

Social Anthropology and the Old Testament -

Present, Past and Future

The Old Testament is a collection of books which can be studied from several angles. Apart from its obvious interest to theologians and historians of religion, it is the major source for knowledge about the ancient Hebrew language, ancient Hebrew history and law, and ancient Hebrew social life and institutions. Moreover, while in practice some scholars have become specialists in only one or two of the latter areas mentioned, it is obvious that the theologian or historian of religion cannot afford to ignore any of these areas of study.

Yet for all that the Old Testament is the major source for knowledge about the ancient Hebrews, its evidence is fragmentary to such a degree that it can often only be elucidated with the help of neighbouring disciplines, that is, by means of a comparative method. Biblical Hebrew, for example, represents only a small proportion of the Hebrew that was spoken and written between 1200 and 200 B.C. (the approximate range of Old Testament literature), and it has long been the practice for languages related to Hebrew to be used in the interpretation of passages whose meaning is obscure precisely because there is much about Biblical Hebrew that is not known. In the sphere of history, the Old Testament evidence is fragmentary because the Old Testament writers selected only certain events for theological comment and ignored the rest, or because the events were the subject of re-interpretation and re-fashioning in the light of ancient Israel's subsequent faith and worship. In this area, much help has been gained from our knowledge of ancient Near Eastern history.

The fragmentary nature of the witness of the Old Testament to the life of ancient Israel is the essential basis for understanding why, at various times in its history, Old Testament study has shown an interest in Social Anthropology. For while modern Social Anthropology has denied that its job is to reconstruct the history of man's social institutions and beliefs, this was certainly not true of those speculations and enquiries about man in community which were the necessary forerunners of Social Anthropology, and which I shall also designate as Social Anthropology for the sake of convenience in this essay. A discipline which claimed to be able to reconstruct the history of the mental, religious and social development of mankind was obviously very attractive to scholars studying as fragmentary a source as the Old Testament. On the other hand, the more Social Anthropology denied that its job was to make such reconstructions, the less attention was paid to it by Old Testament scholars. In what follows, I shall sketch briefly some of the important points of contact between Old Testament study and Social Anthropology, and I shall comment on the present state of relations between the two disciplines and suggest future possible developments.

The modern period of Old Testament study began roughly in the second half of the eighteenth century; and although scholars working prior to this period had shown an interest in Social Anthropology, the beginning of the modern period saw the first attempts to think carefully about methodology. The scholar most directly responsible for this was the Göttingen orientalist Johann David Michaelis (1717 - 1791). Michaelis was an avid reader of the accounts of travellers and the like in the Near East, as well as in areas including North America, and Mongolia. He was early convinced, however, that such accounts were

largely not the work of trained observers, and that a properly-trained expedition to the Near East would shed light on the Old Testament in a way that the usual accounts of travellers and missionaries did not. Accordingly, Michaelis urged the learned world of his day to mount a scholarly expedition to Arabia, and he was rewarded with success when King Frederick V of Denmark agreed to provide the necessary patronage and finance. The expedition set out for Arabia in 1761, and in the following year, Michaelis published one hundred questions which he had addressed to the expedition.¹

The expedition consisted of five members - a professor of Oriental languages, a professor of Botany, a doctor, a painter and a surveyor. Its aims included the study of the flora of parts of Arabia, the study of Arabic dialects, and the observation of the customs and social life of Arabs in those parts of Arabia which were thought to have been most free from foreign influence. This latter aim would, it was hoped, be of particular value for understanding social life in Old Testament times. This is not the place to record the adventures of the expedition, which was characterised by fearful clashes of personality, and the tragic deaths of four out of the five participants. Only the surveyor, Carsten Niebuhr, survived to complete as much as he could of the expedition's work, but his achievement was remarkable. Whereas he might easily have been written off as the least scholarly member of the expedition and therefore the least fitted to bring its work to completion, it was he who was most ready to learn how to adapt to the alien conditions in which he found himself. While his two professorial colleagues were concerned to maintain a rivalry with each other, and a superiority over the other members of the party, and especially over the 'natives', Niebuhr gained sufficient knowledge of Arabic dialects (he had begun to study Arabic under Michaelis in Göttingen), and gained sufficient sympathy with informers to be able to elicit valuable information.²

