

**TEXT FLY WITHIN
THE BOOK ONLY**

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_158097

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY 4

Call No. 572-7
R31 P

Accession No. G-10489

Author Redfield, Robert.

Title Peasant Society and Culture... 1958.

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

PEASANT SOCIETY AND CULTURE

PEASANT SOCIETY AND CULTURE

*An Anthropological Approach
to Civilization*

BY

ROBERT REDFIELD



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 56-6644

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO 37
Cambridge University Press, London, N.W. 1, England
The University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5, Canada

© 1956 by *The University of Chicago*. Published 1956
Second Impression 1958. Composed and printed by THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Acknowledgments

TO SWARTHMORE COLLEGE and the William J. Cooper Foundation I am grateful for the invitation to give these lectures and for the pleasant period of residence at the College in March, 1955. I thank especially Professors Richard B. Brandt, Laurence D. Lafore, and Fredric Klees, who administered the Foundation while arrangements for my visit were being made and who showed me many kindnesses when I came.

The debt I owe to Professor F. G. Friedmann for the stimulations of a discussion he led about peasant peoples is more specially acknowledged in chapter iv. I thank Professors Pedro Armillas, Donald S. Pitkin, and Irwin T. Sanders for permission to refer to their unpublished manuscripts or remarks. J. A. Barnes, McKim Marriott, and Milton Singer read parts or all of the manuscript and made very helpful suggestions; I thank them. Miss Rosemary Witko has again done much in preparing the manuscript for publication.

Some pages of chapter iii have already appeared in the *Far Eastern Quarterly*, Vol. XV, No. 1

Acknowledgments

(November, 1955). Permission to republish these is gratefully acknowledged.

The pages that follow may be read as something of a postscript to *The Little Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955). In that book (with the exception of one chapter) I thought of small communities as independent of things outside of them. In the present chapters there is a very preliminary exploration of one kind of dependent community, that of peasants, as a describable type.

Table of Contents

I

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

1

II

Peasantry: Part-Societies

35

III

The Social Organization of Tradition

67

IV

The Peasant View of the Good Life

105

Notes

143

Index

159

I

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

S U D D E N G R O W T H is often awkward, and this is true of the academic disciplines as it is of human beings. Just as the young person who was a charming child does not quite seem to know what to do with arms and legs, so my own science, anthropology, as it develops, seems a little clumsy and unsure as to what to do with itself. I have chosen to present anthropology in these chapters in an aspect of growth, and the reader may find the spectacle just a little distressing. But I hope to get him to see the growth and thus to gain his sympathy for the awkwardness.

I should like to begin with the observation that the sciences of man tend to form around some abstract image of the very thing that they happen to be studying. This image is never more than an approximation to the manifold reality. It exaggerates and enhances the qualities of that part of the human and social scene to which that discipline is giving special attention. We might say that these images,

Peasant Society and Culture

while they ignore the many particular ways in which the reality departs therefrom, are yet truer than the reality—truer internally, so to speak, truer to the Platonic idea of the reality.

In some of the social sciences the image is very abstract indeed and far from the particular realities. The economist has attended especially to markets and has developed subtle conceptions of mentally constructed markets and of behavior in such markets; the usefulness of these abstractions depends upon the fact that they leave out very much of what goes on in human life. In other sciences no one image dominates; there are many vague images. Thinking of American sociology, I recall the importance of the city as a constellation of social problems and of the immigrant community as two of the kinds of social reality which tended to give rise to abstract statements as to the nature of things in that science. In psychology there may also be such influential recurrent realities from which abstractions have arisen: the experimental animal in the test situation; in Freudian psychology, the troubled urban patient in the medical interviewer's office.

In social anthropology it is, I think, quite plain what has been the recurrent reality which the science has tended to conceive abstractly. It is the primitive

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

band or tribe, the small and self-contained human settlement. My science rests upon the kinds of experiences of a single anthropologist living with some few remote people whose common life is for the most part bounded by the valley, hunting range, or island of their ancient habitation. To go to some distant place, to find there a community of people all much alike and living quite according to tradition, to be responsible, alone, for finding out all about the life of that people, to need to look no farther than that little community for what is relevant to finding it out—this has been the typical expectation of the young anthropologist; and in most cases he has more or less realized it.

In the nineteenth century when anthropology was beginning this expectation did not generally prevail. For the most part the anthropologists of that time studied culture not cultures, all society but no particular society. E. B. Tylor, our founder, our Adam Smith, wrote about religion and gesture language and many other general topics and about culture in general. You cannot find out how any particular people lived, altogether and as a whole, from his books or from those of Frazer or McLennan or many others of that time. At the turn of the century anthropology, or ethnology as it was often called,

Peasant Society and Culture

was added to the list of interests to be represented in expeditions to explore the natural history of unfamiliar parts of the world. A. C. Haddon, a zoölogist, turned into an anthropologist between his 1888 and his 1898 expeditions to the Torres Straits in Melanesia. On the second expedition he took along W. H. R. Rivers to "do" the natives; Rivers gave them tests of their sensory capacities and noted their customs. Though his development of the field method of recording genealogies led the way to the impressive understanding of kinship systems achieved in anthropology today, Rivers' and others' accounts of the natives observed on the Torres Straits expedition were published in a series of short papers each on some one topic; the reader sees no native life clearly as a whole.

Within this early prevailing concern with custom and culture in general or in topical pieces, one can discern, however, nineteenth-century beginnings of the study of primitive groups as self-contained integrated wholes. The beginnings were made by the missionaries who lived for long periods with exotic peoples before anthropology ever came into existence. But in 1851 Lewis H. Morgan on his way to becoming an anthropologist published a part-study of the Iroquois Indians. In 1888 appeared a

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

scientific study of the Central Eskimo by Franz Boas: a round of life is there suggested, although there is little explicit analysis of the way the parts of the culture make up a whole. Before 1900 Boas helped to organize the Jesup expedition which resulted in accounts of certain American Indian and Siberian peoples in which the cultures are presented more or less completely.

Haddon, Rivers, and Boas had their trainings respectively in zoölogy, psychology, and physiological optics and became anthropologists in the course of doing anthropology. They were the teachers of those first anthropologists who became such in universities. Two of these, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and B. Malinowski, published books in 1922: *The Argonauts of the Western Pacific* and *The Andaman Islanders*. Each anthropologist had gone alone to a remote place, lived in a small and self-contained community, and come back to report a culture as a whole, and as a whole that could be understood as a system of functionally interrelated parts. (Malinowski's account was continued in a long series of publications about the Trobriands.) Attracting increasing notice as time passed, these books established clearly the model of research in social anthropology. This was what anthropologists conceived

Peasant Society and Culture

themselves as setting out to do. Each is a report, by a single investigator, of a whole that can be understood as providing for all of life's needs in some orderly way that makes sense to the people who live under it. Each is an account by a single investigator of a culture and community that stands alone, independent of others. Even the trading expeditions of the Trobrianders are part of the system that is Trobriand culture. In reading Radcliffe-Brown on the Andamanese one finds no important account of anything outside of the little communities he describes. And, indeed, it was true that these primitive communities could in fact be regarded without reference to anything much outside of them; they could be understood, more or less, by one man working alone. Nor need that man be a historian, for among these non-literates there was no history to learn.

In consequence of such a characteristic experience with isolated and self-contained little communities, the social anthropologist developed his methods and came to conceive of his universe of comparisons. From the fact of his sole responsibility to report a remote and unfamiliar way of life the anthropologist became the jack of all social science trades, learning something of the economy, family life,

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

government, and religion of the people he studied. From this fact too, and from the convenient smallness and consistency of the primitive community, developed the disposition to present everything about a way of life. Where the student of civilized societies found himself studying some sliver of a great whole—a city slum, delinquency, settlement patterns, or a rural market—the anthropologist was giving us all of some very small whole. These small wholes showed themselves as tightly interrelated parts; they were of such a kind that, taking hold of one at any point, one found one's self compelled also to give account of a great deal of the rest. Conceived as a culture, the primitive community was seen as customs and institutions in a unique design of life. Conceived as a society, the social relations described were all, with small exception, to be found right there in that little body of people. Thus arose the concepts of "a culture," "the social structure," "basic pattern," and anthropological holism generally.

The primitive isolate, the community that is a whole all by itself, now something of an abstraction derived from many experiences approximate to the abstraction, became the model of research and the typical entity for comparisons and generalizations.

Peasant Society and Culture

Social anthropology came to be a natural history of equivalent and distinct social organisms. Wrote Kroeber recently: "So the anthropologist came to conceive of his universe of comparisons as made up of so many cultures or societies or social systems each conceivable as something distinct from all others."† The discovery of these natural wholes provided the natural entity, the organism or life-form, for that branch of natural history concerned with human beings. Haddon was justified. Around the world lay varieties of natural wholes: animal species, cultures, or little isolate societies. The investigator collected and noted each and then, so to speak, spread them out on the laboratory table, comparing them one with another to learn the laws of their structure, function, and process.

Of course reality is not like this. Human living is not composed of mutually isolated small primitive groups, and, in so far as it was once so composed before the rise of civilization, it had long ceased to be arranged that way when anthropology took hold of the reality at that corner of it where the primitive isolate still existed. It is curious to note that just at the time when the primitive isolate as a model of study was being established in anthropology, Graham Wallas was writing a book that called at-

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

tention to the fact that all the world was becoming one great society.² The primitive isolate became connected with the great society while the anthropologist was looking at it; indeed, the anthropologist himself was one of the instruments of this transformation. More and more, anthropologists came to study communities in many and complex relationships with other peoples and with histories known or knowable.

Anthropology barely hesitated before it redefined itself as a study of all kinds of people in all kinds of social and cultural situations. In 1923 Radcliffe-Brown in a presidential address defined social anthropology and ethnology as studies of the non-civilized peoples and confirmed this limitation on its subject matter by offering the practical value of these studies to "save us from many gross blunders in our dealings with native races."³ In 1944 he said that social anthropology "has for its field all human societies."⁴ Evans-Pritchard's position as stated in 1951⁵ that social anthropology is "theoretically" the study of all human societies, a branch of sociological studies which chiefly devotes itself to primitive societies, would be accepted by many anthropologists, except, I think, by some who would not like even the *de facto* limitation to primi-

tive societies. (As early as 1939 W. Lloyd Warner⁶ claimed all kinds of human societies, primitive or civilized, simple or complex, as anthropological subject matter and proved his view by studying the extremely primitive and the extremely civilized.) American anthropologists have moved very rapidly to accept a part of the responsibility for studying civilized people, national states, and such world-wide events as industrialization and urbanization. In a presidential address twenty-eight years after that of Radcliffe-Brown, Ralph Beals⁷ asked, in the name of anthropology in linkage with sociology, for a "common theory" to bring together studies of Asiatic cities, acculturation, and sociological urbanism. (Today anthropology, especially American anthropology, studies just about everything human.)

Today it is usual for an anthropologist to study a community connected with or forming part of a civilization or national state. There are recent books by anthropologists about communities in Malaya,⁸ Burma,⁹ Paraguay,¹⁰ China,¹¹ French Canada,¹² Belgium,¹³ and Missouri, U.S.A.¹⁴ Evans-Pritchard published a book on the history of a Moslem sect under colonialism.¹⁵ Ruth Benedict wrote a famous book about Japan.¹⁶ Professor Lowie has a book about Germany.¹⁷ A French anthropologist com-

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

compares a French village with one in Utah.¹⁸ A group of American anthropologists undertakes a study of the whole of Puerto Rico.¹⁹ Another group studies industrial organization in Japan.²⁰ More and more often the anthropologist shares the work of the study with other kinds of scientists. There is an economist at his elbow when he studies a village in India, and when he sails for the South Seas, psychologists prepared to give projective tests may be among the party. The anthropologist no longer studies a primitive isolate, no longer sees only communities that form natural self-contained systems, and no longer works alone. His habits of work are undergoing profound change because of the sudden and wide expansion of his universe of subject matter.

Nevertheless, habits of work do not at once conform to a newly enlarged subject matter. The anthropologist moves into his widened world still guided by his primary conception, the abstract primitive isolate. So when he seeks his first experience and finds that really primitive people are nowadays far away and costly to reach, then, as Kroeber says, he takes the subway and studies a community of Boston Armenians.²¹ It is as near as he can get to the primitive isolate—and it is cheap. And when he thinks about the urban Armenians,

Japan, or the Missouri town, he tries out the conceptions he formed in working with the real almost primitive isolates. That conception gave him understanding when he studied the Andamanese; now, maybe, it will still give him understanding when he studies Puerto Rico or Japan. It may give him understanding by showing him where his new kind of society is not like the isolate, and thus it may force his recognition of new conceptions and new ways of work. Margaret Mead has led in the study of modern national states by way of the group-personality or character of such peoples. She studies national character even from a distance, as in the case of Russia. It is a very different way of work from that once followed in the Trobriands and in the Andaman Islands. Nevertheless, in enumerating the contributions made by anthropology to the study of contemporary cultures, she puts forward the provision which the anthropological approach makes "for the disciplined use of the primitive small society as a conceptual model."²² The isolated, self-contained community remains the abstract image around which social anthropology has formed itself.

In various publications²³ I have attempted to describe the conceptual model of the primitive small society for which Margaret Mead finds use even in

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

the study of something that is very different from it: the group-characters of modern national states. I tried to make explicit the abstract and general qualities of that society and culture that can be imagined to be more isolated, more self-contained, than is even the Andamanese band. Once this description was on paper, other students of particular real societies forming parts of civilizations and national states made the indicated comparisons between this model and the peasant communities in which they worked. What they noticed was, of course, the differences. The Mexican or Brazilian village was not, in many ways, like the abstract model. In not a few cases these students drew the conclusion that the model was wrong. I would rather say that the abstraction, being, as Mead says, a "conceptual model," cannot be wrong. It does not describe any particular real society. It is there to point the way to the study of that which its use brings to notice. It can suggest the creation of other models. But whether one says that the concept of the folk society must be changed, or whether one simply says that the peasant village in which one works is different, in noted respects, from the model, is not a very important matter. What is important is that the minds of anthropologists are directed to the

Peasant Society and Culture

study of societies that depart from the model for the reason that those societies are bound with towns and cities, because national institutions are present in them, because the townsman and the more rustic person dwell in the same community but carry on somewhat different lives.

The fact is that anthropologists have come to see their real small communities as parts of larger and compound societal and cultural wholes. This concern with larger and more complex societies developed, to a degree, in the study of those parts of the non-European world where tribal societies had grown, outside of the great world civilizations, into native states. In recent years two of the leading students of the native civilization of ancient Middle America have recognized the fact of development, before the coming of the Spaniard, of townspeople and countrypeople among the Indians themselves. "The fundamental characteristic of Mesoamerica was that it was a stratified society, one like ours or that of China, based on the axis of city and countryside," writes Kirchhoff,²⁴ and Armillas sees in the ancient Maya society separation between the sophisticated aristocracy of the shrine-cities and the much more primitive rural people.²⁵ But these beginnings of the development of an aboriginal

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

Indian, urban-rural difference and relationship are, of course, beyond our observation. A recent review of aboriginal peoples of South and Central America groups those peoples according to the scope and complexity of their political development; distinguished are homogeneous tribes, segmented tribes, politically organized chiefdoms, feudal states, city states, and theocratic empires.²⁶

The students of African native societies soon found their subject matter bursting the bounds of the primitive isolate community. In African studies the developments away from that small isolate are of several contrasting kinds. West Africa provides examples of "large, dispersed tribes."²⁷ The Tiv of Central Nigeria are such a tribe. Here, scattered over a territory, live a population numbering about a million who know themselves to be one people, indeed, one body of kindred. In such a large yet homogeneous community the anthropologist may keep his methods of direct observation, for the "unit of personal observation"²⁸ may be assumed to represent the very large tribe. The investigator can study only a few people, but he studies a piece of that network of relationships, bounded ultimately only by the limits of the population of a million Tiv, which connects one individual, familial group,

Peasant Society and Culture

or small settlement with others. The whole society is not a structure of ruler and ruled, city people and countryside, but of kinsmen and neighbors.²⁹ Where people live in distinct camps or villages, as among the Nuer of the Sudan, this expandable network of relationships of kinship and friendliness (or in the more distant connections, of hostility) may be conceived as concentric to formed small communities.³⁰

In contrast are the primitive states of native Africa. In these there is centralized political power affecting the local resident from centers of authority outside of the small community. The Lozi of Central Africa presented Gluckman with small communities to be described, not solely in terms of relationships between people within those small communities, but also in terms of relationships these villagers had with many centers of power, complexly related, that lay outside of the little communities. So Gluckman, while he studied small local groups in the way traditional in anthropology, found himself responsible for studying the entire native state. He found people of different local communities united, as are people in the local communities of modern nations, by the fact of their similar interaction with state-wide centers of authority and influence.³¹

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

Indeed, the African societies lead the anthropologist away from the self-contained primitive community in a variety of respects too numerous to even mention here. I am thinking of the large markets, systems of production and distribution including thousands of people from widespread and, in cases, culturally different origins. Apparently no anthropologist has yet studied such a market system completely. I am thinking of the presence, within the primitive African state, of ethnically distinct subsocieties. Among the Lozi, for instance, and among the Lovedu of Rhodesia,³² the anthropologist is faced with a plurality of distinguishable cultural groups united in one political organization. Tribes and parts of tribes may be united by allegiance to a religious ruler. And in West Africa the development of native states went along with the growth of towns and cities to the degree that Herskovits states the contrast in Dahomey between urban people and rural people: he finds that the people of the city of Abomey show an arrogant manner toward the villager, while the "villagers show all the typical reactions of European peasants toward city-dwellers—they are suspicious, evasive, non-responsive."³³ In short, West Africa was developing its own civilization and its own peasantry. In recent

Peasant Society and Culture

years, on top of this native civilization, or almost civilization, has rapidly come into being a great complex of new institutions resulting from the contacts with European life. The anthropologists who work in Africa in the future will be required, more and more, to study such new supertribal institutions as political councils representing a large region of many peoples, co-operatives and other marketing organizations, mutual aid societies of immigrants to towns, craft and trade associations, churches, social clubs, and political parties. Africa is being transformed into new kinds of large and heterogeneous communities, the forerunners of national states yet to emerge.³⁴

American anthropologists have undertaken the study of national states and urbanized peoples in several ways. There are those, notably Warner and his associates, who have studied modern American towns and cities. There are students of national character, or group-personality, already mentioned. These students take leaps from primitive isolates to complex and heterogeneous societies and cultures. And there are the anthropologists who study small communities in Asia, the Middle East, Europe, and Latin America. It is through these last mentioned studies that anthropology has come to deal with the

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

subject matter of these chapters: peasant societies and cultures.

Until recently the peasantry of the Old World were the business, not of anthropology, but of other disciplines. European and Asiatic peasantry interested economists, sociologists, and historians concerned with the origins of particular peasant institutions, especially agrarian institutions.³⁵ To these students the relations of peasantry to forms of landholding and to feudalism were topics of central interest. Folklore and the study of folk life (peasant life) were distinguished from the anthropologist's or ethnologist's study of primitive life (*Volkskunde* versus *Völkerkunde*). The student of peasant life characteristically did not make holistic community studies. He collected, and he made maps of distributions of customs and artifacts. The problems were historical; the methods led to lists of elements, to schedules and questionnaires, to comparisons of parts of cultures rather than of cultures and communities as wholes. The student of *Volkskunde* was not guided by the "disciplined use of the primitive society as a conceptual model." On the other hand, professors of anthropology or ethnology in France, Germany, and Great Britain were on the whole unconcerned with the study of the peasant villages of

Peasant Society and Culture

their own or other countries. Only recently the British anthropologists, for example, turned to the study of rural societies in England or Wales and began to send their students to Norway or to rural British Guiana.

It was by moving out of aboriginal North America into the study of contemporary village life in Middle and South America that the American anthropologists came first and in largest numbers to undertake the study of peasants. The move brought about a half-perceived transformation in the way in which the entities studied are arranged in the minds of American anthropologists. As already pointed out, when the idea of "a culture" became established, all cultures, primitive and isolated as those studied at that time were, came to be conceived as separate and equivalent entities spread out on a table for comparison. The tribes of California or of the Plains constituted a growing collection of recorded species comprising the North American part of the natural history of mankind. Only problems of diffusion, of the borrowing by one tribe of elements of culture from another, complicated this basis of comparison. Those early comparisons were side-by-side comparisons of societies unaffected by cities and civilization. When American anthropologists were

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

concerned chiefly with North American Indians, the connections those tribes had with modern cities and civilizations could be and largely were ignored until they became a matter for study under the heading "acculturation"—the modifications of the indigenous life under influences from the white man's world.

But when the North Americans came to Latin America to do field work they found that the side-by-side ordering of societies as equivalent separate specimens was inadequate. They rapidly developed a different kind of ordering of their material. In Latin America, Indian life and Spanish-Portuguese life had had a long history of mutual influence. There the anthropologists quickly found something different from the distinct tribes or subtribes of aboriginal North America. They found in Latin America many kinds of peoples in many kinds and degrees of connection with town and city life. Almost with a sense of indignation, as if their abstract conceptual model had betrayed them, they rose to their new responsibilities and began to provide the very different kind of ordering of their materials which the Latin-American materials demanded.

