

78. Hatfield, E., Rapson, R. L., & Martel, L.D. (in press). "Passionate Love." In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.) *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*. New York: Guilford Press.

## **Passionate Love and Sexual Desire**

Elaine Hatfield, Richard L. Rapson, and Lise D. Martel

University of Hawai'i

### **I. Introduction**

Passionate love is a universal emotion, experienced by almost all people, in all historical eras, and in all the world's cultures (see Fischer, Shaver, & Carnochan, 1990; Shaver, Morgan, & Wu, 1996). Yet, despite its universality, culture has been found to have a profound impact on people's definitions of love and on the way they think, feel, and behave in romantic settings. Cross-cultural studies provide a glimpse into the complex world of emotion and allow us to gain an understanding of the extent to which people's emotional lives are written in their cultural and personal histories as well as "writ in their genes" and evolutionary history and in the interaction of the two (Tooby & Cosmides, 1992).

### **II. Passionate and Companionate Love**

#### **A. Defining Love**

Poets, novelists, and social commentators have proposed numerous definitions of love. Ahdaf Soueif (1999), an Arab novelist, once poetically described the multitude of meanings that "love" possesses in Arabic:

*"Hubb" is love, "ishq" is love that entwines two people together, "shaghaf" is love that nests in the chambers of the heart, "hayam" is love that wanders the earth, "teeh" is love in which you lose yourself, "walah" is love that carries sorrow within it, "sababah" is love that exudes from your pores, "hawa" is love that shares its name with "air" and with "falling", "gharm" is love that is willing to pay the price. (pp. 386-387)*

Cultural theorists have long been interested in the impact of culture on the meaning that young men and women ascribe to “love.” Scholars usually distinguish between two kinds of love: “passionate love” and “companionate love.” (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993)

*Passionate love* (sometimes called “obsessive love,” “infatuation,” “lovesickness,” or “being-in-love”) is a powerful emotional state. It has been defined as:

A state of intense longing for union with another. Passionate love is a complex functional whole including appraisals or appreciations, subjective feelings, expressions, patterned physiological processes, action tendencies, and instrumental behaviors. Reciprocated love (union with the other) is associated with fulfillment and ecstasy. Unrequited love (separation) is associated with feelings of emptiness, anxiety, and despair. (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, p. 5)

People in all cultures recognize the power of passionate love. In South Indian Tamil families, for example, a person who falls head-over-heels in love with another is said to be suffering from *mayakkam*—dizziness, confusion, intoxication, and delusion. The wild hopes and despairs of love are thought to “mix you up.” (Trawick, 1990)

The *Passionate Love Scale* was designed to tap into the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral indicants of such longings. (Hatfield & Sprecher, 1986) The *PLS* has been found to be a useful measure of passionate love with men and women of all ages, in a variety of cultures, and has been found to correlate well with certain well-defined patterns

of neural activation (see Bartels & Zeki, 2000, 2004; Doherty, Hatfield, Thompson, & Choo, 1994; Fisher, 2003; Landis & O'Shea, 2000.)

*Companionate love* is a far less intense emotion. It combines feelings of attachment, commitment, and intimacy (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993.) It has been defined as:

The affection and tenderness we feel for those with whom our lives are deeply entwined. (Hatfield & Rapson, 1993, p. 9)

Psychologists have used a variety of scales to measure companionate love. Since Sternberg (1988) postulated that companionate relationships require both commitment and intimacy, many researchers have assessed such love by measuring those two components.

*Other Definitions of Love:* Scientists have proposed a variety of definitions and typologies of love (see Hendrick & Hendrick, 1989; Shaver & Hazan, 1988; Sternberg, 1988.) According to Sternberg (1988), for example, types of love are determined by various combinations of passion, intimacy, and commitment. Possible combinations result in Romantic Love, Infatuation, Companionate Love, Liking, Fatuous Love, Empty Love, and Consummate Love.

In this chapter we will focus on passionate love; we will touch upon other varieties of love only briefly, if at all.

### **III. Theoretical Understandings of Passionate Love**

#### **A. Anthropological Perspectives on Passionate Love**

Passionate love is as old as humankind. The Sumerian love fable of Inanna and Dumuzi, for example, was spun by tribal storytellers in 2,000 BCE. (Wolkstein, 1991)

Today, most anthropologists argue that passionate love is a universal experience, transcending culture and time (Buss, 1994; Hatfield & Rapson, 1996; Jankowiak, 1995; Tooby & Cosmides, 1992).

Jankowiak and Fischer (1992) drew a sharp distinction between “romantic passion” and “simple lust.” They proposed that both passion and lust are universal feelings. Drawing on a sampling of tribal societies from the *Standard Cross-Cultural Sample*, they found that in almost all of these far flung societies, young lovers talked about passionate love, recounted tales of love, sang love songs, and spoke of the longings and anguish of infatuation. When passionate affections clashed with parents’ or elders’ wishes, young couples often eloped.

Social anthropologists have explored folk conceptions of love in such diverse cultures as The People’s Republic of China, Indonesia, Turkey, Nigeria, Trinidad, Morocco, and the Fulbe of North Cameroun, the Mangrove (an aboriginal Australian community), the Mangaia in the Cook Islands, Palau in Micronesia, and the Taita of Kenya (see Jankowiak, 1995, for a review of this research.) In all these studies, people’s conceptions of passionate love appear to be surprisingly similar.

Anthropologists have also been interested in the kinds of societies in which our primate ancestors lived. Sommer (1993), for example, asked a challenging question: Did our ancient *Homo sapiens* ancestors live in monogamous, polygamous, polyandrous, or polygynandrous communities? (In monogamy, a man and woman marry—usually for a lifetime. In polygamy, one man may possess many wives; in polyandry, one woman may take several husbands. In polygynandry, or “promiscuous” mating, men and women may mate at will.)

After observing many kinds of primates, Sommer discovered that it is easy to predict what sort of sexual mating arrangements a primate species will adopt. All he needed to know were four facts: (1) in that species, who is bigger—the males or the females? (2) how much do the males' testes weigh? (3) do females have sexual swellings (which signal sexual receptivity and fertility)? and (4) how long does sexual intercourse last? (The scientists found, for example, that in monogamous species such as gibbons, males and females are generally about the same size. In polygynous species such as orangutans (where successful males must physically dominate their rivals), males are much larger than their mates.

When Sommer classified *Homo sapiens* on these four characteristics, his calculations led him to conclude that although our human forebears *may* have been monogamous, the odds are that they were polygynous.<sup>1</sup> There is no chance that they were either polyandrous or polygynandrous.

What about our more immediate ancestors? How did they live? On the basis of her calculations, Fisher (1989) concluded that throughout the world, although (in theory) most societies are polygynous, in fact, the overwhelming majority of married men and women are actually in monogamous marriages. Fisher studied the marital arrangements of the 853 societies sampled in the *Ethnographic Atlas*. (The *Atlas* contains anthropological information on more than 1,000 representative pre-industrial societies throughout the world.) She found that although almost all societies (84%)

---

<sup>1</sup> Arguing that in prehistory people might have been monogamous is the fact that today men and women are fairly similar in size. Arguing (more strongly) that our ancestors were polygamous are the facts that: (1) men are generally taller and stronger than are women. (2) Since selection is based on physical strength and body mass, not sperm competition, men's testes are fairly small. (3) women do not possess sexual swellings. (4) Sexual intercourse can last fairly long, since there are not many rivals competing for access.

permitted polygyny, men rarely exercised this option. (Only about 10% of men possessed more than one wife. Most possessed just one wife. A few were unmarried.) In 16% of societies, monogamy was prescribed. Polyandry was extremely rare. Only 0.5% of societies permitted polyandry. In recent years, however, theorists such as Wilson and Daly (1992) have observed that in humankind's long evolutionary history, although in theory men and women are "supposed" to be faithful to one partner, there were many situations in which it was to a man or woman's benefit to break the rules and "mate poach." Thus, humans are likely to possess a variety of cognitive structures designed to deal with a multitude of contingencies (See Barkow, Cosmides & Tooby, 1992, Hrdy, 1999, and Wilson & Daly, 1992; for a discussion of the factors that made and make it advantageous (or costly) for men and women to seek a variety of sexual partners.)

### **B. Genetic and Biological Perspectives on Love**

Recently, social psychologists, neuro-scientists, and physiologists have begun to explore the links between love, sexual desire, and sexual behavior.

The first neuroscientists to study passionate love using fMRI techniques were Birbaumer and his colleagues (1993). They concluded passionate love was "mental chaos." More recently, Bartels and Zeki (2000, 2004) studied the neural bases of passionate love using fMRI (brain imaging) techniques. They interviewed young men and women from 11 countries and several ethnic groups who claimed to be "truly, deeply, and madly" in love and who scored high on the *Passionate Love Scale (PLS)*. The authors concluded that passionate love leads to a suppression of activity in the areas of the brain controlling critical thought; they argue that once we get close to

someone, there is less need to assess their character and personality in a negative way. Passion also produced increased activity in the brain areas associated with euphoria and reward, and decreased levels of activity in the areas associated with distress and depression. Activity seemed to be restricted to foci in the medial insula and the anterior cingulate cortex and, subcortically, in the caudate nucleus, and the putamen, all bilaterally. Deactivations were observed in the posterior cingulate gyrus and in the amygdala and were right-lateralized in the prefrontal, parietal, and middle temporal cortices.