The anthropological presuppositions underlying the expedition are obvious. First, there was the idea of the 'changeless desert' which could somehow preserve a people in a state of social equilibrium provided that there was no outside influence. Second, there was the notion that if Arab tribesmen could be found whose material culture resembled, for example, that of the Old Testament patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as described in Genesis), then inferences could also be made from the one to the other about social institutions, and even religious belief. These presuppositions have survived into modern Old Testament scholarship; but if, from the point of view of modern Social Anthropology, these presuppositions were highly questionable, Niebuhr, and before him Michaelis, already perceived something of the importance of what later came to be called fieldwork.

In the preface to one of his accounts of the expedition,³ Niebuhr stressed that the tragic loss of life that had been experienced should not deter subsequent expeditions. Death had occurred because some of his colleagues had been reluctant to adopt the 'native' diet and way of life; they had wanted to live in western fashion in the east. Niebuhr further stressed the need not only to know the language and to win the confidence of informants, but to listen to them without any preconceived criticism drawn from the listener's own religious or cultural background.

In the wake of Niebuhr's successful work, there was renewed interest in materials from the east which might illuminate the Bible. Many accounts of travels in the east from before the time of the Danish-sponsored expedition were published in works such as Paulus's

Sammlung⁴ and there was a re-publication in German of the book by L. d'Arvieux (1635 - 1702) Voyage fait par ordre du Roy Louis XIV dans la Palestine which had first appeared posthumously in 1717.⁵ Arvieux's book, which originated from some twelve years spent in the Palestine area from 1653 - 1665, had been noticed by Michaelis, who had also recognised its value for the interpretation of the Old Testament. Question 58 of the questions addressed to the expedition had asked its members to check the accuracy of Arvieux, and Niebuhr had given a favourable reply. If Niebuhr gave approval to a book that went back to the mid-seventeenth century, but which was to influence the Old Testament research of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, perhaps its influence was excusable. But the same could not be said for many of the accounts that appeared in Paulus's Sammlung, some of them being accounts going back to the sixteenth century, and provided by missionaries and similar 'committed' observers. It would seem that the lessons pointed by Niebuhr about how best to obtain objective information were slow to be learnt. The anthropological theory underlying the whole enterprise was nowhere better expressed than in the preface to the new German edition of Arvieux. This book, said the editor, 'accurately portrays the customs of a people that has preserved the pastoral, nomadic way of life of its ancestors, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in a pure form, and free from foreign customs'.⁶

In the second half of the eighteenth century there was quite a different, but nevertheless equally important, use of theories based on anthropology in the interpretation of the Old Testament. The fons et origo was once more Göttingen, where the classicist, Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729 - 1812) put forward a theory of mythopoeic thought. Basing himself on accounts such as Carver's Travels through the interior parts of North America, Heyne argued that Greek myths should be understood as the product of primitive, and thus earliest, man's attempt to understand and describe the workings of nature.⁷ Heyne's theories were applied to the interpretation of Genesis 3 by the orientalist Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827), himself a pupil of both Heyne and Michaelis.⁸ According to Eichhorn, the story of the 'fall' of man in Genesis 3 was a genuine account of the experiences of the first man and woman.⁹ They had lived in a garden, but had become aware of the dangers of a certain tree because animals died after eating its fruit. When a snake ate the fruit and suffered no harm, the man and the woman were encouraged to do likewise. The fruit was in fact poisonous, and it affected their physical constitution so that they became aware for the first time of physical passion. A thunder storm in the evening caused them to flee in terror from the garden. This is what had actually happened; the extant form of Genesis 3 with its presentation of the events in terms of the divine - the divine prohibition against eating the fruit, the divine expulsion from the garden and so on-derived from the way in which the mythopoeic thought of earliest man had perceived and described the events.

Eichhorn's exegesis of Genesis 3 is today a bizarre example of what could be done even in what I have called the modern period of Old Testament study. It does, however, represent the first positive attempt to de-mythologize the Bible. Not for the last time was the Old Testament interpreted on the basis of a theory of primitive mentality which in turn depended on the accounts by travellers of 'primitives'.

