

methodology. Some would argue that the quantification of qualitative and the wrenching of isolated cultural items from their larger context does irreparable violence to their meaning. This may well be a criticism, but surely it is an empirical question, and the answer must be in further investigations. We have published this truncated study in the hope that a sufficient number of similar researches into religion will be published so that a more confident judgment can be passed.

## NOTES

1. The authors wish to express their gratitude to the Social Science Research Council for the grant which made it possible to carry out this project: Spiro, for a Faculty Research Fellowship; D'Andrade, for a Graduate Research Fellowship.  
 2. For a description of the cross-cultural method, see Whiting 1954.  
 3. The term "belief system" is used to designate the configuration of supernatural beliefs and practices to be found in the various religions.  
 4. Although the differences between our formulation and Kardiner's are crucial in at least two respects, his work has had a profound influence on our thought.  
 5. The expression, "conceptions . . .," is used because all that can be known about supernatural beings are the conceptions which people have of them. Whether these conceptions correspond to some objective reality is a question which no available scientific technique can test. Empirical attempts to establish such correspondences have been effectively destroyed by Hume's arguments in their incisive critiques of the "ontological argument."  
 6. The authors are indebted to James Sakoda of the University of Connecticut for advice on statistical and computational procedures.  
 7. Although this distinction has been employed by some to differentiate "magic" from "religion," and by others to differentiate "higher" from "lower" religions, we neither intend nor imply such distinctions. It is obvious that either or both attitudes may be found in any religion: the Zoroastrian supplicates in his vision quest; the Catholic priest compels in the Mass. The important problem, then, is the degree to which these different attitudes are to be found in any religion. This is of course an empirical question.  
 8. Whiting and Child did not obtain separate measures for rewards and punishments. Their measure of socialization anxiety refers to the anxiety attendant upon total training. For our purposes, following from our theoretical assumptions, it is important to obtain separate measures for "positive" and "negative" reinforcement. Our concept of socialization satisfaction refers to the satisfaction derived from the former dimension of the socialization process.  
 9. On this point, see Whiting 1954:924.

## REFERENCES CITED

- PIAGET, JACQUES  
 1952 Stages in the development of the sense of reality. *In* First contributions to psychoanalysis. London, Hogart Press.
- PIAGET, JACQUES, and ABRAHAM  
 1939 The individual and his society. New York, Columbia University Press.
- MELFORD E.  
 1953 Ghosts: an anthropological inquiry into learning and perception. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 48:376-382.
- WHITING, JOHN W. M.  
 1954 The cross-cultural method. *In* Handbook of social psychology, Gardner Lindzey ed. Cambridge, Addison-Wesley.
- WHITING, JOHN W. M. AND IRVIN L. CHILD  
 1953 Child training and personality: a cross-cultural study. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Sexuality and Aggression on Romonum, Truk<sup>1</sup>

MARC J. SWARTZ

University of Massachusetts

THIS paper will examine the two relationships on Romonum Island which involve direct sexual expression. It will show that one of these, the spouse relationship, is viewed by the islanders as a less satisfactory source of sexual gratification than is the other, the sweetheart relationship. The greater satisfaction found in the sweetheart relationship will be shown to be related to the opportunities it offers for the expression of aggression through its characteristic sexual practices, as well as in other ways. The spouse relationship will be shown to be like other kin relationships in that it is a source of aggressive feelings but offers few channels for the expression of these feelings. Finally, a relationship will be established between the differential operation of hostility-producing conflicts on the sexes and the tendency on the part of males to express a significant proportion of their aggression against themselves.

Virtually everyone on Romonum participates in both the spouse and the sweetheart relationships at one time or another, but the two are markedly different in nature and in the position they occupy in the culture of the island. The marital complex is an integral part of the economic system and provides its participants with a large part of their social relations and orientations. The sweetheart complex is less enmeshed in the economic system than is any other relationship of importance, and it provides few social relations or orientations of wide scope. The marital complex is endowed with as much legitimacy and propriety as any other set of kin roles, while the sweetheart complex, as most often practiced, has an illegitimacy unlike that of any other role set in the society.

Informants agreed that neither men nor women are expected to abstain from coitus prior to marriage and that for both, sex relations generally begin during adolescence. For girls they are said to start when the breasts begin to develop, and for boys at around the age of fifteen. There is no generally accepted first partner, but sometimes a boy's first experience will be with a much older woman. Although Gladwin (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:102) notes a case in which a boy's first partner was the wife of a somewhat older "brother" who "felt sorry" for the boy because he had no one to sleep with, this does not appear too common and does not seem to be consistent with the respect behavior and sexual avoidance of older brothers' wives mentioned to me by five men. If the boy's first partner is a considerably older woman, the relationship consists almost exclusively in performing the sexual act and does not include the other elements of the extramarital complex to be described. Several men told me that their first experience was with a woman who was then middle-aged and who, in one night, would accommodate a number of adolescent boys.

The first sex experience for a boy is not said to produce any physiological

change. However, girls are believed to begin menstruating and/or developing breasts only after their first coitus. Informants did not agree on this: some said that when a girl's breasts begin to develop it is then known by all that she has had sexual relations. Others said that both the onset of menstruation and the development of the breasts are due to coitus. One rather sophisticated informant suggested that men only get interested in girls when the breasts begin to develop, that perhaps both would begin without copulation, but that "we Trukese are bad and when we see a girl is almost a young woman, we want to have intercourse with her." A girl's first "sweetheart" (*kamwet* is the Trukese word for lovers) may be the husband of one of the real or classificatory sisters with whom she lives. There does not appear to be any rule against a man copulating with the younger sisters of his wife,<sup>2</sup> but several informants said there would be "trouble" if the wife found out. In the affairs going on when we were on Romonum, one of the only two adolescent unmarried girls on the island was reported to have been having her first affair, and her partner was said to be a young married man whose wife was not related to the girl.

The sweetheart relation is held to be illegitimate despite the approval of premarital coitus, because in most cases it involves adultery since one, or more often both, participants are married. This is partly because there are at present only two unmarried girls past puberty on the island (although there are a number of elderly widows). Further, by the time a person is old enough to carry on a full sweetheart relationship—that is, has had enough experience—he is probably married, as marriage occurs early. There are eight young men or late adolescents and two men in their thirties who are unmarried. There is an equal number of men and women between the ages of 15 and 37 (53 men and 53 women), but the larger number of unmarried men is due to the older average age of men at marriage.