Now the monographs about Latin-American life take considerable account of the trade with

Peasant Society and Culture

towns, of the participation of the villagers in national institutions, and of the differences between the more rustic inhabitants of the country and those whose way of life represents the town and the gentry class. Now cultures and communities of Latin America are grouped not only according to their aboriginal culture areas but also according to their "level" or typical place in the whole civilization and culture of the state and civilization of which they are components. The regional differences are of course not to be ignored. But the differences between Brazil and Mexico are not to be allowed to obscure the resemblances between certain rural communities in Brazil and certain ones in Mexico.

One recent classification³⁶ recognizes primitive Indians, modern Indians, peasant-type and town-type cultures. In this classification the rural agriculturalists of Brazil, Peru, Haiti, Mexico, and Puerto Rico find themselves in the same category. In content of culture the peoples so grouped show many differences. They would not have been put together by such ordering of cultures as was developed in studying the Indians of the Plains or of the Southwest. They are put together now as peasant-type peoples by Wagley and Harris because in their cul-

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

tures archaic European patterns prevail and because they are rustics who nevertheless consider themselves part of a national life. Thus, as a type, a type without localization (in America) and with many cultural differences among themselves, they are distinguished by these later students from modern Indians, a contrasting yet logically adjacent category, peoples in whose cultures the predominant elements are generically Indian, peoples who do not think of themselves as part of a national life. This is a classification from the bottom to the top, so to speak; it ranges societies from the most isolated to the most urbanized. It involves the anthropologist in studying the local community as a part of a much larger society and compels him to recognize kinds of social and cultural relationships for which his earlier experience did not quite prepare him: the relationships of the more and the less educated, of the townsman and the countryman, of the national institution and the local and traditional institution.

In 1929 one of these rural Latin-American communities impressed me as representing a type of society "intermediate between the tribe and the modern city,"³⁷ like the peasant societies in Europe; and the possibility of clarifying the typical characteristics of peasantry occurred to me when Horace

Peasant Society and Culture

Miner published his account of a French-Canadian parish.³⁸ Since then the anthropological students of Latin America have more and more come to realize that the Latin-American small community is to be understood as a part of the state and the civilization in which it lies. Gillin studies the transformation of Indian culture into Creole culture, a supranational civilized dimension of Latin life.³⁹ Beals studies industrialization and urbanization as a form of acculturation.⁴⁰ Foster defines the intermediate type of society in Latin America.⁴¹ Steward attacks head-on the national state and provides conceptions and methods for describing Puerto Rico both as local communities and cultures and as nationwide institutions.⁴² And Eric Wolf,⁴³ Charles Wagley and Marvin Harris⁴⁴ are developing in some detail typologies of Latin-American cultures or of the peasant subcategory of such cultures. In Latin America anthropology has moved from tribe to peasantry.

Anthropologists have also come to study peasants in China, in the Middle East, and, especially in very recent years, in India. In each case the investigator sees a small society that is not an isolate, that is not complete in itself, that bears not only a side-by-side relation but also an up-and-down relation to more

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

primitive tribal peoples, on the one hand, and to towns and cities, on the other. In some places the two-way relationship is both logical and actual: in parts of Latin America and India the peasant has real relations with townsmen, on the one hand, and with more primitive not-quite-peasant people, on the other. In every case the logical relationship, the intermediacy in the up-and-down relationship of the peasant, is recognizable, and sometimes the anthropologist recognizes it. Peasant society and culture has something generic about it. It is a kind of arrangement of humanity with some similarities all over the world. The remaining chapters will be concerned with some of these similarities. And an attempt will be made to see some of the aspects of culture and society that come into prominence as the anthropologist widens his ideas in his attempts to report justly some characteristics of the peasant.

In making these last assertions I am implying a definition of peasant society as a type. In the following exposition what class of peoples shall I have in mind in speaking of peasants?

It will be a type or class loosely defined, a focus of attention rather than a box with a lid. I do not think that any one definition of peasant society arises inevitably from the facts. The difficulties of a

Peasant Society and Culture

definition are admitted.⁴⁵ Peasantry as a type are not as distinct as birds are from mammals or colloids from crystals. Many a definition is defensible; each is a fixing of attention on some characteristics chosen by the definer as important; and whatever definition we choose, we shall find other societies similar to, but not quite the same as, those that are brought together by the definition we have chosen. We may conceive those societies and cultures in which we are interested as lying scattered about an imaginary field of real societies that differ from and resemble one another in many different ways. The reader might choose one cluster of neighboring real societies within the field, I might choose another.

One may turn one's attention first to the systems of production and to the economies of the little societies scattered about the imaginary field. One may then, as does Firth,⁴⁶ use the word "peasant" for any society of small producers for their own consumption. Beginning thus, one has a very large cluster: included are such tribal peoples as the Hopi Indians; indeed, this choice allows us to call "peasants" such fishermen as the coastal Malay and even such collectors and hunters as the Sioux Indians.⁴⁷ Among the many societies and cultures that fall into this very inclusive category one may perhaps find

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

some significant resemblances, some "characteristic shape to life," as Firth puts it.⁴⁸

I, however, shall exclude the hunters, fishers, and herders from these lectures. The pastoral people who have long-standing relationships to townspeople, as in parts of the Middle East and in Afghanistan, are in some respects like agricultural peasantry. To include them in a series of comparisons would help us to understand what tends to follow from a rural-town relationship rather than from the agricultural peasant's attachment to his land. But one cannot do everything at once. I also set aside the pastoral peoples. Let us look at people who make a living and have a way of life through cultivation of the land.

As I now think of it, those peoples are to be included in the cluster I shall call peasants who have, at the least, this in common: their agriculture is a livelihood and a way of life, not a business for profit. We might say that those agriculturalists who carry on agriculture for reinvestment and business, looking on the land as capital and commodity, are not peasants but farmers. This is the way Eric Wolf puts it in a recent paper,⁴⁹ and I follow him.

From this point of beginning, one sees a peasant as a man who is in effective control of a piece of land to which he has long been attached by ties of

Peasant Society and Culture

tradition and sentiment. The land and he are parts of one thing, one old-established body of relationships. This way of thinking does not require of the peasant that he own the land or that he have any particular form of tenure or any particular form of institutional relationship to the gentry or the townsman. I want to include in the focus of attention the Kwangtung peasant and the Bulgarian peasant who sell directly to city markets. Landlords are not needed to establish the fact of peasantry as I now think of it. A peasant community may be composed in part, or perhaps altogether, of tenants or even squatters on the land, if they have such control of the land as allows them to carry on a common and traditional way of life into which their agriculture intimately enters, but not as a business investment for profit.

It is, of course, quite possible to begin a consideration of peasantry with the historic association of rural Europeans with that peculiar complex of institutions known as feudalism. If one starts from feudalism, one does not first define the peasant; one defines a kind of economic, political, and social system in which peasantry are but one part. This is also a useful way of thinking about it. Sjöberg has recently in helpful detail described the feudal society

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

sociologically.⁵⁰ In that kind of society there is "a small minority (an elite) supported by and 'exploiting' a large subservient populace which passively accepts its role. The upper class is differentiated in terms of its monopoly of power and authority, the 'correct' kinship groupings, and the highly valued achievements." Sjöberg points to the fact, important also in my view, that the elite include literati who "are official carriers of the classical written tradition which provides the social system with a sophisticated and elaborate justification for its existence and continued survival."⁵¹ This guidance of the peasant from above "in the moral sphere," in the manor or the city, is also for me an aspect of peasant life which is interesting and worth some examination.

I shall follow Wolf's conception of peasantry as agricultural producers following a way of life on land the peasant controls. I shall add to this conception that emphasis on the relationship of peasant to an elite of the manor, town, or city which Sjöberg's presentation gives. I want to think about peasants as the rural dimension of old civilizations. Kroeber puts it simply: "Peasants are definitely rural—yet live in relation to market towns; they form a class segment of a larger population which usually con-

Peasant Society and Culture

tains urban centers, sometimes metropolitan capitals. They constitute part-societies with part-cultures."⁵² But I am not inclined to limit the group of real peasant societies, within our view here, to those that form parts of admitted feudal societies. I want to include in our consideration the peasants of India, China, Japan, and the Moslem world, and I once attended a conference of historians and social scientists who could not reach any firm agreement as to whether feudalism, as it is known from Europe, is or was present in any of those other parts of the world.⁵³ So I shall not require that our peasants have any particular kind of economic and political relationship to their elite. The relationships of status between the peasant and the elite above him seem to me to be persistently important and similar in many parts of the world, and I shall try to say something about them.

It is, of course, important to learn what difference it makes that the relationship to the gentry is a feudal relationship. The peasant of feudal England and the peasant of late nineteenth-century England⁵⁴ have much in common. What are their differences, beyond those that have to do with their legal and customary relationship to lords? The Swedish countryman has much of the peasant in him still,

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

though I am told that he may never have been in a feudal system and today is an educated participant in the national life.⁵⁵

Our cluster of real little societies is now sufficiently well determined. We are looking at rural people in old civilizations, those rural people who control and cultivate their land for subsistence and as a part of a traditional way of life and who look to and are influenced by gentry or townspeople whose way of life is like theirs but in a more civilized form. Our cluster has on its edges other little societies in some respects like those that are in the center of our cluster but in other respects unlike them. We have mentioned the pastoral peoples in relation to towns. Herders of ancient Judea bore this relation to Jerusalem. In another direction from the center of the cluster are those peoples who settle on frontiers, carrying some tradition of peasant ways into a hinterland with open resources. Elman and Helen Service use the word "peasant" for the rural people of Paraguay.⁵⁶ These Paraguayans are peasants in their relations to townsmen and in many of their attitudes or values. On the other hand, they do not live in compact communities with closed agricultural resources as is true of so many peasants of Europe and Asia. They live in an underdeveloped

Peasant Society and Culture

country where land (though not good land) can be had for the effort of working for it; and they live in scattered farms, not villages. It may become important to examine the consequences of semi-frontier conditions in affecting the lives of these Paraguayans in directions away from what may prove to be true of the village-dwelling peasants with very limited land. And, in the opposite direction from such peoples as the Paraguayans and farther away from the center of our cluster of peasantry, the more remote frontiersmen call for attention. Such are the *caboclo* of the Brazilian Amazon and coastal selva. These rural dwellers are more solitary, individualistic, and independent of the city than are peasantry. In rural Brazil there seems to be a series of peoples more or less peasant-like, more or less frontiersmen.⁵⁷ And the gaucho is hardly a peasant.

The contrast between Latin America, on the one hand, and Asia and the older Europe, on the other, directs us to another way in which peoples may approach but not fully realize the qualities of peasantry as they appear in our central cluster. The rural people of Latin America, very generally speaking, are of one or two kinds: they are either transplanted European peasantry, or they are Indian peoples in

Anthropology and the Primitive Community

an incompletely developed relationship to their urban elites. The peasantry of the old indigenous civilizations are fully what Kroeber calls them: "part-societies with part-cultures." They are the rural dimension of the common civilized life. But the Paraguayan or the rural Guatemalan *ladino* is less intimately and anciently related to his land and his habitat than is his Indian neighbor, while his Indian neighbor (in Guatemala) does not quite qualify as a peasant in so far as his tradition is a different tradition from that of the townsman with whom he forms a single society. There are, in his case, important cultural differences between the rural and urban parts of the Guatemalan or the Peruvian society. In Latin America, we find peasantry on the make: the people of Tepoztlán⁵⁸ are more like peasantry than are the Indians of the western highlands of Guatemala.⁵⁹ The same difference between rural people more fully peasantry and rural people with incomplete cultural relationships with their elite appears in the history of Europe and Asia. The people of Latium, out of whom Rome grew, became more fully peasants than were the rural dwellers of Syria in their relations to the Hellenic cities founded among them or than were the rural Britons to those Romans who built their towns in England.

Peasant Society and Culture

We have come a long way from the realization of the primitive isolated community. The conceptual model of such an isolate may still serve us, forcing an examination of peasant societies in important ways different from the model. But now we can look at the peasant peoples in their own generic reality. What are their common characteristics? What aspects of social relations and of moral life are we to study; what aspects of human living that anthropologists neglected when they studied tribes and primitive bands shall we turn to now? The relations with outsiders to the small community will surely make new matters of interest for us. Kroeber remarks⁶⁰ that anthropologists used to study organisms, societies by themselves, but now they study organs, societies that are parts of larger societies. How are we to think about and study the small community as an organ and to study the larger organism of which it is a part? These questions can also be asked, in terms of culture, of the systems of traditional ideas and purposes. Chapter ii will have something to say about these questions in terms of social relations, chapter iii in terms of culture or tradition.

II

Peasantry: Part-Societies

IN THE COURSE of their studies of small and self-sufficient primitive societies, anthropologists came to think of each such community as a system of elements in relationship to one another. Each was an analyzable whole. Each could be looked at by itself, without necessary reference to things outside of it, and could be understood as parts working together within a whole. Radcliffe-Brown showed how myth, ritual, and daily life worked together in the Andaman Islands. Malinowski made a name, "functionalism," out of his success in showing the many interrelations of custom, institution, and human need in Trobriand life. In *Patterns of Culture* Ruth Benedict showed us four primitive views of the good life as distinct and equivalent patterns—systems of another kind in which customs and institutions conform to implicit choices of basic values from the range of human possibilities.

Anthropologists have seen the primitive isolated community as several kinds of complete and self-contained systems.¹ It can be seen as a system of customs and institutions. It is sometimes seen, as in

Peasant Society and Culture

Benedict's book, as the fundamental ideas of good and bad which guide a people's life. And often, as in the important work of the British anthropologists in studying especially the native peoples of Africa, it is seen as a system of characteristic relationships between the kinds of people characteristic of that community. Although the phrase has several distinguishable meanings in anthropology,² let us here use "social structure" for the total system of persisting and important relationships that distinguish a community from others. Here we shall be concerned with social structure.

| In studying a primitive society as social structure, the anthropologist looks at the kinds of roles, with attendant statuses, that tradition recognizes in that community| There are fathers and sons; perhaps it is important that mothers' brothers bear some special relationship to sisters' sons; there may be priests and laymen, chiefs and other people, buyers and sellers, and so on. These roles and statuses persist while the particular individuals who fill them enter them and leave them. The community is conceived as the arrangement of the more persistent and important of these roles and the conventional relationships between them. If the community is relatively compact and isolated, the investigator finds these

Peasantry: Part-Societies

roles and relationships within the band, settlement, or tribe that he studies. He does not have to go outside it.

Now I raise the question: { Considering a peasant community as a system of social relations, as social structure, how shall we describe its relations with the world outside of that community? } What are the modifications of concept and procedure that come about if we study a peasant village, thinking of it as a system of persisting important relationships among people? For peasantry, as the word was used in chapter i, are such by reason in part of their long-established interdependence with gentry and townspeople.

(It may be that a peasant village, related as it is to people and institutions outside of it, is so incomplete a system that it cannot well be described as social structure. Perhaps we anthropologists shall come to describe not the peasant village but the larger and more nearly complete system: the feudal society, the complex region, the national state) Primitive states, complexly developed tribes, have been anthropologically described; Herskovits' *Dahomey* is one such account.³ W. Lloyd Warner and his associates have made studies of American urban communities as representative of much in the national

Peasant Society and Culture

life. Margaret Mead and others, working very differently, have studied the national characters of modern peoples. Recently Julian Steward has proposed that any complex society might be regarded as composed of three kinds of parts. He distinguishes first such local groups as households, neighborhoods, and communities; these he calls "vertical divisions." Second, he sees the groups which are not local but which appear in many local communities and arise from some common qualities among the dispersed members, as occupation, class, caste, race, or special interest. These he calls "horizontal" divisions or segments. And third, he recognizes the formal institutions such as banking, trade, school systems, and official doctrine, which run through the whole large society affecting it at many points. This way of looking at a large complex society sees it as a kind of lattice in which the local units run in one direction and the groups that are not local run in the other direction, while the formal institutions of centralized authority and widespread influence, like the vines growing upon the lattice, perhaps, tie the whole together.⁴)

Steward has used this set of conceptions in describing one modern state—Puerto Rico on its island.⁵ The conceptions are not directed necessarily to

Peasantry: Part-Societies

societies with peasants in them. I suppose they could be used in describing Denmark or New Zealand. Their use puts anthropologists to work on complex societies in ways to which they are accustomed, for it breaks down these big wholes into two kinds of smaller groups each of which is thought to have something of a culture which the anthropologist can study. He can make studies of small local communities, of samples of the social classes, maybe, or of the religious groups. And the formal institutions—the law, the church, school or taxation systems—can still be studied from the center by the other kinds of social scientists who are used to that kind of thing; the anthropologist will, I suppose, attend especially to the local modifications of these national institutions.

The development of procedures appropriate to anthropology for studying large modern societies will go forward, and the very different ways of doing so provided by Julian Steward, Lloyd Warner, and Margaret Mead are evidences that the science puts forth its shoots on different sides of the growing tree. Here I look only at the growth outward from the local community study. I try to distinguish some of the kinds of social relations that one comes to describe if one begins with some local

Peasant Society and Culture

peasant community and tries to do justice to the fact that many of its relations are with outsiders.

In identifying three kinds of systems of social relations that we find it necessary to study if we leave the primitive isolate and attempt to describe a peasant society as social structure, I have been helped by a short publication of J. A. Barnes,⁶ an anthropologist trained by British students of the social structures of primitive communities. Barnes, however, went to Norway and made a study of an island parish of that country. He found that he could not keep his attention solely on what happened within the parish: he had to follow the social relations of these rural Norwegians outside of their local community. Yet he saw that what he learned about the parish of Bremnes could "lead directly to knowledge of only a very small sector in the social life of the nation." Thus Barnes studied his little rural community not as a self-contained isolate (which it obviously is not) nor as a sample fully representative of the whole (as anthropologists study the Sudanese Nuer or the Tiv of Nigeria), nor yet as one element in a comprehensively planned study of a modern state (as did Steward). Rather, Barnes pushed outward from the local community, recognizing in the parish he studied kinds of systems of

social relations in part new to the anthropologist of the primitive isolate, systems that connect the small community with other such communities, with the Norwegian nation, and with industrial systems wider than the nation.

The Norwegian parish is today probably not a peasant community. It is outside of but not very far away from the cluster of little communities to which I have here applied the word "peasant." Of every ten men in Bremnes three are fishermen, one is in the merchant marine, two are industrial workers, two are in other occupations or are retired, and only two are in agriculture. One might say that Bremnes is partly seafaring, partly agricultural, and partly a rural community in a modern nation. The people are educated and take a large part in their national life. Yet just because Bremnes is farther away from the primitive isolate community than are the rural communities of less modernized countries, what Barnes found there in the way of social relations will help us to learn what to look for in peasant societies of Asia or Latin America. We need a basis for comparison on the more modernized side of peasantry as well as on the more primitive side.

Barnes finds that these rural Norwegians are members of many kinds of social groups. The

Peasant Society and Culture

groups are so many and so variously related to one another that it might be difficult to arrange them very strictly according to Professor Steward's lattice.⁷ Barnes collects them into what he calls "social fields" of three different kinds. Each social field is a conceived system of activities and social relations somewhat separable from the other two. Each has, I think, a lesson for us in our effort to push beyond the self-contained community to the understanding of the social structure of peasant societies.)

First, "there is the territorially-based social field, with a large number of enduring administrative units, arranged hierarchically, one within the other."⁸ This ascending series of local groups includes hamlets or neighborhoods, wards, and the parish itself, which is then a part of several larger ascending series of units with administrative, judicial, or ecclesiastical functions each including other parishes of Norway.

It is at the level of the parish that we can see a transition from local life to national life. Looked at from the point of view of one studying the nation, the parish of Bremnes is a unit of civil and ecclesiastical administration. There is, for instance, a grouping of parishes of that region which in turn

Peasantry: Part-Societies

belongs within an archdeaconry which is part of a diocese. These groupings are formal and serve very special functions and relationships. Within the parish, relationships are more personal and involve more of human life. Nevertheless, in modern Norway the separation between local life and national life has become obscured by education and the full articulation of local and national institutions. In societies in which the rural people are still clearly peasantry, the territorially based social field or system which Barnes describes for Bremnes unites local life and the life of the feudal system or the state; and in peasant societies the two parts are clearly distinguishable. At the bottom the series of units consists of people in personal and traditional relationship to one another; there kinship and neighborhood are the prevailing connections. At the top of the series are people in more impersonal and formal institutional relationship to one another. As a system of hierarchically arranged social relations, a peasant society is two connecting halves. We may be able to see a sort of link or hinge between the local life of a peasant community and the state or feudal system of which it is a part. In an Indian community of western Guatemala, where the local life and the national life are wide apart, the link or

Peasant Society and Culture

hinge is very obvious; it consists of the administrative officers sent down from the city to relate the Indian community, which is organized within itself, to the national life.⁹ The parish priest and some shopkeepers may be other parts of the hinge. In the Andalusian town, a community of town-dwellers with peasant characteristics, the hinge is also present in a conspicuously different group of professional and wealthy people who live their mental lives in part away from the town where they dwell, in the city, and "who represent the government to the pueblo, and who represent the pueblo to the government."¹⁰ In the old-fashioned Chinese peasant community one would find the hinge in the mandarin negotiating between the *yamen* of the imperial power and the village elders. In the Balkan village the line between the local life and the national life, between the two parts of the ascending territorial-political series, is held by the priest and the mayor.¹¹ Later something will be said here about the functions in the cultural life of the people who hold the hinge.