The conclusion?

We conclude that human attachment employs a push-pull mechanism that overcomes social distance by deactivating networks used for critical social assessment and negative emotions, while it bonds individuals through the involvement of the reward circuitry, explaining the power of love to motivate and exhilarate (Bartels & Zeki, 2004, p. 1155).

The authors also found passionate love and sexual arousal to be tightly linked.

Other psychologists who have studied the links between passionate love and sexual desire (using fMRI techniques) have found similar results. Fisher and her colleagues (2003, 2004), for example, investigated the brain chemistry of men and women passionately in love (again using the *PLS* scale) and found that passionate love markedly increased sexual motivation.

In parallel with this research, a number of social psychologists, neurobiologists, and physiologists have begun to explore the neural and chemical substrates of passionate

love, sexual desire, and sexual mating (Carter, 1998; Komisaruk, 1998; Marazziti et al., 1999; Marazziti & Canale, 2004.)

Scientists interested in the chemistry of passionate love have found that a variety of neurochemicals shape passionate love and sexual desire. According to Fisher (2004) for example, romantic love is associated with the natural stimulant dopamine and perhaps norepinephrine and serotonin. Lust is associated primarily with the hormone testosterone in both men and women. (Estrogen may decrease desire.) Attachment is produced primarily by the hormones oxytocin and vasopressin (see also Hyde, 2005; Marazziti & Canale, 2004; Regan & Berscheid, 1999.)

Psychologists may differ on whether romantic and passionate love are or are not emotions (Aron, et al., in press; Shaver, Morgan, & Wu, S., 1996) and whether passionate love, sexual desire, and sexual motivation are closely related constructs (both neurobiologically or physiologically) or very different in their nature (Aron, et al., in press; Diamond, 2004; Hatfield & Rapson, 1987). Nonetheless, this path-breaking research has the potential to answer age-old questions as to the nature of culture, love, and human sexuality.

In spite of the fact that anthropologists, neurobiologists, and physiologists consider passionate love to be a pan-human characteristic—an emotion thought to exist in all cultures and in all historical eras—culture has been found to exert a profound impact on people's romantic and sexual attitudes, emotions, and behaviors.

### **C. Historical Perspectives on Love**

Any time scholars begin talking glibly about “cultural universals,” historians tend to react with skepticism. Historians prefer to emphasize the multiplicity, variability, and



mutability of human behavior. They shy away from all single-cause explanations for how cultures and individuals work, and they revel in complexity, movement, and change.

Not surprising then, when it comes to romance, historians invariably note that passionate attitudes and behaviors have varied dramatically from one culture to another or from one temporal period to the next. Some typical examples: The sage Vatsayana advised men and women to marry for love; the Medieval church condemned such sinful indulgence. The early Egyptians practiced birth control and some Polynesians practiced infanticide; the Classical Greeks rewarded couples who were willing to conceive. The Eskimos considered it hospitable to share their wives with visitors; the Muslims jealousy locked their wives and concubines away in harems. Sumerian and Babylonian temples were staffed by priests, priestesses, and sacred prostitutes; the ancient Hebrews stoned “godless” prostitutes. Hellenes idealized the pure sexual love between older men and young boys; the Aztecs punished homosexuality by tying men to logs, disemboweling them, covering them with ash, and incinerating them. (Tannahill, 1980)

Historians have also documented how profoundly a society’s attitudes toward love, sex, and intimacy can alter over time. Consider China. China possesses an ancient culture. Its archeological record begins 5,000 years ago in the *Hongshan* (Red Mountain) dynasty. Its historical record begins 4,000 years ago in the *Xia* (or First Dynasty). The oldest Chinese medical texts on love and sexuality date from 168 BCE.

Traditionally, Chinese history is divided into three periods: the Formative Age (Prehistory-206 BCE), the Early Empire (206 BCE-960 CE), and the Later Empire (960-1911 CE). The Chinese historian Ruan (1991,) argued that during the first 4,000 years of Chinese history, attitudes toward passionate love and sexual desire were generally

positive—although hardly uniform and unchanging during these epochs. Medical texts dating back to 168 BCE make it clear that the ancients assumed that love and sexual pleasure were two of the great joys of life. In the Late Empire (1,000 years ago), during the Sung dynasty, the Neo-Confucianists gained political and religious power, and Chinese attitudes began to alter, gradually becoming more and more negative and repressive concerning sex. Displays of love outside marriage were forbidden, and erotic art and literature were often burned.

When the People's Republic of China was established in 1949, Communist officials imposed even tighter controls on love and "inappropriate" sexual activity. On a visit to Beijing, Money (1977) reported: "I came across a slogan: 'Making love is a mental disease that wastes time and energy.'"

Gil (1992) noted:

A puritanical, if not heavy-handed, sexual "primness" became firmly established. . . This included a denial of romantic love, the affirmation of the absolute role of the collective over the individual as a basic tenet toward which one should direct any affections. The Great Leap Forward demanded, in Communist parlance, the "renunciation of the heart." Party policy deliberately constructed an altruism which sought (for every man and woman) hard work during the day, without being "deflected or confused" by love, sexual desire, or any strivings for private happiness (p. 571).

Today, of course, in China as throughout much of the rest of the world, the winds of change are wafting. Young people—perhaps as a consequence of globalization (as

evidenced in the availability of international cinema, the Web, world travel, MTV)—are adopting more “liberal” or “worldly” views of passionate love, sexual desire, marriage for love (rather than arranged marriages,) and romantic and sexual diversity. In China, then, things appear to have come full circle.

Historical research, then, reminds us that, throughout time, people have embraced very different attitudes toward romantic and passionate love, have ascribed very different meanings to “love,” have desired very different traits in romantic partners, and have differed markedly in whether such feelings were to be proclaimed to the world or hidden in the deepest recesses of the heart. In the real world, human sexual attitudes and behavior seem forever in flux.

#### **D. Culture and Passionate Love**

Americans are preoccupied with love—or so cross-cultural observers once claimed. In a famous quip, Linton (1936) once mocked Americans for their naïve idealization of romantic love and their assumption that romantic love was a prerequisite to marriage:

All societies recognize that there are occasional violent, emotional attachments between persons of opposite sex, but our present American culture is practically the only one which has attempted to capitalize these, and make them the basis for marriage. . . . The hero of the modern American movie is always a romantic lover, just as the hero of the old Arab epic is always an epileptic. A cynic may suspect that in any ordinary population the percentage of individuals with a capacity for romantic love

of the Hollywood type was about as large as that of persons able to throw genuine epileptic fits. (p. 175)

Throughout the world, a spate of commentators have echoed Linton's claim that the idealization of passionate love is a peculiarly Western institution.

*A bit of background:* The world's cultures differ profoundly in the extent to which they emphasize individualism or collectivism (although some cross-cultural researchers would focus on related concepts: independence or interdependence, modernism or traditionalism, urbanism or ruralism, affluence or poverty).

Individualistic cultures such as the United States, Britain, Australia, Canada, and the countries of Northern and Western Europe tend to focus on personal goals. Collectivist cultures such as China, many African and Latin American nations, Greece, southern Italy, and the Pacific Islands, on the other hand, press their members to subordinate personal interests to those of the group (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990). Triandis and his colleagues (1990) point out that in individualistic cultures, young people are allowed to "do their own thing;" in collectivist cultures, the group comes first.

Hsu (1953 and 1985) and Doi (1963 and 1973) contend that passionate love is a Western phenomenon, almost unknown in China and Japan . . . and so incompatible with Asian values and customs that it is unlikely ever to gain a foothold among young Asians. Hsu (1953) writes: "An American asks, 'How does my heart feel?' A Chinese asks, 'What will other people say?'" (p. 50). Hsu points out that the Chinese generally use the term "love" to describe not a respectable, socially sanctioned relationship, but an *illicit* liaison between a man and a woman.

Chu (1985; Chu & Ju, 1993), too, argues that although in America, romantic love and compatibility are of paramount importance in mate selection, in China such things matter little. Traditionally, parents and go-betweens arranged young peoples' marriages. Parents' primary concern is not love and compatibility but *men tang hu tui*. Do the families possess the same social status? Are *they* compatible? Will the marriage bring some social or financial advantage to the two families?

On the basis of such testimony, cross-cultural researchers proposed that romantic love would be common only in modern, industrialized countries. It should be less valued in traditional cultures with strong, extended family ties (Simmons, Vom Kolke, & Shimizu, 1986.) It should be more common in modern, industrialized countries than in developing countries (Goode, 1959; Rosenblatt, 1967.)

In recent years, cultural researchers have begun to test these provocative hypotheses.

#### **IV. Recent Research on Culture and Passionate Love**

Recently, cultural researchers have begun to investigate the impact (if any) of culture on people's definitions of love, what they desire in romantic partners, their likelihood of falling in love, the intensity of their passion, and their willingness to acquiesce in arranged marriages *versus* insisting on marrying for love. From this preliminary research, it appears that although the differences cultural theorists have observed do in fact exist, oft times, cultures turn out to be more similar than one might expect. Let us now turn to this research.