Some informants say that preadolescent children would get sick if they engaged in sexual activity. Others said that boys "just did not start to think of women until they were almost young men." Sex play was not observed in children's groups, although boys in the 10- to 13-year-old age range were sometimes heard laughingly to accuse each other of masturbation.

Adolescent girls do not stay unmarried long and although boys seem generally to marry later, they too marry rather young. The girls most often marry men several years older. This first marriage is rather distinctive in three respects.<sup>3</sup> First, it is usually the one in which parents have the most to say about whom the individual will marry. Gladwin, in speaking of marriage, says (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:119): "the introduction of a new member into the cooperative group has major consequences for the members of the lineage and household and it is therefore also felt that the parents should have more authority than merely the right to disapprove of a proposed marriage at more or less the last minute," and my information indicates that this authority is most often and most easily exerted in regard to the first marriage. This is not to say that all first marriages are arranged by the parents of the couple, but rather that most marriages which are not entirely brought about through the

wishes of the couple are first marriages for one or both participants. The second distinctive feature is that first marriages are sometimes preceded by *kofót* or betrothal; the boy lives with and works for the girl's family, while she lives with and works for his family. *Kofót* is not a prelude to all first marriages (although it may have been more common formerly), but all three reported cases were in first marriages. Breaking the betrothal is considered to be like divorce, although the couple has not openly lived together. Marriage is informal on Truk and there is a ceremony only if the couple is married in church. Many couples publicly live together with the consent of their parents in the premissionized practice, and are thereby married. The first marriage is the one most likely to end in divorce. Of 48 informants ranging in age from about 20 to 45, 26 admit having been divorced, and only 8 of these more than once. Divorce is obtained at the desire of either person and, barring a Catholic marriage, is without formality beyond getting the consent of the island chief. In most cases a divorce is effective after the couple has stopped living together for a time.

The main causes of divorce are adultery, the man's failure to satisfy his wife's relatives by the amount of work and goods he contributes to them, excessive wife-beating, the woman's failure to perform sufficient services for her husband (or rarely for his matrilineal family<sup>4</sup>), dissatisfaction by either or both families with the amount of goods, services, and support contributed by the other in disputes and litigation, and incompatibility (reflected in constant quarreling over the allocation and use of money and goods).

I will deal with adultery in the discussion of the sweetheart complex, and will only comment here that it is almost always a factor and by far the most common reason given for divorce except in the rare instances among elderly people.

Another refrain running through many accounts of divorce is the assertion by the wife and her consanguines that the husband or ex-husband is lazy and unwilling to do the work his wife, her brothers, father, and mother tell him to do. Once I mentioned to some friends that I had not seen my wife's father for two years. This brought great expressions of amazement from them, and in discussing it they agreed that if a Trukese did this, his wife's father would quickly tell her to "throw away that man." "We Trukese," one of them said, "if we don't go to our wives' fathers every day, there will be trouble. He often has work to give us." The demand on a husband for work includes not only helping provide his wife's family with food (the gathering and preparation of all vegetable food and a great part of protein food is men's work), but also working with them on any undertaking such as house or boat building and copra production.

The wife's father and adult brothers (if the woman has no true brothers, then *MoSiSos* or *MoMoSiDaSos*) are the principal ones to "command" the man's labor, with the brothers often more active than the father. They do not restrict themselves to requiring work immediately connected with their own needs, but may tell him to do anything from filling their work obligation to

someone else to how to testify in a court case. A man clearly recognizes that if he fails to do the bidding of his wife's father and brothers, they may bring about a divorce.

There are few measures the husband may take if he does not choose to accede to their wishes. First, he can determine whether or not his wife will actually divorce him if she is told to. A woman is usually not in a position to stand against her male relatives, who control the land from which her food comes and are in an accepted position of authority over her. However, when a woman lives on land given her by her father, there is considerable flexibility in her position, and if she can withstand the pressure put on her by the men, it is possible for her to be more independent of her relatives. There is an excellent example of this on Romonum at present. A very intelligent and determined woman has been told repeatedly by her "brothers" (MoSiSos) and her dead father's brothers to divorce her husband, who will not work for them and who has brought a land suit against one of them. She refuses. Since she and her sister live on land given them by her father and she is unimpressed by their authority, they can do nothing and the marriage continues.

Second, the husband can win an ally among his wife's relatives. For example, a young man asked his sister's husband to go spear fishing with him, but the husband did not want to go. The husband appealed to another of his wife's brothers, pointing out that there was breadfruit to be pounded and that he would do that instead. The second brother agreed, and told the first brother that the husband should not go fishing. The first brother grumbled that the husband was "disobedient" and that his sister should divorce him, but as he knew that both his brother and the sister would oppose this, he carried the matter no further. If the sister had not cared much for her husband, this incident might have precipitated a divorce. It is advantageous for a husband to win general support from one of his wife's brothers. Action of any kind is virtually impossible unless all those involved are of "one heart," i.e., unanimous. In order for the husband's ally to be effective he must be a strong person, because unless he is very determined he will join the majority in any division of opinion.

Finally, if the husband is sufficiently pressed by his wife's relatives, he may leave her. The woman's brothers and father realize that unusually severe demands on the husband will possibly bring an end to the marriage and may make it very difficult for the woman to get a desirable husband.

The above discussion applies as well to requests for goods (*kiis*). As Goodenough and Gladwin both point out, such requests have a status distinct from presents (*niffang*), for they require no return gift. A man may ask his sister's husband for anything he has, with the same limitations as those applying to the amount of work. There is some reciprocity in that a man may ask his wife's brothers for things, but it is much easier for them to refuse him.

The husband's family does not frequently press him to divorce his wife because they are dissatisfied with the assistance she has given them. The woman is expected to do relatively little work for her husband's family, so

few occasions for complaint can arise. The husband's family most commonly brings pressure on him to divorce his wife when they feel that he is advancing the interests of his wife's family at the expense of his own. "He is only with his wife" (i.e., his wife's interests) and "he thinks only of his wife" are very meaningful remarks for a Trukese to make about a brother, and I recorded such remarks where a man was believed not to be fully supporting his kin in work or in a dispute.

