

A Cross-cultural Test of Nancy Jay's Theory About Women, Sacrificial Blood and Religious Participation

Virginia S. Fink Ph.D.ⁱ

Abstract

I examine the theoretical insights of Nancy Jay's 1992 investigation of patrilineal sacrificial rituals and their role in the restriction of women in religious rituals. I use the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample, a representative sample of preindustrial societies, to test the strength of patrilineality and other factors identified as subordinating women in preindustrial societies. A societal pattern of male inheritance of property and patrilineal descent are the strongest predictors of women being restricted or excluded from major public religious rituals. The implications of this pattern for modern societies are discussed.

Key Words: Women's Religious Ritual Restriction, Patrilineal descent, Standard Cross-Cultural Sample.

Introduction

Religious rituals have been thought of as holding a society together.ⁱⁱ They are often said by sociologists and anthropologists to model a sense of connection and create a shared identity. In the past several decades, there has been a contentious dialogue in many modern religious groups about the extent that women will be included in denominational structures and participate in major ritualsⁱⁱⁱ. Will they be allowed to be official leaders? Or must they simply be participants? Many denominations, at least forty-four of the major American denominations, now ordain women as leaders. Yet, there continues to be strong opposition to women leaders in some denominations in the United States.^{iv} This type of restriction of women and the debate about their role can be found for many religions worldwide in both industrializing and more industrial societies. It is found in some groups within Christianity, Islam, and Judaism as well as Buddhism and Hinduism.^v Some insight into aspects of this current debate can be gained from examining a representative sample of preindustrial societies for their patterns of religious ritual restriction. While the strict patrilineal lineages that controlled property and women's ability to reproduce are not often found in modern societies; there are vestiges of this way of thinking about connection that seem to remain in modern industrial societies. Religion is said to be a more cumulative process with layers remaining from the previous tradition.^{vi} This stress on men connecting through time can be seen in "father and son" businesses and corporations. It is also seen in the famous Mt Rushmore in South Dakota where male leaders have been memorialized in stone proclaiming at one level that males made and continue to connect this county over several centuries.

Some previous scholars discuss patrilineal descent as simply a reflection of the material facts of work role.^{vii} However Nancy Jay (1992), a feminist sociologist of religion, and several other anthropologists have suggested that the ideas about lineal connection over generations are more important in shaping a society than was previously thought. Moreover, they maintain that these rules are more about procreative roles than productive roles.^{viii} Patriliney, a short hand word for the rule of a patrilineal sense of connection between generations, may have shaped inheritance rules, residence patterns and other rules so that they favor men.

This stress on the power of patrilineality is echoed in the recent work of anthropologist Carol Delaney. Describing modern rural Turkey, she comments on the association between men, paternity, and divine power: According to Delaney, "This association is part of the power behind these patriarchal systems, for it is the glorification, not just of the male, but of the male as 'father.' That, to me is what

patriarchy is about. The widespread uses of the term ‘patriarchy’ to refer to other systems of male dominance seems too intellectually sloppy, for the term ‘father’ derives its meaning from an entire system of beliefs about procreation that is not universal.” (Delaney 1990 28).

Instead of a simple reversal of the Marxist stress on the power of production or inheritance patterns, this definition of patriarchy is pointing to the need to include a different set of “materials and labor” and the ideas that develop around them to explain restrictive behaviors. Procreation may have had a larger role in shaping patrilineal thoughts than production. However here, I am not making a strictly biological argument. The material conditions of conception, childbirth, mothering, and fathering are universal biological facts have been given very different meanings in many societies. Patrilineality is a social construction of a particular type of fatherhood and motherhood. This type of fatherhood is not found in all societies. Women are not thought of as passive vessel in all societies. Nor were women restricted from religious rituals in all societies. This restriction as has been often assumed by older scholarship. A stronger explanation of variations in religious participation could be more inclusive of productive roles and reproductive roles as well as the control of women’s sexuality.^{ix}

Feminist investigations of religion have also described how elements of religion constrain women.

At first, they stressed importance of the sex of God as male^x. Recent work expands this by discussing more abstract “symbols of the divine” and the efforts at the “reimagining” of god.^{xi} Victoria Erickson, building on past sociological insights of Weber and Chodorow, maintains that often violence is justified by religious institutions in the control of women’s reproductive and sexual abilities^{xii}, but the most dynamic perspective was Nancy Jay’s theoretical examination of religious ritual dynamics of unilineal descent systems. She demonstrated a strong linkage of patrilineality with sacrificial/blood letting rituals and restriction or even exclusion of women during religious rituals since their ability to give birth visibly pollutes this sense of connection through time.^{xiii} While her work examined many patrilineal societies in diverse places, she did not examine a representative sample of societies to see if this was a widespread pattern of association. That is what I will do in this paper.

In the next section, I review the literature about women’s status in preindustrial societies and describe in more detail the bar of patrilineality and other factors that have previously been identified as contributing to the restriction of women from religious rituals. Then, I show, using a logistic regression model of association, that the presence of patrilineality in a society is an important factor in a model that would predict women being restricted from religious rituals in preindustrial societies. Finally, I discuss the implications of patrilineality for modern religion and society.

Women in Preindustrial Societies

In 1977, Elizabeth Zelman, using cluster analysis and a worldwide sample of societies, described two poles around which most societies were clustered. One cluster of societies was where men were integrated into the birth process, the care of children and where women were not restricted from societies rituals or delegated to a lower social status. The other cluster of societies was where men were remote from the birth process, not involved in the care of children, there were many menstrual taboos, and often women were restricted or had lower status. Zelman did not focus on what may have preceded or caused these two major ways of organizing, but several scholars who came after her have worked to identify the mechanisms in the patriarchal societies that create a subordinate status for women. Writing in the 1980’s sociologists, Nancy Hartsock and Mary O’Brien point to the material conditions of birth as central for understanding the ways societies have structured their social worlds.^{xiv} For Hartsock, it was the sexual division of labor, the fear of women’s ability to give birth and the fusing of sexuality, violence, and death that produced gender inequality. For Mary O’Brien, it was the layers of physical and mental alienation

of men from their children due to the processes of conception, pregnancy, and birth that drove their attempts to control women and appropriate their children.