Even in Bremnes, though the people are for the most part no longer peasants, it is the territorially organized local life that gives the society stability. "The same fields are cultivated year after year, and new land comes into cultivation only slowly . . . for the most part people go on living in the same

houses and cultivating the same land from year to year.”¹² A century and a half ago, we may suppose, this was the social system of dominant importance; only the fishing, not yet industrialized, modified the peasant life of that time.

But fishing has now been industrialized in Norway to the degree that for the man of Bremnes parish it is an activity fairly independent of his life on the land. Fishing is highly competitive; “herring fishing is war,” people say. Here loyalties to kinsmen operate to only a limited extent. “Any man can try to get himself included in a crew and each owner seeks to engage the crew that will catch most fish. During the herring season, men from Bremnes sail in vessels belonging to other parishes, and vessels registered in Bremnes sometimes have on board fishermen from as much as six hundred miles away. In effect, there is something like a free labour market.”¹³ The social field through which the Bremnes man moves in his role as fisherman is composed of unstable relations with many kinds of men in many different places—shipowners, skippers, net bosses, cooks, and others—with whom he has happened to become linked; and each man’s social field for fishing intersects the vast, world-wide organized fishing industry.

This is the second lesson from Barnes’s account. It

Peasant Society and Culture

is the market, in one form or another, that pulls out from the compact social relations of self-contained primitive communities some parts of men's doings and puts people into fields of economic activity that are increasingly independent of the rest of what goes on in the local life. The local traditional and moral world and the wider and more impersonal world of the market are in principle distinct, opposed to each other, as Weber¹⁴ and others¹⁵ have emphasized. In peasant society the two are maintained in some balance; the market is held at arm's length, so to speak. We may see the intermediacy of the peasant community in this respect also if we suggest a series of societies in which the separation of the world of the market is progressively greater. The Andamanese band approximates a self-contained isolate. But from time to time people of one band will take up some of their bows and baskets and go to visit another band. There they will make presents of what they have brought and receive from their hosts presents of some of their artifacts.¹⁶ The economic life is not even distinguishable as such: it is a casual exchange between friendly persons on a basis of good will. In rural India, in a society with a great division of labor, much of the exchange of services is involved in hereditary status in the form of caste.

There are also markets where trading is relatively free. In the Guatemalan American Indian community of Chichicastenango, a peasant society except for the cultural separation between the Indian and the urban elite, most of the men devote large parts of their lives to commercial travel; they walk about a wide circle of markets buying and selling.¹⁷ But this commercial life is separate from the social and political life of the town and hamlet. Observers have been struck with the insulation of the Guatemalan trader from the influences of the many other local cultures through which he moves.¹⁸ As a trader, this Indian semipeasant leads a separate life; he enters a distinct "field of activity." The Bulgarian peasant buys from and sells to the city, but we are told that his weekly trips to town and city introduce few changes to the village.¹⁹ In the city the peasant is an onlooker; he talks chiefly with other peasants. So in this case too peasant world and city world are kept apart, though in apparent contact. Inside a peasant village commercial life and agricultural life may fall into separate patterns of thought and action. In the intensely agricultural Yucatecan village, the Maya, more of a peasant than is the western Guatemalan Indian, carries on his agriculture as a mode of life, indeed, as religious activity, as does the

Peasant Society and Culture

Hopi or the Zuni. But he sells half his maize to market. Growing in the field or offered to the gods, maize is traditional, sacred, moral. But once made ready for sale, the people call it by a different name; and the commercial dealings with maize have a certain separateness from the local dealings with it.²⁰ And trade with hogs or cattle is a secular activity in which one joins with any buyer or seller one happens to meet.

Every peasant society offers for our study some field of economic activity which is to some degree separated out from that closely integrated union of all activities which characterizes the primitive isolate community. The economic field comes to have, as Barnes says, a different "analytical status." One has to make a special study of that field. In studying rural Swedish life of a century ago, B. Hanssen describes²¹ the relations of those villagers, chiefly cotters, with those gentry of the manor with whom they took service, as a distinct field of activity. In that case the field was not wholly economic: the cotters entered into the domestic life of the manor; some of the peasants had for parts of their lives persisting relationships, of utility and also more or less cultural, with some of the gentry. A connection between the two halves of the double society, peas-

antry-gentry, was made by a field with separate analytical status, but a field in which, no doubt, the examples of custom and manners provided by gentry life were made to influence the peasantry. The fishing field of modern Norway is fully industrialized; the rural fisherman is largely separated off from the life on the land, and the fishing field is fluid, competitive, increasingly independent of the ties formed in the local life.

"Market" means both a state of mind and a place to trade. We can use both conceptions in studying peasant and rural life. Barnes refers to the industrialized fishing of the Norwegian as a "social field." The field is not spatially defined; it is a set of activities, attitudes, and relationships that belong together wherever and whenever the Norwegian enters industrialized fishing. Such a field we may study as a more or less coherent body of things done and thought. Also, of course, we may study those markets which do have geographical definition. McBryde has described one kind of market in western Guatemala: the people who come together in one town at one time to buy and sell.²² One can also describe the people who move about the country from one market, in the former sense, to another town market. Taken together, these ambulatory

Peasant Society and Culture

merchants in all their relationships of trade are another kind of market with definition upon the land. Students of rural sociology and economics describe the regions in which goods of one kind or another are sold, and the regions from which are drawn the buyers who come to centers of sale and distribution. Arensberg and Kimball, anthropologists, have well described such markets, centering on crossroads, fairs, and shops, in rural Ireland.²³

The third "social field" which Barnes recognizes in the Norwegian parish he calls a "network." All the relations of all kinds of the rural people with one another and with people elsewhere are thought of as a network in which people are the knots or points, and relationships, of whatever kind, are the threads or lines. Barnes, however, here thinks in particular of that part of the total network that is left if the relationships of the territorial and the industrial systems are removed. To distinguish this residual part of the network, and to give it a name suggestive of its presence in every society that is more than the imagined primitive isolate, let us call it "the country-wide network." The simple fact that creates this network is that every person, through kinship, friendship, acquaintance, or some common interest, "is in touch with a number of people, some of

whom are directly in touch with each other and some of whom are not.”²⁴ In Bremnes this kind of network of relationships not only knits together people of the parish but connects them with people of other parishes. There it has no boundaries; there is no way of defining a group with membership; “each person sees himself at the center of a collection of friends.”²⁵ But sometimes defined groups are formed, fishing crews or committees, out of clusters of people in such boundless networks.

✓ In every society, however primitive, some attention is paid to the connections of one kinsman to another or of one friend to another. People are nowhere organized only into lineages or other formed and bounded social groups. So there are always boundless networks in so far as genealogical kinship is extended outward or as mere acquaintance or other occasional personal association creates a relationship. In the primitive societies it is kinship that largely contributes to the qualities of such networks as there are. In some of them there is a kind of latency in the kinship which allows it to expand at the edges of the local community to include individuals newly encountered. One remembers the way in which in central Australia strangers to one another establish friendly relations through identi-

fication of some third individual to whom each applies a kinship term.²⁶

If the tribe is large and dispersed, its people not settled in distinct villages, as is true of the Tiv of Nigeria, the whole tribe is one great country-wide network. But if we study the early Plains Indians, or the Indians of the Amazon, or the tribesmen of Luzon, we do not find ourselves much concerned with country-wide networks. The band, the camp, the village, or the tribe is a relatively discrete social system. Between it and other such systems there are no very impressive and persisting networks of relationship. One unit may join another or separate off, and one individual may be captured or otherwise become a part of a local society to which he was once a stranger. But the communities are compact, and relationships for the most part institutionalized in kinship or other kinds of groups. As to the compactness, Barnes puts the point well when he says that in primitive societies the mesh of the network is small, in civilized, urban, or mass societies the mesh is large. "By mesh," he writes, "I mean simply the distance round a hole in the network . . . in primitive society many of the possible paths leading away from any A lead back to A after a few links; in modern society a smaller proportion lead back

again to A.”²⁷ In Zuni the links go right back to the man with whom you started. In rural Norway the links carry one outside of the parish to distant communities. In peasant societies as in primitive, many links are those of kinship, but the mesh is wider and looser. In French Canada the peasant travels, but travel is to visit relatives. If there is no relative in the neighboring parish, the peasant does not go there, but he may make a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupré and make his stay with relatives in Quebec.²⁸

This fact of the developed and widespread country-wide network in societies that are not primitive gives the anthropologist another kind of system of social relations to study. He cannot keep his attention solely on the peasant village or scattered rural community of neighboring farmers. He finds himself looking down on village tied to village, farm to distant relative, and town to countryside, in a web of social relations. The connections that people have with one another, apart from the system of relationships that begins in the family and the neighborhood and grows upward to the formal government of the state, are in peasant and in rural communities so significant as to demand description in their own right. Where the relations continue to

have localization, and constitute a system of ties relating people to one another although they dwell apart, then they seem to emerge from the societal map to meet our scientific imaginations. Points and lines meet the concept-forming eye of the mind. We begin to wonder what will be the ideas by which we shall characterize that class of social systems, that aspect of social structure, that might be called country-wide networks.

Plainly the purpose or interest which relates people in the network is an important matter of similarity or difference. Oscar Lewis has compared Mexican and East Indian rural societies to stress a difference of this kind.²⁹ If we look down on the Mexican countryside we see village connected with village chiefly through trade, visiting at festivals, and, less important, through performance of governmental duties and through pilgrimages to shrines. The local communities tend to be endogamous, each has a more or less homogeneous culture, and the sense of local community loyalty is strong. The people who go out from one local community to another, or to a town, on the whole do so as separate individuals or family parties carrying on perhaps similar but parallel and independent activities. The activities are incidental to a familial and cultural

life lived within the village. We do not find whole groups with culture and social structure that have persisting relationships along the country-wide network with other such groups in other local communities.

This is what we do find in India. Should we look down on the countryside of India, we should see each local community connected with many other local communities through caste. The internal unity of the village is qualified or balanced by the unity that is felt by the villager with a fellow caste member of another village. In times of stress the fellow caste member of the other village will come to one's aid. In the cases of the higher castes this unity may be felt over wide areas, and it may be institutionalized by genealogists and caste historians.

Furthermore, the country-wide network of rural northern India is composed of widespread connections of marriage. The villages are exogamous. In the Punjab, for example, "each village is said to have a traditional set of villages to whom its girls regularly go in marriage and another set from which it regularly receives wives." Here there is a country-wide marital network. With reference to the Punjabi villages studied by Marian Smith "the marital community to be considered would start

four miles away and have to include at least those villages up to eight miles distant.”³⁰ In Kishan Garhi, a village southeast of Delhi, again there is no marriage within the village. “Daughters of the village move out and wives of the village move in at marriage, moving to and from more than three hundred other villages.”³¹ When Marriott studied this village, he found that fifty-seven marriages then connected Kishan Garhi with sixteen towns and cities. The connection a villager has with other villages than his own remains very strong. In another village in northern India if a lower-caste man gets into trouble with the upper-caste landowner he “may still take refuge with his mother’s, his wife’s or his sister’s relatives.” “Often a child spends two or three years with his mother on a long visit to his mother’s father’s household in another village.”³²

In short, the principal elements of the country-wide networks of India consist of familial and caste associations that persist through generations. These associations connect one set of villages with another or some of the families in one village with families corresponding in culture and social status in other villages. It is as if the characteristic social structure of the primitive self-contained community had been dissected out and its components spread about a

wide area. Rural India is a primitive or a tribal society rearranged to fit a civilization.

The closeness or openness of the mesh, the range or scope of the network, the kinds of human interests served by the relationships that make up the mesh, the stability of the relationships, whether occasional or permanent—these are all elements to be considered in understanding country-wide networks.

In these remarks I have perhaps extended and generalized the three kinds of sets of social relations which Barnes notes in rural Norway beyond his meaning and intention. I see in them exemplars for many who will study societies that very plainly are more complex, more interrelated with others, than are the primitive tribal communities. I think we will find it helpful to look for the three kinds of systems or "fields" which Barnes found in Bremnes: the hierarchy of territorially based groups; the more or less independent economic fields of activity; and the country-wide networks of relationship. These three kinds will not be found in peasant societies only. Their beginnings occur also in primitive and non-European societies, and they occur in modern states. One can think of them as three ways in which the primitive isolate is exceeded or in which it breaks down, is pulled apart and extended over

Peasant Society and Culture

the social landscape. Country-wide networks are notable within those African tribes that grow in size till they occupy a wide area with scattered houses and settlements. These are networks involving no peasantry. Such networks must have developed as between villages in the highlands of Mexico before the Spaniard came, and, in so far as the Aztec capital was an urban center with its elite, the networks were becoming truly rural. Wherever civilization has fully arisen we may speak of the networks as rural, for now there is an *urbs*. Yet local differences within the great civilizations in this respect are to be recognized: the networks of intimate peasant-elite relationships continued in England until very late to maintain something of the manorial form of medieval times, for the English gentry were countrymen themselves in contrast to their equivalents in France or Italy who lived the civilization of the city and kept farther apart from their peasantry.

The economic field is already present in the "silent market" of which German writers on primitive economy made much, and it grows in preliterate societies to the great markets of Abomey—we are told that ten thousand people might take part in such a market.³³ But it is industry outside of the indigenous local life, especially capitalistic and

highly technological industry, that takes the Camar worker from his Indian village to work in the cotton or jute mills, the African tribesman to labor in the diamond mines, and the New Guinea tribesman to toil on the distant plantation. The distinct economic "fields" of the peasant are on the whole less distinct and less disruptive of the local life than are those that affect the tribesman. The more primitive man is the man likely to enter modern industry when it is established in his country; the landowning peasant, with a way of life already in stable adjustment to many aspects of civilization, is more resistant to industrialization.³⁴

The political autonomy of the local community is much qualified in many non-European societies by chieftainship, councils, and other authorities affecting more than one band or settlement. In many an African society political and administrative authority is hierarchical, and there are non-territorially organized attachments to power, as instanced by the "sectors" and the loyalties to queens and storehouses among the Lozi: men of different settlements are united by the fact of a common tie to a center of power, itself subordinate to the king.³⁵ In the African kingdoms, such as Dahomey, units of the political system intermediate between kinship

Peasant Society and Culture

groups and the state are in part territorially defined, and so the "hierarchy of territorially based groups" that Barnes identifies for Norway is present. There is, however, one feature of this hierarchy that characterizes peasant societies. Indeed, it follows from the very basis of my choice in grouping as peasant societies those in which there are long-established relations with an elite whose culture is that of the peasant carried to another level of development. I have remarked on the two halves that compose the total society; there are two kinds of people, peasants and a more urban (or at least manorial) elite. The two kinds of people look at each other, at that joint or hinge in the total society, and have for each other attitudes that complement (but not always complement) each other. The relationships between the two kinds of people define the relative status of one to the other. The lower kind of people recognize, in certain respects, the political authority of the other and also their "guidance in the moral sphere."³⁶

The anthropologist who comes to peasant society through the study of the social structure of a peasant village will find that important parts of that structure are represented in the village by a few individuals or, perhaps, by people who are not in the

village but somewhere else. In peasant communities remote from town, city, or manorial country estate, the elite may not be immediately present. In the Brazilian peasant village described by Pierson and his associates, there were none. The villagers managed their own local affairs. But they had relations with the elite when the villager went to the city or the officials came to them.³⁷ In the Yucatecan village that I studied the people were more or less peasantry; the relations they had with a more urban elite (*dzulob*, they called them) were many and frequent, but the schoolteacher was then the only resident from that upper and outer world. In many a European peasant village live a few people with urban manners and some learning who manage those affairs of the peasants which relate to the national state. To these administrative and cultural intermediaries between local life and wider life the word "intelligentsia" has long been applied. Sanders uses it to denote the small group in the Bulgarian village composed of the mayor, the doctor, and the schoolteachers. These people associated with one another, showed their separation from the peasantry, talked politics and perhaps literature, organized and led all the patriotic celebrations, and provided something for the peasants to recognize as better than them-

selves. Sanders writes: "The *intelligentsia* . . . had more importance than their village duties seemed to indicate. They were the channels through which the national state, the national church, and the national school system expressed themselves. . . . Their high status rested not only upon the influence they wielded as representatives of powerful institutions, but also upon the fact that they were educated.³⁸ Much the same is said by Miner of the curé and the senator in the peasant parish of French Canada. These two, and their relatives, "are so far removed from the society of the parish that they cannot carry on personal social contacts with the other parishioners. . . . Their position is due to contacts which they have with the world outside the parish, from which sphere they have received recognition far higher than anything the parish can give."³⁹ In early Norway most of the priests lived in the country and each parish had its bureaucrat; these persons were part of an urban elite.⁴⁰

The Andalusian town of Alcalá recently described by Pitt-Rivers provides a striking instance of the two kinds of people, each representing one distinguishable half of a double society, and both dwelling in the same compact community.⁴¹ As the agricultural people live in the town and identify

themselves with it, and not a rural village or dispersed settlement, they are not typically peasants, although in many respects their manner of life and thought is like that of Bulgarian or Italian peasants. In the town lives also an educated class, called *señoritos* by those of the town who work the land or otherwise live the socially inferior kind of life. The *señoritos* are distinguished by superior manners, acceptance of responsibility to protect inferior dependents, a higher sense of honor, and the fact that they do not participate in the local customs. They provide the small ruling group; they serve as the intermediaries, administrative, and also cultural, between near-peasant and city. The *señoritos* identify themselves with the common people as against a rival pueblo or against a predatory bureaucracy from outside, but identify themselves with *señoritos* of other pueblos in the business of administration and commerce. Within the pueblo the investigator discerns two contrasting ways of life corresponding to the two social classes: “. . . one can see, in place of the sanctions of law, the sanctions of the pueblo’s mockery; in place of the food-control, the clandestine mills and the black market . . . in place of the Civil Guard, the bandit and the smuggler. In place of the schools, the *maestros rurales*; in place of the

Peasant Society and Culture

doctor, vet and chemist, the *curanderos*; in place of the . . . trained nurse, the . . . country midwives. And for the purpose of invoking the powers of religion in such matters, in place of the priest, the *sabia*.”⁴² Here we have the folk in the town, the urban elite in common habitation and in one social structure with a more folklike people.

The social structure of peasant and peasant-like societies includes, then, the relations of cultural influence and example between the elite half and the peasant half of the whole larger social system. It will not do to describe these relations only as relations of ruler and ruled or of exploiter and exploited, although these elements are likely to be present. The student will want also to describe the prestige or contempt, the feelings of superiority or inferiority, and the examples of excellence to be emulated or of baseness to be avoided that may be present in the relations between peasant and elite. The peasant is a rustic and he knows it. The educated man, whose life is in part in the local community and in part—at least mentally—in more urban circles, looks down on the peasant. “Oh what a rogue and peasant slave am I!” exclaimed Hamlet in one of his frequent moods of self-depreciation. All over the world the terms applied to rural people by urban people imply

contempt, condescension, or—and this is the opposite face of the attitude—a certain admiration for the virtues of the simple, the primitive, and the hardy. On his side the peasant admits his relative inferiority as to culture and manners but naturally claims the virtues accorded him and sees the city man as idle, or false, or extravagant. He sees himself as low with regard to the common culture but nevertheless with a way of life morally superior to that of the townsman.

The isolated primitive community presents the student of social structure with a simpler and smaller system. There social relations are compact, congruent, and largely personal. With the growth and the spread of civilization social relations extend themselves out from the local community, lose much of their congruence (as in the development of industrial fields of activity), and develop many kinds of impersonal and formal varieties of connection. In peasant societies we see a relatively stable and very roughly typical adjustment between local and national or feudal life, a developed larger social system in which there are two cultures within one culture, one social system composed of upper and lower halves. The cultural relations between the two halves are to be emphasized. Sjoberg puts it well:

Peasant Society and Culture

“... the elite exhibits to the peasant the highly valued achievements . . . and provides the peasant's social system with a sophisticated justification for its existence and survival.”⁴³ The priest and the senator in the French Canadian parish, the intelligentsia of the Bulgarian village and the *señoritos* of Andalusia, in East Indian peasant communities the pundits and the gurus, show by their examples and tell by their teaching of another and higher version of that same life which the ordinary peasant lives. We may think of peasant culture as a small circle overlapping with much larger and less clearly defined areas of culture, or we may think of the peasant life as a lower circle unwinding into the upward-spreading spirals of civilization. If the student of peasant society is to describe the systems of social relations of that society, he will study those social relations that communicate the higher dimension of the civilization to the lower or peasant dimension. Let us look into the matter in the next chapter.