##### **A. The Meaning of Passionate Love**

Recently, Shaver, Wu, and Schwartz (1991) interviewed young people in America, Italy, and the People's Republic of China about their emotional experiences. They found that Americans and Italians tended to equate love with happiness and to assume that both passionate and companionate love were intensely positive experiences. Students in Beijing, China, possessed a darker view of love. In the Chinese language, there are few "happy-love" words; love is associated with sadness. Not surprisingly, then, the Chinese men and women interviewed by Shaver and his colleagues tended to associate passionate love with such ideographic words as infatuation, unrequited love, nostalgia, and sorrow love.

Other cultural researchers agree that cultural values may, indeed, have a profound impact on the subtle shadings of meaning assigned to the construct of "love." (Cohen, in press; Kim & Hatfield, 2004; Kitayama, 2002; Luciano, E. M. C., 2003; Nisbet, 2003; Oyserman, Kimmelmeier, & Coon, 2002; Weaver & Ganong, 2004.)

There is, however, considerable debate as to how ubiquitous and how important such differences are. When social psychologists explored folk conceptions of love in a surprising variety of cultures—including the People's Republic of China, Indonesia, Micronesia, Palau, and Turkey, —they found that people in the various cultures possessed surprisingly similar views of love and other "feelings of the heart" (see Fischer, Wang, Kennedy, & Cheng, 1998; Jankowiak, 1995; Kim and Hatfield, 2004; Shaver, Murdaya, & Fraley, 2001, for a review of this research.) In a typical study, for example, Shaver, Murdaya, and Fraley (2001) argued that love and "sexual mating, reproduction, parenting, and maintaining relationships with kin and reciprocally altruistic relationships with friends and neighbors are fundamental issues for humans (p. 219-220.)

To test the notion that passionate and companionate love are cultural universals, they conducted a “prototype” study to (1) determine what Indonesian (as compared to American) men and women considered to be “basic” emotions, and (2) the meaning they ascribed to these emotions. Starting with 404 Indonesian “perasaan hati” (Emotion names or “feelings of the heart,”) they asked people to sort the words into basic emotion categories. As predicted, the Indonesians came up with the same five emotions that Americans consider to be basic: joy, love, sadness, fear, and anger. Furthermore, when asked about the meanings of “love,” Indonesian men and women (like their American counterparts) were able to distinguish passionate love (“asmara,” or sexual/desire/arousal) from companionate love (“*cinta*” or affection/liking/fondness.) There were some differences in the American and Indonesian lexicons, however. The authors note:

The Indonesian conception of love may place more emphasis on yearning and desire than the American conception, perhaps because the barriers to consummation are more formidable in Indonesia, which is a more traditional and mostly Muslim country. (p. 219.)

Much more research needs to be done, of course, before scientists can state this conclusion with any certainty.

Perhaps love is, indeed, a cultural universal. Or perhaps the times they are ‘a changing. One impact of globalization (and the ubiquitous MTV, Hollywood and Bollywood movies, chat rooms, and foreign travel) may be to ensure that when people speak of “passionate love,” they are talking about much the same thing.

## **B. What Men and Women Desire in Romantic Partners**

Since Darwin's (1871) classic treatise on *The Descent of Man*, evolutionary theorists have been interested in mate preferences. Many evolutionary psychologists contend that there are cultural universals in what men and women desire in a mate.

This contention is supported by a landmark cross-cultural study conducted by Buss (1994). Buss asked over 10,000 men and women from 37 countries, to indicate what characteristics they sought in potential mates. These people came from a variety of geographic, cultural, political, ethnic, religious, racial, economic, and linguistic groups. Buss and his colleagues found that, overall, the single trait that men and women in all societies valued most was "mutual attraction-love." After that, men and women cared next about finding someone who possessed a dependable character, emotional stability and maturity, and a pleasing disposition. Men tended to care more about the physical appearance and youth of their partners than did women; women tended to be more insistent that their mates possess high status and the resources necessary to protect themselves and their children than did men.

Buss was interested in cultural and gender universals; nonetheless, he could not help but be struck by the powerful impact that culture had on other mentioned preferences. In China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel (the Palestinian Arabs), and Taiwan, for example, young people were insistent that their mate should be "chaste." In Finland, France, Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden, and West Germany, on the other hand, most judged chastity to be relatively unimportant. A few respondents even jotted notes in the margin of the questionnaire, indicating that, for them, chastity would be a *disadvantage*.

In an alternative analysis of Buss's (1994) data, Wallen (1989) attempted to determine which was the most important—culture or gender—in shaping people's mate



preferences. He found that for some traits—such as good looks and financial prospects—gender had a great influence on preferences. (While gender accounted for 40%-45% of the variance, geographical origin accounted for only 8%-17% of the variance.) For other traits—such as chastity, ambition, and preferred age—on the other hand, culture mattered most. (In those instances, gender accounted for only 5%-16% of the variance, whereas geographical origin accounted for 38%-59% of the variance.) Wallen concluded that, in general, the cultural perspective may well be even more powerful than evolutionary heritage in understanding mate selection.

Cultural researchers provide additional evidence that in different cultural, national, and ethnic groups, people often desire very different things in romantic, sexual, or marital partners. Hatfield and Sprecher (1996), for example, studied three powerful, modern, and industrial societies—the United States, Russia, and Japan. Men and women in Western, individualistic cultures (such as the United States and to some extent Russia) expected far more from their marriages than did couples in a collectivist culture (such as Japan).

As we observed earlier, cultural theorists have predicted that cultural rules should exert a profound impact on the commonness of passionate feelings within a culture, how intensely passion is experienced, and how people attempt to deal with these tumultuous feelings. Alas, the sparse existing data, provide only minimal support for this intriguing and plausible sounding hypothesis.

### **C. The Likelihood of Being-in-Love**

Sprecher and her colleagues (1994) interviewed 1,667 men and women in the United States, Russia, and Japan. Based on notions of individualism versus collectivism,

the authors predicted that American men and women would be most vulnerable to love, the Japanese the least likely to be “love besotted.” The authors found that they were wrong. In fact, 59% of American college students, 67% of Russians, and 53% of Japanese students said they were in love at the time of the interview. In all three cultures, men were slightly less likely than were women to be in love. There was no evidence, however, that individualistic cultures breed young men and women who are more love-struck than do collectivist societies.

Similarly, surveys of Mexican-American, Chinese-American, and Euro-American students have found that in a variety of ethnic groups, young men and women show similarly high rates of “being in love” at the present time. (Aron & Rodriguez, 1992; Doherty, Hatfield, Thompson, & Choo, 1994).

#### **D. The Intensity of Passionate Love**

Cultures also seem to share more similarities than differences in the *intensity* of passionate love they experience. In one study, Hatfield and Rapson (1996) asked men and women of European, Filipino, and Japanese ancestry to complete the *Passionate Love Scale*. To their surprise, they found that men and women from the various ethnic groups seemed to love with equal passion. Their results were confirmed by a study done by Doherty and his colleagues (1994) with European-American, Chinese-Americans, Filipino-American, Japanese-American, and Pacific Islanders.

### **V. Love and Marriage**

In the West, before 1700, no society ever equated *le grand passion* with marriage. In the 12<sup>th</sup> century, in *The Art of Courtly Love*, for example, Andreas Capellanus (1174/1957) stated:

. . . everybody knows that love can have no place between husband and wife . . . . For what is love but an inordinate desire to receive passionately a furtive and hidden embrace? But what embrace between husband and wife can be furtive, I ask you, since they may be said to belong to each other and may satisfy all of each other's desires without fear that anybody will object? (p. 100).

And Capellanus wasn't even talking about passionate love—just love. To make his argument perfectly clear, he added: “We declare and we hold as firmly established that love cannot exert its powers between two people who are married to each other (p. 106).”

Shakespeare may have written a handful of romantic comedies in which passionately mismatched couples hurtled toward marriage, but his plays were the exception. Until 1500, most courtly love songs, plays, and stories assumed a darker ending—either passionate love was unrequited, unconsummated, or it spun down to family tragedy and the suicide or deaths of the lovers.

As late as 1540, Alessandro Piccolomini could write peremptorily that: “love is a reciprocity of soul and has a different end and obeys different laws from marriage. Hence one should not take the loved one to wife” (Hunt, 1959, p. 206). True to his times, Piccolomini, began to change his mind just before he died.

In the great societies of Asia—China, Japan, and India (lands of the arranged marriage)—at least since the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, thousands of *haiku* poems, *Noh* plays, and heroic legends later, the notion that passionate love and sexual desire go together with thwarted hopes for marriage and suicide has been embedded in the

Eastern psyche as an Eternal Truth. Classical tales recount the couple's journey together to the chosen place, leaving forever behind them familiar scenes, agonizing mental conflicts, and the last tender farewells (Mace & Mace, 1980).