Peggy Sanday, looking cross-culturally and using a worldwide sample focused on the gender symbolism in creation stories, demonstrated that the sex of God was also a guide for sex role prescriptions.^{xv} Women were seen as having special powers and were entitled to use them in societies with a Goddess or a male and female divine couple. Often these were more forager-based societies. On the other hand, in male God societies, often strictly hunter based, the sense of what was powerful was associated with men, and women were not thought to be powerful. By articulating how things were in the beginning, people were making a basic statement about their relationships with nature and about their perception of the source of power in the universe.^{xvi} Later, Scott Coltrane, using another set of the societies in the Standard Cross Cultural Data set, showed that a societal prescription for a distant father and child relationship was also associated with a lower overall status of women. His work supported the work of Sanday, for he also found a higher status for women in a society that had a symbolic system that stress a female ancestor.

Victoria Erikson's insightful theoretical critique of Durkheim, Hartsock and Chodorow maintains: "that both reproduction and religion be retained as primary categories in the constellation of patriarchy."^{xvii} In a related historical investigation, Gerda Lerner described the formation of Western patriarchy stressing that when the Mesopotamian patriarchs commodified women and their abilities, they also appropriated a sense of what was creative in the cosmos. Women's ability to bear and raise children, to link ruling families, to act as a stand-in for their husbands, fathers or brothers and to be more easily enslaved—all of these useful qualities also facilitated the rise of archaic states. According to Lerner, "Whenever such changes occur, the power of creation and of fertility is transferred from the Goddess to the God." Men and maleness then were seen as the creative agent and creativity as the work of men. She credits this transition to a combination of factors.

"My thesis is that, just as the development of plow agriculture, coinciding with increasing militarism, brought major changes in kinship and in gender relations, so did the development of strong kingships and of archaic states bring changes in religious beliefs and symbols".^{xviii} Lerner's work was especially consequential for modern societies since the Mesopotamian society she studied underlies Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The sex of God/Goddess and a sense of what was creative were not the only significant conceptual shifts that may have occurred with a transition to patriarchy.^{xix} Along with changing creative ideas, the sense of what was creating connection between generations was also changing.

Nancy Jay's, 1992, study contrasted the ritual dynamics of unilineal descent systems in both patrilineal and matrilineal societies. She found that in patrilineal rituals from many regions of the world what was being created by the sacrifice of a male animal. Those who performed this type of ritual usually maintained that it created connection between men who were alive and those who had died before- thus creating an eternal group of men. Her study did not reduce patrilineal descent to just a way of passing on property or a naming of kin caused by an exogamous marriage pattern or simply an artifact of environmental circumstances as many previous studies had done. She unpacked this very peculiar concept by focusing on the structures of the ritual and the society that influence the internal logic shared by the patrilineal rituals in many societies around the world.

Most commonly these rituals were used to create strong cohesion between fathers and sons^{xx}. The rituals were a formal discourse about creating connection between persons in the same generation and also between persons in successive generations. (Some times, their sons were actually only sons by adoption). But it was a particular and peculiar type of connection. Jay demonstrated that the major

religious ceremonies in patrilineal societies were often considered by the participants as a “better” birth into the world of grown men. A rebirth, so to speak! But women’s presence or active participation at the ritual was a glaring reminder that women could give birth and were more clearly linked to sons to the next generations. Women then were often understood in these societies as polluting to this type of conceptual logic or sense of a lineage based in male blood^{xxi}. They visibly contradicted this patrilineal way of thinking about connection over time. Often women’s clearer bodily claim to creating connection was “undone” in the ritual logic. The blood sacrifice of animals undid the blood let during a birth to a woman. Men ritually transcended their dependence on women’s reproductive, creative and connective powers. The patrilineal eternal line creating the society became a “remedy for being born of women.”^{xxii} To me, this important concept of the ritual making of a patrilineal sense of connection through time should be included in explanations of why women were restricted or excluded from religious rituals in some patriarchal societies. Importantly, this was not a universal restriction of women as is often posited by the classic sociological scholars such as Weber^{xxiii}. The restriction and even the exclusion of women was most often found in societies with patrilineal ideas about connection through time.

For example, within a patrilineally linked world, such as the classic Greeks, children were said to be only related to their father and his lineage. They may have “issued” from their mother’s womb, but they could be successfully unlinked from their mother and her lineage by powerful ritual interventions. In this worldview, women were vessels for males to use, and men were ritually linked to other generations forming society and great civilizations. Maleness linked through time. Societies in such diverse places and times as the Romans, Tallensi, Nuer and Hawaiians shared aspects of this perception of continuity^{xxiv}.

So if Jay’s examples are correct, the presence of this way of thinking about connection over time should be associated with restriction or even exclusion of women from religious rituals in a cross-cultural test using a representative sample of all known preindustrial societies. This concept could also be indicated by a society only recognizing the significant male ancestors.^{xxv}

I will then test the relative strength of these major religious and material variables that have been identified as contributing to the restriction of women in religious rituals. These are the sex of god, presence of agriculture and hunting, monotheism, types of lineality, inheritance patterns and sex of ancestors.

