transvestism cross-culturally encompasses a variety of phenomena that often have very different meanings.

1. temporary gender role reversals during religious rituals (Matory 1994) or periods of license such as carnival (Babcock 1978)
2. gender role reversals as theater, such as female impersonators who cross-dress for performance but maintain their expected dress and gender roles in other contexts (Newton 1972)
3. permanent and publicly accepted gender role reversals by individuals such xanith in Oman (Wikan 1977), the BERDACHE among the Plains Indians (Callendar & Kochems 1987), or women warriors like Joan d'Arc who choose to take on the role of the opposite sex and signal this in part by cross-dressing
4. hermaphroditism, where the definition of gender and dress is often problematic (Herdt 1994)
5. transsexuals who alter not only dress but their bodies as well, such as the Hijras of India, who are eunuchs (Nanda 1990), or transsexuals who have not fully completed their surgical transformation from one sex to the other (Bolin 1992)
6. same-sex couples in which each partner assumes a complementary gender role in dress: by definition one will be cross-dressed

Anthropologists have focused mostly on the social rather than sexual aspects of transvestism because it provides a unique perspective on gender roles in any given culture, particularly where gender boundaries are alleged to be fixed.   TB
See also HOMOSEXUALITY, SEX

tribe, tribal organization The word "tribe" has a long and ignoble history and remains one of the most variably used terms within and outside of anthropology (Helm 1968). Anthropologists often use it as a catch-all substitute for "primitive," avoiding the invidious comparison of "nonstate." But most who use the term analytically narrow it to mean some form of *political unit,* as distinct from "ethnie" or "nation," which suggest a cultural identity.

At least two kinds of political unit are imagined: tribe as an EVOLUTIONARY STAGE, and tribe as a recognized group around a state frontier. These two meanings framed a debate about tribe in the 1960s and 1970s.

Service (1962) followed a long tradition in positing tribe as a stage in political evolution falling between more independent BANDS and more centralized and hierarchical CHIEFDOMS. Sahlins (1968b) also saw tribes as evolutionary predecessors of states but was more concerned with mechanisms of integration than boundaries. Here tribes were seen as unified and bounded by kinship or other ties and constituted the broadest level of cooperation in a segmented hierarchy of functions. By contrast, Fried (1967, 1975) disputed the evolutionary existence of such bounded groups, arguing instead that tribes arose from interactions with existing states. Despite their differences, all three agreed that boundedness of tribes was a result of external conflict, or WAR.

As the debate about tribe faded in cultural anthropology, it grew in ARCHAEOLOGY. Some theorists proposed that tribal networks evolved as cooperative responses to increasing environmental or other risk (Braun & Plog 1982), while others saw tribes as systems of exchange with a structural tendency toward inequality (Friedman & Rowlands 1977; Kristiansen 1982; Bender 1985). Still other approaches stressed boundaries, arguing that cooperative networks among the Anasazi, for example, were chopped into separate and competing groups in response to increasing resource stress (Haas & Creamer 1993). In general, however, approaches stressing the connections and permeability of groups are far more common than those that posit firm borders in both archaeology (Green & Perlman 1985) and ethnohistory (N. Whitehead 1994). Some archaeologists would prefer to drop "tribe" altogether (B. Hayden 1995).

ETHNOLOGY offers various models of tribal integration. In contrast to the agnatically based segmentary lineage emphasized by Sahlins (1961), matrilocal societies unify by dispersing related men (R. Murphy 1957). Institutions such as mili-

children, who were his heirs. DIVORCE was frequent, and the constant scheming of ambitious men to expand their own villages at the expense of others ensured that there were no fixed corporate groups. Turner's response, set out in great detail in *Schism and continuity* (1957), the ethnography that first made his name, was to find orderliness not in social structure but in the power struggles themselves, the repeated scenes of domestic strife that he labeled "social dramas." He gives many examples, analyzed in terms of a simple schema: a breach of social norms results in a crisis; this leads to redressive action of some kind, and finally to reintegration. The persistence of a homeostatic model shows the underlying influence of FUNCTIONALISM, since even when schism is the outcome, it only reproduces Ndembu society as Turner found it.

Three things now pointed Turner toward RITUAL: (1) it was the most common "redressive action;" (2) his schema suggested that three phases of a RITE OF PASSAGE as described by Arnold van GENNEP applied more generally to ritual; (3) most profoundly, it emerged that the true stability of Ndembu life lay not in social organization at all but in abstract religious or philosophical ideas that were most clearly expressed in ritual. (Interestingly, it was Max GLUCKMAN, Turner's doctoral supervisor at the University of Manchester, who first suggested that the Ndembu might be worth study because of their complex rites. Gluckman always displayed more interest in ritual than other functionalists.) In a series of articles and monographs (1961, 1962, 1968, 1975), Turner explored an array of Ndembu "cults of affliction," complex rites in which the spiritual resources of the community were brought to bear on the misfortunes of individuals. In so doing, he worked out techniques for the interpretation of the symbolism in ritual, and these are best described in his most successful book, *The forest of symbols* (1967). These techniques were widely adopted and influenced a whole generation of anthropologists.

At the same time, Turner moved beyond his African ethnography in several studies that elaborated van Gennep's notion of the liminal. Where van Gennep had seen dangerous transitions, Turner found something more positive: a release from the constraints of prescribed social roles. The egalitarian and invigorating state that a shared liminality could induce he called "communitas," and his most convincing demonstrations of it concern Christian PILGRIMAGE (1974; esp. Turner & Turner 1978). In *The ritual process* (1969) liminality is found everywhere; in all manner of social and religious phenomena, in the counterculture of the times, and in the arts. In contemporary societies, Turner argued, marginal people assume a permanently liminal, or *liminoid*, condition. Some of this now seems dated, and the very wide extension of the notion of liminality had the unfortunate consequence of undermining its initial power. Nevertheless, Turner was ahead of his time in his willingness to move beyond a narrow ethnographic base. In his later years Turner was drawn toward performance theory, though he always took the keenest delight in the dramatic; perhaps in the end drama and ritual were for him synonymous.

Turner was born in Scotland in 1920. After his period with the Rhodes–Livingstone Institute (1950–4), he held a lectureship at Manchester until 1963. His most productive years were spent in the United States, however, first at Cornell University, then at Chicago University, and finally at the University of Virginia, where he died in 1983.   PM

See also BLOOD, HUMANISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY, POETRY

Tylor, Edward Burnett (1832–1917)

E. B. Tylor was responsible for developing a theory of social EVOLUTION that laid the basis for treating anthropology as a science in the nineteenth century. The theory, outlined in his two-volume *Primitive culture* (1871), laid out an idea of progress in which human societies evolved and improved through time.

Tylor argued that all human beings had similar intellectual potential. He rejected the notion, common at the time, that contemporary primitive societies had degenerated after a common Biblical origin. As a basis for demonstrating his evolutionary