The next important methodological step in the relation between the Old Testament and Social Anthropology was not taken until the latter part of the nineteenth century, when, indeed, there developed

one of the few serious discussions among Old Testament scholars about anthropological method. The protagonists were on the one hand, scholars who took an evolutionary view of the development of social institutions and religion, backed up by Tylor's doctrine of survivals; and the historical, diffusionist scholars often referred to as the pan-Babylonians.

One of the first Old Testament scholars to attempt to demonstrate the evolutionist viewpoint was W. Robertson Smith in his book Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia.¹⁰ In this work, Robertson Smith argued that the earliest form of social life among the Semites was that of the unit bound together by common blood and identified with a totem animal or object; within each unit the matriarchal principle was dominant. The argument was backed up by an exemplary use (or misuse!) of the doctrine of survivals (Robertson Smith preferred the term 'relics') in which from the Old Testament point of view, texts were interpreted with complete disregard for their literary context, and a search was made of the Old Testament for every possible personal or group name which might be derived from an animal, and thus be evidence for the totemic theory.¹¹

In Germany, J. Wellhausen searched ancient Arabic texts, especially those of the pre-Islamic period, for survivals of primitive Semitic religion,¹² and the efforts of both Wellhausen and Robertson Smith in the study were reinforced in the field by an American, Samuel Ives Curtiss. Curtiss believed that it was possible to find survivals of primitive Semitic religion in present-day (i.e. around 1900) Syria and Palestine, provided that certain criteria were applied. First, to be primitive, a religious belief or practice should be contrary to Christianity or Islam. Second, it should, if possible, be found in areas where both Christianity and Islam normally held sway. Third, it should correspond with what had been discovered from the ancient literary sources. Curtiss's field researches were embodied in a book entitled Primitive Semitic Religion Today¹³, one of whose main assumptions was that religions like Christianity and Islam were merely a veneer spread thinly over peoples who in fact bore witness to the sort of religion practised by the ancestors of the Hebrews some 2,000 years before Christ. The findings of Robertson Smith, Wellhausen and Curtiss greatly influenced the reconstruction of the history of Israelite religion. The ancient Hebrews were commonly represented as passing through animism and polytheism to monotheism, and their social development was classified as first nomadic, then agriculturalist, and then urbanised.

This picture of ancient Hebrew life and religious belief was challenged by the pan-Babylonian school, as were the assumptions on which it rested.¹⁴ The school, of course, arose from the publication from roughly 1870 onwards of the recently-discovered cuneiform texts from ancient Mesopotamia, texts which for the first time provided first-hand knowledge of ancient Assyria and Babylonia. The evolutionist school deliberately ignored these texts on the grounds that although they were undoubtedly ancient, they were not primitive. The Semitic culture of Mesopotamia had been built on the foundations of the earlier non-Semitic Sumerian culture, and it was preferable to use the much later 'purer' evidence from Arabia for the interpretation of the early parts of Old Testament than the 'impure' Mesopotamian evidence, even though the latter ante-dated or was contemporary with the earliest parts of the Old Testament.

The pan-Babylonians, on the other hand, argued that it was impossible to ignore the newly-discovered history of the ancient world in Old Testament times, especially as the Old Testament itself claimed that its forebears had originated from Mesopotamia. They challenged the notion of the changeless desert, which was so important a part of the evolutionary argument. The fact that the history of the Arabian desert was unknown did not mean that it had had no history; and the pan-Babylonians, on the basis of Assyrian texts, posited the existence of a powerful North Arabian kingdom of Musri, which had exerted influence on the Hebrews in ancient times. Further, the pan-Babylonians questioned the doctrine of survivals as it was used to reconstruct the primitive Semitic religion. Far from being survivals, the practices adduced by Curtiss and the others were degenerations from an advanced pattern of culture that had spread from Babylon in ancient times, and had affected the whole of the ancient Near East. It was a mistake to imagine that Christianity and Islam were the veneer spread over a folk religion which had its roots in primitive times. Christianity, Islam and Judaism had themselves arisen out of the remains of the ancient Babylonian culture pattern.¹⁵

In view of the fact that the doctrine of survivals for the purpose of historical reconstruction has been generally discredited in the present century, it would appear that the pan-Babylonians were closer to a sound methodology than their opponents; though presumably few today would accept their exaggerated theories of culture patterns and diffusion. In the eyes of Old Testament scholars, the pan-Babylonians took such extreme standpoints on other issues that their whole position was disregarded. For example, they adopted an astral/mythological view of the origin of ancient historical texts, a view which at its most extreme derived the Passion Narrative of the Gospels from the Epic of Gilgamesh, which in turn was ultimately based on speculations about the sun and moon and other heavenly bodies. Again, subsequent research has shown that their claims about the ancient North Arabian kingdom of Musri were unfounded.