To today's young individualistic Americans and Europeans, such tales of forbidden romance may seem ridiculous. But to Asian young romantics, who knew that passion had little chance of flowering into marriage, the tales were sublime tragedies.

In traditional cultures, it was the lovers who had to adapt, not society. Individual happiness mattered little; what was important was the well-being of the family and the maintenance of social order. As one modern Chinese woman asserted: "Marriage is not a relation for personal pleasure, but a contract involving the ancestors, the descendants, and the property" (Mace & Mace, 1980, p. 134).

In contemporary societies, however, East and West, most young men and women do meet, fall in love, feel sexual desire, and live together or marry. In this section, we will discuss the revolution that is occurring in the ways young men and women (heterosexual and homosexual) currently select their romantic, sexual, and marital partners. We will see that throughout the world parental power is crumbling and that arranged marriages are being replaced by the ideal of love marriages.

### **A. Arranged Marriages**

Throughout history, cultures have varied markedly in who possessed the power to select romantic, sexual, and marital partners.

As we have seen, in the distant past, in most societies, parents, kin, and the community usually had the power to arrange things as they chose. Marriage was assumed to be an alliance between two *families* (Dion & Dion, 1993; Lee & Stone,

1980). Families might also consult with religious specialists, oracles, and matchmakers (Rosenblatt & Anderson, 1981). When contemplating a union, parents, kin, and their advisors were generally concerned with a number of background questions. What was the young person's caste, status, family background, religion, and economic position? Did their family possess any property? How big was their dowry? Would they fit in with the entire family? In Indian families, for example, men and women observed that what their families cared most about in arranging a marriage was religion (whether one was a Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, or Christian), social class, education, and family background (Sprecher & Chandak, 1992). If things look promising, parents and go-betweens begin to talk about the exchange of property, dowries, the young couple's future obligations and their living arrangements.

Some problems were serious enough to rule out any thought of marriage. Sometimes religious advisors would chart the couples' horoscopes. Those born under the wrong sign may be forbidden to marry (Bumroongsook, 1992). Generally, young people were forbidden to marry anyone who was too closely related (say, a brother or sister or a certain kind of cousin). Sometimes, they were forbidden to marry foreigners. (In Thailand, Thais are often forbidden to marry Chinese, Indian, Japanese, Mons, or Malay suitors [Bumroongsook, 1992]).

Similar assets and liabilities have been found to be important in a variety of countries—such as India (Prakasa & Rao, 1979; Sprecher & Chandak, 1992), Japan (Fukuda, 1991), Morocco (Joseph & Joseph, 1987), and Thailand (Bumroongsook, 1992).

Today, in many parts of the world, parents and matchmakers still arrange their children's marriages. Arranged marriages are common in India, in the Muslim countries, in sub-Saharan Africa, and in cultural enclaves throughout the remainder of the world (Rosenblatt & Anderson, 1981).

### **B. Compromising on Love**

Cross-cultural surveys document the variety of types of mate selection systems that currently exist throughout the world (Goode, 1963; Goodwin, 1999; Rosenblatt, 1967; Stephens, 1963). These surveys indicate that currently, in most of the world, prospective brides and grooms, parents, elders, and the extended family consult with one another before arranging a marriage.

The *Ethnographic Atlas* contains anthropological information on more than 1,000 preindustrial societies throughout the world. When Broude and Green (1983) sampled 186 of these groups, they found that in most societies, parents, kin, and young men and women are supposed to consult with one another in this most important of family decisions. In most societies, men have considerably more power than do women to determine their own fates. In only in a minority of societies are men and women allowed complete power in choosing their own mates.

Today, even in the most traditional of societies, parents and husbands are generally forced to balance conflicting interests. The Moroccan tribal world, for example, is definitely a man's world. Men possess absolute authority over their wives and children. They possess the power take several wives. They often promise their sons and daughters to potential allies at very young ages. Yet, in families, things do not always go as they are "supposed" to go; men may possess all the power in theory, but in

fact they do not. Joseph and Joseph's (1987) vivid descriptions of Moroccan family life make it clear that even in Morocco compromise is often required. When "all powerful" Moroccan fathers try to force their children into unappealing marriages, sympathetic family members may employ an avalanche of strategies to thwart them. Young lovers may enlist an army of mothers, uncles, brothers, neighbors, and business partners to plead, threaten, and haggle on their behalf. Mothers may warn prospective brides about their son's "faults." Young men may complain that an undesirable bride is a witch. Young men and women may threaten to kill themselves. Many young men and women rely on witchcraft or magical charms to get their way. Sometimes these desperate stratagems work, sometimes they don't.

Within a single society, arrangements often vary from ethnic group to ethnic group, class to class, region to region, and family to family (Bumroongsook, 1992).

### **C. Marriage for Love**

In the West, romantic love has long been considered to be the *sine qua non* of marriage. (Kelley, et al., 1983; Sprecher, et al., 1994)

In the mid-1960s, Kephart (1967) asked more than 1,000 American college students: "If a boy (girl) had all the other qualities you desired, would you marry this person if you were not in love with him (her)?" In that era, men and women were found to possess very different ideas as to how important romantic love was in a marriage. Men considered passion to be essential (only 35% of them said they would marry someone they did not love). Women were more practical. They claimed that the absence of love would not necessarily deter them from considering marriage. (A full 76% of them admitted they would be willing to marry someone they did not love.) Kephart suggested

that while men might have the luxury of marrying for love, women did not. A woman's status was dependent on her husband's; thus, she had to be practical and take a potential mate's family background, professional status, and income into account.

Since the 1960s, sociologists have continued to ask young American men and women about the importance of romantic love. They have found that, year-by-year, young American men and women are coming to increasingly value and demand more and more of love. In the most recent research, 86% of American men and a full 91% of American women answered the question as to whether they would wed without love with a resounding "No!" (Allgeier & Wiederman, 1991). Obviously, in the West, romantic love *is* considered to be a prerequisite for marriage. Today, American men and women assume that romantic love is so important that they claim that if they fell out of love, they would not even consider *staying* married! (Simpson, Campbell, & Berscheid, 1986). Some social commentators have suggested that with more experience these young romantics might find that they are willing to "settle" for less than they think they would, but as yet there is no evidence to indicate that this is so.

How do young men and women in other countries feel about this issue? Many cultural psychologists have pointed out that cultural values have a profound impact on how people feel about the wisdom of love matches versus arranged marriages.

Throughout the world, arranged marriages are still relatively common. It seems reasonable to argue that in societies such as China (Pimentel, 2000; Xu & Whyte, 1990), India (Sprecher & Chandak, 1992) and Japan (Sprecher, et al, 1994) where arranged marriages are fairly typical, they ought to be viewed more positively than in the West, where they are relatively rare.



To test this notion, Sprecher and her colleagues (1994), asked American, Russian, and Japanese students: “If a person had all the other qualities you desired, would you marry him/her if you were not in love?” (Students could answer only yes or no.) The authors assumed that only Americans would demand love *and* marriage; they predicted that both the Russians and the Japanese would be more practical. They were wrong! Both the Americans and the Japanese were romantics. Few of them would consider marrying someone they did not love. (Only 11% of Americans and 18% of the Japanese said “Yes”). The Russians were more practical; 37% of them said they would accept such a proposal. Russian *men* were only slightly more practical than were men in other countries. It was the Russian *women* who were most likely to “settle.”

Despite the larger proportion of Russian women willing to enter a loveless marriage, it remains that a large majority of individuals in the three cultures would refuse to marry someone they do not love.

Similarly, in a landmark study, Levine and his colleagues (1995) asked college students in 11 different nations if they would be willing to marry someone they did not love even if that person had all the other qualities they desired. (Students could answer “yes” or “no” or admit that they were “undecided”). In affluent nations such as the United States, Brazil, Australia, Japan, and England young people were insistent on love as a prerequisite for marriage. Only in traditional, collectivist, third world nations such as the Philippines, Thailand, India, and Pakistan were students willing to compromise and marry someone they did not love. In these societies, of course, the extended family is still extremely important and poverty widespread.

Research suggests that today, young men and women in many countries throughout the world consider love to be a prerequisite for courtship and marriage. It is primarily in Eastern, collectivist, and poorer countries that passionate love remains a bit of a luxury.

### **VI. How Long Does Passionate Love Last?**

Passion sometimes burns itself out. Consider this exchange between anthropologist Shostak (1981) and a !Kung (African) tribesman, who were observing a young married couple, running after each other:

As I stood watching, I noticed the young man sitting in the shade of a tree, also watching. I said, “They're very much in love, aren't they?” He answered, “Yes, they are.” After a pause, he added, “For now.” I asked him to explain, and he said, “When two people are first together, their hearts are on fire and their passion is very great. After a while, the fire cools and that's how it stays.” . . . “They continue to love each other, but it's in a different way—warm and dependable.” . . . How long did this take? “It varies among couples. A few months, usually; sometimes longer. But it always happens.” Was it also true for a lover? “No,” he explained, “feelings for a lover stay intense much longer, sometimes for years.” (p. 268).