The above points to one of the most severe strains on a man on Romonum. On the one hand, he must work for and side with his wife's family if he is to prevent them from persuading his wife to divorce him; on the other, he must give his own kin no reason to believe that "he thinks only of his wife." In order to preserve his marriage from pressure for divorce from one side or the other, a man must carefully allocate his goods, services, and support. While the techniques used by men to avoid carrying out the tasks assigned them by their affines sometimes relieve this pressure, considerable frustration of personal desires must be tolerated in order to maintain satisfactory relations with both own and wife's relatives. The wife is not subjected to this stress, as her work is not the sort that her husband's family requires but is limited largely to the house and children (and women do not often live with their husbands' families). Women rarely have goods of their own, and they rarely participate in public affairs or disputes.

The less strained role of the wife is only one aspect of the fundamentally more secure position of women, as Gladwin and Sarason have pointed out (1953:223 ff.; see also Gladwin 1953). She is less subject to conflicting demands from her own and her husband's families for her emotional and physical support. Since women rarely control goods of any significance, she need not worry about keeping what she has or getting what she wants. Her male relatives, both her husband's and her own kin, will expend most of their effort in obtaining goods and services which will benefit her as well. However, she is subject to the will of her brothers, father, and husband. All of them can tell her to do any woman's work they wish her to do, and may respond to disobedience by beating her. The woman is saved from excessive domination by the rather limited scope of women's work. Only two kinds of work commonly done by women directly provide food: they carry on group fishing and help in the few kinds of gardening that require active cultivation, notably tapioca-growing. Neither of these activities is as difficult or as economically important as the work of men, and in helping in these activities, as in any work commonly performed by women in assisting men, there is little conflict for her. Even if she is helping her husband, the work will benefit her own relatives either because it is being done completely for them, or because her husband will give them a share. If her husband's relatives or her own are not satisfied with the division, it is the husband who usually bears the brunt of any difficulty since he presides over the apportioning of their joint product.

However, the wife's position is not completely free from stress. She must decide whose authority to accept when there is conflict between her consanguineal

male relatives and her husband, and must obey her mother and older sister as well as her husband's older female relatives. This last seems to offer the same potentialities for conflict as her husband's position in regard to his affinal and consanguineal relatives, but because of the nature of women's work and the residence pattern, the conflict does not seem to materialize. As already noted, a woman who is told to divorce her husband may not wish to, but unless she holds land independent of her lineage, there is little she can do to avoid getting the divorce. She must also balance her behavior toward her husband and her consanguineal male relatives if she is to avert conflict between them or avoid their anger. They may express this anger by "talking strong" to her or by beating her.

In strictly interpersonal disputes between spouses, the wife's brothers often side with the husband. One morning I heard a young man shouting at his wife that she had lost the key to the locked box she shared with him. (Everyone has a box that can be locked, in which prayer books, money, or other valuables are kept.) As I approached the house, the woman rushed out carrying her infant daughter and followed by her husband, who was brandishing a machete. He shouted "You are very disobedient," and struck her across the chest with the flat of the machete. The woman staggered back and began to wail that the baby had been cut. Her brother, who was with me, ran to her and began shaking her. "See the price of your disobedience!" he told her. The brother explained afterward that his sister was not virtuous (*mirit*) and that she "drove everyone crazy." The woman's brothers must also protect a man's marital rights with their sister if the husband fulfills his obligations to them.

A woman may not be sure of support from her sons in any conflict with her husband. It is generally accepted that a woman may beat her husband if she is able, but it appears that grown children are expected to help their fathers in conflicts with their mothers. Informants agree that this is true of the sons, but do not agree on the role of daughters. The father is to be helped because in striking him the mother violates a major Trukese value, that of not being *namanam tekia* (literally, "high beliefs" or "high thoughts" or, translated more freely, to engage in behavior appropriate to a status higher than the one occupied). Goodenough translates this as "haughty behavior." A good case of this occurred while we were on Romonum, when a woman struck her husband for gambling away all the money he had got for trochus. In the fight which ensued, the husband was joined by their adolescent son and the two beat her badly. Several informants, including one woman, indicated that the son had acted quite properly and that the woman had only "got the price of her sins."

Wife beating is quite common but is appropriate only if there is a good "reason." When a woman violates the proscriptions on "haughty behavior" or is disobedient, her husband may beat her with no fear of interference from her relatives. However, if a husband beats his wife too frequently, or if the beatings are too severe, the woman's relatives will "pity her" (*tongei*) and will cause a separation. If the man continues to offend, a divorce will result. Another restriction is that a man should never beat his wife in his own family's

house. If he does, a divorce may result even if he is justified in striking her and does so rather moderately. When a man slapped his wife upon finding her in his family's house after he had told her to go and wash his clothes, her family enforced a separation which lasted for several weeks. The woman's brother told me that his family was very angry about their sister being beaten in the house of her husband, and that "it's bad [for] one to beat his wife if it isn't under the faces of her family." He said the reason is that the man's relatives would not "think of her" and would not stop the man, regardless of how badly she was being hurt.

Despite these restrictions, men sometimes use their wives as objects for the displacement of aggression. Rather early in my stay I was forced to discharge the man who worked for me as linguistic informant. He was clearly very angry at this, but Romonum people behave rather humbly toward foreigners and cannot express much anger toward them. He went to his own house and shortly afterward beat his wife. His wife's sister's husband told me of this but when asked why the man had done it, could only reply, "maybe because he was angry." However, behavior toward the wife cannot often be as free as that. Divorce is undesirable for the man because of the economic and social dislocations it brings, and the threat of divorce is a partial restraint on the promiscuous mistreatment of a wife. Similarly, a woman may not freely aggress against her husband. While she need have little fear of economic and social displacement, for her to engage in free and open aggression toward her husband would violate the values of humble or nonhaughty behavior and would tend to alienate the support of her own family. These values also apply to men and combine with the threat of divorce to limit overt aggression against the wife.

These restrictions are similar to those which apply to all kin relations, but are somewhat less severe. The expression of feelings, particularly aggressive feelings, is inhibited in all kin relationships. Informants unanimously agreed that in all phases of behavior which I investigated through direct interviewing (dependence, dominance, submission, aggression, and sexuality), the spouse relationship is more "open" than any other kin relation. Spouses dominated each other, submitted to each other, depended on each other, aggressed against each other, and were less restricted in such sexual behavior as joking, using bad language, and sleeping together than were participants in any other kin relationship. Informants indicated that other relationships were relatively unrestricted in one or another of the kinds of behavior studied, but never in all kinds. While the spouse relationship offers greater freedom for the expression of aggression (and other kinds of behavior studied) than does any other kin relationship, this expression is possible only under prescribed conditions and within definite limits.