III

The Social Organization of Tradition

OUT OF THAT ANTHROPOLOGY which rested on studies of isolated primitive or tribal peoples arose the concept, "a culture." The Andamanese had a culture, as did the Trobrianders, the Aranda of Australia, and the Zuni. Each culture came to be conceived as an independent and self-sufficient system. Recently words have been found to make clear this conception of an "autonomous cultural system." It is "one which is self-sustaining—that is, it does not need to be maintained by a complementary, reciprocal, subordinate, or other indispensable connection with a second system." Such units—such cultures as those of the Zuni or the Andamanese—"are systems because they have their own mutually adjusted and interdependent parts, and they are autonomous because they do not require another system for their continued functioning."¹ The anthropologist may see in such a system evidence of elements of culture communicated to that band or tribe from others, but he understands that the system as it now is keeps going by itself; and in describing its parts and their workings he need not go outside

Peasant Society and Culture

the little group itself. The exceptions, where the band or tribe relies on some other band or tribe for a commodity or service, are small and do not seriously modify the fact that that culture is maintained by the communication of a heritage through the generations of just those people who make up the local community.

The culture of a peasant community, on the other hand, is not autonomous. It is an aspect or dimension of the civilization of which it is a part. As the peasant society is a half-society, so the peasant culture is a half-culture. When we study such a culture we find two things to be true that are not true when we study an isolated primitive band or tribe. First, we discover that to maintain itself peasant culture requires continual communication to the local community of thought originating outside of it. The intellectual and often the religious and moral life of the peasant village is perpetually incomplete; the student needs also to know something of what goes on in the minds of remote teachers, priests, or philosophers whose thinking affects and perhaps is affected by the peasantry. Seen as a "synchronic" system, the peasant culture cannot be fully understood from what goes on in the minds of the villagers alone. Second, the peasant village invites us to attend to the long course of interaction between

The Social Organization of Tradition

that community and centers of civilization. The peasant culture has an evident history; we are called upon to study that history; and the history is not local: it is a history of the civilization of which the village culture is one local expression. Both points, in recognition of both generic aspects of the peasant culture, were clearly made by George Foster when he reviewed recently his experiences in Latin-American communities and wrote that there the local culture "is continually replenished by contact with products of intellectual and scientific social strata."² He said also that "one of the most obvious distinctions between truly primitive societies and folk [peasant] societies is that the latter, over hundreds of years, have had constant contact with the centers of intellectual thought and development. . . ."³

This is a new experience for one whose ways of work were developed in studying such primitive isolates as Australian tribes, Andamanese, or Trobrianders. It calls for new thoughts and new procedures of investigation. For studies of villages, it requires attention to the relevance of research by historians and students of literature, religion, and philosophy. It makes anthropology much more difficult and very much more interesting.

How shall we begin to take mental hold of this

Peasant Society and Culture

compound culture that deserves a special word, "civilization"? Let us begin with a recognition, long present in discussions of civilizations, of the difference between a great tradition and a little tradition. (This pair of phrases is here chosen from among others, including "high culture" and "low culture," "folk and classic cultures," or "popular and learned traditions." I shall also use "hierarchic and lay culture.") In a civilization there is a great tradition of the reflective few, and there is a little tradition of the largely unreflective many. The great tradition is cultivated in schools or temples; the little tradition works itself out and keeps itself going in the lives of the unlettered in their village communities. The tradition of the philosopher, theologian, and literary man is a tradition consciously cultivated and handed down; that of the little people is for the most part taken for granted and not submitted to much scrutiny or considered refinement and improvement.

If we enter a village within a civilization we see at once that the culture there has been flowing into it from teachers and exemplars who never saw that village, who did their work in intellectual circles perhaps far away in space and time. When George Foster looked at Latin-American villages with civi-

The Social Organization of Tradition

lization in mind, he saw chiefly what had come into those villages from preindustrial Europe: irrigation wheels, elements of the Catholic religion from "theological and philosophical reflections of many of the best minds of history over a period of centuries," church organization, religious dramas, political institutions, godparenthood, the humoral pathology of Hippocrates and Galen, and dances and bullfights that had worked their way downward from Spanish gentry to little Indian-mestizo farmers in Mexico or Peru.⁴ In every peasant village we see corresponding things.

The two traditions⁵ are interdependent. Great tradition and little tradition have long affected each other and continue to do so. The teachings of Galen about the four humors may have been suggested by ideas current in little communities of simple people becoming but not yet civilized; after development by reflective minds they may have been received by peasantry and reinterpreted in local terms. Great epics have arisen out of elements of traditional tale-telling by many people, and epics have returned again to the peasantry for modification and incorporation into local cultures. The ethics of the Old Testament arose out of tribal peoples and returned to peasant communities after they had been the subject

of thought by philosophers and theologians. The Koran has the content it has because it arose among Arab not Chinese peoples, and the teachings of Confucius were not invented by him singlehanded; on the other hand, both teachings have been and continually are understood by peasants in ways not intended by the teachers. Great and little tradition can be thought of as two currents of thought and action, distinguishable, yet ever flowing into and out of each other.¹ A picture of their relationships would be something like those "histomaps" we sometimes see, those diagrams of the rise and change through time of religions and civilizations.

The two traditions are not distinguishable in very isolated tribes or bands. In reading Radcliffe-Brown on the Andaman Islands we find nothing at all about any esoteric aspect of religion or thought. Apparently any older person will be as likely to know what there is to know as any other. This diffuse distribution throughout the population of knowledge and belief may be characteristic of very large primitive societies of much greater development of the arts of life than the Andamanese enjoyed. Thus, among the Tiv of Nigeria, a tribe including about a million agricultural people, "there is no technical vocabulary, because there are no pro-

The Social Organization of Tradition

fessional classes, and little specialization beyond that which is the result of sex or age. Every aspect of tribal life is everybody's business."⁶ This is a primitive society without a great tradition. Among the Maori, however, "two different aspects of all the superior class of myths were taught. One of these was that taught in the *tapu* school of learning, a version never disclosed to the bulk of the people but retained by the higher grade of *tohunga* (experts or priests) and by a few others. The other was that imported to the people at large, and this, as a rule, was of an inferior nature, more puerile and grotesque than the esoteric version."⁷ And in West Africa, where aborigines had developed complex states, a distinction between what we might call a littler and a greater tradition appears in the control by certain priests of elements of worship, recognized by the people as recondite and esoteric. Initiates into these cults are secluded for seven months of instruction in secret. Also, there are differences as between layman and specialist in the understanding of the religion: the priests of the Skycult in Dahomey clearly see distinctions among deities and their characteristics about which laymen are very vague.⁸ Among Sudanese peoples reported by Professor Griaule⁹ there is extraordinary development

Peasant Society and Culture

of highly reflective and systematic specialized thought among certain individuals.

These instances suggest the separation of the two traditions in societies that do not represent the great world civilizations. The content of knowledge comes to be double, one content for the layman, another for the hierarchy. The activities and places of residence of the carriers of the great tradition may remain close to those of the layman, or the priests and primitive philosophers may come to reside and to work apart from the common people.

This series of non-European societies arranged according to the degree to which a distinguishable great tradition is or was present can be supplemented with some references to the ancient Mexican and Mayan societies. These fulfil the logical series, for there is little doubt that those Meso-American peoples had developed something that might well be called a civilization in so far as the growth of a great tradition is its sign. Adopting the words of a recent leading student of those civilizations, I identify the hierarchic culture of the Maya with the monumental stone architecture for temples and palaces, the highly sophisticated art, the hieroglyphic writing, complex arithmetic, astronomy and calendar, the deities not directly associated with

The Social Organization of Tradition

the earth or the forces of nature, and the theocratic government. On the other hand, outside of the shrine-cities and in the little villages there was a lay culture of the subsistence activities, the crafts, the village, and related organization, and a religion based on the forces of nature. In the following words, I think Dr. Armillas somewhat exaggerates the separation of great and little traditions among the pre-Columbian Maya, but he does recognize just the conception that interests me: "a new concept of the classic Maya civilization . . . that it was formed by two cultural strata or subcultures corresponding to two social groups: the dominant aristocracy of the ceremonial centers and the hamlet-dwelling farmers. The dominant group was apparently of religious origin, although martial or commercial segments of it might have been developed later. The village communities seem to have preserved their folk culture little affected by the culture of the upper class. The pseudo-urban character of the ceremonial centers, if it is true that they had not a large resident population and that some of the functions of real cities were lacking, and strong class barriers might have been the factors preventing the cultural influence of the ceremonial centers from filtering down to the rural masses, transforming

Peasant Society and Culture

their folk culture into peasant culture. If this view is correct, the world outlook and moral order of the Maya sophisticated aristocracy and the rural people must have been sharply different. In this light the collapse of the classic Maya civilization was in fact the disintegration of the pan-Maya upper stratum of society, leaving practically intact the underlying local folk cultures. That this actually happened has been made very apparent by Longyear's report on Copan, and the hypothesis is not in contradiction with the scanty data we have on this collapse from other places."¹⁰

There is a growing conviction that the development of aboriginal American civilization passed through phases and developed cultural and societal relationships similar to those that appeared in the independent beginnings of the civilizations of the Old World.¹¹ Elements in the development of civilization which are common to both the Old and the New World origins of civilization are those characteristics which are generic to indigenous civilizations: the separation of culture into hierarchic and lay traditions, the appearance of an elite with secular and sacred power and including specialized cultivators of the intellectual life, and the conversion of tribal peoples into peasantry. Some part

The Social Organization of Tradition

of the course of events in the Meso-American instance can be recovered. But, of course, it is beyond our immediate observation, and the record of its events is overlaid with the strong impress of another civilization that invaded America from abroad.

(In the case of the peasant societies of Latin America it is this impress of an invading civilization, one not indigenous but entering the local community from abroad, that is likely to strike the student of culture. It impressed George Foster: he saw elements of culture that had worked their way from Spanish gentry downward to communities perhaps founded by American Indians. But the Mexican and Peruvian cases are hybrid civilizations. We might call them "secondary civilizations" in contrast to the primary civilizations of India and China where the civilization is indigenous, having developed out of the precivilized peoples of that very culture, converting them into the peasant half of that same culture-civilization) (India and China, it is sure, have been strongly influenced since their founding by other civilizations; nevertheless, continuity with their own native civilization has persisted; Chinese and Indian peasants remain connected with their own civilizations.)

Some of the Latin-American local cultures are in-

Peasant Society and Culture

complete aspects of both the great tradition of Spain and the great tradition of that part of aboriginal America. Had I studied the villages of Yucatan as aspects of civilization, I should have conceived the culture of the village as referring to the Spanish-Catholic great tradition and also as referring to a now vanished great tradition that was once maintained in the shrine-cities of Yucatan by native priest-astronomers. The shaman-priests of the villages I studied carried on rituals and recited prayers that would have their full explanation only if we knew what were the ritual and the related body of thought at Chichen Itza or Coba. Certain prayers recited in the present-day Maya village include phrases that I am sure would have been more understandable to the Maya priest of the early sixteenth century than they were to the Indian whose praying I heard. The secondary civilizations, especially where one great tradition has supplanted, but incompletely, another and native great tradition, provide situations that the anthropologist may regard as instances of acculturation still going on. So far as the "decapitation" (as Kidder called it) that Spanish conquest brought about four centuries ago, they are also instances of "deculturation"—removal of a great tradition.

The Social Organization of Tradition

In the comments that follow I shall be thinking for the most part of the primary civilizations of the Old World. In coming to study peasant villages of primary civilizations, the anthropologist enters fields of study that have long been cultivated by historians and other humanistic scholars. He slips in by the back entrance: through the villages, by way of the little tradition, and after the fact of centuries of interaction of peasant and philosopher, both indigenous and so representatives of local culture, and both the makers of that civilization. He looks about him, he finds a mode of life that records this long interaction, and he sees people and institutions—priests, teachers, sacred books and tales, temples and schools—that still carry it on. To describe this village life at all fully will take him far from the village and, as he pursues the interactions of the traditions in the past, into sources of information relatively new to him. He becomes aware of the numerous and impressive studies by historians and students of art, literature, and religion. Do these studies have a relevance for him who makes a field study of a peasant village?

In their principal and important work, the humanist and historian stand somewhat remote from studies of present-day peasant life. A recent collec-

tion of excellent papers on what is called "Chinese thought"¹² is concerned with the reflective ideas of Chinese philosophers, poets, and moralists. It includes hardly a reference to what went on, in periods covered by the book, in the minds of Chinese peasants. It is probably impossible to know. It is, however, possible to know something of what goes on in the minds of Chinese peasants today—political conditions permitting. (The scholars of the great traditions of India are concerned first with the development of the Vedic philosophy among a small number of reflective thinkers, ancient and modern. A recent English translation of the Upanishads¹³ is provided with a commentary in which matters understood by Indian philosophers, not by peasants, are discussed, although those teachings distantly, and after much diffraction and diffusion, are reflected in the lives of peasants. In this particular book we are not told about this distant reflection in peasant life. We are told about the interpretation of certain Vedic texts by Sankaracharya, a thinker of the eighth century, and we are instructed on such matters as the differences between the strands of thought called non-dualism, qualified non-dualism, and dualism.

Nevertheless, in other writings or, at least, in

The Social Organization of Tradition

passages of other writings an occasional historian-humanist seems to be coming forward to meet the anthropologist who is at work in the village. A recent student of Chinese religion, impressed with the mixture of teachings that have made up that religion and by the great differences between the beliefs and practices of peasants and those of educated Chinese, states that "instead of dividing the religious life of the Chinese people into three compartments called Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism, it is far more accurate to divide it into two levels, the level of the masses and the level of the enlightened."¹⁴ Reading this, one asks, how then did the enlightened come to transform popular belief into their own kind of religion, and how was it that with the presence of educated teachers in China for many centuries the masses transformed these teachings into their kind of religion? One might become interested in the ways in which the high tradition is communicated to the common people and how it becomes a part of the little tradition.

Every great tradition has its teachers, and the humanistic scholar of that tradition is in a position to tell us something about who these teachers are and about how their teachings reach the common people. For India these matters have been interest-

Peasant Society and Culture

ingly described by V. Raghavan.¹⁵ He tells us something of the customs and institutions by which the Vedic lore and the religious and ethical instruction of the philosopher and religious thinker were and are communicated, by intention and organized effort, to the masses. He tells us of compositions, notably the epics and the Purāṇa, which were made expressly to broadcast Vedic lore to the people at large. The prefaces of these compositions "were recited to vast congregations of people gathered at sacrificial sessions . . . by a class of reciters called Sutapauranikas." Hindu culture was, he says, carried to Cambodia and other lands by endowments made by rulers for the recital, in temples they built, of Hindu epics. With regard to south India Raghavan traces an unbroken tradition of deliberate provision, by ruler and teacher, for recitation in the vernacular languages of the ancient Hindu epics, especially the *Ramayana*. Professor Raghavan, historically minded and familiar with the Sanskrit classics, follows their course through many centuries and languages and through modifications of institutionalized instruction. The stories were not only recited, they were also expressed in devotional hymns sung by traveling singer-saints. So this Sanskritist, pursuing the great tradition downward, comes into the villages

The Social Organization of Tradition

of present-day India. He is thinking of peasant India when he writes that "hardly a day passes without some sweet-voiced, gifted expounder sitting in a temple, *mutt*, public hall or house-front and expounding to hundreds and thousands the story of the Dharma that Rama upheld and the Adharma by which Ravana fell."¹⁶

This same interest on the part of humanistic scholars in the relations between the hierarchic and the lay cultures is shown in a work about the relations between Islamic doctrine and the local cultures that became Islamized. In the introductory chapter Professor G. von Grunebaum considers different ways in which the conflict, coexistence, and interaction of the Islamic high culture and the local cultures can be described. Adopting the terms that are used in this book, he writes: "This is to say that one of the two patterns is recognized as the more advanced; it is assumed to make authority; it is almost exclusively represented in the writings as well as the public actions of the elite; social prestige is dependent on its adoption. In the *dâr al-Islâm* the Islamic pattern is in general in the position of the great tradition. In contrast, the little tradition is the catchment of the popular undercurrent; its effectiveness is still felt by the intelligentsia, but 'officially'

it will be denied or deprecated. Where the hypotheses of the great tradition are considered beliefs, the hypotheses of the little tradition will be considered superstitions. In fact, the social position of a person may depend on which of the two traditions he determines to live by.”¹⁷

Von Grunebaum distinguishes between two kinds of adjustment between these two patterns or traditions. They may become accommodated to each other, as when the Islamic teachers recognize the popular tradition as the religion of the ignorant or tolerate local practices which might have been considered heretical. Saladin sent a Christian cross to Baghdad; it was first despised but in the end was treated with reverence. In Turkey and Syria Muslims were or are permitted to resort to the invocation of Christian saints. The expounders of hierarchic Islam, says Von Grunebaum, may integrate the local belief or practice with orthodoxy by interpretations of doctrine that provide a sanction for it. “The Prophet himself set the precedent for this procedure by giving an Islamic meaning to the heathen pilgrimage rites which he welded into the Muslim *hajj* to Mecca. . . .” This integration or incorporation of the local culture is abundantly illustrated by “the justification within the framework of

The Social Organization of Tradition

orthodoxy of the cult of the saints.”¹⁸ In spite of the apparently uncompromising monotheism of Islam, the saint “is interpreted as the possessor of gnostic knowledge” and so accepted, or Koranic evidence is found to prove the existence of familiars of the Lord, therefore of saints. Here the Islamist comes to meet the anthropologist. Professor von Grunbaum, discussing the interaction between local saint and Islamic orthodoxy, sees from the top, so to speak, the same interaction that Westermarck,¹⁹ studying local saints in Morocco, saw from the bottom.

The Islamist can study a great tradition from its first origins, and the first interrelations of hierarchic and lay culture are relatively close to his own day and power of observation. Islam, a doctrine thrown up from local culture, itself became a secondary civilization as it moved into Persia and India. The Sanskritist and the Sinologist are concerned with much more ancient and complex interactions of great traditions, slowly developing from primitive thought and practice, themselves dividing and undergoing much modification and restatement, while influencing and being influenced by the thoughts and actions of millions of little people. All these scholars tell the story of the relationships be-

Peasant Society and Culture

tween the two strands of culture in civilization from the point of view of the elite, of those who uphold the great tradition. Raghavan follows Vedic lore downward into the villages. Von Grunebaum reads the writings of Islamic thinkers and teachers and reports their struggles with the local and lay cultures. Both reach the village and the peasant in the course of their studies, and now they will find arrived there the anthropologist—a fellow ill prepared to report his villagers as terminal points in the long history of a great doctrine. Yet the anthropologist cannot ignore these connections with philosophy and with refined schools of thought. He sees their traces and their professional representatives in the villages. He may wish he had stayed with autonomous cultures, alone and undisturbed, in a community that is a world to itself and in which he, the anthropologist, is the sole student. But in considering peasantry, he has taken on something else.

(He has taken on some part of the responsibility for the study of a composite cultural structure comprised of little and great traditions which have interacted in the past and which are still interacting today.) He shares the responsibility with the historian and the humanist. Both can conceive of the civilization which they study as a persisting and char-

The Social Organization of Tradition

acteristic but always changing interaction between little and great traditions. So conceived, the civilization is a content of thought with its expressions in action and symbol. The civilization is compound in that it has parts or levels, each present in some of the people who carry on that civilization more than in others. These people live similar but notably different lives, and they live them apart, some in villages, some in cities or shrine-centers, temples, or monasteries. These parts or levels are something other than local (regional) cultures; they are something different from the subcultures characterizing the occupational groups concerned with secular specialties. They are different because the learning of the great tradition is an outgrowth of the little tradition and is now an exemplar for the people who carry the little tradition. Great and little traditions are dimensions of one another; those people who carry on the lower layers and those who maintain the high alike recognize the same order of "highness" and "lowness."

Thought of as basic values, or as world view, the two layers or dimensions will be seen as similar and yet notably different. Even one who knows as little of India as I do may suppose that the world view of the little traditions of India is on the whole

polytheistic, magical, and unphilosophical, while the different strands of the great Vedic tradition choose different intellectual and ethical emphases: the Vedas tend to be polytheistic and poetical, the Upanishads abstract, monistic, and not very theistic, while the important Vaishnavism and Shaivism are theistic and ethical. Corresponding contrasts appear, to mention just one other great tradition, "when we compare Taoism as a philosophy . . . with Taoism as a popular organized religion. Thus in philosophical Taoism the emphasis is on the subordination of man to nature, whereas in religious Taoism the goal is in the acquisition of human immortality through magical means, in other words, the gaining by man of control over natural forces; likewise in philosophical Taoism any idea of divine causation is rigidly excluded, whereas in religious Taoism the universe is peopled by a vast host of anthropomorphic deities."²⁰

As we proceed to understand civilizations thus composed, we shall need to improve the communication between humanist-historian and anthropologist. The former may come better to understand the relations of the reflective thought he studies to the total life of that civilization; the latter may be helped to describe his small community in so far as

The Social Organization of Tradition

its ways of life affect and are affected by the teachings of the great traditions. The forms in which the two kinds of research enterprises are conceived and carried on differ notably, of course; but their relevance to each other can be clarified and cultivated. We need the textual studies of the historian and student of art and literature. The student of the hierarchic culture has for his subject matter a corpus of texts. These texts are not only verbal. The world view of Hindu thought is written in the architecture of its temples as well as in its philosophies.²¹ The studies of the anthropologist are contextual:²² they relate some element of the great tradition—sacred uook, story-element, teacher, ceremony, or supernatural being—to the life of the ordinary people, in the context of daily life as the anthropologist sees it happen.

