

in the sense that they represent a fixed constellation of traits. Each one is an empirical characterization, and probably is not duplicated in its entirety anywhere else in the world. Nothing could be more unfortunate than an effort to characterize all cultures as exponents of a limited number of fixed and selected types. Categories become a liability when they are taken as inevitable and applicable alike to all civilizations and all events. The aggressive, paranoid tendencies of Dobu and the Northwest Coast are associated with quite different traits in these two cultures. There is no fixed constellation. The Apollonian emphases in Zuñi and in Greece had fundamentally different developments. In Zuñi the virtue of restraint and moderation worked to exclude from their civilization all that was of a different nature. Greek civilization, however, is unintelligible without recognizing the Dionysian compensations it also institutionalized. There is no 'law,' but several different characteristic courses which a dominant attitude may take.

Patterns of culture which resemble each other closely may not choose the same situations to handle in terms of their dominant purposes. In modern civilization the man who is ruthless in business competition is often a considerate husband and an indulgent father. The obsessive pursuit of success in Western civilization is not extended to family life to anything like the same degree that is developed in commercial life. The institutions surrounding the two activities are contrasted to an extent that is not true, for instance, in Dobu. Conjugal life in Dobu is actuated by the same motives as Kula trading. Even gardening in Dobu is an appropriation of other gardeners' yam tubers. But gardening is often a routine activity that is little affected whatever the pattern of the culture may be; it is a situation to which the dominant motives are not extended, or in which they are curtailed.

This unevenness in the extent to which behaviour is