Because of the limitations on the expression of aggression between spouses, the kin relationship most free from restriction in this respect, it follows that the hostility aroused in the individual has only limited outlet within the framework of kinship. The aggression aroused by conflicting responsibilities to

affinal and consanguineal kinsmen can neither be expressed to them nor freely displaced to the spouse. In all the hostility-producing conflicts, of which the last is an example, kinship does not provide adequate channels for the expression of the aggression aroused.

Fischer has clearly pointed out another major source of such conflict:

Relations between old and young in Truk imply special sociopsychological conflicts. The elders are hesitant to demand much of their juniors until absolutely necessary and consider that it is difficult to get the juniors to work [because they are preoccupied with their love affairs], but still the elders know that they must someday transfer the major subsistence responsibilities to their juniors. It is not surprising that even the elders often do not approach the job of food production wholeheartedly. The daily food supply in many Truk households thus tends to be erratic, although the climate is favorable and the soil fertile enough for a stable food supply. The juniors, on their part, are liable to resent the elders for not providing food regularly enough, and for the threat of giving to outsiders valuable real estate and esoteric lore belonging wholly or in part to the lineage (J. Fischer 1957:255).

The threat Fischer mentions is that an elder may give his property to anyone he wishes, and need not give it to his "regular heirs" if they do not care for him properly when he is too feeble to care for himself (ibid:255).

This is not the only conflict over giving away goods. Another is found in the *tingor* or request system. Anyone can request that anyone else, particularly his relatives, give him things, and the only acceptable way out is to claim that one does not have the object which has been requested. Since everyone knows this device, really serious requests are made when the desired object is in sight and other people are around, so that the possessor will be ashamed (*mäfen*) to say that he doesn't have it. Such an episode leaves the loser full of aggressive feeling which he cannot fully vent, although after some time (a few days at least) he can request something of equal value of the recipient. However, he can by no means be sure of having this request fully or promptly granted.

It is not only the various structurally induced conflicts which produce aggressive feelings. Beginning with the mother and infant, almost all interpersonal relations are characterized by inconsistency and tension. A. Fischer (1956:123) notes that adults sometimes quiet a crying child whose mother is absent by saying, "look, here comes your mother up the path"; when the child stops crying and looks for its mother, they will say, "I was only lying." This desire to deal with the immediate situation without regard for reality is seen in all relationships. One does not ordinarily oppose the wishes of another in his presence, and people in a face-to-face situation make verbal agreements which they do not intend to fulfill. Although everyone is aware of this, and a person telling about an agreement reached almost always adds, "maybe he just lied," strong feeling is engendered by an unfulfilled agreement.

This feeling cannot be expressed openly to a relative, for reasons already outlined, and cannot usually be expressed to nonrelatives, because pressure is

often applied to stop the hostile expression of feeling. When two unrelated persons exchange heated words, others quickly surround them and repeatedly tell them *pöütönö*, meaning "throw it [the quarrel away]" The relatives of each man will lead him away, forcibly if necessary, and the activity which brought on the quarrel will be abandoned. One day at a baseball game the captain of one team wanted to use a new ball, as the cover had come off of the one in play. He and two unrelated men had bought a ball, and with one of the men he went to the third, who was holding the ball, and asked him for it. This man did not want to give it to them, and even refused the team captain's offer to buy his share of ownership. The two men argued for a minute or two while the players and spectators chorused "throw it away." Without having made any concession in argument, the holder suddenly gave the captain the ball. But the game, which was about three-fourths over, did not resume and everyone drifted away from the baseball field. When I asked why the game was stopped, people said it was because there had nearly been trouble.

A further inhibition to the expression of aggression is found in the previously mentioned values of humbleness and the avoidance of "trouble" (*fiti-kooko*). A person who freely expresses aggression is said to engage in "haughty behavior" and to like "trouble," and informants are unanimous in wanting not to be characterized in this way.

To review the argument to this point, it is held that the spouse relationship, while allowing greater freedom of behavior than any other kin relationship, severely restricts the expression of aggression. This restriction results from its being part of a larger system of social and economic relations which would be endangered by uninhibited behavior, particularly aggressive behavior. Although many sources of aggressive feelings exist in the spouse relationship and elsewhere in the kinship structure through the strains put on the individual by conflicting demands, and further sources of such feelings exist in the nature of individual relations, the kinship structure does not provide channels for the free expression of these feelings. Further blocking of aggressive responses comes through condemning them as "haughty behavior" and stigmatizing those who express them as people who like trouble. The generally restricted nature of even the marital relationship and the hostility produced by a number of sources are factors which must be considered in order to understand the important relationship of sweethearts.

The preoccupation of Trukese, especially the men, with sweethearting has struck all the anthropologists who have worked on Romonum and elsewhere in Truk. Two of them, Gladwin and Goodenough, have written on the topic. Briefly, Goodenough believes that the great interest in a romantic love complex, including free sexuality, is due to three principal factors. First, while there is no bar to heterosexual relations other than incest and adultery, the scarcity of unmarried young women, intensified by widening the incest taboo to include all consanguineal relatives whether matrilineal or patrilineal, frustrates the young man's sexual impulses. This frustration leads to a center-

ing of interest on sex, which is intensified by a second factor: the necessity for secrecy in affairs. Since an unrelated man and woman seen talking together alone are assumed to be engaging in illicit relations ("to speak" is a euphemism for "to copulate with"), it is necessary for sweethearts to employ intermediaries and signals in all their communications. A man often comes to his sweetheart at night in her house, but if she is married he must be cautious. If he is discovered, his sweetheart's husband and brothers are likely to beat him or have him fined in court. When sweethearts meet by day, as they frequently do, they must be prepared for discovery since the island is so small and heavily populated. This furtiveness and hurry lead to further frustration because of the hazards involved and because of the unsatisfactory nature of coitus under such circumstances.

Goodenough says that interest in the sweetheart relationship is further intensified by the ego satisfaction which this relationship provides.

In marriage, the husband is subordinate to the authority of his wife's brothers and the men of her lineage. His wife must side with her brothers against him. In turn, his obligations to his own lineage take precedence over his obligation to his wife. These lineage obligations on both sides keep the marital relationship from yielding the satisfaction which results when a couple puts its joint interests above all other considerations (Goodenough 1949:617).

and

It is the willingness to run such risks for one another's sake in this relationship which seems to supply the ego-satisfaction of being loved (ibid: 618).