The textual and the contextual studies will easily be found to come into connection with one another where the content of the text has important place in the context of village life. The *Ramayana* is the ancient source widely influential in village India to-day. Derived from oral tales, it was fashioned into a Sanskrit epic by some poet—it is said, one Valmiki—and so became part of India's great tradition. From the ninth century to the sixteenth century it was

Peasant Society and Culture

translated into many of the Indian vernaculars and in these forms was taught and sung by those professionals of the cultural structure about whom Professor Raghavan has told us. In the sixteenth century Tulsi-Das made a Hindi version which became the script for many a village celebration. This writer, an exponent of high culture, made a kind of basic text. We are told that this version is perhaps better known among the common people of India than is the Bible among rural English people. But then, as time went on, the Hindi of the Tulsi-Das version became hard for the peasants to understand. They added to it accretions from their local popular usage. And now, in village India, this basic text requires interpretation to be intelligible to the villagers. This is how it is done in connection with the festival of Ram Lila. There are two kinds of participants in the dramatic representation of the stories of Ram and Sita and the struggle with Ravana. The pundit, on behalf of the greater tradition, steps on the stage and reads from the Hindi text of the sixteenth century—with later popular interpolations. It is necessary that this text be read, because it is holy. But it is hard to understand. So, while the pundit is yet reciting, the impersonator (who is an unlettered villager) “starts to enact the deed

The Social Organization of Tradition

which the recitation mentions. The pundit pauses, and the actor, raising his voice, paraphrases in a speech in clear modern prose the verse which the audience has just heard."²³ So are the levels of the tradition linked in the actual arrangements for ceremonial moral instruction in the villages. So might we study Bible stories in the sermons of a rustic Western community or the actual communication and modification of Confucian teaching in Chinese villages.

When the anthropologist studies an isolated primitive community, the context is that community and its local and immediate culture. When he comes to study a peasant community and its culture, the context is widened to include the elements of the great tradition that are or have been in interaction with what is local and immediate. If he is interested in the transformations that take place through this interaction (diachronic studies), he will investigate the communication of little and great traditions with each other and the changes that may have resulted or come to result in one or both because of the communication. If he regards the peasant village as a persisting system, as synchronic studies (perhaps limiting his view of the lapse of time to the three generations that are sometimes said to constitute

Peasant Society and Culture

the period within which the recurrent changes that sustain the system take place), he will include in the analysis the persisting and expectable communications from the great tradition to the village as these are necessary to maintain the culture of the peasant. How is this to be done?

In some published accounts of peasant communities the reader does learn something of the ways in which local religious belief and ritual are like or unlike the belief and ritual of the hierarchic religious culture with which the villagers are in communication through their priests, teachers, or experiences in travel.²⁴ But procedures for the reporting and analysis of these communications and their effects, either in sustaining the local culture or in contributing to the history of its modifications and its effects on the great tradition, are yet to be developed. I suggest that it may be in the course of their work in India that anthropologists will come to develop them. It is in India that the great (Sanskritic) tradition is in constant, various, and conspicuous interaction with the life of the local communities. It is there that the teachings of reflective and civilized minds appear plainly in the festivals, rituals, and in the ideals of the peasantry. It is in India that a man's ascribed status, in the form of caste, is closely as-

The Social Organization of Tradition

sociated with the claim of that caste to participation in the rituals and ideals of life as inculcated in Sanskritic teaching. Professor Srinivas has given us an account²⁵ of the way that certain village people, the Coorgs, who had ways of life somewhat apart from the Sanskritic tradition, have been taking on, in part quite consciously, elements of Hindu culture. The Coorgs have come to think of themselves as Kshatriyas, people of the warrior *varna*, and have come under the influence of Hinduism to the point that four of their number have become *sanyasis*, dedicated holy men observing the teachings of the Indian high tradition. The Coorgs have taken a high place in the general Indian hierarchy of status; they have Hinduized their claims to status. So far does the great tradition reach and so much does it yet do in India to change the cultures of depressed or marginal peoples.

In very recent years Western anthropologists have come in considerable numbers to study the Indian peasant villages as they lie within Hindu, Moslem, or modern Western civilization. One such recent study begins to provide conceptions and ways of work for analyzing the mutual effect of hierarchic Hinduism and village culture on each other. This is a paper by McKim Marriott.²⁶ The viewpoint is

“diachronic”; the subject is conceived not only in terms of social relations but also “culturally”—as customs and institutions in course of modification. In the village he studied, which he calls Kishan Garhi, in Uttar Pradesh, the religion consists of elements of local culture and elements of the high Sanskrit tradition in close adjustment and integration. He finds “evidences of accretion and of transmutation in form without apparent replacement and without rationalization of the accumulated and transformed elements.” Fifteen of nineteen festivals celebrated in Kishan Garhi are sanctioned in universal Sanskrit texts. But some of the local festivals have no place in Sanskrit teaching; those that do are but a small part of the entire corpus of festivals sanctioned by Sanskrit literature; villagers confuse or choose between various classical meanings for their festivals; and even the most Sanskritic of the local festivals have obviously taken on elements of ritual that arose, not out of the great tradition, but out of the local peasant life.

This kind of syncretization is familiar to students of paganism and Christianity or to students of Islam in its relations to local cults in North Africa. “Marriott proposes that the two-way interaction between little and great traditions be studied as two comple-

The Social Organization of Tradition

mentary processes to which he gives names. For one thing, the little traditions of the folk exercise their influence on the authors of the Hindu great tradition who take up some element of belief or practice and, by incorporating it in their reflective statement of Hindu orthodoxy, universalize that element for all who thereafter come under the influence of their teaching. Marriott cannot quite prove²⁷ that the following was indeed an instance of universalization, but he suggests that the goddess Laksmi of Hindu orthodoxy is derived from such deities as he saw represented in his village daubed on walls or fashioned in images of dung: the natures and meanings of the high goddess and the local godlings are similar, and some villagers identify the latter with Laksmi. Also, Marriott reports an annual festival in which wives go to visit their brothers in the villages of their origins and in which these women, leaving their brothers to return home, express their attachment to them by placing barley shoots on the brothers' heads and ears, the brothers reciprocating with gifts of small coins.† One of the Purāṇas, a classic source of Sanskrit instruction, fixes the form for a Brahmanical ritual according to which, on the same day as that on which is held the village rite referred to, each village priest goes to his patron

and ties upon his wrist a charm of many-colored thread, the patron then giving money to the Brahman. Did the local rite give rise to the ceremony fixed in the Purāna, or is it an application of what the Purāna teaches? Marriott inclines to the former explanation and thinks of this interaction between the two dimensions or layers of the religion as illustrating universalization.

The opposite process, which Marriott calls "parochialization," is that by which some Sanskritic element is learned about and then re-formed by the villagers to become a part of their local cult. For example: a divine sage of the Sanskritic tradition, associated by the Brahman elders with the planet Venus, is represented by erection of a stone in the village. Brides are now taken here to worship with their husbands. But then the origins of the stone are forgotten; it comes to be regarded as the abode of the ancestral spirits of the Brahmans who put it there. Again, the Sanskritic tradition, as expressed in the great Indian myths, gives sanction to a festival celebrated in nine successive nights in honor of great goddesses of the pantheon of India's great tradition. In the village of Kishan Garhi the people include in the beings to be honored during the festival of Nine Nights a being they call Naurtha: each morning and

The Social Organization of Tradition

evening during the nine days women and children worship this Naurtha by bathing, singing, and making figurines of mud. Naurtha has no place in the great tradition. Marriott is able to show that she has come into existence in the village through simple linguistic corruption—a misunderstanding of the phrase “Nava Ratra” which means “Nine Nights.” So by mere linguistic confusion in the communication between the little tradition and the great tradition, a minor goddess has been created.

Marriott was able to learn something about the interaction of great and little traditions in bringing about the translation or substitution of meanings and connections of rite and belief because he has read some of the sources of Hindu orthodoxy and because in the village he studied he found some people much more than others in communication with those sources. The village includes the educated and the ignorant, and the villager himself is well aware of the difference. A more educated villager calls himself a *sanātani*, a follower of the orthodox and traditional way; a Brahman domestic priest distinguishes “doers and knowers”; the ordinary villager says that a certain ritual is Nārāyan, a deity inseminating the mortar in which the family husks grain, but an educated man of the same village says

Peasant Society and Culture

that it is a symbol of the creation of the world.²⁸ Where there are such differences as between villagers, the connections the village has with the philosopher or theologian can be traced in part by the anthropologist in his community study. The analysis then moves outward and upward to meet such investigations of the downward movement of orthodoxy or philosophy as is studied by Von Grunebaum for Islam and by Raghavan for Hinduism.

One is encouraged to imagine the kinds of studies of the interaction of the two aspects of tradition that will develop in anthropology. Still thinking of India, where the material is abundant and interesting, I remark that the interaction may be conceived in a more cultural or in a more societal way. Marriott's study represents the former. Milton Singer, writing from India, is impressed with the importance of what he calls "the cultural media"—song, dance, drama, festival, ceremony, recitations and discourse, prayers with offerings—in expressing Indian culture. He is struck by the ways in which these forms constantly merge with one another and suggests that Indians, and perhaps all peoples, conceive of their culture as encapsulated in specific cultural forms which can be exhibited in "cultural per-

The Social Organization of Tradition

formances” to outsiders and to themselves.²⁹ One may perhaps analyze how elements of high tradition are communicated to the villager in these cultural forms, and how the elements are modified as they are taken into the local culture.

Or it may become possible and important to study particular “cultural institutions,” those activities and personnel that exist for the purpose of communicating the great tradition. In India it should be possible, as Marriott suggests, to study a temple at its points of contact with pilgrims or one of those many regional shrines which house the images of those deities that are intermediate between great and little traditions, being local forms of the one and universalized forms of the other. Where a fairly limited community contains institutions of formal instruction, the social organization of tradition can be studied, I should imagine, in those institutions.

The Muslim school differs from the Hindu temple as a religion based on fidelity to an ultimate perfect revelation recorded in one book differs from a religion of polymorphous symbolic expression of levels of the same truth. From what I read,³⁰ the Magreb of Morocco even today provide an instance of an ancient and little changed structure of Islamic sacred tradition. We are told by Professor Le Tour-

Peasant Society and Culture

neau that there is practically no difference there between a work written in the sixteenth century and one written in the twentieth, newspapers are unknown, and the intellectual life is confined to a small elite who are concerned ever with the same problems of interpreting Muslim orthodoxy. The peasant in the village is connected with Muslim orthodoxy by koranic teachers and minor administrative employees; such people are taught in mosque-schools in the minor cities; a few then attend the mosque to learn Muslim law or elements of Arabic grammar; and a very few go to Muslim universities in Fez or Tunis. Here the stable connections between village and city life with regard to the cultivated sacred tradition can be defined.

In India one might study one of the subcastes whose functions are to cultivate the history and genealogy of their caste, or one might study a caste composed of entertainers and singers who sing traditional stories from the *Ramayana* or the *Mahabharata* to their patrons.³¹ Such castes are corporate groups relating great and little traditions to each other. (It seems that in India the structure of tradition is very complex indeed and provided with a great variety of specialists, often caste-organized, for communicating the greater traditions to the

The Social Organization of Tradition

lesser. Milton Singer says that in Madras he finds three major groups of specialists associated with the Sanskritic tradition: the priests supervising domestic and temple rites; reciters, singers, and dancers who convey the popular Purāṇic culture; and Sanskrit pundits and scholars who cultivate different branches of Sanskritic learning.

Looked at in this way, the interaction of great and little traditions can be regarded as a part of the social structure of the peasant community in its enlarged context. We are concerned with those persisting and important arrangements of roles and statuses, in part appearing in such corporate groups as castes and sects, that are concerned with the cultivation and inculcation of the great tradition. The concept is an extension or specialization of the concept of social structure as used by anthropologists in the study of societies that are more nearly self-contained than are peasant villages. We turn now to consider, for the compound peasant society, a certain kind of the persisting social relations, a certain part of the social structure. The relations between Muslim teacher and pupil, between Brahman priest and layman, between Chinese scholar and Chinese peasant—all such as these that are of importance in bringing about the communication of great tradition to the

Peasant Society and Culture

peasant or that, perhaps without anyone's intention, cause the peasant tradition to affect the doctrine of the learned—constitute the social structure of the culture, the structure of tradition. From this point of view a civilization is an organization of specialists, of kinds of role-occupiers in characteristic relations to one another and to lay people and performing characteristic functions concerned with the transmission of tradition.

We might, as does Professor Raymond Firth, reserve the phrase "social organization"³² in connection with concrete activity at particular times and places. Social organization is the way that people put together elements of action so as to get done something they want done. Social structure is a persisting general character, a "pattern" of typical relationships. Social organization is described when we account for the choices and resolutions of difficulties and conflicts that actually went on in one particular situation. Accordingly we might withdraw the title of this chapter from its wider use and reserve it for the way in which elements of action are put together in any particular case of transmission of tradition. Thus we shall be studying the social organization of tradition when we investigate the way in which the school day is arranged in the

The Social Organization of Tradition

conservative Islamic school, or when we study the way in which the festival of Ram Lila is brought about in an Indian community, the peasants and the literate pundit co-operating to the end that the sacred stories are acted out to the accompaniment of readings from the sacred text of the higher tradition. If there are problems of adjustment between what the more learned man would like to see done and what the lay people of the village think proper or entertaining, these cases of social organization of tradition will be the more interesting. I remember lost opportunities to study the social organization of tradition in my own field work, especially one occasion when the Catholic parish priest and the local shaman of the Maya tradition took part, successively, in a ceremony of purification in a Guatemalan village. There were then many pushings and pullings, many matters of doubt, conflict, and compromise, which I failed to record. In that case there were, of course, two more esoteric traditions, in some degree of conflict with each other, and both requiring some adjustment to the expectations of the villagers.

So we come to develop forms of thought appropriate to the wider systems, the enlarged contexts, of our anthropological work. In studying a

Peasant Society and Culture

primitive society, in its characteristic self-containment, its societal and cultural autonomy, we hardly notice the social structure of tradition. It may be present there quite simply in a few shamans or priests, fellow-members of the small community, very similar to others within it. In a primitive and preliterate society we cannot know much of the history of its culture. The structure of tradition in early Zuni is seen as a division of function within the tribal community and is seen as something now going on, not as a history. But a civilization has both great regional scope and great historic depth. It is a great whole, in space and in time, by virtue of the complexity of the organization which maintains and cultivates its traditions and communicates them from the great tradition to the many and varied small local societies within it. The anthropologist who studies one of these small societies finds it far from autonomous and comes to report and analyze it in its relations, societal and cultural, to state and to civilization.

IV

The Peasant View of the Good Life

THE ANTHROPOLOGY of the early twentieth century stressed the differences among peoples rather than the resemblances.¹ Primitive societies, especially those distant from each other, were shown to exhibit contrasting customs, opposing views of the good life. Two neighboring tribes of the Plains may be similar, but the Canadian Kwakiutl have a way of life very different from that of the Zuni and yet more different from that of the Melanesian Dobu.¹ We learned that people with roughly similar ways of getting a living may nevertheless have different moral systems and world views.¹ The Australian food gatherers and those of aboriginal California would not feel at home each in the company of the other, and the agricultural Zuni and the agricultural tribes of northern Luzon are notably different kinds of people. Even as between tribal peoples living in the same part of the world, marked differences in value-orientation have been reported.²

On the other hand, whatever anthropologists may think about it, there is a common impression that peasantry are much the same over very wide

Peasant Society and Culture

regions, even the whole world over. Oscar Handlin, reviewing the peasant qualities that immigrants brought to North America, asserts that "from the westernmost reaches of Europe, in Ireland, in Russia in the east, the peasant masses had maintained an imperturbable sameness."³ He then describes that sameness: everywhere a personal bond with the land; attachment to an integrated village or local community; central importance of the family; marriage a provision of economic welfare; patrilocal residence and descent in the male line; a strain between the attachment to the land and the local world and the necessity to raise money crops; and so on. An observer of East Indian peasant life finds in these peasants "the real link between East and West." "He represents a way of life as old as civilization itself" with "an underlying unity which makes peasants everywhere akin."⁴ The same impression is reported by a recent French writer, who thinks that peasantry are so much the same everywhere that he calls them "a psycho-physiological race," and declares that peasant and remote peasant are more alike than are city man and peasant in the same country. And he also mentions features he thinks present among peasantry everywhere: the family as a social group, the mystic attachment to

The Peasant View of the Good Life

the farm, the emphasis on procreation.⁵ The impression that peasantry are somehow a type of mankind is strengthened when one finds in a Latin writing of the fourth century a description of the peasantry of that time and place that could be substituted for Handlin's words about other and later peasants.⁶

This impression became my own personal experience when in reading about peasant societies in many places and times I came to feel that much that I read was already familiar to me from what I had experienced in peasant communities of Maya Indians in Yucatan. In Reymont's novel⁷ about Polish peasants, in Chinese villages, in recent accounts of Latin-American and European country people, I felt this "imperturbable sameness." And I began to wonder of what this sameness consisted and whether or not it could be shown to be a fact.

In a paper published nine years ago, Professor E. K. L. Francis suggested that the sameness might consist of "an integrated pattern of dominant attitudes"⁸ of "a distinct peasant substratum of society in widespread areas of the globe."⁹ Professor Francis proceeded to identify this integrated pattern of dominant attitudes as it appeared to him from a study of the oldest book we have about peasant life: Hesiod's *Works and Days*. Hesiod had enough urban

Peasant Society and Culture

sophistication to go to law with his brother in disputing an inheritance and to learn poetic art from books and so go on to win prizes at poetry-writing, but he did for years live with peasants.

Professor Francis' summary of what Hesiod tells us was so well done and so suggestive of other peasantry that it occurred to me to look for similar things in some other peasant communities. Invited to contribute to a series of lectures on "The Good Life," I adopted this phrase for the "integrated pattern of dominant attitudes," especially as representing the value-orientations of people, and made a brief comparison of Hesiod's description of Boeotians of the sixth century B.C. with the Maya Indians of recent Yucatan (because I knew them directly) and with the simple rural people of Surrey as described by George Sturt.¹⁰ Sturt (who wrote under the name of George Bourne) also directs our attention toward dominant attitudes or ideas as to how life ought to be lived, in this case those of English peasants transformed into rural people after the inclosure of the commons in 1861 and the later coming to the countryside of people from towns and cities. George Sturt witnessed many of these changes.

In the course of my little comparison of these

The Peasant View of the Good Life

three peoples, so separate in space and time, I found so much likeness that I wrote that "if a peasant from any one of these three widely separated communities could have been transported by some convenient genie to any one of the others and equipped with a knowledge of the language in the village to which he had been moved, he would very quickly come to feel at home. And this would be because the fundamental orientations of life would be unchanged. The compass of his career would continue to point to the same moral north." And I went on to particularize the resemblances that I found.¹¹ The rest of this chapter is about these particularizations as to peasant attitudes and values and especially about what became of them as they were examined and tested by other evidence.

The lecture in which I came to this conclusion was not written as a contribution to science but merely to suggest to an audience that peasants have something that one would want to call a view of the good life. To declare important similarities, with no attention to differences, as to qualities only vaguely defined as among peoples so widely separate in time and space as the ancient Boeotians, the recent English countrypeople, and the remade Indian peasantry of present-day Yucatan, is not good science, but it

Peasant Society and Culture

is a good way to get a discussion going. There is so much about the comparison that may be challenged. The meaning of the phrase, "the good life," and of other words used to describe peasant values, the validity of comparisons based on such different kinds of sources of information on such widely separated peoples, and the worth of generalizations offered after brief examination of only three out of thousands of more or less peasant peoples, all invite criticism.

The criticism came. It was provoked and guided through the kindness and skill of Professor F. G. Friedmann, himself a student of the peasants of southern Italy and long interested in those aspects of the life of simple peoples that anthropologists call "value orientations" or perhaps "ethos." As a philosopher and humanist, he called these orientations more simply, "way and view of life," and he brought about a discussion, by exchange of letters, of my lecture and of the topic generally. About a dozen persons who had studied peasant peoples in one part of the world or another contributed to this little symposium. In what follows I draw very largely on the contributions of these other students, and in connection with particular issues mention their names. I am very grateful to them all and hope that they will further correct and develop the small begin-

The Peasant View of the Good Life

nings I make here in reporting some of the results of the discussion. I use their contributions not so much to provide a description of peasant values as to support an opinion that the problem is a real one. The effect of the discussion, as far as it has gone, seems to me to intensify the impression that the circumstances of peasantry tend to bring about in such peoples views of life that have some similarity: that the view of life of one peasant people will be found to have resemblances to that of some others, but not always at the same points of resemblance. Further, I believe that as terms come to be better defined and as facts are more sharply reported and brought more definitely to bear on more restricted questions, some of these points of resemblance or difference will be provided with explanations, with statements of particular circumstance which account for them. In short, this excursion into problems of peasantry as a human type, an attitude toward the universe, seems to me to be one of the consequences of that enlargement of the anthropological subject matter which is the subject of these four chapters. Not much is known about these problems as yet. I think that the discussion led by Professor Friedmann has shown them to be accessible to more considered examination and investigation.