Fisher (2004) argues that the transient nature of passionate love is a cultural universal. She believes that our *Homo Sapien* ancestors experienced passionate love and sexual desire for very practical genetic reasons. Our hominid ancestors were primed to fall ardently, sexually, in love for about four years. This is precisely the

amount of time it takes to conceive a child and take care of it until it is old enough to survive on its own. (In tribal societies, children are relatively self-sufficient by this age. By that time, they generally prefer to spend most of their time playing with other children.) Once our ancestors no longer had a practical reason to remain together, they had every evolutionary reason to fall out of love with their previous partner and to fall in love with someone new. Why were people programmed to engage in such serial pairbonding? Fisher maintained that such serial monogamy produces maximum genetic diversity, which is an evolutionary advantage. To test her hypothesis that generally, love is fleeting, Fisher (1989) examined the divorce rates in collecting/hunting societies, agricultural, pastoral, fishing, and industrial societies, scouring ethnographic records and the *Demographic Yearbooks* of the United Nations. She found that, as predicted, throughout the world, couples most commonly divorced in their fourth year of marriage. She argues that today the same evolutionary forces that influenced our ancestors shape the modern cross-cultural pattern of marriage/divorce/remarriage. Fisher's ideas are stimulating, but her exclusion of cultural forces, considering their omnipresence in nearly all matters related to love and sex, mandate a certain skepticism on the part of the reader.

## **VII. The Dark Side of Passionate Love—Jealousy**

What is jealousy? Social commentators have argued that jealousy consists of two basic components: bruised pride and indignation at the violation of one's property rights.

Anthropologist Mead (1931) contended that jealousy is really little more than wounded pride. The more shaky one's self-esteem, the more vulnerable one is to

jealousy's pangs. She observed: "Jealousy is not a barometer by which depth of love can be read. It merely records the degree of the lover's insecurity . . . it is a negative, miserable state of feeling, having its origin in the sense of insecurity and inferiority" (pp. 120-121). Researchers in the United States, Israel, and the Netherlands have found that people with low self-esteem *are* especially susceptible to jealousy (Bringle & Buunk, 1986; Nadler & Dotan, 1992; White & Mullen, 1989).

The French philosopher Rene Descartes, writing in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, defined jealousy as "a kind of fear related to a desire to preserve a possession (cited in Davis, 1948/1977, p. 129). Researchers in several countries have found that a loss—whether one thinks of one's romantic partner or mate as a beloved person or a mere possession—can stir up jealousy (White and Mullen, 1989). Researchers in Israel (Nadler & Dotan, 1992) and the Netherlands (Bringle & Buunk, 1986) have found that individuals experience the most jealousy and the most severe physiological reactions (trembling, increased pulse rate, nausea), when an affair poses a serious threat to their dating or marital relationship.

Berscheid and Fei (1977) provide evidence that both factors (low self-esteem and the fear of loss) are important in fueling jealous passion. They found that the more insecure men and women are, the more dependent they are on their romantic partners and mates, and the more seriously their relationship is threatened, the more fiercely jealous they will be.

## **A. Gender Differences in Jealousy: Evolutionary Theory**

### **1. What makes men and women jealous?**

Evolutionary psychologists such as Buss (1994), Tooby & Cosmides (1992), and Wilson and Daly (1992) argue that:

“The specifics of evolutionary biology have a central significance for understanding human thought and action. Evolutionary processes are the “architect” that assembled, detail by detail, our evolved psychological and physiological architecture.”

In attempting to understand cultural differences and the factors that predispose cultures to view love and emotional and sexual fidelity as more or less essential, we would do well to look to mankind’s evolutionary heritage and the adaptive problems our ancestors were attempting to solve in devising jealousy. Consider this example:

According to Buss (1994), in the course of evolution, men and women have been programmed to differ markedly in the kinds of things that incite jealousy. Men can never know for sure if the children they *think* are theirs, (and in which they choose to invest their all), are really their own. Thus, men should find sexual infidelity the most worrying. Women, on the other hand, know that any children they conceive are theirs. Thus, they should care far less about their mates’ sexual liaisons. What worries *them* is the possibility that their mates may be forming a *deep, emotional attachment* to a rival and squandering scarce resources on a rival.

As Wilson and Daly (1992) observe:

In the case of *Homo sapiens*, parental investments are often substantial, including allocations of time and effort and transfers of resources over the course of decades. Thus a major threat to a man’s fitness is the possibility that his mate may become pregnant by another man, especially if the

cuckold should fail to detect the fact and invest in the child as his own. If there is a corresponding threat to a woman's fitness . . . it is that her mate will channel resources to other women and their children. It follows that men's and women's proprietary feelings toward their mates are likely to have evolved to be qualitatively different, men being more intensely concerned with sexual infidelity per se and women being more intensely concerned with the allocation of their mates' resources and attentions (p. 292).

Scientists have also collected some sparse evidence that in men, cuckoldry and sexual infidelity incite the most jealousy, while in women, it is their husbands spending time talking, sharing common interests, or sharing resources with other women that is most upsetting (Buss and Schmitt, 1993; Glass & Wright, 1985).

## **2. How do Men and Women React to Jealous Provocations?**

Researchers have found that when men and women may react in somewhat different ways, to jealous provocation. Israeli psychologists Nadler and Dotan (1992), for example, found that when jealous, men tend to concentrate on shoring up their sagging self-esteem. Jealous women are more likely to try to do something to strengthen the relationship. Bryson (1977) speculated that these gender differences may well be due to the fact that most societies are patriarchal. It is acceptable for men to initiate relationships. Thus, when men are threatened, they can easily go elsewhere. Women do not have the same freedom. They therefore devote their energies to keeping the relationship from floundering. Studies in a variety of countries—including Israel

(Nadler & Dotan, 1992) and the Netherlands (Buunk, 1982)—have found that these same gender differences to exist in many parts of the world.

Alas, when Harris (2003) conducted a “meta analysis” of more than 100 studies designed to determine whether or not there were gender differences in what sparked jealousy, she found little support for this contention. Harris reviewed men and women’s self-reports and psychophysiological reactions, as well as data on morbid jealousy, spousal abuse, and jealousy-inspired homicides in a variety of jealousy provoking situations. In summarizing this voluminous research, she was forced to conclude: “The results provide little support for the claim that men and women are innately wired to be differentially upset by emotional and sexual infidelity” (p. 117). Jankowiak (1995) agrees. He argues that in all cultures men and women find both emotional or sexual infidelity extremely upsetting. It is male power, he contends, not innate gender differences that account for differences in men and women’s willingness to express their jealous feelings.

In attempting to explain why there might *not* be a sexual dimorphic sexual jealousy mechanism, Harris (2003) makes an important point: (1) Our ancestral past may have been significantly different from the one envisioned by evolutionary theorists, (2) Even if the adaptive problems were as described, more *general* jealousy mechanisms may have been selected for, rather than the hard-wired *specific module* postulated.

As, there exists no spaceship that will allow scientists to travel back to the Pleistocene, so we can observe how our hunter-gather forebears lived. In part, we scholars are forced to make up “just so” stories about the past—plausible stories, to be

sure, but stories none-the-less. In fact, evolutionary theorists *have* postulated many alternative views of love relationships during the Pleistocene. These include such ideas as: (1) Men invested very little in childrearing, versus (2) a significant paternal involvement in childbearing was a key factor in determining the number of viable offspring who lived to reproduce; thus men were motivated to devote a great deal of time, energy, and resources to childrearing. Harris (2002) lists a number of these possibilities. If the Pleistocene adaptive solutions were different than those we currently envision, it would of course, lead to different cognitive structures in today's men and women. Only if cultural and evolutionary theorists work hand-in-hand, will scientists be able to develop compelling theories of human behavior—theories that respect both the “architecture” of the past and the cultural challenges to be met by men and women of the future.

Let us now turn to some of the discoveries of cultural theorists in the area of jealousy.

### **B. Cultural Differences in Jealousy**

Anthropologists have noted that cultures differ markedly in what sets off jealousy, in how jealous people get, and in whether or not they have the power to do anything about it (Hupka & Ryan, 1990; Hupka, 1991).

**1. What sparks jealousy.** Men and women can use a number of clues to tell them that someone they love is drifting away. Hupka (1981) illustrated the point that cultures define very different things as threats to self-esteem, relationships, and property with this scenario:



On her return trip from the local watering well, a married woman is asked for a cup of water by a male resident of the village. Her husband, resting on the porch of their dwelling, observes his wife giving the man a cup of water. Subsequently, they approach the husband and the three of them enjoy a lively and friendly conversation into the late evening hours. Eventually the husband puts out the lamp, and the guest has sexual intercourse with the wife. The next morning the husband leaves the house early in order to catch fish for breakfast. Upon his return he finds his wife having sex again with the guest. The husband becomes violently enraged and mortally stabs the guest.

At what point in the vignette may one expect the husband to be jealous? It depends, of course, in which culture we place the husband. A husband of the Pawnee Indian tribe in the 19<sup>th</sup> century bewitched any man who dared to request a cup of water from his wife. . . . An Ammassalik Eskimo husband, on the other hand, offered his wife to a guest by means of the culturally sanctioned game of “putting out the lamp.” A good host was expected to turn out the lamp at night, as an invitation for the guest to have sexual intercourse with the wife. The Ammassalik, however, became intensely jealous when his wife copulated with a guest in circumstances other than the lamp game or without a mutual agreement between two families to exchange mates, and it was not unusual for the husband to kill the interloper.