Gladwin points out that since the incest taboo excludes related persons from being sweethearts, it allows a relationship marked by unrestrained behavior. The partner will not be one with whom there is economic interdependence, or one of those "who collectively provide the framework for practically all important activities" (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:101). The relationship between sweethearts is possible because "the restraint with which one must behave toward those defined as important relatives need not be exercised between the partners in an affair in matters sexual or otherwise" (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:101); and "The difference, again, between marital and extra-marital relationships . . . lies in the obligations and reserve which characterize the former" (ibid:101). Although the spouse relationship is the most uninhibited of kin relationships, compared to the sweetheart relationship it is highly restrictive.

In stressing the restricted nature of the relations of spouses as compared with sweethearts, Gladwin says, "It is significant that while sexual relations are permitted between man and wife, humor with a sexual content is disapproved and considered in bad taste in this context" (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:101). Gladwin emphasizes the unrestrained nature of relations between sweethearts as the aspect which appeals most strongly to the participants.

He distinguishes between a casual liaison which "appears to be attractive because of the conquest it implies; there is little question that many men and women derive a great deal of satisfaction from the number of their lovers" (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:113) and "the more intense type of liaisons" where the "individuals achieve the fullest expression of the sexual relationship. . . . Here the objective is not merely to bring the woman to orgasm but for each to arouse in the other the greatest possible heights of passion. Such relations have a far greater character of intimacy and appreciation of the needs of the other partner than do more casual affairs. But it remains only a sexual relationship . . . lovers meet only to have intercourse. Discretion, if nothing else, prevents any intimacy on other occasions. The liaison can only expand into marriage and with this it loses its savor" (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:114). Both Gladwin and Goodenough point out the restrained character of Trukese social relations, and both hold the sweetheart relationship to be desirable because it provides gratification not available elsewhere. Gladwin believes the free expression of sexuality and the opportunity for participants to "give free rein to their desires to achieve self-expression and interpersonal mastery" (ibid:459) to be responsible for the preoccupation with sweethearting. Goodenough maintains that this preoccupation is due to frustration brought about not by a moral code which condemns sexual relations between unmarried and unrelated persons, but by a demographic situation which does not make many such persons available.

Goodenough also holds that the gratifications available in the sweetheart complex are not limited to sexuality, but that ego satisfactions result from "a couple placing its joint interests above all other considerations" and from the hardships, pain, and danger a sweetheart is willing to submit to for his lover. A. Fischer (1956:181) also makes this point. She holds the sweetheart relationship to be important for the gratification to the person as an individual, and not as a rather anonymous member of a cooperative group.

The importance of the sweetheart relationship, as emphasized by Gladwin, is particularly striking in contrast to the marital relationship as outlined above. Behavior toward one's spouse is only uninhibited relative to one's behavior toward other kinsmen. Compared to the behavior appropriate to the sweetheart, the spouse relationship is extremely restrictive. No aspect of the relations between spouses, or between any other kin, is free from restriction on the expression of strong feelings. This extends even to the sexual relations between spouses.

No sexual behavior is actually forbidden between spouses and all the types of sexuality reported for sweethearts are also practiced in marriage, but many were reported only for older married people well beyond the sweetheart age range. Most reports of copulation between spouses told of the side position—couple facing each other, with each person lying on his side, and entwining their legs—which informants say is quietest and least likely to awaken the people sleeping in the house. There were only two reports in which a married

couple used the position favored by sweethearts: the man sits with his legs crossed and the woman sits in front of him on the ground, or the man sits with his legs in front of him and the woman sits on them. Sometimes the woman sits upright but more often she leans back. This position is the one in which *wehewechen Chuuk* or "Trukese striking" is practiced. This involves the man manipulating his penis against the woman's genitals for the purpose of stimulating the clitoris. The penis is inserted into the vagina just before ejaculation, but informants say that sometimes it is not inserted at all. This "striking" is associated by all my informants with sweethearting, but occasionally occurs in marriage. Cunnilingus and fellatio are also sometimes practiced by married couples. I have one report of an elderly married couple doing this, and informants agree that married persons who enjoy these oral practices sometimes engage in them. Informants also agree that this is not often done by married people, but is common in the relations of sweethearts.

My information is generally in accord with Gladwin's in that sexuality between sweethearts is much less inhibited than between spouses, and is more satisfying. As Gladwin also suggests, there seems to be greater awareness of the needs of the partner in the sweetheart complex than in the marriage relation. This is due in part to the necessity for gratifying the lover if the sweetheart relationship is to be maintained. Goodenough's insight into the importance of ego-satisfaction is also borne out by my information. When inquiring about the word *ekitekil*, which means something like "zealous in doing one's work when one's sweetheart is around," I was told by a male informant that when a man does anything well in the presence of his sweetheart, even though others are present, "she knows that you are doing it for her and she is happy about you." Also, the meaning given by my informants to the exchange of cigarette burns by sweethearts is that the lovers thereby show how much they will do for each other. The sweetheart relationship, unlike the marital relationship, is not part of an economically important complex nor are most of one's social relations dependent upon it. Sweethearts accept one another not because the man is a good and obedient son-in-law and brother-in-law to the woman's male relatives or because the woman is obedient, faithful (or at least discreet), and the provider of a home, but because "their thoughts of each other are strong."

There are other aspects of the sweetheart relationship which I would like to consider here. From the methods of initiating the relationship to the erotic practices involved, and including the laws pertaining to the suppression of sweethearting, everything about the sweetheart complex occupies a unique status on Romonum. Since Gladwin's description of how sweetheart relationships are initiated (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:102-04) is most complete, I will discuss it only briefly.

One of the most common ways to begin a sweetheart relationship, and to communicate when it has begun, is through letters delivered by intermediaries. Gladwin points out that when a woman answers a man's letter she is ac-

cepting an invitation to sexual relations, even though sexuality is not explicitly mentioned in the letter. These letters are written in highly flattering terms and always dwell upon the anguish with which the man suffers separation from the woman, the love he bears for her, and the undying character of this love. They always include apologies for the poor quality of the prose and, as Gladwin remarks, this apology generally follows a particularly apt phrase such as, "my love for you walks through my body with heavy feet."