I begin now with the first three generalizations I

Peasant Society and Culture

offered in that early offhand comparison and say what became of them in the discussion that followed. Among peasants of nineteenth-century England, present-day Yucatan, and ancient Boeotia, I seemed to find a cluster of three closely related attitudes or values: an intimate and reverent attitude toward the land; the idea that agricultural work is good and commerce not so good; and an emphasis on productive industry as a prime virtue. As to the intimate and reverent attitude toward the land, the injunction of Hesiod chimed in closely with many a piece of advice I had heard the Yucatecan agriculturalist give to his son or offer to me, the recording ethnologist. The Maya farmer teaches his boy how to use the ax and the machete, while also he sees to it that the youth bows his head in prayer when the forest is cleared for planting and that he always treats the maize plant with reverence and the maize field as something of a holy place. In Hesiod's pages too I found this mixture of prudence and piety as to the agricultural life, and I concluded that for ancient Greek as for recent Maya, nature is man's and gods' both; nature is wrought upon, but decent respect attends the work; farming is practical action suffused with religious feeling. In the book about the Sussex countryman I found no explicit religious

The Peasant View of the Good Life

expressions with regard to agriculture, but quoted George Sturt to the effect that there too prevailed a similar feeling of intimacy with nature and reverence for it. There, although the formal expressions of religion-in-agriculture are lacking, there remains what Sturt calls "the faint sense of something venerable" in the landscape and in agricultural activity.

I went on to declare the peasant's emphasis on agricultural industriousness as a prime virtue and suggested that this emphasis is supported by three principal considerations: security, respect, and the religious feeling already noted. I quoted Hesiod again as to the security and respect that comes to a man who is industrious, and I reported how the rural Yucatecan also taught his children to work hard on the land, because both his livelihood and his reputation depended on it and because the gods expected it. I showed that in a Maya village I knew some men continued to practice agriculture although economically disadvantageous because to plant a corn-field was essential to participating in the moral and religious life of the community.

Further, I mentioned the scorn exhibited by the rural Maya toward the townsman as a creature easily tiring and unable to sustain the labor which was the necessity and pride of the villager and

Peasant Society and Culture

quoted George Sturt to similar effect in connection with the Sussex countryman. This contrast, to the advantage of himself, the rural Mayan, and the Boeotian, extends also to the man of commerce. In Yucatan commerce became something of a game and venture to the later peasantry but never came to have anything like the importance and seriousness of agriculture. Similarly, Hesiod's advice is unfavorable to business ventures; his section on the subject begins with the words, "If you turn your misguided heart to trading. . . ." In summary, I thought I found in the three peoples I reviewed a sober attitude toward work, a satisfaction in working long and hard in the fields, a disinclination to adventure or to speculate. I thought all this in striking contrast (as Francis and others have noted) to the view and ideals of such warrior-chieftains as are described in the *Iliad* or the *Mahabharata*.

And how did this characterization fare in the discussion? At first some corroboration appeared. Professor Irwin T. Sanders had already described the Bulgarian peasant as putting forward among chief values "land ownership, hard work, frugality."¹² Professor Donald Pitkin remarked, from his reading, that to the Irish countryman and to the French Canadian peasant also "the emphasis on productive

The Peasant View of the Good Life

industry as a prime good and central duty would ring true."

But it soon appeared that not all the people we find it easy to call peasants feel this way about their land and work. Pitkin told us that the peasant of southern Italy works because one must in order to eat but feels that it is better to work with one's head than with one's hands and better yet not to work at all. And Friedmann does not find that the impoverished southern Italian takes that reverent attitude toward the land which is so marked among the Maya and was at least recognizable among the late peasantry of England according to Sturt.

Why are the southern Italian peasants different in this respect? And what other peasantry or near-peasantry also feel that the land is just something on which one works as a necessity, not as a virtue? Looking further, I find that the town-dwelling Andalusians recently reported by J. A. Pitt-Rivers lack a mystical attitude toward the land; they go out to cultivate the land, but they do not love it.¹³ Labor on the land is no prime virtue with them. And a French author whom Pitt-Rivers quotes in his book says that much the same may be said of the Syrian peasant: "The fellah cultivates . . . with regret . . . he works for himself and not for the land; he does

not feel that the land is an extension of himself" ("Il ne sent pas que celle-ci le dépasse et le prolongue").¹⁴ This appears to be a real difference: the Maya, and I think the French Canadian, and the old-fashioned rural Englishman, did feel that the land was an extension of himself.

Professor Tullio Tentori, another student of Italian peasantry, and also Donald Pitkin have proposed that those peasants who emphasize labor on the land as a virtue have enough land and security so that agricultural work does, in fact, result in an existence with some dignity, not "just a sort of desperate scrounging for existence" (Pitkin). The economic condition of the south Italian is certainly bad, and one can see that there, where also examples of wealth and of pleasanter urban living are present, the wish to escape agricultural toil might easily develop. I am not so sure that the same explanation will serve for the Spanish mountain-dwelling agriculturalist, who is apparently better off economically than is the south Italian.

I begin to wonder if it is a mere accident that those European peasant villages where the dignity of agricultural work is recognized are, so far as these reports go, some distance from the Mediterranean. It is the Bulgarian, the Irish countryman,

The Peasant View of the Good Life

the Englishman, who are reported as showing the feeling of dignity in work on the land. It is the south Italian, the Andalusian, the Syrian, who do not. Pitt-Rivers says that the attitude he found in the Andalusian town "is typical of the whole Mediterranean, though it contrasts with the north-west of the Iberian peninsula."¹⁵ This sounds as if the differences in attitude might in part reflect some ancient regional differences of culture. One recalls the emphasis on town-dwelling throughout the ancient Mediterranean area as contrasted with the more tribal and migratory character of the ancient people of northern and eastern Europe. The Andalusian thinks of himself as a townsman although he works the land and belongs culturally to a class inferior to the more educated elite. The possibility presents itself that around the Mediterranean Sea the prestige of the town, the *polis*, carried with it at an early date the peasant's distaste for agricultural life. But does not this possibility seem less likely when one recalls Hesiod's injunctions as to agricultural industry? Or do his words express a time and place when and where rural Greeks had not come to form a distaste for farming? Or is it that Hesiod is not to be read as evidence of a sense of virtue in performing agricultural work?

Peasant Society and Culture

It may be that both kinds of explanations, historical and ecological-economic, for peasant attitudes toward land and labor are valid with different weights and effects in different parts of the world. To the Maya Indian labor on the milpa is dignified by its connections with religion and manly virtue; and, in fact, he does earn himself a decent way of life by agricultural toil. The religiousness of his agriculture arose in primitive life and has not been destroyed by a more secular civilization. The sentimental and moral attachments of the old-fashioned English peasant to his land are farther away from such primitive involvements of religion and agriculture. The Maya is a primitive agriculturalist who, having been something of a peasant to his indigenous elite, has become a peasant to the Spanish-Maya elite of the present day. The English countryman ceased to be a more secular kind of peasant while it was yet possible to earn a life of dignity in rural labor. The south Italian may bring a distaste for rural life down from ancient times, while he also is influenced by the fact that he now lives in hardship in contrast to the life of the gentry and the rich.

The case of the rural Paraguayans described by Elman and Helen Service is interesting and suggests possible directions in which explanations for re-

The Peasant View of the Good Life

semblances and differences in these attitudes may be found. The Paraguayans live on scattered farms as squatters. Their agricultural resources are not closed: the people can get more land by making an effort to reclaim waste for agriculture. We are told that these people, who have important relationships of power and status with an educated elite, have "typical peasant attitudes" in that, at least, they farm to keep themselves fed and as a way of life and not as a business enterprise. These Paraguayans do not regard ownership of land as particularly desirable; they get along all right without owning it, for they control the land on which they live without legal right. When they work for hire, they regard their relationship to their employer as personal, and their work as the performance of a favor to a friend. It is not clear from the account just how they value their own labor on the land. But one gets the feeling that to understand the attitudes of these Paraguayans one must take into account both the fact that land resources are not strictly limited and the fact, historical rather than environmental or ecological, that they came to Paraguay as pioneers and did not bring with them such religion and social systems centered around agriculture as grew up in America among the Maya. ✓

Peasant Society and Culture

Up to this point the attempt to reconcile the somewhat conflicting accounts of the attitudes peasants have with regard to the land and their work upon it has proceeded on the assumption that the different accounts are equivalent, that is, that all these writers provide us with reliable answers to the same question: Do these peasants think labor on the land is good? It is doubtful that they do. What is meant by "think good"? Apparently the contributors to the symposium all understood that what was under discussion was the peasant's view of what is good, not the good as judged by the observer and outsider. But the "good" of the peasant is of several kinds or dimensions. Dr. Börje Hanssen, in writing of old-time Swedish peasants, brought this to the fore by pointing out that physical vigor and endurance are "goods" in that it is a desirable and necessary thing to have these powers; on the other hand, labor on the land is not desired: the peasant prefers "his resting place by the warm stove more than any kind of hard work." One imagines that it could be truly said of more than one peasant that hard work in the fields is a virtue taught and respected, while at the same time rest and leisure are not merely desired but desirable—that is, within some limits of disapproved idleness, it is thought

The Peasant View of the Good Life

good in the nature of things not to work but to be free from work. Dr. Hanssen has also raised the point that the good (the desirable?) for the individual may be distinguishable from the good for the community, that is, there may be a certain inconsistency among elements of the desirable.

This turn in the discussion demands a reconsideration of our sources and a re-examination of our concepts. Maybe the sources are talking of different aspects of "the good." It may be that Friedmann, Tentori, and Pitkin could tell us something about the positive value placed on industriousness in the field in the face of the south Italian's wish to escape his little-rewarding toil, while it yet remains true that labor has more dignity in French Canada and in Yucatan than it has in Calabria. My report of Maya attitudes is on the whole an account of values these peasants see in agriculture; it does not report—something which is also a fact—that leisure is also desirable and that hard work is, if possible, to be escaped. Hesiod's account does not amount to proof that his peasantry were entirely content with their lot:¹⁶ much of *Works and Days* is as didactic as *Poor Richard's Almanac*; he is telling his neighbors how to make a success—practical and religious—of farming. The sources are not equivalent. In some

Peasant Society and Culture

there is an emphasis on the reverence or religious feeling in the agricultural activity; in others on the preferences for rest or leisure; in others on the teaching of industry as an admirable habit. In part these emphases conform, I imagine, to differences between the communities reported; but in part, I also suppose, they arise from choices made by observers and writers as to an aspect of a social situation to be stressed.

Nor is it sure that all these reporters from Hesiod to Professor Friedmann's band of irregulars have described, in the same sense, a view of "the good life"—a phrase brought into the discussion through the title put upon my lecture by the organizer of a series of addresses to general audiences in Chicago in 1953. Within any investigation as to what the "goods" (values) of certain other people are, at least three questions are implied: What do these people desire? What qualities, at least as a matter of prudence, do they try to bring about in their children? To what kind of life do they attach highest esteem—whether or not they foresee it for themselves and whether or not it is what they desire? I should think that there might be considerable discrepancy among the answers to these three questions about any particular peasantry.

The Peasant View of the Good Life

If we could become sure that we were all asking the same question of the facts about particular peasants, and that the answers reported were of equivalent validity, we might reach conclusions as to the conceptions of goodness and badness that attach to land and labor in peasant societies. Even through the many uncertainties, I think I see in the discussion that has been carried on among a few of us the probability that many peasants share, not identically but with some notable resemblances, a cluster of attitudes or values in this part of their experience. Perhaps it will prove convenient to recognize such a cluster in the first instance only in cases of peasantry in long-standing and stable relationship to limited land and to a little-changing gentry or elite. For such peasants the cluster may include an involvement of agricultural labor with traditional, often reverential, sentiments about the land; the connection of that labor with ideals as to personal worth; the inculcation in the young of endurance and hard work rather than a disposition to take risks and to perform personal exploits; the acceptance of arduous labor, yet with great enjoyment of its surcease. Because of regional differences in traditional attitudes that come to prevail through a history special to that region, we may find it better

Peasant Society and Culture

to characterize the peasant values for one part of the world at a time. And then we may further come to see how this cluster or these clusters of goodness and badness in agricultural labor have, in particular cases, been pulled into some different direction of emphasis because of something peculiar to the ancient history of those people or because of such more recent events as a sudden increase in the burden of poverty or the appearance of an opportunity to escape it.

I turn now to another group of characteristics possibly attributable to peasantry and discussed in the interchange led by Professor Friedmann. In reviewing Hesiod's account of Boeotian views of marriage and the family, Francis had emphasized the practical disposition toward such personal matters and the economic values seen in marriage and in children: the ancient peasant chose a bride because she had a reputation for industry, and children were welcomed because they made more hands for work. In reviewing also the Surrey rural people and the Maya I knew, I made a wider generalization as to prevailing values or cast of character. I wrote: "It is . . . the state of mind at once practical and reverent, the inseparable mixture of prudence and piety, which gives the essential character to peasant

The Peasant View of the Good Life

life. . . . In this scheme of values sobriety is the chosen mode. The peasant values decorum and decency. Passion is not to be exhibited. A man does not flaunt his appetites, or make a show of his emotions."

And I thought I found in Hesiod and in Sturt evidence of a scorn for sentiment, an earthy matter-of-factness, a masking of tenderness and restraint of passion that to me contrasted with the behavior of the warriors of the *Iliad* or the chieftains of the Viking age.

In particular I saw this temper of mind and feeling manifest in the practical attitudes toward sex and marriage in the three peasant communities which I tried to compare. I recalled a Maya villager's remark to me that "one should care for the land as for a wife and family" when I read the parallel injunction in Hesiod: "First of all get a house and a woman and an ox for the plough."¹⁷ In Chan Kom, in rural Surrey as described by Sturt, and in Hesiod's pages I seemed to find similar prudential views for getting a wife and for living with her; in all three communities, I ventured to say, one marries as a part of the work and the piety of life. Sturt's characterization of the marriage of the old English countryside as "a kind of dogged partnership"¹⁸ seemed to me to

Peasant Society and Culture

fit Maya and ancient Greek as well, and so I was led to write that "the peasant would not approve of the careless raptures of some urban marriages and would make no sense of the action of the Plains Indian brave, who, to show his manly independence and scorn of pleasant comforts, might, if he chose, publicly cast off a good wife only because he suffered a slight smart at the hands of his parents-in-law."¹⁹ This line of thought led me into some generalizations as to the place of sex experience in the peasant scheme of values: In peasant life, where work and practical good sense join with a spirit of decent restraint, there is little room for sexual exploit as a sport or for bravado. The cultivation of amorous adventure, as practiced in not a few Polynesian societies, or among some modern Western groups, is hardly possible in peasant communities. Before marriage sexual experiment is common, yes, and may receive some public approval or at least licensed regulation (as in the custom of bundling). But adultery is not looked on with favor. Bourne says of his Surrey people that "it scandalizes them to hear of it. They despise it."²⁰ And Hesiod puts a large part of the reason for this attitude pithily: "Do not let a flaunting woman coax and cozen and deceive you—she is after your barn."²¹ In Chan Kom

The Peasant View of the Good Life

too the occasional adultery, when brought to a public issue, exposed the principal parties as figures almost as comic as reprehensible.

With these assertions that the three peasants were similar in minimizing sexual experience as a good in itself or as a sport or manly achievement I connected what I took to be another characteristic: a distaste for violence, a disfavor of prowess in any form of conspicuous aggressiveness. And again, as in the case of what I had said as to the attitudes connected with agricultural labor, other men who knew other peasants challenged the scope of the generalizations, and again it was the south Italian who provided evidence to support the challenge. Professor Tentori reported that to those rural people sexual experience is highly valued. "It is the only way," a peasant told him, "that we know to enjoy life." And I was referred to the statement by Signor Nitti, himself from southern Italy, as to "the violence of the carnal instinct" in that part of the rural world. Also I was reminded of the violence of which Mediterranean peasantry are capable when revenge is involved. At once I recalled much of what had been written about Mediterranean peoples: the expression of passion, the disposition to use violence to redress personal wrong, and the role of sexual exploit in

conceptions of manhood. There are indeed, even at this first glance, differences among peasant peoples as to these matters of violence and emphasis on sexual exploit.

But again it is not yet clear just what these differences are or to what they are to be attributed. In part the difference may be only apparent and arise from a report which emphasizes an ideal of good conduct with which, perhaps, other concepts of good present in the same society are in some conflict. Or it may in part be the difference between saying what certain peasants will tell you ought to be man's conduct and what they tell you they enjoy. But there may here be real differences between the habits of mind and character that have come to be established in one part of the world as compared with those that have developed in another. And some of such differences may perhaps be compatible with the common circumstances of peasant life.

There is such a thing as ethnic temperament. The group-personality of the Chinese is something to investigate and describe, and the results will not correspond with the results of investigations of the group-personality of south Italians. The Maya Indians, peasantry remade, have a group-personality which in important degree must have come about

The Peasant View of the Good Life

before ever they began to come into relationship with the Spanish-American gentry of the present-day towns. Yet in their case the group-personality that had been developing before the Conquest was already congenial, one may perhaps think, to the conditions of peasant life and, indeed, had partly been developed in the course of their relationships to their own priestly elites. The Comanche if moved to Yucatan would have had to change very much more to become peasantry. So it may turn out that the general circumstances of peasant life do not set aside other influences on character but yet do dispose a people toward the more restrained and sober valuation of sex and violence which I first tried to describe.

Possible explanations of peasant values appear to be numerous and complicated. Even in this brief discussion as to what peasants think of sexual prowess or manly aggressiveness, and as to whether the tone of their lives is sober or passionate, one sees that several explanations might be seriously considered. It may be that the characteristics of peasant life do on the whole dispose people to a sober temper unfavorable to individual exploit in any field of action. It may also be that even within such generally conforming circumstances old-established character-

Peasant Society and Culture

istics of the modal personality may be more congenial to such a result in one place than in others. And it may also be that in some parts of the world the peasantry have been strongly influenced by the gentry and elite with whom their lives are completed and entertain views of what is good, desirable, and ideal that they have taken over from examples provided by the gentry. Is it not the gentry of Spain, for instance, that exhibited most markedly that value called *hombria* which involves a certain approval of male sexual exploit and a touchy pride and use of violence in defense of honor? And yet do not the peasantry also show it? Certainly the rural townspeople of Andalusia show it.²² Do (or did) the peasants or the gentry in Italy show the satisfactions in sexual exploit and in manly violence which Professor Tentori calls to our attention? The extent to which a gentry ideal has influenced a peasantry probably differs from one part of the world to another: I imagine the influence to have been stronger in Spain than in Poland or Russia. At any rate, I am glad to remind myself by one fact I know well of the obvious importance of differences in historic heritage in explaining differences in peasant value-systems: In rural western Guatemala the Indian peasant or almost-peasant lives beside another

The Peasant View of the Good Life

peasant, the man called a *ladino*, whose ancestry is partly Spanish and whose language and culture are Spanish. The two rural agriculturalists work side by side and have similar material conditions of life, but they are notably different in manners and character: the *ladino* shows much of the formal courtesies of Castile and exhibits the remnants of *hombra*, manly pride; the Indian does not.

It becomes, then, impossible justly to explain the ideals of peasantry without considering the kind and duration of the relationships those peasants have had with their gentry. I think that it is in the relations between the peasant and his gentry or townsman that we shall find much of what makes a peasant different from a primitive person. There is very much in peasant life which is also in primitive, tribal life. Peasant activity too is so organized as to provide for what the people there accept as a good life. A structure of meanings gives the pleasure that comes from a life well lived with little. Satisfaction comes from the exercise of unquestioned virtues and the enjoyment of one's own skills and the fruits of one's own labor. What Sturt says about the good life of the English peasantry he knew could be said as well of many an African or American Indian primitive: "*By their own skill and knowledge they formed the*

Peasant Society and Culture

main part of their living out of . . . their own neighborhood. And in doing so they won at least the rougher consolations which that mode of life had to offer. Their local knowledge was intensely interesting to them; they took pride in their skill and hardihood; they felt that they belonged to a set of people not inferior to others . . . ; and all the customs which their situation required them to follow contained their belief in the ancestral notions of good and evil.”²³

As with other long-established people, peasants find in life purpose and zest because accumulated experience has read into nature and suffering and joy and death significance that the peasant finds restated for him in his everyday work and play. There is a teaching, as much implicit as explicit, as to why it is that children come into the world and grow up to marry, labor, suffer, and die. There is an assurance that labor is not futile; that nature, or God, has some part in it. There is a story or a proverb to assure one that some human frailty is just what one ought to expect; there are in many cases more serious myths to explain the suffering of the innocent or to prepare the mind for death. So that although peasants and primitives will quarrel and fear, gossip and hate, as do the rest of us, their very way of life, the persisting

The Peasant View of the Good Life

order and depth of their simple experiences, continue to make something humanly and intellectually acceptable of the world around them.