The Toda of Southern India, who were primarily polyandrous at the turn of the century . . . would consider the sequence of events described in the vignette to be perfectly normal. That is to say, the husband would not have been upset to find his wife having sexual relations again in the morning if the man were her *mokhthodvaiol*. The Todas had the custom of *mokhthoditi* which allowed husbands and wives to take on lovers. When, for instance, a man wanted someone else's wife as a lover he sought the consent of the wife and her husband or husbands. If consent was given by all, the men negotiated for the annual fee to be received by the husband(s). The woman then lived with the man just as if she were his real wife. Or more commonly, the man visited the woman at the house of her husband(s).

It is evident from these illustrations that the culture of a society is a more potent variable than characteristics of the individual in predicting which events someone will evaluate as a threat (pp. 324-325).

Buunk and Hupka (1987) found that there are also cultural differences in the kinds of things that trigger jealousy in modern, industrialized nations. They interviewed 2,079 college students from seven industrialized nations—the United States, Hungary, Ireland, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia. (The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia no longer exist as nations.) Students were asked to take a look at several statements: *flirting* (“It does not bother me when I see my lover flirting with someone else”); *kissing* (“When I see my lover kissing someone else my stomach knots up”); *dancing* (“When my lover dances with someone else I feel very uneasy”); *hugging*

(“When somebody hugs my lover I get sick inside”); *sexual relationships* (“It would bother me if my partner frequently had satisfying sexual relations with someone else”); and *sexual fantasy* (“It is entertaining to hear the sexual fantasies my partner has about another person”). They were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed with each of these statements.

There were some striking cross-national similarities in the kinds of things that people found threatening or non-threatening. Behaviors such as dancing, hugging, and talking about sexual fantasies were taken in stride. Explicit erotic behavior—flirting, kissing, or having sexual relations with someone else—evoked strong jealousy.

There were some striking cultural differences in *exactly* what people found upsetting, however. United States citizens for example, took “hugging” for granted. They were about average in how upsetting they found the other activities to be. In the Netherlands, kissing, hugging, and dancing evoked less jealousy than in most other countries; but they got more upset by the idea of their partner's having sexual fantasies about other people than did others. In Yugoslavia flirting evoked a more negative emotional response than in any other country, but they were least concerned about sexual fantasies or kissing. The Hungarians found both hugging and kissing most provoking. Those from the Soviet Union were upset by dancing and sexual relations.

**The next step, Buunk and Hupka (1987) observe, is to find out why such cultural and cross-national differences exist.**

**2. Intensity of Jealousy.** Hupka and Ryan (1990; Hupka, 1991) argued that a culture's social structure should have a marked impact on how vulnerable its members were to jealousy. Consider two tribes—the Ammassalik Eskimos (known for their

extreme jealousy) and the Toda tribe of India (known for their startling lack of jealousy). The Ammassalik Eskimo family had to be completely self-sufficient (Mirsky, 1937). Each couple had to produce everything that they needed to survive—shelter, clothing, food, and utensils. Loners rarely survived the long, harsh Arctic winters. It is not surprising that to discover that the Ammassalik were eager, if not desperate, to find a competent mate. No wonder that those who did had problems with jealousy. A passionate rival was literally a threat to survival.

The Todas of India, on the other hand, had a clan economy (Rivers, 1906). Marriage was a luxury, not a necessity. (The most common form of marriage was fraternal polyandry: When a woman married, she became the wife of all her husband's brothers.) Not surprisingly, people did not distinguish much between their own children and those of other tribesmen. (Of course, men had no way of knowing who was the father of “their” children). Companions for friendship and for sex were easy to find. The clan worked together on most tasks and shared everything. The idea of “private” property did not really exist. Not surprisingly, in this society, jealousy was rare.

Hupka and Ryan argued that there was a simple explanation for such findings. In any culture, the more important marriage and private property are, the more jealous of potential romantic rivals will be the marital partners. To test this notion, the authors selected 150 tribal societies from those described in *The Human Relations Area Files*. The scientists then classified societies' political and economic customs: How important was it to be married? (Was it, for example, necessary for survival?) How easy was it to find sex outside of marriage? How important was private property? (Was everything

owned in common? Privately owned? Was theft punished?) How important was it to have children?

Next, the authors coded the extent of jealousy in each society. In some, men generally had little reaction when they heard their mates had been unfaithful. In others, such as the Maori of New Zealand (Mishkin, 1937), husbands demanded money or valuable property from their wives' lovers. If a Bakongo adulterer could not pay the compensation, he had to work the husband's fields as well as his own. This generally insured that he would be too exhausted to chase women (White & Mullen, 1989). In other cultures, infidelity was cause for separation or divorce. In some, the adulterous spouse or rival was banished or killed. For example, the ancient Hebrews would stone to death a married woman and her lover if the affair took place in the city. In the country, it was assumed the woman had been raped, but that no one had heard her screams; hence there only the man was killed (Murstein, 1974).

The authors found that culture, and the severity of the threat<sup>2</sup> that adultery posed in that culture, had a powerful impact on how men reacted to their wives' adultery. It was culture, not genes, that determined the nature of male response to news that their wives were having an affair. Would they react with a shrug, with indignation, or with murderous violence? Much depended on where they called home.

The data also highlighted the importance of power in determining how people respond to jealous provocation's. In most tribes, women, who were usually physically weaker than men, had less political and economic power. Although neither men nor women liked infidelity, only the men were in a position to do much about it. In general,

---

<sup>2</sup> The authors judged sexual dalliance to be most threatening if in that culture: (1) Marriage is required for companionship, status, or survival. (2) It is difficult to find sex outside of marriage. (3) Property is privately owned, and (4) It is important to have children.

women were “supposed” to respond to adultery with only the gentlest forms of aggression. They could express righteous indignation, cry, threaten to walk out, or divorce. The men were allowed to bring out the really big guns: when offended, to banish or murder their mates.

**3. How the Jealous React.** Salovey and Rodin (1985) surveyed 25,000 Americans (heterosexual, bisexual, and homosexual) from a variety of ethnic groups. How did they react the last time they were jealous? Although men and women differed little, heterosexuals (possibly because of their views of commitment) had a more passionate reaction than did their gay, lesbian, or bisexual peers to provocation. Whatever their gender and orientation, however, jealous lovers described a variety of jealous behaviors: They became obsessed with painful images of their beloved in the arms of their rivals. They sought out confirmation of their worst fears. They searched through their partner's personal belongings for unfamiliar names and telephone numbers. They telephoned their mates unexpectedly just to see if they were where they had said they would be. They listened in on their telephone conversations and followed them. They gave their mates the third degree about previous or present romantic relationships.

Anthropologists find that people throughout the world engage in similar kinds of detective work: The Dobuan husband watches his wife while she works the fields and counts her footsteps if she goes into the bush. Too many footsteps mean a possibility of a secret sexual liaison (Mead, 1931). Apache men who leave their encampment generally ask their close blood relatives to spy on their wives (Goodwin, 1942).

White and Mullen (1989) found that people try to cope with their jealous feelings, the threats to their self-esteem and their fears of loss in a variety of ways: Sometimes, lovers

refuse to see what they don't want to see. Some jealous lovers focus on *themselves*. “What's wrong with me”? “What did I do wrong”? they ask. Once they spot “the problem,” they set out to try to make themselves more appealing. Other people focus on controlling *their mates*. In Medieval times, British and European nobility locked their wives up in chastity belts while they were off at the Crusades. Other cultures have relied on infibulation (stitching together the labia majora), vaginal plugs, and clitoridectomy (a form of female castration, designed to eliminate sexual pleasure), to keep women in check (Daly, et al., 1982). Other lovers focus on eliminating *the rival*.

Eventually, in most societies, most people give up. If the relationship really is over, they recognize it and try to get on with their lives.

**4. Vengeance.** Of course, some jealous lovers react more violently. In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Burton (1621/1827) wrote in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* that “those which are jealous proceed from suspicion to hatred; from hatred to frenzie; from frenzie to injurie, murder and despair” (p. 428). Historically, since men had the most power, they were allowed to let their “frenzie” lead to murder. Women had to be content with more tepid responses.

Arapaho (American Indian) men might beat their wives if they suspected they had been having sexual relations with anyone else.

Occasionally a suspicious man calmly sent his wife away, either to her paramour or to her home. More often he became angry and jealous. Usually he whipped her, and cut off the tip of her nose or her braids, or both. According to Kroeber . . . he also slashed her cheeks.

This treatment of an unfaithful wife was conventional and neither her parents nor the tribe did anything about it (Hilger, 1952, p. 212).

The king of the Plateau tribes of Zimbabwe executed men caught with any of his wives. The wives were grossly mutilated (Gouldsbury & Sheane, 1911). In earlier times, Apache husbands also killed their rivals and mutilated their wives (by cutting off the end of their noses); presumably that made them less appealing the next time (Goodwin, 1942).