Methods

I use the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS) of pre-industrial societies. This sample was devised and refined by George Peter Murdock and Douglas White in 1969. It was to be a representative sample of all preindustrial societies on the globe. This sample and several others were carefully selected from existing data in the Human Relations Area Files.^{xxvi} Their data were coded from the historic and ethnographic literature. I examine societies for the statistically significant associations between factors mostly likely to restrict women in religious rituals. (See Appendix A for more information on the variables used.) This sample included societies from each major region around the globe and has all subsistence types (forager, hunting, fishing, horticulture, and agriculture) found in preindustrial societies. Societies were chosen to minimize diffusion of patterned behaviors from one society to another, so they are not found geographically next to each other. Statistical methods to understand women lives and this sample of preindustrial societies are used more by those sociologists and anthropologists who are concerned with examining general world wide patterns and middle-levels of theory instead of ethnographic details. There is much precedent for using the sample in this manner.^{xxvii} By using a logistic regression model, I control for the effects that may overlap and identify the fewest, but strongest

predictors of women being restricted. All variables are dichotomized since there are good theoretical (patrilineal/non patrilineal) and practical grounds (variables in model with missing cases) for doing this. Women's participation in religious rituals in preindustrial societies varies; it is not the universal restriction so often alluded to in discussion of the past. Restriction of women or exclusion from religious rituals was not a universal rule as has been so often assumed in sociological theoretical analysis. I am asking which of the previously identified variables best explains the variation of participation in religious rituals.

Previous Quantitative Research in this Women and Religion

This question about the variation in participation of women and religion in preindustrial societies has been asked before. Michael Welch, in 1982, a sociologist, used the SCCS and expected the restriction of women would be explained by a fear of sex, the presence of an ideal of different spheres, and which sex controlled the resources in a society^{xxviii}. But he only found a significant positive association between women's control of resources and societies where women could be shamans. So we might expect that where women control resources today they would function as shamans and not ministers or priests. Ronald Stover and Christine Hope in 1984, using a similar sample of preindustrial societies, demonstrated a link between societies with monotheism and a measure of overall gender inequality. Patrick Gray, in 1987, using yet another sample asserted that they would not have gotten this result if they had controlled for region. He said bias was best predicted by Guy Swanson's previous measure that used the number of sovereign groups that had been conquered by a society, as a proxy for monotheism. In a subsequent set of articles Stover, Hope, and Gray reached no consensus about gender inequality and religion. The inconclusive nature of these efforts suggests that it is appropriate to test for another perspective. No further research has been done in the area of women, religion and a worldwide sample. It is hard to conclude from the various composite measures of gender inequality that a strong case was made about what is causing lower status for women or their restrictions especially in religion. Monotheism may be associated with patrilineality but the way it has been measured is debated.

Quantitative Research on the Status of Women in Preindustrial societies

Martin Whyte, Rae Lesser Blumberg, Peggy Sanday, Scott Coltrane and Marc Ross have also tested other aspects of gender status using either a similar sample of preindustrial societies. Previously tested cross-cultural explanations for restricting women in a society in either politics, general social situations or religion have included: sex of God, sex of significant ancestors, men's fear of sex, monotheism, animal husbandry, male focused inheritance patterns, agriculture, patrilocality and patrilineality, political complexity, and the presence of classic religion. So all of these will be considered in a model that will just look at the religious restriction of women.

Best Fitting Model- Independent and Dependent Variables

Societies with male dominance or a male-focused inheritance of property have often been identified as having the important condition affecting women's overall status. The overall status measure combined religious, social and political status measures. A measure of male dominance was created by combining male inheritance, patrilineal descent, patrilocality, presence of bride price and men's control of economic resources^{xxix}. Combining these variables captures how patriarchal domination occurs with a matrix of traits, but does not allow us to test Nancy Jay's insights about patrilineality and the relationship to religious rituals. While male-focused inheritance and patrilineal descent often occur together and seem to interact to create total exclusion for women, this is not always the case. Not all patrilineal societies

have a pattern of male property inheritance or patrilocality (where women move to their husband's family).

The recent ethnographic accounts of both Maurice Godelier and Carol Delaney suggest that in some societies a *sense of patrilineality* preceded individual-based property inheritance rules. The sense of what is creating connecting between generations would most likely influence rules about who will inherit property. Pasternak, Ember and Ember, noted cross-cultural researchers, also support this idea by maintaining that private property cannot be used to explain descent groups, since only a small proportion of known societies have had private property, but most have had some forms of unilineal (either matrilineal or patrilineal) descent groups^{xxx}. Patrilineality does not consistently predict a rule of male inheritance or vice versa. Consequently, I do not combine inheritance and lineality but use separate measures and examine lineality, locality and inheritance patterns.

Locality

Patrilocality, or residing with a husband's family after marriage, has been shown by several feminist researchers to contribute to women's overall subordination. Nielsen maintains that locality causes the sense of lineality and control over resources.^{xxxi} Karen Sacks pointed to patrilocality as determinative of decreased status for wives. Women who move into a strong family are restricted and experience a lost of status^{xxxii}. Stephanie Coontz and Peta Henderson also stress the importance of patrilocality for decreasing the status of women^{xxxiii} I extrapolate that with patrilocality young wives would most likely be restricted or excluded from religious rituals, since they would have been considered outsiders in their husband's family or patrilineage.

Sex of God and the Sex of Significant Ancestors

How a society describes the sex of God and the sex of significant ancestors have been identified as important factors by Lerner, Sanday and Zelman. There is a small problem in that the coding of Sex of God and Sex of Significant Ancestors is not as extensive as the other variables. Still, they are included in the statistical model due to their theoretical significance. The current writing of women back into the historical accounts of denominational histories such as the work of Rosemary Ruether and Rosemary Keller was a recasting of important ancestors. All of the above factors will then be used individually in the initial model construction. They are often found together so that a society with a female god would also have significant female ancestors, but not in all cases. The sex of significant ancestors, while somewhat correlated with the sense of lineality, is not always found together.