The love letter is dangerous. If the woman's husband sees it, or if she wishes to spurn the man and shows the letter to her husband, the writer may be taken to court and/or beaten by the woman's husband and brothers. A husband is suspicious of any piece of paper he sees his wife holding, and unless she demonstrates the paper to be innocent, trouble is sure to result. For example, a woman informant told me that her husband had snatched away a piece of note paper she had taken from me, but when he saw that it was blank he had not been angry. The following account, given by an informant, is an example of what may happen if a woman does not wish to engage in sweetheart relations with a letter writer:

My wife gave me the letter that man had sent her. Well, I just thought of beating that man. One time there was a baseball practice and that man was on my team. There was a meeting before the practice and I told that man to come with me to a mango tree of mine after the meeting and before the game because we would eat some of my mangos. I was just lying. I put a stick by that tree earlier and I was thinking of beating him but I told him we would go eat my mangos because I didn't want him to be afraid to come with me. Well, maybe he knew my thoughts because he just wanted to go to the baseball field with the others. I flattered him very much and he came with me. Well, we came to my mango tree and I got that stick I had prepared. I told him to take the stick and beat me because he was thinking of "haughty behavior" to me about my wife. He told me he didn't want to beat me, that there was no point in his doing that. I said: "That's good, then I'll beat you because you sinned against me." I hit him hard and he cried for me not to hit him any more but I just hit him with my stick until he fell down. Well, he was very sick after that and he stayed in his house for a few days.

In many cases the wife does not show a letter to her husband, even if she does not wish to be sweetheart to the writer. She simply does not answer it.

If a man does not write a letter because he thinks it too dangerous or because he feels unskilled in letter writing, he may try other approaches. He may go to the woman's house at night and ask to be let under the net with her. A favorite time is when the husband is out fishing or visiting on another island, although the husband may have an unmarried brother on guard in the house. Whatever the circumstances, a night approach is dangerous because the woman may cry out and the man's only hope is to get out of the house before he is seized by her relatives. Women are often kept from raising a cry by the fact that if they get a reputation for doing this, men will be reluctant to try to be sweethearts with them. Very often an unwanted suitor is told in whispers to go away.

A rejected suitor has two possible courses if he still wishes to copulate with the woman who has spurned him. First, he can try to have relations with her while she is sleeping. Informants say that the women sleep very heavily and that a bold but unattractive man can possess many women while they sleep. Sometimes the man only looks at the woman's genitals while she is asleep, but this in itself is considered an important sexual conquest akin to copulation. It is interesting to note in regard to this voyeurism that a humorous euphemism for copulation is "watch the movie" and that the word for motion picture, *kachilo*, is sometimes used to refer to women's genitals.

Another course is a form of blackmail. If a man finds out that a woman already has a sweetheart or is doing something that she would not like generally known, he can threaten to expose her activities if she will not be his sweetheart. One man told me how he had become the sweetheart of a woman who had rejected his letters. One day he concealed himself at the place where she came to bathe. He watched her bathe, and was about to leave when he saw that she was masturbating with a bar of soap. He went to her later and told her that if she would not be his sweetheart, he would tell everyone what he had seen. Not wanting everyone to "laugh at her," as my informant put it, she consented. I also have a report of a man who became a woman's sweetheart by threatening to tell her husband that he had seen her having connection with another man. It is not clear whether the sweetheart relations initiated by blackmail have the same characteristics as those started by letter or oral request, since informants would only say that no matter how the relationship began, it was the same if the pair had "sympathy (or love) together."<sup>5</sup>

It is my contention that, regardless of how it is started, the man expresses considerable aggression against the husband of the woman he is sweethearting and to some degree against her male consanguines as well. The Trukese themselves recognize this. A man said to me concerning the husband of a woman on whom he had designs: "I want very much to sin against that man." Similarly, women are aggressing against the wife of the sweetheart by the fact of taking her man. The commonest cause of fights among women is over the taking of another's husband as sweetheart. Gladwin says that the outrage a man feels when another takes his wife as sweetheart is due not so much to sexual jealousy as to loss of face, since one's wife is an indifferent source of sexual satisfaction. I agree, but would like to suggest that it is fruitful to examine this from the adulterer's point of view as well. It is the husband who loses face, but here we are more concerned with the adulterer's causing him to lose it.

I agree with Gladwin that the sweetheart relationship serves as a vehicle for the free expression of feelings which must be restricted in all other relationships. This applies not only to the free expression of sexuality. The man engaging in a sweetheart relationship is "sinning" against the woman's husband and knows it, but if he is careful and does not get caught, he may do so with impunity. Two examples suggest that the adulterer gets pleasure from knowing

that he is acting against the interests and welfare of another man, and that the object of aggression does not know that he is doing so.

One night a trading boat brought a movie to Romonum and most of the islanders assembled in one of the village meeting houses to see it. A man was sitting on the ground, his friend was sitting beside and slightly behind him, and his wife was in back of the friend. During the entire movie, the friend rested his right hand on the man's shoulder while he fondled the wife's thigh with his left hand, and his expression indicated that he was enjoying the situation immensely.

Again, I knew that an affair was going on between A and the wife of B, and I noticed that A went out of his way to joke and be friendly with B, although before the affair began A had acted toward B with the polite indifference unrelated people adopt toward each other. When I asked A why he was doing this, he replied that he was sinning against B and that by adopting a friendly-joking attitude he could tell by B's reaction if B knew what he was doing. Since A would find out quickly enough if B even suspected his activity, he seems to have been enjoying what he was doing to B and relishing B's ignorance.

The sweetheart complex, then, is shown to provide some relief from a situation in which constant pressure is exerted against a display of aggression, although hostile feelings are engendered by conflicting responsibilities, the nature of interpersonal relations, and the conflict of values with psychological reality. Additional aggression is expressed within the sweetheart relationship itself. Earlier it was noted that the sexual practice most characteristic of the sweetheart relationship is called *wecheweche* Chuuk, and it is significant that the Trukese chose the word *wecheweche* to characterize this practice. Informants stress that it is the best way to bring a woman to orgasm, and that it is explicitly valued for the reason that she may laugh at the man if he fails to accomplish this before he reaches climax himself. The aggressive element seems very clear: the man is "striking" the woman. *Wechei*, which is reduplicated into *wecheweche* to show repetition and duration (Elbert 1947:15) is the word used to tell a child: "I will hit you" (*u pwe wecheiuk*). The verb *löni*, "rub," would seem from informants' descriptions to characterize the practice equally well. Moreover, the man is "striking" the woman in a kind of competition in which, if he loses by not "striking" adequately enough to bring orgasm, he must pay the penalty of being laughed at; this is something the Trukese dislike intensely. This free play of aggression is allowable because, like the adulterer's relationship to the husband, it has none of the consequences of aggression expressed in other personal relations. The adulterer-husband relationship lacks these consequences as long as the husband does not know that an affair is going on, while the sexual practices are allowable because they are not consciously recognized as aggressive. If my analysis is correct, preoccupation with extramarital sexual expression is best understood when the aggressive components of this expression are considered.