And yet the peasant is differently situated from the primitive because peasants know of and are dependent upon more civilized people. There is another dimension of life, outside the village, in that powerful manor or that alarming town. The peasant has given his hostage to the fortunes of a society and mode of life that is both like his and yet alien to it. He keeps the integrity of his traditions by making compromises: by selling his grain in the town, paying his taxes, respecting the priest or the political leader, acknowledging that there are things out there that are perhaps better than his own village. He is not self-sufficient in his moral or intellectual life. Out there, he knows, are people who will baptize my child; people who will, in their courts of law, get me my rights or deprive me of them. There, in that town, or in the person who comes to me from the town, is one who can tell me more than I know of the life and death of Christ, or of the teaching of Confucius, or of Rama and Sita and the great struggle with the evil being, Ravana. There, in that outsider's keeping and understanding, is the holy tale or the book, the book that, read by those who

can, gives knowledge about what I already know, a deeper, better knowledge. And perhaps, if I scrape and sacrifice, my son can go to that man or town and learn that deeper knowledge too. When George Sturt says that the English peasants felt they belonged to a set of people not inferior to others, he adds the qualification, "albeit perhaps poorer and ruder."²⁴ Yes, every peasant finds his self-respect, his contentment, qualified by the knowledge that he is poorer and ruder than the gentry, those people of the towns.

So it seems that in extending his studies of values to peasant peoples the anthropologist encounters another "heteronomous" characteristic: the value-orientation, the view of the good life, of peasantry, is not to be understood solely from consideration of the way the people of the village look upon themselves. The townsman or the gentry form an aspect of the local moral life—form it by reflection, by the presence of example, by the model these outsiders offer, whether that model be one the peasant seeks to imitate or to avoid, or whether he merely recognizes both its likeness to and its difference from his own ideals.

In the peasant's view of the good life do the townsman and the gentry occupy such a place that

The Peasant View of the Good Life

the characteristics of this relationship are much the same everywhere? In writing the lecture which later came into discussion I was struck by statements that in European history up to very recent times no peasant revolt had revolution for its goal, and that the prevailing relation between the peasant and his gentry has not been one of oppressor and oppressed but rather that the peasant has thought that the rich should be generous and the powerful should not abuse their power.²⁵ The occasional resentment of or hatred for a rich and powerful man seemed to me on the whole to represent cases where someone had failed to preserve the traditional and approved roles and statuses of gentry and peasantry.

Beyond this fact—if it is a fact—of acceptance of these relative positions of power, one wants to find out about the resemblances and the differences in content of culture and conceptions of the good between peasant and gentry. Is there indeed a guidance in the moral sphere²⁶ which the elite exert upon the peasantry? Is the gentry imitated or is his example avoided? The discussion on which this chapter has so largely drawn has not reached very far into this question. Dr. Hanssen tells us that the Swedish peasant of a hundred or more years ago regarded, more or less, every representative of the gentle folk

as a foreigner, and that this attitude slowed while it did not prevent the interchange of ideas and forms between the two classes. In the French village of Nouville (Seine-Inférieure) at the present time the difference between the peasant and the bourgeois is marked; the peasant puts his daughter to work with the bourgeois "so that she will learn good manners"; but he does not expect his child to become bourgeois. "The idea of *becoming* (such a one) does not exist. What exists is the idea of *being*."²⁷ Many of the facts from India mentioned in the preceding chapter indicate how strongly there influences from intellectuals outside of the local community influence its moral life; they do not show the peasant rejecting these influences nor, on the other hand, do they show him trying to become something different from what he has been. Nevertheless, we know that in some parts of the world, in China for example, at certain periods occasional peasants, by act of will and through success in the examinations, became something other than—and better than—peasants. These few considerations suggest that the relations with elites of various kinds are essential parts of peasant life and that they take different forms in different times and places.

Nowadays they are indeed taking new and differ-

The Peasant View of the Good Life

ent forms. Looking back on history one may justly see the peasant as on the whole and for thousands of years little changing and somehow typical. He came about indigenously as cities and civilizations rose in the Old World, and today more peasants are made as Indian or Chinese civilization moves into the communities of tribal peoples. As European civilization spread to the New World, secondary peasantry, with roots of culture different from that of the invaders, came and still come to be made.

In every part of the world, generally speaking, peasantry have been a conservative factor in social change, a brake on revolution, a check on that disintegration of local society which often comes with rapid technological change. And yet in our days many peasants are changing very rapidly. For the future it may be said that peasantry are ceasing to be. The troubles of the anthropologist in taking account of compound societies and cultures in the Far and Near East and in Latin America are made greater by the fact that what was stable is no longer so. In many a peasant village where the anthropologist works the peasant is going to town to become a factory worker, even a member of the urban middle class. Peasants now want to be something other than peasants. They are pulled by the city into industrial

Peasant Society and Culture

work. The promises and the pressures of Communism, while they meet great resistance in peasant communities, do succeed in unmaking peasants.

These are times in which even the isolated and the backward experience discontent. Quite plain people want to be different from what they have always been; peasantry develop aspirations. The desires attending peasantry are of two kinds. The old stable, landed life is attractive to that rural man who has no land and wants only the security of having land. In many a peasant society many people are landless laborers who cannot be practicing peasants because they have not the ancestral land that would make it possible. This is true in Calabria and Lucania, in south China, in parts of India. In such rural communities there are people seeking to become peasants and there are people seeking to escape from peasant life. "We can today see land-hunger and land-flight next to each other. Sub-peasants seek to get in while peasants seek to get out" (Friedmann). The anthropologist on such a scene will find himself not only studying the ways in which the incomplete cultural, societal, and value systems of the peasants are completed by the relations and conceptions which the gentry and the town provide. He will find himself also devising ways to study the trans-

The Peasant View of the Good Life

formation of peasantry into kinds of peoples—industrial workers, urban social classes, proletariats, marginal peoples of one sort or another—that have had little or no attention here.

The peasant and the anthropologist are both changing, and it is the changes in the anthropologist rather than those in the peasant that have been the subject of these pages. Of some of them the peasant, as subject matter of new and greater interest for anthropology, is a cause. I have tried to show here some of the ways in which the thoughts and procedures of anthropologists are growing as they study people whose ways of life are only in part present in the small communities in which they live and in which anthropologists are accustomed to work. I have looked for the developing attention given to the “heteronomous” features of community life, be that life conceived as social relations, as culture, or, more specially, as a value-orientation.

This last chapter is concerned with an anthropological frontier not only because the subject matter, peasantry, is such, but also because ethos or value-orientation has only recently become a matter of serious anthropological attention.²⁸ Anthropologists are only now learning how to think about and how validly to report the basic values of primitive and

Peasant Society and Culture

self-contained communities. Perhaps they are not ready for further complexity: the interdependence of gentry ethos and peasant ethos, this relation between a widespread tradition of the town and priest and a local tradition of the village.

The question which set in motion the preliminary discussion reported in this chapter is put at too ultimate, inclusive, and vague a form to serve the needs of science, a science that grows, on the whole, upward from its base, in small increments of new knowledge. Here the topic has been considered at a level of abstraction remote from the terrain of particular research. Even at this misty upper level, I do think that something remains of the assertions made as to the peasant view of the good life; but others might not accept even the following modified statement of peasant values: ¹an intense attachment to native soil; ²a reverent disposition toward habitat and ancestral ways; ³a restraint on individual self-seeking in favor of family and community; ⁴a certain suspiciousness, mixed with appreciation, of town life; ⁵a sober and earthy ethic. The characterization is no doubt too vague and impressionistic to serve the methods of the more scientific kinds of inquiry. For serious work in the establishment of truth by precise definition and close comparison, the study of

The Peasant View of the Good Life

peasant values will attack much more particular questions, such as the effects of changes in land tenure on family relations and attitudes,²⁹ or the question whether many children are wanted where there is abundant land, as among the Maya, and not wanted where limited land must be divided among heirs (as Hanssen reports for eighteenth-century Sweden).

Such advances in more precise knowledge will be welcome. Yet they will destroy, as science always does, something of the integrity of the concrete reality: that way of life of just those peasants. It is no harm and some good that more speculative and perhaps philosophically inclined thinkers, such as some of those whom Professor Friedmann brought together, also turn their minds to what is, in spite of all difficulties in the way of precise knowledge of the subject, a recognizable and long-enduring human type. To reach for a much higher generalization about the way of life of that human type, with some control on the results from facts as to particular peasants, helps to open the area of investigation and to suggest the more particular questions while retaining something of the natural integrity of peasant life. Vision and craftsmanship are mutually helpful indispensable parts of the effort toward

Peasant Society and Culture

understanding of truth. All who make that effort use both in some degree, though the proportions of one to the other vary greatly. The perception of resemblance and of natural unity needs to work its way down to precise words and procedures that yield generally accepted proof. On the other hand, the wide perception may quicken the developing procedure, the growing edge of science, and help guide it to the light.

Notes

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. A. L. Kroeber, in *Method and Perspective in Anthropology*, ed. Robert F. Spencer (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954).
2. Graham Wallas, *The Great Society* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1914).
3. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, "The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology," *The South African Journal of Science*, XX (October, 1923), 143.
4. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, "The Meaning and Scope of Social Anthropology," *Nature*, Vol. CLIV, No. 3904 (August 26, 1944).
5. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Social Anthropology* (London: Cohen & West, Ltd., 1951), pp. 10-11.
6. W. Lloyd Warner, "Introduction," in *The Irish Countryman*, by Conrad M. Arensberg (New York: Macmillan Co., 1937), p. viii.
7. Ralph L. Beals, "Urbanism, Urbanization and Acculturation," *American Anthropologist*, LV, No. 1 (January-March, 1951), 1-10.
8. Raymond Firth, *Malay Fishermen: Their Peasant Economy* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1946).
9. Edmund R. Leach, *Political Systems of Highland Burma: A Study of Kachin Social Structure* (London: London School of Economics and Political Science, 1954).
10. Elman R. and Helen S. Service, *Tobatí: Paraguayan Town* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).
11. Morton H. Fried, *Fabric of Chinese Society: A Study of the*

Notes to Pages 10-13

Social Life of a Chinese County Seat (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1953).

12. Horace Miner, *St. Denis: A French-Canadian Parish* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

13. H. H. Turney-High, *Château-Gérard: The Life and Times of a Walloon Village* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1953).

14. James West, *Plainville, U.S.A.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945).

15. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Senusi of Cyrenaica* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949).

16. Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1946).

17. Robert H. Lowie, *Toward Understanding Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

18. Henri Mendras, *Études de sociologie rurale: Novis et Virgin* ("Cahiers de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques" [Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1915]).

19. Julian Steward *et al.* (forthcoming).

20. Iwao Ishino and John W. Bennett, *The Japanese Labor Boss System: A Preliminary Sociological Analysis* (Ohio State University Research Foundation and Department of Sociology, Report No. 3 [Columbus, April, 1953]).

21. A. L. Kroeber, in *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, ed. Sol Tax *et al.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 360.

22. Margaret Mead, "National Character," in *Anthropology Today*, ed. A. L. Kroeber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 653.

23. Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII, No. 4 (January, 1947), 293-308; "The Natural History of the Folk Society," *Social Forces*, XXXI, No. 3 (March, 1953), 224-28.

Notes to Pages 14-22

24. Paul Kirchhoff, in "Four Hundred Years After: General Discussion of Acculturation, Social Change, and the Historical Provenience of Culture Elements," *Heritage of Conquest*, ed. Sol Tax et al. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952), p. 254.

25. Pedro Armillas, "The Mesoamerican Experiment," in "The Ways of Civilization," ed. Robert J. Braidwood, MS.

26. Kalervo Oberg, "Types of Social Structure among the Lowland Tribes of South and Central America," *American Anthropologist*, LVII, No. 3, Part 1 (June, 1955), 472-87.

27. Daryll Forde, "The Conditions of Social Development in West Africa, Retrospect and Prospect," *Civilizations*, III, No. 4 (1953), 471-89.

28. Firth, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

29. Laura and Paul Bohannon, *The Tiv of Central Nigeria* (London: International African Institute, 1953); *Akiga's Story*, trans. and annotated by Rupert East (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).

30. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950).

31. *Seven Tribes of British Central Africa*, ed. Elizabeth Colson and Max Gluckman (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), pp. 39 ff.

32. E. Jensen Krige and J. D. Krige, *The Realm of a Rain-Queen: A Study of the Pattern of Lovedu Society* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943).

33. Melville J. Herskovits, *Dahomey: An Ancient West African Kingdom* (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1938).

34. Forde, *op. cit.*

35. Paul Honigsheim, "Max Weber as Historian of Agriculture and Rural Life," *Agricultural History*, XXIII (July, 1949), 179-213.

36. Charles Wagley and Marvin Harris, "A Typology of

Notes to Pages 23-28

Latin American Subcultures," *American Anthropologist*, LVII, No. 3, Part 1 (June, 1955), 428-51.

37. Robert Redfield, *Tepoztlán, A Mexican Village: A Study of Folk Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), p. 217. The suggestion made in this passage that "folk" be used for such intermediate societies and cultures has lately been revived by Foster (note 41 below). I later used the word for the "abstract conceptual model."

38. Robert Redfield, "Introduction" to *St. Denis: A French-Canadian Parish*, by Horace Miner (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

39. John Gillin, *Moche: A Peruvian Coastal Community* (Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Pub. No. 3 [Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945]); "Modern Latin American Culture," *Social Forces*, XXV, No. 3 (March, 1947), 243-48.

40. Beals, *op. cit.*

41. George M. Foster, "What Is Folk Culture?" *American Anthropologist*, Vol. LV, No. 2, Part 1 (April-June, 1953).

42. Steward, *op. cit.*

43. Eric R. Wolf, "Types of Latin American Peasantry: A Preliminary Discussion," *American Anthropologist*, LVII, No. 3, Part 1 (June, 1955), 452-71.

44. Wagley and Harris, *op. cit.*

45. C. von Dietze, "Peasantry," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, XII, 48-53. "... it is difficult to define the term, while the construction of a comprehensive theory of peasantry is wellnigh impossible, . . ." (p. 50).

46. Raymond Firth, *Elements of Social Organization* (London: Watts & Co., 1951).

47. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 88.

49. Wolf, *op. cit.*

Notes to Pages 29-34

50. Gideon Sjoberg, "Folk and Feudal Societies," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII, No. 3 (November, 1952), 231-39.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 234.

52. A. L. Kroeber, *Anthropology* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1948), p. 284.

53. Rushton Coulborn (ed.), *Feudalism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1956).

54. George Bourne, *Change in the Village* (New York: George H. Doran & Co., 1912).

55. Von Dietze (*op. cit.*) remarks that although in Europe the peasant has changed from being an inferior rustic with an essentially maintenance economy to something of an entrepreneur with full civil and political rights, yet he retains his ethos: "intense attachment to his native soil and family tradition, which, even in the economic sphere, takes precedence over his desire for individual gain and advancement" (p. 50).

56. Helen and Elman Service, *op. cit.*

57. James B. Watson, "Way Station of Westernization: The Brazilian Caboclo," *Brazil: Papers Presented in the Institute for Brazilian Studies* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press), pp. 9-58.

58. Oscar Lewis, *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951).

59. Oliver La Farge, *Santa Eulalia: The Religion of a Cu-chumatán Indian Town* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947); Charles Wagley, "The Social and Religious Life of a Guatemalan Village," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. LI, No. 4, Part 2, Memoir No. 71 (October, 1949); Ruth Bunzel, *Chichicastenango: A Guatemalan Village* ("Publication of the American Ethnological Society," Vol. XXII [New York: J. J. Augustin, 1952]).

60. Kroeber, *op. cit.*, p. 361.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. Robert Redfield, *The Little Community: Viewpoints for the Study of a Human Whole* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955).

2. Raymond Firth, "Social Organization and Social Change," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, LXXXIV, Part I (January-June, 1954), 1-17.

3. Melville Herskovits, *Dahomey: An Ancient West African Kingdom* (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1938).

4. Julian H. Steward, *Area Research, Theory and Practice* (Social Science Research Bull. 63 [New York: Social Science Research Council, 1950]).

5. Julian H. Steward *et al.* (forthcoming).

6. J. A. Barnes, "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish," *Human Relations*, VII, No. 1 (1954), 39-58.

7. In Steward's words, the local units are "vertical" and the groups formed by common occupation, caste, etc., are "horizontal sociocultural subgroups." Apparently some groups are both vertical and horizontal: in Bremnes the local fishermen's associations are territorially defined. In many an East Indian village the caste groups are also neighborhoods.

8. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

9. Ruth Bunzel, *Chichicastenango: A Guatemalan Village* ("Publication of the American Ethnological Society," Vol. XXII [New York: J. J. Augustin, 1952]).

10. J. A. Pitt-Rivers, *The People of the Sierra* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1954), pp. 32-33.

11. Irwin T. Sanders, *Balkan Village* (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1949).

12. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

Notes to Pages 46-56

14. Max Weber, *General Economic History* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950).
15. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937).
16. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *The Andaman Islanders* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1948), p. 42.
17. Bunzel, *op. cit.*, pp. 67 ff.
18. Robert Redfield, "Primitive Merchants of Guatemala," *Quarterly Journal of Inter-American Relations*, I, No. 4 (October, 1939), 42-56.
19. Sanders, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-6.
20. Robert Redfield, *The Folk Culture of Yucatan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), p. 163.
21. Börje Hanssen, *Österlen* (Stockholm: L. T.'s Förlag, 1952).
22. Webster McBryde, *Sololá* (New Orleans, La.: Department of Middle American Research, Tulane University, 1933).
23. Conrad Arensberg and Solon T. Kimball, *Family and Community in Ireland* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940), chap. xiii.
24. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
26. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, *The Social Organization of Australian Tribes* ("Oceania Monographs" No. 1 [Melbourne: Macmillan Co., 1931]), p. 95.
27. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
28. Horace Miner, *St. Denis: A French-Canadian Parish* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), pp. 69-70.
29. A. M. Shah, "A Dispersed Hamlet in the Panchmahals," *Economic Weekly* (Bombay) (January 26, 1955), p. 115.
30. Marian W. Smith, "Social Structure in the Punjab," *Economic Weekly* (Bombay), II, No. 47 (November 21, 1953), 1297.

Notes to Pages 56-66

31. McKim Marriott, "Little Communities in an Indigenous Civilization," *Village India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 175.

32. Bernard Cohn, "Changing Status of a Depressed Caste," *Village India*, p. 57.

33. Herskovits, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

34. Wilbert E. Moore, *Industrialization and Labor* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1951).

35. Max Gluckman, "The Lozi of Barotseland in Northwestern Rhodesia," in *Seven Tribes of British Central Africa*, ed. Elizabeth Colson and Max Gluckman (London: Oxford University Press, 1951).

36. Gideon Sjoberg, "Folk and Feudal Societies," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII, No. 3 (November, 1952), 234.

37. Donald Pierson (with the assistance of Levi Cruz *et al.*), *Cruz das Almas* ("Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology Publications," No. 12 [Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1948]).

38. Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

39. Miner, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-51.

40. "Thus a hundred and fifty years ago there were in each rural parish one or two bureaucrats living at a much higher standard from the rest of the population, speaking a different language, and moving from post to post without developing marked local affiliation. Below them in status were a few traders, usually burghers of a town; they had more local ties and were not so mobile as the bureaucrats. The rest of the population were peasants . . ." (Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 56).

41. Pitt-Rivers, *op. cit.*

42. *Ibid.*

43. Sjoberg, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. "Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation" (The Social Science Research Council Summer Seminar on Acculturation, 1953 [Members: H. G. Barnett, Leonard Broom, Bernard J. Siegel, Evon Z. Vogt, James B. Watson]), *American Anthropologist*, LVI, No. 6 (December, 1954), 974.

2. George M. Foster, "What is Folk Culture?" *American Anthropologist*, LV, No. 2, Part 1 (April-June, 1953), 169.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 164. In quoting this passage I venture to substitute "peasant" for "folk" to make the terminology fit that chosen for these chapters. I think Foster's "folk societies" are much the same as those I here call "peasant societies."

4. *Ibid.*

5. Of course there may be several great traditions, as Islam and Sanskritic Hinduism are present in India, and there may be numerous subdivisions of a great tradition: I speak of "two" for simplicity.

6. *Akiga's Story*, trans. and annotated by Rupert East (London: Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 11.

7. Elsdon Best, *Maori Religion and Mythology* (Dominion Museum Bulletin No. 10 [Wellington, N.Z.: W. A. G. Skinner, Government Printer, 1924]), pp. 31-32. See also B. Malinowski, "Baloma: The Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriand Islands," in *Magic, Science and Religion* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1948), pp. 125-227, 231 ff.

8. Melville Herskovits, *Dahomey: An Ancient West African Kingdom* (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1938), Vol. II, chap. xxvi.