In Western cultures, men are far more likely to beat or murder their girlfriends and wives than their rivals (White & Mullen, 1989). Today, In America, family peace centers report that about two-thirds of the wives who are forced to seek shelter, do so because their husbands' excessive or unwarranted jealousy has led them to repeatedly assault the women (Gayford, 1979). Male jealousy is the leading cause of wife battering and homicide worldwide (Buss, 1994; Daly & Wilson, 1988a, 1988b).

In the West, until recently, such vengeance was approved or treated leniently until recently. The 18<sup>th</sup> century English jurist Blackstone commented that killing in a situation where a man or woman is caught in the act “is of the lowest degree of manslaughter; . . . for there could not be a greater provocation” (quoted in Smith & Hogan, 1983, p. 288).

In many countries, the courts have been sympathetic to such “crimes of passion.” Traditionally, it was considered to be a man’s right to defend his “honor.” In Morocco, for example, the law excuses killing one's wife if she is caught in the act of adultery, but a woman would not be excused for killing her husband in the same circumstances (Greenhouse, 1994). In Sao Paulo (Brazil's most populous city), in 1980-1981, 722



men claimed “defense of honor” for murdering their wives. Brazilian women adopted the slogan “Lovers don't kill,” and campaigned against allowing such a defense in murder trials. Once again, we see that worldwide, the times they are a' changing (see Brooke, 1991, for a discussion of the changes globalization has brought to views of “honor” and crimes of violence in one culture—Brazil;

### **VIII. In Conclusion**

The preceding studies, then, suggest that the large differences that once existed between Westernized, modern, urban, industrial societies and Eastern, modern, urban industrial societies may be fast disappearing. Those interested in cross-cultural differences may be forced to search for large differences in only the most underdeveloped, developing, and collectivist of societies—such as in Africa or Latin America, in China or the Arab countries (Egypt, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi-Arabia, Iraq, or the U. A. E.).

However, it may well be that, even there, the winds of Westernization, individualism, and social change are blowing. In spite of the censure of their elders, in a variety of traditional cultures, young people are increasingly adopting “Western” patterns—placing a high value on “falling in love,” pressing for gender equality in love and sex, and insisting on marrying for love (as opposed to arranged marriages.) Such changes have been documented in Finland, Estonia, and Russia (Haavio-Mannila & Kontula, 2003) as well as among an Australian aboriginal peoples of Mangrove and a Copper Inuit Alaskan Indian tribe (see Jankowiak, 1995, for an extensive review of this research.)

Naturally, cultural differences still exert a profound influence on young people's attitudes, emotions, and behavior and such differences are not likely to disappear in our lifetime. In Morocco, for example, marriage was once an alliance between families (as historically it was in most of the world before the 18<sup>th</sup> century,) in which children had little or no say. Today, although parents can no longer simply dictate whom their children will marry, parental approval remains critically important. Important though it is, however, young men and women are at least allowed to have their say (see Davis and Davis, 1995.)

Many have observed that today two powerful forces—globalization and cultural pride/identification with one's country (what historians call "nationalism")—are contending for men's and women's souls. True, to some extent, the world's citizens may to some extent be becoming "one," but in truth the delightful and divisive cultural variations that have made our world both such an interesting, and simultaneously dangerous place, are likely to add spice to that heady brew of love and sexual practices for some time to come. The convergence of cultures around the world may be reducing the differences in the ways passionate love is experienced and expressed in our world, but tradition can be tenacious and the global future of passionate love cannot be predicted with any certainty.

## IX. References

- Allgeier, E. R., & Wiederman, M. W. (1991). Love and mate selection in the 1990s. *Free Inquiry, 11*, 25-27.
- Aron, A., Fisher, H., Mashek, D., Strong, G., Li, H-F., & Brown, L. L. (in press) Early-stage, intense romantic love uses subcortical reward/motivation regions and dynamic network that varies with intensity of passion, duration of relationship, and gender.
- Aron, A., & Rodriguez, G. (1992, July 25). *Scenarios of falling in love among Mexican-, Chinese-, and Anglo-Americans*. Sixth International Conference on Personal Relationships. Orono, ME.
- Barkow, J. H, Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.) (1992). *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bartels, A. & Zeki, S. (November 27, 2000). The neural basis of romantic love. *Neuroreport, 11*, 3829-3834.
- Bartels, A. & Zeki, S. (2004). The neural correlates of maternal and romantic love. *Neuroimage, 21*, 1155-1166.
- Berscheid, E., & Fei, J. (1977). Romantic love and sexual jealousy. In G. Clanton & L. G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy* (pp. 101-114). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Birbaumer, N., Lutzenberger, W., Elbert, T., Flor, H., & Rockstroh, B. (1993) Imagery and brain processes. In Niels Birbaumer and Arne Öhman (Eds.) *The structure of emotion*. Göttingen, Germany:Hogrefe & Huber Publishers. (pp. 132-134)

Bringle, R. G., & Buunk, B. (1986). Examining the causes and consequences of jealousy: Some recent findings and issues. In R. Gilmour & S. Duck (Eds.), *The emerging field of personal relationships* (pp. 225-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Brooke, J. (1991, March 29). "Honor" killing of wives is outlawed in Brazil. *The New York Times*, Sec. B p. 16.

Broude, G. J. & Green, S. J. (1983). Cross-cultural codes on husband-wife relationships. *Ethology*, 22, 273-274.

Bryson, J. B. (1977, August). Situational determinants of the expression of jealousy. In H. Sigall (Chair), *Sexual jealousy*. Symposium presented at the 85th meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Bumroongsook, S. (1992). *Conventions of mate selection in twentieth-century central Thailand*. Unpublished Masters thesis. Department of History, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.

Burton, R. (1621/1927). *The anatomy of melancholy*. London: Longman.

Buss, D. M. (1994). *The evolution of desire*. New York: Basic Books.

Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204-232.

Buunk, B. (1982). Anticipated sexual jealousy: Its relationship to self-esteem, dependency, and reciprocity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8, 310-316.

Buunk, B., & Hupka, R. B. (1987). Cross-cultural differences in the elicitation of sexual jealousy. *Journal of Sex Research*, 23, 12-22.

Capellanus, J. (1957). *The art of courtly love*. New York: Ungar Publishing Co.

Carter, C. S. (1998). Neuroendocrine perspectives on social attachment and love. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 23, 779-818.

Cohen, D. (in press). Cultural variation: Considerations and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*.

Chu, G. C. (1985). The changing concept of self in contemporary China. In A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos, & F. L. K. Hus (Eds.), *Culture and self: Asian and Western perspectives* (pp. 252-277.) London, England: Tavistock.

Chu, G. C. & Ju, Y. (1993). *The great wall in ruins*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 3, 11-27.

Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man and selection in relation to sex*. London: Murray.

Darwin, C. (1872/1965). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Davis, D. A. & Davis, S. S. (1995). Possessed by love: gender and romance in Morocco. In: William Jankowiak, (Ed.) (1995). *Romantic passion: A universal experience?* New York: Columbia University Press (p. 219-238.)

Davis, K. (1948/1977). Jealousy and sexual property. In G. Clanton & L. G. Smith (Eds.), *Jealousy* (pp. 129-135). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Diamond, L. M. (2004). Emerging perspectives on distinctions between romantic love and sexual desire. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 116-119.

Dion, K. K. & Dion, K. L. (1993). Individualistic and collectivistic perspectives on gender and the cultural context of love and intimacy. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 53-69.

Doherty, R. W., Hatfield, E., Thompson, K., & Choo, P. (1994). Cultural and ethnic influences on love and attachment. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 391-398.

Doi, L. T. (1963). Some thoughts on helplessness and the desire to be loved. *Psychiatry, 26*, 266-272.

Doi, L. T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence* (J. Bester, Trans.). Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Fischer, K. W., Shaver, P. R., & Carnochan, P. (1990). How emotions develop and how they organize development. *Cognition and Emotion, 4*, 81-127.

Fischer, K. W., Wang, Li, Kennedy, B., & Cheng, C-L. (1998). Culture and biology in emotional development. *Socioemotional development across cultures. New directions for child development, No. 82*. (pp. 20-43.)

Fisher, H. E. (1989). Evolution of human serial pairbonding. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 78*, 331-354.

Fisher, H. E. (July 16, 2003.) The brain chemistry of romantic attraction and its positive effect on sexual motivation. Paper presented at: International Academy of Sex Research. Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting. Bloomington, IN.

Fisher, H. E. (2004). *Why We Love: The nature and chemistry of romantic love*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Fukutake, T. (1981). *Japanese society today*. (2nd Ed.). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

- Gayford, J. J. (1979). Battered wives. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 22, 496, 503.
- Gil, V. E. (1992). Clinical notes: The cut sleeve revisited: A brief ethnographic interview with a male homosexual in mainland China. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 29, 569-577.
- Glass, S. P. & Wright, T. L. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 12, 1101-1120.
- Goode, W. J. (1959). The theoretical importance of love. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 38-47.
- Goodwin, G. (1942). *The social organization of the Western Apache*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goodwin, R. (1999). *Personal relationships across cultures*. London: Routledge.
- Gouldsbury, C., & Sheane, H. (1911). *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Greenhouse, S. (1994, February 3). State dept. finds widespread abuse of world's women. *The New York Times*, 143, 1A-6A.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. & Kontula, O. (2003). Single and double sexual standards in Finland, Estonia, and St. Petersburg. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 36-49.
- Harris, C. R. (2003). A review of sex differences in sexual jealousy, including self-report data, psychophysiological responses, interpersonal violence, and morbid jealousy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 102-128.