The Dependent Variable - Restriction from Religious Rituals

Religious rituals are a public, prestige-conferring situations where cultural knowledge is acted out and reaffirmed. Who is allowed at the ritual is an important fact in the creation of status and power. Who leads the rituals is usually also a status matter. Even simple spatial segregation has been identified as part of the gender status process^{xxxiv}. With women excluded from the "knowledge" production done in rituals, men can comfortably accrue status and power and define the cosmos. Spatial separation and gendered spaces are an important part of the lower status of women^{xxxv} Women's exclusion or restriction during ritual activities is not then a trivial matter.

In this representative sample of 93 societies, only five pre-industrial societies had exclusive male religious participation. In fifty societies, men dominated religious rituals restricting women's participation. In fifteen societies, there was equal participation of women and men in religious rituals, in

four societies, women dominated religious rituals. There were no societies where men were excluded from general religious rituals.^{xxxvi} (See Appendix B for the table with this data.)

Results

I built my model in two stages. First, I put in all the theoretically relevant variables identified in previous research in this area. By looking at the coefficient, the logistic R (the proper measure of association for this ordinal and nominal data) and the level of statistical significance from a series of simple two variable logistic regressions, you can eliminate some of the very weakly associated variables and begin to build a more accurate model of the variables that are correlated with religious restriction^{xxxvii}. Variables are listed in order of the levels of statistical significance, from highest to lowest. Seven variables--inheritance, descent, sex of ancestors, sex of God, the importance of agriculture, male's fear of sex, and control of the fruits of women and men's labor -- were within the .25 level of significance suggested for inclusion into a best fitting model. The other theoretically relevant variables are not used to do a multi-variate test.

Then, a final multivariate logistic regression was performed to identify the best fitting model from the variables identified as statistically significant. Due to its very low significance level, males fear sex was dropped from the final equation. The remaining six variables inheritance, descent, sex of ancestors, sex of God, the importance of agriculture, and control of the fruits of women and men's labor produce the best fitting model for explaining the restriction of women during religious rituals.

Then the best fitting logistic regression model for the predicting the restricted participation of women in religious rituals was with 6 variables. This model has an overall prediction rate of 83% and was statistically significant at the .02 level. This means this pattern of association was not due to chance and has 33 percent chance over random prediction (50%) of identifying a society where women are restricted in religious rituals. When the individual predictors are examined the male inheritance pattern is the strongest, followed by patrilineality. These were statistically significant at .10 or above. The other four variables the sex of significant ancestors, the sex of God, presence of agriculture and males control the fruits of labor were not statistically significant when used with inheritance and lineality. The significance of sex of significant ancestors and sex of god may be affected by the low number of societies coded at this time.

Looking at the Exponent's of B (the easiest coefficients to interpret) for the two significant variables we see that for patrilineality the Exp of B of -.1321 means that a society with patrilineality is 1/.1321 or 7.57 times less likely to have women participating equally in religion rituals. Societies with a rule of male inheritance are 1/.0527 or 19 times less likely to have women participating equally in religious rituals. Other exponents can be similarly interpreted, but are not statistically significant.

Conclusions

This type of model analysis provides evidence that in preindustrial societies patrilineality interacts with a pattern of male inheritance, sex of mythical ancestors, sex of God, the importance of agriculture and male control of fruits of labor to accurately predict the restriction of women from religion rituals. The strongest predictor is a pattern of male inheritance of property, but alone this variable does not have the power of prediction that it does when the other variables are in the model. This would seem to say that exclusion or restriction of women in religious rituals is due to more than property relations.

If, both lineality and inheritance are taken into an account in explaining the restriction from religious rituals then it is clearer how both procreation and production are linked over time into a sense of continuity. What is being proclaimed in the rituals is about who creates and connects. While patrilineal

descent ideology is related to the sex of mythical ancestors, patrilineality is more than that. When the father and son relationship is highlighted as the model of connection other familial relationships are muted. Women are not active connectors; they are more passive vessels to carry the seeds of men through time. As Jay so aptly concluded “In all of them (patrilineal societies), not physiological paternity, but an eternal agnatic (a one sided tracing of ancestors) principle maintained by sacrifice, transcends individual mortality and transitory relatedness through women, prevents social chaos and gives enduring continuity to their (men’s) social world.”^{xxxviii}

Perhaps, patrilineal rituals decrease the physical alienation experienced by men in the procreative act, but this way of ritually disconnecting and reconnecting and thus describing connection has a price for the women in these societies. Now that biological sciences have shown that children have the genetic materials of both father and mother we can see that patrilineality is not biologically based it seems strange that it is still ritually being proclaimed.

Patrilineal thought places little value on the sister or mother and daughter relationships. Other forms of tracing descent such as matrilineality, ambilineality^{xxxix} or bilineality do not stress the father and son relationship at the expense of all others, nor would they create a strong need to mute women’s role in the rituals proclaiming connection. Descriptions of women ancestors and a “lineage” of women connected back in time is a part of the current feminist and womanist task of writing women back into the history of Christianity, Judaism, Islam and Buddhism that is being carried out by numerous scholars previously mentioned. These efforts should help to reframe the understanding of what connects generations of persons in a denomination.