The refusal consciously to characterize acts as aggressive allows the sweethearts to inflict considerable bodily harm on each other. The practice of burning each other with cigarettes is said by informants to be a way of showing how much one cares for the sweetheart by showing what he is willing to endure. This conscious meaning of inflicting pain gives the act a large measure of personal satisfaction since it demonstrates to the individual that another person cares enough to suffer for him, but it must be recognized that this meaning also provides a rationalization for the direct and free expression of aggressive impulses. The fact that one is burned in return adds another aspect to the situation, that of seeking aggression against oneself. Psychoanalysts (e.g., Fenichel 1945:292 ff.) have cogently demonstrated that one manner of dealing with aggressive impulses is to turn them against oneself, and that this is in no way in opposition to turning them simultaneously against another. The pain inflicted on each other by sweethearts is now mostly limited to cigarette burns on the arm, but formerly included cutting with a knife and knocking out teeth with stones. It is a mutual expression of both in-turned and out-turned aggression.

Men's preference for Trukese striking indicates their ambivalence toward the expression of out-turned aggression. It is a technique which allows them to strike the woman, but it is also a way of giving pleasure to them. In telling me why this form of intercourse is desirable, men never stated that it increased their own pleasurable sensations. Rather, they emphasized the ecstasy it produced in their partners. This is partially attributable to their preference for a technique which maximizes the speed and certainty of female orgasm and so reduces men's chances of being laughed at. However, were this the primary goal, it could be attained by avoiding the sweetheart relationship altogether. The male eagerness for Trukese striking, despite the fact that it is explicitly valued for the pleasure it gives their partners rather than themselves, can only be understood in the perspective of the strong male ambivalence toward expressing out-turned aggression. This ambivalence applies even to such disguised forms of aggression as the Trukese striking, in which the man minimizes his own pleasurable sensations in order to increase those of his partner.

This same ambivalence leads men to seek aggression against themselves in a number of ways. One of these is the preference expressed by men for sweethearts who micturate when they reach climax. Informants said that not all women did this, but that those who did were preferred as sweethearts. This reaction is said to be brought about most often by Trukese striking or by cunnilingus, and seldom by the more restrained kinds of sexuality usually practiced by spouses. Informants say that the man does not object to being wet, but is pleased because he knows that the woman has reached a full climax.

It seemed possible that the people of Romonum did not abhor urine, but investigation revealed that their attitude is much like our own. The only serious marital trouble recorded for people past middle age was a man's leaving his wife's house for a week because her infant granddaughter had wet on his

sleeping mat. People also scolded children who voided near their houses. In view of this general avoidance and repugnance, men's preference for women who will wet them can be viewed as a desire to receive aggression.

This desire is seen again in regard to cigarette burns. Although informants say sweethearts burn each other, one observes more burns on men than on women. Since men and women engage equally in sweetheating (i.e., a small number of individuals of one sex does not act as sweethearts to a large number of the other sex), women therefore express more out-going aggression in this way than do men, who deal with more of their aggression by turning it upon themselves.

A further indication of this masochistic tendency in men appears in the relations between an adulterer and his sweetheart's husband. Testing whether the husband knows of the affair increases the chance of discovery and so puts the adulterer in jeopardy. Just as the male actively seeks painful and degrading treatment from his sweetheart, so he increases his chances of being punished for engaging in sweetheating.

So far, the sweetheart relationship has been considered as a device by which aggression can be expressed on an interpersonal level against a member of the opposite sex, the sweetheart; and against members of the same sex, the sweetheart's spouse and brothers. A tendency to turn some of the aggression inward has been noted in all these contexts. The relationship provides a further object for the expression of aggressive feelings: the community, as symbolized by its laws.

When we first came to Romonum there were a number of laws concerning sweetheart behavior. A nine o'clock curfew forbade anyone to "walk at night" unless he had explicit permission from the island chief; this permission was available only to those who were going torch fishing or participating in a card game. In addition, there was a supposedly night-long patrol in each of the two villages. Both the curfew and the patrol were explicitly for the purpose of preventing sweetheart activities at night and for apprehending anyone who attempted them. The most important law was the one setting fines of \$25.00 for "talking to another man's wife," \$50.00 for "going under the mosquito net with another man's wife," and \$100.00 for bringing about the divorce of a couple because of the wife's wish to marry the offender. Later, two more laws were added: a woman could not go to bathe after four in the afternoon unless her husband accompanied her (this was a re-enactment of an old law); and adults could not play marbles because this was used as an occasion for "talking sweetheart talk together."<sup>6</sup>

According to the formal arrangement, laws are enacted by the island congress (called *mwich en kankeres*), administered by the island chief and the chiefs of the two villages, and enforced by the island judge. When the island chief is a strong personality, the congress may have little power, but both of the sweetheart laws enacted while we were on Romonum were passed by the congress.

The "oneheartedness" mentioned earlier operates in the congress as elsewhere in life on Romonum. Because of the necessity for attaining unanimity, passage of even routine matters can take many hours, and unusual measures are unlikely to be passed. Not so laws relating to sweethearting: the speed in approving these is unique. The council is composed of the senior nonsenile men of each lineage, but, despite this emphasis on age, three of the eleven members are under thirty and a fourth is between thirty and forty. Of these four men, three are known to be engaging actively in the sweetheart complex. It was one of these three who proposed the law prohibiting marble playing, and all three supported both of the new antisweethearting laws. The reaction of male and female informants to these laws was positive, although the laws caused considerable inconvenience in carrying out quite innocent activities.

The obvious explanation for the support of such laws by persons actively engaged in sweethearting is their wish to be on record as "against sin" so as not to reveal their participation in the sin. This is a valid consideration, but it does not account for the fact that people would privately recount their past and present affairs, and virtually in the next breath say that the laws against sweethearting are good. At least three factors operate to bring this about.

First, the sweetheart laws can be desired as protection for one's own spouse. Individuals hope that they can carry on their own affairs without being hindered much by the laws designed to make sweethearting more difficult. At the same time, it can be hoped that persons seeking a liaison with one's wife will either be caught or will be intimidated by the laws and unwilling to take the risk. The actual effectiveness of these laws is not very great, since the two major prohibitory laws, the curfew and night patrol, are not zealously enforced or even completely enforceable. However, the fines offer attractions in that a husband may use them in addition to or instead of beating the man who has cuckolded him. This man, in his role as sweetheart, simply accepts the fines as part of the "game" and hopes by elaborate planning to avoid being caught.

