being constantly required for scratching. The knowledge of this probably offended the real owner's sense of cleanliness and decency, and he snatched it from the chief-tain's head. He could not have committed any deadlier offense. . . . The insult to the chief's honor . . . sealed Mr. Baker's fate.<sup>10</sup>

Other rules of etiquette may also involve strong feelings. Williams tells the story of a chief on the island of Thithia

who was addressed disrespectfully by a younger brother: rather than live to have the insult made the topic of common talk, he loaded his musket, placed the muzzle at his breast, and pushing the trigger with his toe shot himself through the heart.<sup>11</sup>

Williams adds that he knew of a very similar incident on Vanua Levu. The same author has also given us some interesting observations on etiquette in connection with meals and eating, which are to the point in this connection.

I have often been struck by the promptness with which a party of natives, while eating have transferred their meal to others passing by; and so long as I was a tyro in native matters, I liked to regard this as a sign of the people's hospitality. But the assurance of many among themselves compelled me to believe that this act of seeming liberality was the result of fear; lest by withholding any part or by something in their manner of eating they should give offense.<sup>12</sup>

And he adds an account of the disastrous consequences resulting to those who once offended in this way.

Further light on native attitudes regarding this particular rule of etiquette is afforded us in Brewster's work on the hill tribes.

Early missionaries introduced a rough code such as they had established in the Friendly Islands, from whence they brought it on to Fiji. . . . Under it there was a judge . . . in every village. Every three months or so they would assemble in the principal centre of their district and hold a sort of quarter sessions. . . . Soon rough written notes of the cases were recorded. . . . We came across some of these old and curious records and found minutes of convictions for selfishness, *for not sharing food with one's friends and comrades*, and for stinginess.<sup>13</sup>

Generally speaking all rules of etiquette, however trivial, should be observed; since, though no direct steps be taken by an offended person to avenge the insult, his anger itself may be a dangerous thing in that it may

<sup>10</sup> A. B. Brewster, *The Hill Tribes of Fiji* (Philadelphia, 1922), p. 30.

<sup>11</sup> T. Williams and J. Calvert, *Fiji and the Fijians* (New York, 1859), p. 96.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 119.

<sup>13</sup> Brewster, *op. cit.*, p. 49. Italics ours.

cause sickness to one against whom it is directed. When I asked why one should step over rather than on the door sill I was told simply that the owner of the house would be angry; this in itself seemed a sufficient reason to my informant. On one occasion I threw a small empty match box toward the fireplace and accidentally hit a woman in the head. Of course I immediately sat down and clapped my hands, explaining that I had not hit her intentionally and begging her not to be angry with me. She assured me, with an earnestness the meaning of which was unmistakable, that she was not angry; in other words I was not to worry.

Broadly interpreted the term etiquette as defined by Hogbin can be used to cover the social usages discussed in this paper but it should be recognized that in Fiji there can be between these rules and others sanctioned by public opinion no distinct line which is drawn on the basis of the strength of the sanction.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

## THE USE OF PEYOTE BY THE CARRIZO AND LIPAN APACHE TRIBES

By MORRIS E. OPLER

### INTRODUCTION

**D**URING the summer of 1935 the writer made an attempt to salvage as much ethnographic data as possible from the few surviving Lipan Apache living on the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico.<sup>1</sup> Among the most interesting materials coming out of this effort were those which had to do with the use of peyote, for they involved an account purporting to be a description of a Carrizo peyote meeting which indicated that the use of peyote had diffused from the Carrizo Indians to the Tonkawa and Lipan Apache. In the first half of the nineteenth century, according to Lipan informants, their tribe claimed a home in the Texas gulf region around Houston and Galveston. Their neighbors to the east were the Carrizo. In the third quarter of the century, the pressures of warfare and epidemic divided the Lipan, forcing the segments west across the Rio Grande and north, respectively.

Only one Lipan man who had lived under aboriginal conditions could be found at the time of the field researches. Lipan women were barred from most activities concerning peyote, so the entire account had to be recorded from this man, Antonio Apache. There is a manifest danger in accepting the account of one man in respect to the peyote rite of another tribe and his own, but since one of the tribes under consideration is extinct and the other is nearly so, and since these notes are very likely the last we shall obtain about these peoples on this subject, they are offered without further apology.

If the picture given below is accurate, it is plain that with Lipan and Carrizo peyote we are close to the source of this interesting cult within the present boundaries of the United States. There is no reason to believe that this Lipan's account is not highly authentic. He proved to be a very patient, intelligent, and careful informant whose descriptions checked perfectly with such scraps concerning peyote as other Lipan were able to give me. The information is rendered in the informant's own words. The only liberties taken have been to organize the material a bit more logically in view of the anthropological interest and to omit a few asides and irrelevancies.

<sup>1</sup> The field-work was made possible by the generous financial support of Columbia University, the National Research Council, the Social Science Research Committee of the University of Chicago, and the Southwest Society.