Scholars have been reclaiming significant women ancestors. Religious histories have been connecting the past and present creating a history where women were active. This gives a new sense of connection to the past. These efforts may begin to change how religious communities think and talk about connectivity between generations. Male inheritance of property and thus control of valuable resources was the strongest predictor of religious restrictions for women in preindustrial societies. Male inheritance alone does not accurately predict the religious restriction of women. Interestingly, in the United States we no longer have laws that restrict the inheritance of property to men. Some denominations may have rules that favor men or have only men on the board of trustees. However, we find many women owning property, working in all areas and levels of the paid labor force, yet we continue to have religious denominations that seem in their liturgical or creedal statements to proclaim a patrilineal world and that also continue to restrict women from full participation in religious rituals.

These data do not answer the question; to what extent a patrilineal sense of connection disadvantages modern women? But these data do suggest that this is a question worth asking. In my ongoing investigation of modern religious denominations for indicators of patrilineal thought, several modern elements of patrilineality were found. They each seem to be associated with various forms of restriction for women. Nancy Jay had pointed to a sense of male-only continuity in the concepts of apostolic succession and a sacrificial communion as recreating male continuity.^{xl} These are currently an integral part of the Roman Catholic Church. There are several other indicators of this patrilineal thought process that exist as part of many religions. The frequent formulaic highlighting of a father and son relationship in hymns, this same stress in the doxologies and in the three major creedal statements used by many modern Christian denominations—the Nicene, Apostles and Athanasius Creeds. When these are used in religious rituals, the patrilineal sense of connection through time is being proclaimed.

It may be interesting to understand with further study how women and men using these creedal statements think about connection to the past and future. Reading the history of several liberal Christian denominations, during the 1840 to 1890 period, especially in the formal statements issued after their

yearly meetings, I found that these statements changed in structure over time. Early in that period the statements began with a clear patrilineal declaration of Father and Son. Then they would move or demote this statement to a later paragraph and several deleted this statement altogether toward the end of the century. Often this process occurred before their rules about ordination of women changed. This same process may have occurred in denominations who begin to ordain women in the late twentieth century or who will start to ordain in this century. A close reading of official documents or proclamations may find this pattern.

Zikmund in 2002, found the most women were now ordained in the United Methodist church, followed by the Church of Christ. But when they examined the highest percentage of women in the active clergy it was the Unitarian Universalists who scored the highest percentages. These researchers maintain that some of the differences found were due to the ways denominations are connected. Their type of polity influence whether women could lead. Whether they are congregation centered like the Unitarians and Congregationalist or more hierarchical like the Methodists seems to effect when and how much women are restricted.^{xli}

Christian denominations, that are currently labeled as fundamentalist, often view the Bible as the literal word of God and then accept the description of a patrilineal society, found in the Hebrew Bible as the definitive model for connection through time. Most of the genealogical accounts found in the Bible do not include women but are lists of fathers and sons. This sacred book is not just important to Christians but influences both Jewish and Islamic societies.

Recently, numerous scholars have noticed the association between fundamentalism and a patterned restriction of women.^{xlii} Little work has been done to examine how much patrilineality is retained in these denominations. How do they talk about connection over time and between themselves? The official documents of yearly meetings or their web sites may be good places to look for this important sense of connection. Fewer restrictions for women in these denominations may occur after the ideas about connection through time change, if this model holds for denominational groups in modern societies. This may also mean that women are allowed to be trustees of the property and valuable assets if the model is correct for modern societies.

As a modern feminist philosopher of religion has said, “The ultimate hope is that, in creating new versions of old myths or less biased versions of new myths, we can connect with our own history as embodied beings and with each other as desiring, reasoning, intuiting, believing women and men.”^{xliii} The other factors in the model such as sex of God and sex of significant societal ancestors were important. They were not as important as the pattern of thinking that the connection between generations was due to this link between fathers and sons created by the religious ritual. This was a declaring that the birth to a woman as less important in determining the shape of society. Since this patterned ritual behavior may alleviate some of the alienation felt by men around birth and children, it would be important not to further exclude men from the processes associated with birth. This exclusion of men was a common pattern in America as birth was brought into hospitals early in the twentieth century; it is only in the end of the last century that men were more actively incorporated into the process again.

Examining rules that forbid women from inheriting property would also seem to be an important issue if one is looking at increasing women’s roles in religious rituals in countries which currently restrict them. However, this focus is not enough to understand the dynamics of religious rituals and rules about restricting women. The need is to reveal or deconstruct the religious understandings about the linkage between reproduction and production that is interlaced in a way that may lead to restrictions of women due to their more concrete associations with the next generations.

**TABLE 1:
BIVARIATE LOGISTIC REGRESSION OF RESTRICTION OF WOMEN DURING
RELIGIOUS RITUALS AND THEORETICALLY RELEVANT VARIABLES**

Note: Uncollapsed R's and Walds close to collapsed categories in all cases. In order of statistical significance from highest to lowest^{xliv}

Logistic R correlation coefficient	Wald level of Significance	Independent Variables with categories
.25	.006	Inheritance (Males preferred and both male and female)
.22	.008	Descent (Patrilineal vs. All Others)
.18	.039	Sex of Mythic Ancestors (Males mostly vs. Both/Female)
.00	.16	Sex of God (Male vs. Both/Female) Whyte
.00	.18	Importance of Agriculture (Dominant/Co- dominant vs. Mixed/Unimportant)
.00	.19	Males fear sex (None vs. Menstrual/Other)
.00	.23	Control of fruits of labor (Males mostly vs. Both/Female)
.00	.28	Control of Animal Husbandry (Male mostly vs. Both/Female)
.00	.34	Locality (Patrilocal/Other Types)
.00	.39	Religion (Classical/Pre-classical & tribal)

.00	.48	Importance of Animal Husbandry (Dominate vs. Unimportant)
.00	59	Control of Agriculture (Male mostly vs. Both/Female)
.00	.69	Political Complexity (Large State vs Local/No political Integration)

APPENDIX A:

Frequency Distributions For Variables Used From The Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS)

Only 93 ODD Numbered Societies used. N = is the number of societies in each category. Final Column is the person who is credited with coding the data. The Whyte data was coded by several graduate students and cross-checked.