This leads to the next factor, suggested to me by Ann Fischer, which operates to make the laws desirable for those against whom they are aimed: they add to the personal satisfaction derived from seeing the sweetheart will run in order to be with one. Like the pain inflicted by sweethearts, the man bears the larger part since it is he who must go from his house to his sweetheart's house (if the meeting is at night) and risk discovery by the patrol or by persons in the sweetheart's house. It is also he who pays fines for adultery. Women run the risk of legal trouble mainly if they go out of their houses at night to meet their lovers.

In addition to other satisfactions available in the sweetheart relationship, the laws make possible a delicious illegality in that their violation brings satisfaction. The personal satisfaction obtained from the sweetheart's violation of the laws for one's sake is only a part of this. The individual's own violation of these laws is also a source of gratification in that violation is an expression of

aggression against the entire society, since the laws are made and supported by almost every adult in the society. (Violation of any law is referred to in Trukese as "stepping on the law" or "bending the law.") This aggression is part of the masochistic pattern in that its expression exposes the violators to punishment and, as in other forms of aggressive behavior involving masochism, men are the main participants. Since breaking the law is an expression of aggression, it follows that the greater the proliferation of laws, the more numerous the opportunities for gratification. The more extreme the penalty decreed for law breakers, the more satisfactory both because of the masochistic element and because the severity of the penalty indicates the importance of the law and thus the extent of injury done to the community by violating it.

Despite the different ways in which men and women express their aggression, the sweetheart complex offers both sexes channels for the expression of aggression which are not available in any other regular relationship. The preoccupation with the sweetheart complex and the preference for it as a source of sexual gratification is held here to be due to the absence of such channels in the spouse relationship as well as in all other kin relationships.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on field work sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. It was read in a slightly different form at the Peabody Anthropology Colloquium. The author is indebted to Ann Fischer, John L. Fischer, Arnold Green, and Audrey R. Swartz, who was with me in the field, for comments and suggestions during the preparation of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> One man said that "it is bad" to engage in sexual behavior with wife's older sister, i.e., to use obscene language, to sleep under one mosquito net, to see her bare breasts.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed description of how marriages come about, see Goodenough 1951:121-44; he distinguishes four ways in which marriages are begun.

<sup>4</sup> The borrowed word *fameni* is used to refer to the matrilineal lineage and subsib. See Goodenough 1951:66 ff. The word "family" in this paper refers to the matrilineal group.

<sup>5</sup> As Gladwin points out, there is no word in Trukese meaning "love," and the word here, *long*, means sympathy or pity more than anything else.

<sup>6</sup> Marble playing among children was common when we came to the island, but as a game among adults it appeared to occur rarely until the sixth month of our stay, when it became a very important adult pastime. The game is played on any level surface which is sand-free, and consists of one player "lagging" a marble which is then "shot" at by the second player. If the second player's marble strikes the first player's, the second player wins. But if he misses, then the first player "shoots" at his marble and wins if he hits it. There are two forms of the game, called *ramene* and *tōmachiki*, which differ only that in the latter the winner keeps the marble that he has hit.

<sup>7</sup> There is a similarity to phenomena in this country, such as people in prohibition states "voting dry and drinking wet."

## REFERENCES CITED

- ELBERT, S. H.  
1947 Trukese-English and English-Trukese dictionary. U. S. Naval Military Government.
- FENICHEL, OTTO  
1945 The psychoanalytic theory of neurosis. New York, Norton.
- FISCHER, ANN  
1956 The role of the Trukese mother and its effect on child training. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Cambridge, Mass.

FISCHER, JOHN L.

1957 Totemism on Truk and Ponape. *American Anthropologist* 59:250-66.

GLADWIN, THOMAS

1953 The role of man and woman on Truk. *Transactions, N. Y. Academy of Science, Series 2, Vol. 15.*

GLADWIN, THOMAS AND S. B. SARASON

1953 Truk: man in paradise. Viking Fund Publication in Anthropology No. 20, New York.

GOODENOUGH, WARD

1949 Premarital freedom on Truk. *American Anthropologist* 51:615-20.1951 Property, kin, and community on Truk. *Yale Publications in Anthropology* No. 46, New Haven.

## *The Influence of Anthropology on Sociological Theories of Religion*

J. MILTON YINGER

*Oberlin College*

IN EXPLORING this topic, we are met at the outset with problems of definition and distinction. It is unnecessary here to discuss the many definitions of anthropology and the different conceptions of its appropriate range of interests. However, I believe that it would be generally agreed that insofar as anthropology is concerned with the study of such topics as religion, it approaches the area where it is closest to sociology. The question is: How close is that? In principle, I believe, the two disciplines are almost identical to the degree that they involve efforts to develop analytic and systematic theories of religion. There may well be differences in method and in the type of data given primary attention, but it is difficult to conceive of a theoretical "anthropology of religion" separate from "sociology of religion."

If this point of view is accepted, we can distinguish only roughly between anthropological and sociological studies of religion. Some separation can be made on the basis of the professional identity of workers in the area, on the degree of emphasis on primitive or modern societies, on the extent to which cultural or social interactional aspects of religion are given primary attention. But even these criteria permit us to develop only a thin line of distinction. It is not always clear who is to be classified as an anthropologist: Tylor certainly, but Malinowski not quite so certainly, and Radcliffe-Brown less certainly still. Nor is attention to primitive societies a sure sign of the anthropological approach of a study, as the work of Durkheim and Mauss, and more recently Goode, demonstrates. A distinction based on the degree of attention to culture or social interaction is even less clear. For example, Kroeber believes that sociology is concerned with churches primarily "as operating systems of interacting people," while anthropology is concerned also with their cultures. I find it difficult to see how the sociologist can profitably study "the relations of the communicants" independent of the beliefs and other cultural items they share in common. What Kroeber requires of the anthropologist, that he study social and cultural facts together, is equally incumbent on the sociologist, although there may be some difference in emphasis.

By this introduction I have almost demolished the topic of my paper—almost, but not quite. One can certainly draw some distinction between the work of Malinowski and Durkheim, or between the approach to religion of Howells and Parsons. It is my conviction, however, that in an advanced science of religion such distinctions must be lost. This conviction is reflected in the following formal definition of the sociology of religion. It is "the scientific study of the ways in which society, culture, and personality . . . influence reli-