Hatfield, E. & Rapson, R. L. (1987). Passionate love/sexual desire: Can the same paradigm explain both? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 16, 259-277.

Hatfield, E. & Rapson, R. L. (1993). *Love, sex, and intimacy: Their psychology, biology, and history*. New York: Harper Collins.

Hatfield, E. & Rapson, R. L. (1996). *Love and sex: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon (p. 71).

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate relations. *Journal of Adolescence*, 9, 383-410.

Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1996). Men's and women's mate preferences in the United States, Russia, and Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 728-750.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1989). Research on love: Does it measure up? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 784-794.

Hilger, M. I. (1952). *Arapaho child life and its cultural background*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Hsu, F. L. K. (1953). *Americans & Chinese: Passage to difference* (3rd ed.). Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Hsu, F. L. K. (1985). The self in cross-cultural perspective. In A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self: Asian and Western perspectives* (pp. 24-55). London, England: Tavistock.

Hunt, M. (1959). *The natural history of love*. New York: Grove Press.

Hupka, R. B. (1981). Cultural determinants of jealousy. *Alternative Lifestyles*, 4, 310-356.



Hupka, R. B. (1991). The motive for the arousal of romantic jealousy: Its cultural origin. In P. Salovey (Ed.). *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 252-270). New York: Guilford Press.

Hupka, R. B., & Ryan, J. M. (1990). The cultural contribution to jealousy: Cross-cultural aggression in sexual jealousy situations. *Behavior Science Research*, 24, 51-71.

Hyde, J. S. (Ed.) (2005). *Biological Substrates of Human Sexuality*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Hydy, S. B. (1999). *The Woman That Never Evolved*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jankowiak, W. (Ed.). (1995). *Romantic passion: A universal experience?* New York: Columbia University Press.

Jankowiak, W. R. & Fischer, E. F. (1992). A cross-cultural perspective on romantic love. *Ethology*, 31, 149-155.

Joseph, R., & Joseph, T. B. (1987). *The rose and the thorn*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Kelley, H. H., Berscheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvey, J. H., Huston, T. L., Levinger, G., McClintock, E., Peplau, L. A. & Peterson, D. R. (Eds.) (1983). *Close relationships*. New York: Freeman.

Kephart, W. M. (1967). Some correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 29, 470-479.

Kim, J. & Hatfield, E. (2004). Love types and subjective well being. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 32, 173-182.

Kitayama, S. (2002.) Culture and basic psychological processes—Toward a system view of culture: Comment on Oyserman et al., (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 89-96.

Komisaruk, B. R. & Whipple, B. (1998). Whipple B. Love as sensory stimulation: Physiological consequences of its deprivation and expression. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 8, 819-835.

Landis, D. & O'Shea, W. A. O. III, (2000). Cross-cultural aspects of passionate love; An individual difference analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 754-779.

Lee, G. R., & Stone, L. H. (1980). Mate-selection systems and criteria: Variation according to family structure. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 319-326.

Levine, R., Sato, S., Hashimoto, T., & Verma, J. (1995). Love and marriage in eleven cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 554-571.

Linton, R. (1936). *The study of man*. New York: Appleton-Century, p. 175.

Luciano, E. M. C. (2003). *Caribbean love and sex: ethnographic study of rejection and betrayal in heterosexual relationships in Puerto Rico*. International Academy of Sex Research meetings, Bloomington, IN.

Mace, D., & Mace, V. (1980). *Marriage: East and West*. New York: Dolphin Books.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.

Marazziti, D., Akiskal, H. S., Rossi, A., & Cassano, G. B. (1999). Alteration of the platelet serotonin transporter in romantic love. *Psychological Medicine*, 29 (3), 741-

745.

Marazziti, D. & Canale, D. (2004). Hormonal changes when falling in love. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 29 (7) 931-936.

Mead, M. (1935/1969). *Sex and temperament in three primitive societies*. New York: Dell Publishing.

Mirsky, J. (1937). The Eskimo of Greenland. In M. Mead (Ed.), *Cooperation and competition among primitive peoples* (pp. 51-86). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mishkin, B. (1937). The Maori of New Zealand. In M. Mead (Ed.), *Cooperation and competition among primitive peoples* (pp. 428-457). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Money, J. (1977). Peking: The sexual revolution. In J. Money & H. Musaph (Eds.) *Handbook of Sexology* (pp. 543-550). Amsterdam: Excerpta Medica.

Murstein, B. I. (1974). *Love, sex, and marriage through the ages*. New York: Springer.

Nadler, A., & Dotan, I. (1992). Commitment and rival attractiveness: Their effects on male and female reactions to jealousy arousing situations. *Sex Roles*, 26, 293-310.

Nisbett, R. (2003). *The geography of thought: how Asians and Westerners think differently . . . and why*. Chicago, IL: The Free Press.

Oysermann, D., Kemmelmeier, M. & Coon, H. M. (2002). Cultural psychology, a new look: Reply to Bond (2002), Fiske (2002), Kitayama (2002), and Miller. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 110-117.

Pimentel, E. E. (2000). "Just how do I love thee?: Marital relations in urban China." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 32-47.

Prakasa, V. V., & Rao, V. N. (1979). Arranged marriages: An assessment of the attitudes of the college students in India. In G. Kurian (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives of mate-selection and marriage* (pp. 11-31). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Regan, P. C. & Berscheid, E. (1999). *Lust: what we know about human sexual desire*. London: Sage Publications.

Rivers, W. H. R. (1906). *The Todas*. London: Macmillan.

Rosenblatt, P. C. (1967). Marital residence and the function of romantic love. *Ethnology*, 6, 471-480.

Rosenblatt, P. C., & Anderson, R. M. (1981). Human sexuality in cross-cultural perspective. In M. Cook (Ed.), *The bases of human sexual attraction* (pp. 215-250). London: Academic Press.

Ruan, F. F. (1991). *Sex in China: Studies in sexology in Chinese culture*. New York: Plenum.

Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1985, September). The heart of jealousy. *Psychology Today*, 19, 22-29.

Shaver, P. R., & Hazan, C. (1988). A biased overview of the study of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 474-501.

Shaver, P. R., Morgan, H. J., & Wu, S. (1996). Is love a "basic" emotion? *Personal Relationships*, 3, 81-96.

Shaver, P. R., Murdaya, U., & Fraley, R. C. (2001). Structure of the Indonesian emotion lexicon. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 201-224.

Shaver, P. R., Wu, S., & Schwartz, J. C. (1991). Cross-cultural similarities and differences in emotion and its representation: A prototype approach. In M. S. Clark

(Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, (Vol.13)* (pp. 175-212). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Shostak, M. (1981). *Nisa: The life and words of a !Kung woman*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Simmons, C. H., Vom Kolke, A., & Shimizu, H. (1986). Attitudes toward romantic love among American, German, and Japanese students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 126*, pp. 327-337.

Simpson, J. A., Campbell, B., & Berscheid, E. (1986). The association between romantic love and marriage: Kephart (1967) twice revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 12*, 363-372.

Smith, J. C., & Hogan, B. (1983). *Criminal law* (5th ed.). London: Butterworths.

Sommer, V. (1993, November 13). *Primate origins: The hardware of human sexuality*. Meetings of The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex. San Diego.

Soueif, A. (1999). *The Map of Love*. London, England: Bloomsbury Publishing, p. 386-387.

Sprecher, S., Aron, A., Hatfield, E., Cortese, A., Potapova, E., & Levitskaya, A. (1994). Love: American style, Russian style, and Japanese style. *Personal Relationships, 1*, 349-369.

Sprecher, S., & Chandak, R. (1992). Attitudes about arranged marriages and dating among men and women from India. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 20*, 1-11.

Stephens, W. N. (1963). *The family in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Triangulating love. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (pp. 119-138)

Symons, D. (1992). On the use and misuse of Darwinism in the study of human behavior. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press. (pp. 137-162.)

Tannahill, R. (1980). *Sex in history*. New York: Stein & Day.

Tooby, J. & Cosmides, L. (1992). The evolutionary and psychological foundations of the social sciences. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press. (pp. 19-136.)

Trawick, M. (1990). *Notes on love in a Tamil family*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006-1020.

Wallen, K. (1989). Mate selection: Economics and affection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12, 37-38.

Weaver, S. E. & Ganong, L. W. (2004). The factor structure of the Romantic Belief Scale for African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21, 171-185.

White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Wilson, M. & Daly, M. (1992). The man who mistook his wife for a chattel. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press. (pp. 289-326.)

Wolkstein, D. (1991). *The first love stories*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Xu, X. & Whyte, M. K. (1990). Love matches and arranged marriages: A Chinese replication. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 709-722.