Variables:	Categories Used	Missing	Coded by:	
Religious Rituals	Women Restricted N=61	Women Not Restricted N=19	Missing 16	Whyte 1979
Descent	Patrilineal 34	All other types of descent 59	Missing 0	Murdock and White 1969
Inheritance	Men mostly 45	Equal and Women 26	Missing 0	Whyte 1979
Locality	Patrilocal 28	All other types 75	Missing 0	Whyte 1979
Sex of Mythic Ancestor	All males /mostly males 39	Both or female 6	Missing 48	Whyte 1979

Sex of God	Male 46	Couple Female 21	or	Missing 16	Originally Sanday coded Whyte 1979
Importance of Agriculture	Dominate 63	Not Important 30	as	Missing 0	Originally coded by Sanday Whyte 1979

APPENDIX B:

Categories of Religious Restrictions by the societies Odd numbered societies of the SCCS

Category	Societies			
Only Males may participate in collective religious ceremonies.	Nubians Javanese Turks Abipon Toda			
Males more prominent or women restricted in religious rituals	Nama Hottentot Konso Bemba Hadza Kikuyu Tallensi Massa N.Vietnamese Khmer- Cambodians Manchu Atayal Twana Pomo Paiute	Japanese Gilyak Chukchee Yanamano Saramacca Tupinamba Shavante Cayua Shilluk Kaffa Amhara Egyptians Yurak Abkhaz	Montagnais Salteaux Kaska Haida Omaha Creek Comanche Zuni Papago Cubeo Inca Kwoma Ajie Palauans	Alorese Aranda Kutenai Hadatsa Aztec Quiche Bribri Goajire Callinago Siriono Trumai Kurds
Both participate, no restriction for women in religious rituals	Thonga Ashanti Wolof Fulani Fur		Irish Punjabi Garo Tanela	Iban Kiman Marquesans Tuareg Truk

	Burmese			
Both, but women more prominent	Uttar Pradesh Semang		Toradja Tehuelche	
Missing	Mbundu Mbuti Banen Ibo	Babylonians Gilbertese Aluet Jivaro	Romans Kazak Lolo Adamanese Lesu	Siuai Pentecost

Computer Ready Data obtained from World Cultures Electronic Database.
Compiled by Douglas White 1985-1989.

References

- Allan, Alexander Jr. 1988. "Phallic Symbolism and Reproductive Expropriation: Sexual Politics in Cross Cultural Perspective" in Richard Randolph, David Schnieder and May N. Diaz. *Dialectics and Gender: Anthropological Approaches*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Anderson, Pamela Sue. 1998. *A Feminist Philosophy of Religion*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Barnard, Alan and Anthony Good. 1984. *Research Practices in the Study of Kinship*. London: Academic Press.
- Bendroth, Margaret L. 1993. *Fundamentalism and Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blumberg, Rae Lesser. 1978. *Gender Stratification: Socioeconomic and Sexual Inequality*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. Brown Publishers.
- Blumberg Rae Lesser. 1984. "A Theory of Gender Stratification in *Sociological Theory: 1984* edited by Randall Collins. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 1984. *Sex and Advantage*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.
- Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 1988. "The Gender Division of Labor and the Reproduction of Female Advantage. *Journal of Family Issues*. 9:1.
- Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 1990. *Gender Equity: An Integrated Theory of Stability and Change*. Newbury, CA: Sage.
- Chaves, Mark. 1993. *Ordaining Women: Culture and Conflict in Religious Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Chevillard, Nicole and Sebastin Leconte. 1986. "The Dawn of Lineage Societies: The Origins of Women's Oppression" in Stephanie Coontz and Peta Henderson. Editors. *Women's Work, Men's Property: the Origins of Gender and Class*. London: Verso.
- Chodorow, Nancy. 1978 *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, Kate and Ryan Feldman, "Women, Religious Fundamentalism and Reproductive Rights," *Reproductive Health Matters* 8 (1996) 124-147.
- Coleman, James. 1993. "The Rational Reconstruction of Society," *American Sociological Review*. 58.
- Collier, Jane and Sylvia Jurko Yanagisako. 1987. *Gender and Kinship: Essays Toward a Unified Analysis*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Collins, Randall. 1975. *A Theory of Sexual Stratification in Conflict Sociology*. edited by Randall Collins. New York: Academic Press.
- Collins, Randall, Chafetz, Janet S., Blumberg L. Rae, Coltrane, Scott and Jonathan H. Turner. 1993. Towards and Integrated Theory of Gender Stratification *Sociological Perspectives*. 36:3.185-216.
- Coltrane, Scott. 1988. "Father Child Relationships and the Status of Women: A Cross Cultural Study." *American Journal of Sociology* 93:5.
- Coltrane Scott. 1992. "The Micro Politics of Gender in Non-Industrial Societies" in *Gender and Society*. 6:1.
- Coontz, Stephanie and Peta Henderson. 1986. *Women's Work, Men's Property: the Origins of Gender and Class*. London: Verso.
- Delaney, Carol. 1990. *The Seed and The Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Divale, William and Marvin Harris, 1976. "Population, Warfare and the Male Supremacy Complex". *American Anthropologist*. 78:3
- Durkheim, Emile. 1915/1965. *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. translated by Joseph Swain. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Ember, Melvin and Carol Ember. 1983. *Marriage, Family and Kinship: Comparative Studies of Social Organization*. New Haven, CT: HRAF Press.
- Ember, Carol and Melvin Ember. 1988. *A Guide to Cross-Cultural Research Using the HRAF Archive*. New Haven, CT: HRAF Press.
- Engels, Frederick. ([1884] 1972). *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. New York: International Publishers.
- Erickson, Victoria Lee. 1992. "Back to the Basics: Feminist Social Theory, Durkheim and Religion" *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 8: Spring.
- Fortes, M. 1945. *The Dynamics of Kinship Among the Tallensi*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Godelier, Maurice. 1986. *The Making of Great Men: Male Domination and Power Among the New Guinea Baruya*. translated by Rupert Sawyer. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gray, Patrick J. 1987A. "Do Women Have Higher Social Status in Hunting and Gathering Societies Without Gods?" *Social Forces*, 65:1121-1131.
- Gray, Patrick J. 1987B. "Response to Hope and Stover." *Social Forces*, 65:1139-1142.
- Grusky, David B., ed. 1994. *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Harris, Marvin. 1980. *Culture, People and Nature: An Introduction to General Anthropology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hendrix, Lewellyn and Zakir Hossain. 1988. "Women's Status and Mode of Production: A Cross-Cultural Test". in *Signs*. 13:3.
- Hartsock, Nancy. 1983. *Money, Sex and Power: Towards a Feminist Historical Materialism*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Hope, Christine A., and Ronald G. Stover. 1987. "Gender Status, Monotheism, and Social Complexity: Response to Gray." *Social Forces*, 65:1132-1142.
- Hosmer, David W. and Stanley Lemeshow. 1989. *Applied Logistic Regression*. New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Irigaray, Luce. 1993. *Sexes and Genealogies*. translated by Gillian C. Gill. NY: Columbia University Press.