9. Marcel Griaule, *Dieu d'Eau* (Paris: Les Éditions du Chêne, 1948).

10. Pedro Armillas, "The Mesoamerican Experiment," in "The Ways of Civilizations," ed. Robert J. Braidwood, MS.

Notes to Pages 76-84

11. Julian H. Steward, "Evolution and Process," in *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*, ed. A. L. Kroeber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 323; "Cultural Causality and Law: A Trial Formulation of the Development of Early Civilizations," *American Anthropologist*, LI, No. 1 (January-March, 1949), 1-27.

12. *Studies in Chinese Thought*, ed. Arthur F. Wright. "Comparative Studies in Cultures and Civilizations," ed. Robert Redfield and Milton Singer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

✓ 13. Swami Nikhilananda, *The Upanishads: A New Translation* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949).

14. Wing-tsit Chan, *Religious Trends in Modern China* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), pp. 141 ff. The distinction between the lay and hierarchic levels of Chinese religion and philosophy is made by Wolfram Eberhard, in a review article in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXXIII, No. 3 (1936), 304-44. For religions of the Middle East it is recognized by Raphael Patai, "Religion in Middle Eastern, Far Eastern, and Western Culture," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, X, No. 3 (Autumn, 1954), 239-41.

15. V. Raghavan, "Adult Education in Ancient India," *Memoirs of the Madras Library Association* (1944), pp. 57-65; "Methods of Popular Religious Instruction, South India," MS; "Variety and Integration in the Pattern of Indian Culture," MS.

16. Raghavan, "Methods of Popular Religious Instruction, South India," MS.

17. G. von Grunebaum, "The Problem: Unity in Diversity," in *Unity and Variety in Muslim Civilization*, ed. G. von Grunebaum (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 28.

Notes to Pages 85-97

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.
19. Edward Westermarck, *Ritual and Belief in Morocco* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1926).
20. Derk Bodde, "Harmony and Conflict in Chinese Philosophy," in *Studies in Chinese Thought*, ed. Arthur F. Wright (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 79, n. 46.
21. Stella Kramrisch, *The Art of India through the Ages* (London: Phaidon Press, Ltd., 1954).
22. For this way of contrasting the two kinds of studies, I am indebted to Milton Singer.
23. Norvin Hein, "The Ram Lila," *The Illustrated Weekly of India*, October 22, 1950, pp. 18-19 (provided by McKim Marriott).
24. Oscar Lewis, *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Re-studied* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951), pp. 273. ff; John Gulick, *Social Structure and Culture Change in a Lebanese Village* ("Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology," No. 21 [New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc., 1955]), pp. 92 ff.
25. M. N. Srinivas, *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952). See also Bernard S. Cohn, "The Changing Status of a Depressed Caste," in *Village India*, ed. McKim Marriott ("Comparative Studies in Cultures and Civilizations," ed. Robert Redfield and Milton Singer [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955]).
26. McKim Marriott, "Little Communities in an Indigenous Civilization," in *Village India*, pp. 171-222.
27. Mr. Marriott kindly tells me something of the strong evidence for the conclusion that Lakshmi has entered the great tradition relatively late and from the folk cultures of India. He quotes Rhys Davids, Renou, and Filliozat to this effect. It ap-

Notes to Pages 98-103

pears that this deity was absent from early Vedic literature, that early statues to her were set in places reserved for popular deities, and that the Buddhist canon castigates Brahmans for performing nonsensical, non-Vedic rituals such as those to Siri Devi (Laksmi), etc.

28. Marriott tells me that in "Kishan Garhi" the more learned villager takes, in short, quite distinguishable positions toward great and little traditions. The latter, which he sees manifest in the doings of the uneducated villagers, is a matter of practice, of ignorance or fragmentary knowledge; it is confusion or vagueness and is expressed in concrete physical or biological images. The great tradition, which he thinks of himself as representing in larger degree, is theory or pure knowledge, full and satisfying; it is order and precision and finds for its expression abstractions or symbolic representations.

29. Personal communication.

30. Roger Le Tourneau, "The Muslim Town: Religion and Culture," MS.

31. Shamrao Hivale, *The Pardhans of the Upper Narbada Valley* (London: Oxford University Press, 1946).

32. Raymond Firth, *Elements of Social Organization* (London: Watts & Co., 1951), chap. ii, pp. 35 ff.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. Ruth Benedict, *Patterns of Culture* (New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1946).

2. Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1935). The opposite demonstration—of resemblance in value-orientations between distant and otherwise very different peoples—is illustrated in Walter Goldschmidt, "Ethics and the Structure of Society: An Ethnological Contribution to the Sociology of

Notes to Pages 106-20

Knowledge," *American Anthropologist*, LIII, No. 4, Part 1 (October-December, 1951), 506-24.

3. Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1951), p. 7.

4. Malcolm Darling, *Rusticus Loquitur: The Old Light and the New in the Punjab Village* (London: Oxford University Press, 1930), p. x.

5. René Porak, *Un village de France: Psycho-physiologie du paysan* (Paris: G. Doin & Cie, 1943).

6. "Rusticam plebem, quae sub divo et in labore nutritur, solis patiens, umbrae negligens, deliciarum ignara, simplicis animi, parvo contenta, duratis ad omnem lanorum tolerantium membris; cui gestare ferrum, fossam ducere, onus ferre consuetudo de rure est" (Vegetius *Epitoma Rei Militaris*, i. 3, quoted in Darling, *Rusticus Loquitur*, p. x).

7. Ladislav Reymont, *The Peasants* (4 vols.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925).

8. E. K. L. Francis, "The Personality Type of the Peasant According to Hesiod's Works and Days: A Culture Case Study," *Rural Sociology*, X, No. 3 (September, 1945), 278.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 277.

10. George Bourne, *Change in the Village* (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1912).

11. In a lecture delivered at University College of the University of Chicago, May 14, 1954.

12. Irwin T. Sanders, *Balkan Village* (Lexington, Ky.: University of Kentucky Press, 1949), p. 147.

13. J. A. Pitt-Rivers, *The People of the Sierra* (New York: Criterion Books, 1954), p. 47.

14. J. Weulersse, *Paysans de Syrie et du Proche-Orient* (Paris, 1946), p. 173.

15. Pitt-Rivers, *op. cit.*, p. 47, n. 1. Yet Hamed Ammar in

Notes to Pages 121-35

Growing Up in an Egyptian Village, Silwa, Province of Aswan (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1954) tells us the fellah has strong emotional attachment to his land. Also he tells us that to be an industrious farmer attending to his business is a good qualification for a youth about to get married (p. 35) and stresses "the dignity of farmwork compared to other occupations" (p. 39).

16. Work "is felt as a definite burden imposed by the gods and—regretted." "The cycle of the seasons itself occasionally admits full enjoyment of a happy time of rest, which Hesiod depicts with a poetical verve . . ." (Francis, *op. cit.*, p. 284).

17. Hesiod *The Homeric Hymns and HomERICA*. With an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-Whyte (London: William Heinemann; New York: Macmillan Co., 1914), p. 55.

18. Bourne, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

19. Robert H. Lowie, *The Crow Indians* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1935), p. 57.

20. Bourne, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

21. Hesiod, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

22. Pitt-Rivers, *op. cit.*, chap. vi.

23. Bourne, *op. cit.*

24. *Ibid.*

25. "The agrarian revolutions of 1917-19 in Eastern Europe . . . were quite different from earlier revolts, such as the Peasants' War of 1524-25 in south and central Germany or the peasant movements in the early years of the French Revolution, which aimed primarily at reducing or abolishing the oppressive services and dues exacted by landlords" (C. von Dietze, "Peasantry," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, XII, 50). "Hesiod apparently takes domination by feudal lord and the stratification of society for granted. What he resents is abuse of power, although he makes no attempt to remedy that, except by per-

suasion and reference to divine sanction" (Francis, *op. cit.*, p. 293). "The deep differences among peasants and between the peasants and other groups was not a cause for envy. This was the accepted configuration of society. The lord was expected to be proud and luxurious, but humane and generous, just as the peasant was expected to be thrifty and respectful. Even bitterly burdensome privileges were not open to dispute" (Handlin, *op. cit.*, p. 23). Karl Marx himself wrote that French peasantry were incapable of revolution because they had no common sense of oppression.

26. Gideon Sjoberg, "Folk and 'Feudal' Societies," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII, No. 3 (November, 1952), 235.

27. Lucien Bernot et René Blancard, *Nouvelle, un village français* (Paris: Institut d'ethnologie, 1953), p. 282.

28. *Stanford Humanities-Anthropological Conference, Santa Barbara, May 16, 17, 1947* (mimeographed); David Bidney, "The Concept of Value in Modern Anthropology," in *Anthropology Today*, ed. A. L. Kroeber (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 682-99; "Values" in *An Appraisal of Anthropology Today*, ed. Sol Tax et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), chap. xviii, pp. 322-41; Clyde Kluckhohn, "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action" in *Toward a General Theory of Action*, ed. T. Parsons and E. Shils (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), pp. 388-433; and papers published or forthcoming of the study, under Kluckhohn's direction, of values in certain communities of the Southwest; A. L. Kroeber, "Reality Culture and Value Culture" in *The Nature of Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 152-68.

29. Donald S. Pitkin, "Land Tenure and Family Organization in an Italian Village" (Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 1954).

Index

- Acculturation, 21
- Africa: "networks" in, 58; states in, 17-18, 59; studies of, 15, 36
- Agriculture: for the market, 47-48; as mode of life, 47, 111 ff.; and peasantry, 27
- Amazon, 52
- Andalusia, 44, 62, 114, 116, 129
- Andaman islanders, 12, 13, 46, 66, 68, 71
- Anthropology: definitions of, 9-10; field experience basic to, 2-4; interests in all of a culture, 8; as natural history, 4; studies civilized communities, 17, 38, 41; studies compound societies, 14, 23, 38; studies peasants, 19 ff.; studies social systems, 35 ff.; studies urban communities, 37; as study of primitive or of all peoples, 9-11, 66, 68, 137-39; views the small community, 35
- Aranda, 67, 105
- Armillas, Pedro, 14
- Australia, 5, 69, 105
- Balkans, 44
- Barnes, J. A., 40, 41, 60; quoted, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 52
- Beals, Ralph, 10, 24
- Benedict, Ruth, 10, 35
- Bernot, Lucien, quoted, 136
- Blancard, René, quoted, 136
- Boas, Franz, 5
- Boeotians, 107, 108, 109, 112, 114, 124
- Bourne, George, quoted, 126
- Brazil, 32, 61
- Bremnes, 41, 44, 45, 51, 57
- Buddhism, 81
- Bulgaria, 44, 47, 61
- Caboclo*, 32
- Calabria, 121, 138
- California, 105
- Cambodia, 82
- Caste, 56, 92-93, 99-100
- Chan Kom, 124, 125-27
- Chichen Itza, 78
- Chichicastenango, 47
- China, 44, 77, 80, 135, 136, 137, 138
- Christ, 133
- City, and countryside, 14
- Civilization, 104; European, 137; Maya, 73-78; in Meso-America, 73-78; and peasantry, 29, 67 ff.; primary and secondary, 76, 77, 78, 137
- Classification, of cultures and societies, 23
- Coba, 78
- Comanche, 129
- Comparisons of cultures, 20
- Compound societies, 14, 136; as civilizations, 69-70
- Confucianism, 81
- Confucius, 72, 133
- Coorgs, 93
- Copan, 76

Peasant Society and Culture

- Culture and cultures: as autonomous system, 67, 104; civilization as compound, 70; concept of a, 67; folk and peasant among the Maya, 75-76; hierarchic and lay, 69, 80-85, 88; Hindu, 82, 92 ff.; as wholes, 4
- Dahomey, 17, 37, 59, 73
- Division of labor, 46
- Dobu, 105
- Economic "field," 45 ff., 58
- Elite, 29, 30, 60-62, 62, 64, 66
- Endogamy and exogamy, 54
- England, 58, 107, 108, 112, 114
- Ethos, 139-41; *see also* Peasants, attitudes and values of; Group-personality
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E., 9, 10
- Far East, 137
- Feudalism, 28-31, 43
- Firth, Raymond, 26, 102; quoted, 15
- Fishing, 45 ff., 48
- Folk society, 12-13, 65, 69, 74-75
- Folklore, 19
- Forde, C. Daryll, quoted, 15
- Foster, George, 24, 69, 70-71, 77
- France, 58
- Francis, E. K. L., 107-8, 114, 124
- French Canada, 24, 53, 66
- Friedman, F. G., 110, 111, 115, 121, 122, 124, 141; quoted, 138
- Frontiersman, 32
- Functionalism, 35
- Galen, 71
- Gaucha*, 31
- Gentry, 30, 37, 48, 58, 60; influence of, on peasantry, 128, 129-35; Spanish, 71, 77, 130
- Gillin, John, 24
- Gluckman, Max, 16
- Great and little traditions; *see* Traditions, great and little
- Griaule, Marcel, 72
- Group-personality, 12; of peasantry, 128-33
- Guatemala, 43, 47, 49, 130
- Haddon, A. C., 4
- Handlim, Oscar, 106-7
- Hanssen, Börje, 48, 120-21, 135, 141
- Herskovits, Melville J., 17, 37
- Hesiod, 107-8, 112, 113, 117, 121, 124, 125; quoted, 114, 125, 126
- Hierarchical structure, 43, 57, 59
- Hippocrates, 71
- Hombria*, 131
- "Horizontal divisions," 38
- Iliad*, 114, 125
- Images of reality, 1
- India, 46, 54, 55-56, 57, 59, 77, 80, 81-82, 86, 136, 137
- Industry and industrialization, 58-59, 137-38, 139
- Intelligentsia, 61, 62
- Ireland, 106
- Islam, 83-86, 94, 98-100, 103
- Isolate, primitive, 9, 11, 34, 40, 41, 46, 57, 65, 66, 69
- Judea, 31
- Kidder, A. V., 78
- Kinship, 51
- Kirchhoff, Paul, 14
- Kishan Garhi, 94-97
- Koran, 72, 85
- Kroeber, A. L., 11; quoted, 29, 33, 34
- Kwakiutl, 105

Index

- Ladino*, 131; definition of, 131
 Laksmi, 95
 Latin America: anthropological studies in, 22, 24, 137; contrasted with Europe, 32; peasant societies in, 69, 77-78
 Latium, 33
 Le Tourneau, Roger, 99-100
 "Levels" in societal organization, 22
 Lewis, Oscar, 54
 Lineages, 51
 Literati, 29
 Longyear, John M., 76
 Lovedu, 17
 Lowie, Robert H., 10
 Lozi, 17, 59
 Lucania, 138
 Luzon, 52, 104

 McBride, Webster M., 49
Mahabharata, 100, 114
 Maize, 48
 Malinowski, B., 5, 35
 Manor, 48, 60
 Maori, 73
 Markets, 17, 49, 55; "silent," 58
 Marriage: and "networks," 56; peasant attitudes toward, 124-30
 Marriott, McKim, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99; quoted, 56, 94
 Maya, 47, 61, 74-78, 107, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 121, 124, 125, 126-27, 128-29, 141
 Mead, Margaret, 12, 13, 39
 Meso-America, 14, 74
 Mexico, 33, 54, 58, 70
 Miner, Horace, 24; quoted, 62
 Model, conceptual, 13
 Morgan, L. H., 4
 Morocco, 85, 99-100

 Nation, studied, 24, 37, 38, 42 ff.
 Near East, 137
 "Networks," 50, 52 ff.
 New Guinea, 59
 Nigeria, 19, 40, 52, 72
 Nitti, Francesco, quoted, 127
 North America, 105
 Norway, 40, 41, 44, 48, 57, 59, 62
 Nouville, 136
 Nuer, 16, 40

 Organ and organism, 34

 Paraguay, 31, 33, 118-19
 Parish, 40, 41, 62
 "Parochialization," 96-97
 Part-societies and part-cultures, 30, 34; peasant society as example of, 68-69
 Patterns, 35
 Peasants: in Africa, 17, 131; attitude of: toward cities and trade, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 133, toward land, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 123, 138, toward marriage and sex, 124 ff., toward nature, 112-13, 132, toward work, 112, 113, 114, 115, 118, 120, 121, 123; attitudes and values of, 109 ff.; Bulgarian, 44, 47, 61, 66, 114, 116; Chinese, 44, 77, 108, 128; in city, 47; culture of, not autonomous, 68; definition of, 25-28, 31; different from folk society, 13; East Indian, 106; English, 108, 109, 112, 115, 116, 117, 118, 124, 125, 131, 134; European, 106, 107; French, 136; French-Canadian, 24, 53, 62, 66, 114; Greek, 107-8, 112, 113, 114, 117; Guatemalan, 33, 47, 49, 130; Indian, 44, 54, 55, 66, 76, 94-97; as intermediate, 46; Irish, 113, 116, 127; Italian, 110, 115, 128;

Peasant Society and Culture

- Latin-American, 70-71, 77-78, 107; "link" or "hinge," 43, 60; Mayan, 47, 61, 107, 108, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 121, 124, 125, 126-27, 128-29; Mexican, 33, 54, 107, 109; Norwegian, 40, 57, 62; Paraguayan, 31, 33, 118-19; as part-societies, 68-69, 79; Polish, 107; relations of, to gentry, 129, 130-36; self-consciousness of, 64; social change among, 137-41; Spanish, 44, 62, 115, 116, 117; Swedish, 30, 48, 120, 135-36; as synchronic system, 67-69; Syrian, 115, 116; as type, 23, 105 ff.; view of good life, 105 ff., 108, 140
- Persia, 85
- Personal versus impersonal, 43, 46, 65
- Peru, 71
- Pierson, Donald, 61
- Pilgrims, 53, 54
- Pitkin, Donald, 114, 116, 121; quoted, 114-15, 116
- Pitt-Rivers, J. A., 62, 115; quoted, 44
- Plains Indians, 52
- Poland, 130
- Political organization, 17
- Puerto Rico, 38
- Punjab, 55
- Purāna, 82, 95-96
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R., 5, 9, 35, 71
- Raghavan, V., 82, 86, 90, 98
- Ramayana*, 82, 88, 99
- Ravana, 83
- Raymont, Ladislav, 107
- Region, 2; as unit of study, 37
- Rivers, W. H. R., 4
- Roles, 36
- Roman towns, 33
- Rural sociology, 50
- Russia, 105, 129
- Sanders, Irwin T., 61, 114; quoted, 61, 114
- Sankaracharya, 80
- Señoritos*, 63
- Service, Elman and Helen, 3, 118
- Shaivism, 88
- Singer, Milton, 98, 101
- Sita, 133
- Sjoberg, Gideon, 28, 29
- Smith, Marion, quoted, 55
- Social change; *see* Peasants, social change among
- Social fields, 41 ff., 57
- Social organization, 102
- Social relations, 36 ff.
- Social structure, 36, 40, 101; relation of, to social organization, 102
- Societies as social systems, 35
- Spain, 42, 62, 129
- Srinivas, M. N., 93
- Statuses, 36
- Steward, Julian, 21, 38, 39, 40, 41
- Sturt, George, 108, 113, 114, 115, 125, 133; quoted, 131-32, 134
- Sudanese, 72
- Surrey, 108, 124, 125
- Sussex, 114
- Sweden, 30, 48, 141; *see also* Peasants, Swedish
- Syncretization: in India, 94-96; Islamic, 84-86
- Syria, 33; *see also* Peasants, Syrian
- System(s): autonomous cultural, 66; culture as independent and

Index

- self-sufficient, 66; larger than small community, 37; societies and cultures as, 35 ff.
- Taoism, 80, 88
- Tentori, Tulio, 116, 121, 127, 130
- Tepotzlán, 23
- Tiv, 15, 40, 52, 72
- Trade, 43-48
- Tradition: defined, 100-101; social organization of, 66 ff.
- Tradition, great and little, 70 ff.; in Andaman Islands, 72; Catholic, 71, 78, 104; in India, 80, 87-101; interaction between, 79 ff.; Islamic, 83-86, 99-100; among the Maori, 73; Maya, 75-76, 103; among the Sudanese, 73-74; among the Tiv, 72; in West Africa, 73
- Tribes, 52
- Trobriands, 5-6, 12, 66
- Tylor, E. B., 3
- Typology: of Latin-American cultures, 22; of peasant society and cultures, 25 ff.; regional versus "vertical," 24
- Unit of personal observation, 15
- "Universalization," 94-96
- Upanishads, 80, 88
- Urban communities, 37, 58
- Urban-rural, 15, 21, 33, 58, 61, 64, 111, 112, 113, 117, 133
- Vaishnavism, 88
- Vedas, 80, 82, 88
- "Vertical divisions," 38
- Von Grunebaum, G., 83-86, 98
- Wagley, Charles, and Harris, Marvin, 22, 24
- Warner, W. Lloyd, 10, 17, 37, 39
- Weber, Max, 46
- West Africa, 73
- Westermarck, Edward, 85
- Weuleresse, J., quoted, 115
- Wolf, Eric, 24, 27, 29
- Yucatan, 47, 61, 78, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113, 121
- Zuni, 48, 53, 66, 104, 105