- Jay, Nancy. 1992. *Throughout Your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion and Paternity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnson, Elizabeth . 1992. *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse*, New York, Crossroads Press.
- Johnson, G. David and Lewellyn Hendrix. 1982. "A Cross-cultural Test of Collin's Theory of Sexual Stratification". *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. August.
- King, Ursula. editor. 1995. *Religion and Gender*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Press
- Lerner, Gerda. 1986. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levinson, David and Martin J. Malone. 1980. *Toward Explaining Human Culture: A Critical Review of the Findings of Worldwide Cross-Cultural Research*. New Haven, CT: HRAF Press.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S. 1980. *Applied Regression*. Beverly Hills, CA Sage.
- Mann, Michael . *The Sources of Social Power* (England: Cambridge University Press, 1986);
- McFague, 1987 *Sallie Models of God: Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*. Philadelphia, PA Fortress Press.
- Maryanski, Alexandra and Jonathan H. Turner. 1992. *The Social Cage: Human Nature and the Evolution of Society*. Stanford: CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mead, Margaret. 1949. *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World*. Dell Press.
- Murdock, George P. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: MacMillian.
- Murdock, George P. 1965. *Ethnographic Atlas* . *Ethnology*. 6. 109-236.
- Murdock, George P. and Douglas R. White. 1969. *Standard Cross-Cultural Sample* . *Ethnology*. 7:4. 329-369.
- Naroll, Raoul, Gary Michik and Frada Naroll. 1976. *Worldwide Theory Testing*. New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files
- Norusis, Marija J. 1992. *SPSS: Advanced Statistics Guide*. Chicago, IL: SPSS.
- O'Brien, Mary. 1981. *The Politics of Reproduction*. Boston, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1984. "Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties". *Journal of Comparative Study of Society and History*.
- Ortner, Sherry B. and Harriet Whitehead. Editors. 1981. *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Paige, Karen Erikson and Jeffery Paige. 1981. *The Politics of Reproductive Rituals*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Pasternak, Burton, Carol Ember and Melvin Ember. 1997. *Sex, Gender and Kinship*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Peach, Lucinda, Joy. 2002. *Women and World Religions*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Randolph, Richard, David Schnieder and May N. Diaz. 1988. *Dialectics and Gender: Anthropological Approaches*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Riesebrodt, Martin 1990. *Pious Passion: The Emergence of Modern Fundamentalism in the United States and Iran*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Riesebrodt, Martin and Kelly Chong, 1999. "Fundamentalism and Patriarchal Gender Politics," *Journal of Women's History*. 10:4.
- Rosaldo, Michelle and Louise Lamphere editors. 1974 *Women, Culture and Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ross, Marc Howard. 1986. *Female Political Participation: A Cross-Cultural Explanation.*" in *American Anthropologist*. 86. 843-858.

- Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex" in Reyna Reiter, editor. *Toward An Anthropology of Women*. NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford and Rosemary Skinner Keller. 1986. *Women in Religion in America: A documentary History*. Vol 1 and 2. NY: Harper and Row.
- Sacks, Karen. 1974 "Engels Revisited : Women, the Organization of Production and Private Property". in Michelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere editors. *Women, Culture and Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sacks, Karen. 1979. *Sisters and Wives*. Westport, CT: Greenwood
- Sanday, Peggy. 1981. *Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlegel, Alice. 1977 editor. *Sex Stratification: A Cross Cultural View*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Schneider, David M. 1968. *American Kinship: A Cultural Account*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Schneider, David M. 1984. *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Schussler, Elizabeth and M. Shawn Copeland 1996. *Feminist Theology in Different Contexts*. London: Concilium
- Schneider, Laurel. 1998. *Reimagining the Divine: Confronting the Backlash against Feminist Theology*, Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press.
- Shapiro, Judith. 1987. "Men In Groups: A Reexamination of Patriliney in Lowland South America". in Jane Collier and Sylvia Yanagisako. *Gender and Kinship: Essays Toward a Unified Analysis*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Shields, Dean. 1975. "Towards a Unified Theory of Ancestor Worship," *Social Forces*. 54:2 (December) 427-440.
- Spain, Daphne. 1992. *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Stover, Ronald G., and Christine A. Hope. 1984. Monotheism and Gender Status: A Cross Societal Study. *Social Forces* 63:335-48.
- Weber, Max. 1930/1957. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. translated by Talcott Parsons. NY: Scribner.
- Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Welch, Michael R. 1982. "Female Exclusion from Religious Roles: A Cross-Cultural Test of Competing Explanations," *Social Forces*. 61:1 (Sept.): 79-96.
- White Douglas R. editor. 1985-1989. *World Cultures an (MRDF) of the Standard Cross Cultural Sample*. La Jolla, CA.
- White, Douglas, Michael Burton, and Malcom Dow. 1981. "Sexual Division of Labor in African Agriculture: A Network Autocorrelation Analysis." in *American Anthropologist*. 83:824-849.
- White, Leslie. 1953. *The Evolution of Culture: The Development of Civilization to the Fall of Rome*. NY: McGraw Hill.
- Whiting, Beatrice B. 1965. "Sex Identity Conflict and Physical Violence: A Comparative Study" *American Anthropologist*. 67
- Whyte, Martin King. 1978. *The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zelman, Elizabeth. 1977. "Reproduction, Ritual and Power. in *American Ethnologist*. 4.

Zikmund, Barbara Brown, Adair T. Lummis and Patricia Chang. 1998. *Clergy Women: An Uphill Calling*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press

- i. Assistant Professor, University of Colorado Denver. I wish to thank Kathleen Ochs, Jodi Wetzel, Karen Tonso, Candan Duran-Aydintug, Steve Nock and Murray Milner for their comments.
- ii. Often discusses religion as a collective consciousness or effervescence. Durkheim 1912.
- iii. King (1995) examines women and religion worldwide from a religious studies perspective. Zikmund, Lummis and Chang, (1998) has a description of current issues in American denominations in this area.
- iv. Chaves, 1997 16-18.
- v. Peach, 2002. Is an excellent volume with a discussion of current ways women are restricted and how actual women have participated and contributed to each of the big five religions. She also has a section on Women in African Religions and the newer Goddess based religions of the west.
- vi. King (1995) 3.
- vii. Ross (1986), Coltrane (1988) Brown and Bohn 1989 all discuss this idea as emergent from modes of production.
- viii. Godelier (1986) found this thought pattern in a New Guinea tribe before there was private property and a sense of male ownership of property.
- ix. Nielson (1990), Chafetz (1984), Blumberg (1978), Delphy (1978) Schlegel (1977) are good examples of the work/family issues. Millett (1969), O'Brien (1981) are more focused on the role of sexuality..
- x. Daly (1973/1986), Ruether (1975)(1992), Sanday (1981) and Lerner (1984) have all worked in this area
- xi. See Anderson (1998). Elizabeth Schussler and M. Shawn Copeland (1996). Laurel Schneider (1998); McFague, (1998) Elizabeth Johnson (1992);
- xii. Erickson (1992), p. 35-46.
- xiii. Nancy Jay (1992).
- xiv. Hartsock (1983), O'Brien (1981) and Zelman (1977)
- xv. Sanday (1981)
- xvi. Sanday (1981) p5-7.
- xvii. Erickson (1992) 45.
- xviii. Lerner (1984) p. 84.
- xix. This transition may also occur when a patriarchal society conquers one with a different sense of connection.

-
- xx. Jay (1992) p. 41-60.
- xxi. Jay (1992) p 37.
- xxii. Jay (1992) p28.
- xxiii. Weber, Max 1922/1963, *The Sociology of Religion*, translated by Epraim Fischhoff. Boston, Beacon Press, 104-105.
- xxiv. Jay (1992) pages .41-60.
- xxv. The sex of significant ancestors was also identified by Peggy Sanday as an important predictor of women's overall status and would be most clearly linked to a patrilineal sense of connection
- xxvi. White (1979). This is a stratified purposive sample of the 186 societies drawn from the Human Relations Area files. One half-the odd numbers in this case are used to further control for diffusion. . Levinson and Malone (1980) identify this sample as the most representative of pre-modern societies. Naroll, Michik and Naroll (1976) say that testing a hypothesis on a sample of pre-modern societies is known as holocultural analysis
- xxvii. I realize that most feminist religious deconstructions are usually qualitative; they do not count or look to statistics to support their conclusions. But I think that many feminist scholars of religion can ask many new questions of preexisting quantitative (numbered and coded) data and gain insight into some current issues being discussed
- xxviii. Welch (1982)
- xxix. Coltrane (1988) and Ross (1986).
- xxx. Pasternak, Ember and Ember (1997) p 44-65.
- xxxi. Neilson (1990) p.29
- xxxii. Sacks (1979)
- xxxiii. Coontz , Stephanie and Peta Henderson. (1986).
- xxxiv. Spain (1992)
- xxxv. Spain (1992) 101-103.
- xxxvi. These rituals were general religious rituals, that one would expect most persons could participate in, not rituals that Martin Whyte expected to be sex segregated such as age segregated rituals of a religious nature
- xxxvii. Hosmer and Lemeshow (1989)
- xxxviii. Jay (1992) p.60.
- xxxix. Ambilineality is where sons inherit from fathers and daughters inherit from mothers.
- xl. Jay (1992).

xli. Zikmund et al. (1998) p 7-15.

xlii. See Reisbrodt and Kelly Chong (1999). Chaves (1997). Clark and Feldman (1996), Bendroth (1993), Reisbordt (1990), for examples of this. .

xliii. Anderson

xliv. Hosmer, David and Stanley Lemeshow, (1986).