Perhaps in the debate between the evolutionists and the pan-Babylonians, the issues were too much polarised; but at least the issues were recognised. In subsequent Old Testament scholarship, there has been a tendency to ignore the methodological issues, and to have one's cake and eat it. Thus many scholars have recognised the importance of the Babylonian material and of setting the Old Testament in its historical background, yet they have continued to use the doctrine of survivals and to observe contemporary Bedouin in order to understand parts of the Old Testament. If they have used a cultural model, whether consciously or unconsciously, it has been one in which centres of civilisation like Babylon, Egypt, Ugarit and even the Palestinian city states are seen as having generated spheres of cultural influence, but these spheres did not cover the entire ancient Near East; there were numerous 'gaps', and in these gaps, peoples like the forbears of the ancient Hebrews lived, largely untouched by the higher cultures of the area, so that it remains legitimate to deduce social and religious facts about these people from later peoples such as Bedouin Arab tribes who have similarly, so the theory would suppose, had minimal contact with more advanced culture.

Whether this model is an adequate one in the light of the evidence available, is perhaps something that cultural anthropologists could tell Old Testament specialists. What is certain is that more evidence relevant to the construction of a more adequate model if one be needed, can be expected to be forthcoming. The pan-Babylonians

may have been wrong about Musri, but North Arabia has yet to be systematically excavated, and if and when this can be done, the 'changeless desert' theory may have to retreat a little further.¹⁶

I now turn to the present century, and to the contemporary use by Old Testament study of material or theories derived from Social Anthropology, and this can perhaps be best done by making comments under several headings.

The doctrine of survivals

Although often clothed in sophisticated quasi-historical dress, the doctrine of survivals continues to be used for historical reconstruction. A noteworthy example is the 'God of the Fathers' theory of the German scholar Albrecht Alt.¹⁷ Alt uses inscriptions found in various parts of Arabia, and dating from the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, to reconstruct the religion of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who are usually dated in the 18th century B.C. by Old Testament scholars. The method used supposes that the religion implied in the phrases 'the god of X' (X being a man's name) in the inscriptions, can be used to understand phrases such as 'the God of Abraham' in Genesis 28: 13. The biblical phrases are treated as survivals, and are removed completely from their context. Interpreted in the light of the much later inscriptions, they allow us to reconstruct the religion of the patriarchs. In fact, we know next to nothing about the people who wrote the inscriptions, and data which might support the comparison is almost wholly lacking.

Primitive mentality

Theories of primitive mentality or of mythopoeic thought derived directly or indirectly from Social Anthropology have been greatly influential in modern Old Testament Studies. Lévy-Bruhl's theories of pre-logical thought have become the main-stay of the theory of 'corporate personality' which was first advanced among Old Testament scholars by H. Wheeler Robinson. Although, as I have argued elsewhere,¹⁸ the notion of 'corporate personality' as understood in Old Testament study is complex and ambiguous, and in some of its facets is not to be dismissed out of hand, the following quotation from Wheeler Robinson indicates its more questionable nature.

'There is a fluidity of conception, a possibility of swift transition from the one to the many, and vice versa, to which our thought and language have no real parallel. When we do honour today to the "Unknown Warrior", we can clearly distinguish between the particular soldier buried in the Abbey and the great multitude of whom we have consciously made him the representative. But that clearness of distinction would have been lacking to an earlier world, prior to the development of the modern sense of personality.'¹⁹

In a different connection, Old Testament scholarship has used a theory based on Cassirer's interpretation of largely pre-fieldwork evidence in Kantian epistemological terms. The position expounded in the second volume of Cassirer's Philosophy of Symbolic Forms was taken up in the symposium of essays entitled Before Philosophy.²⁰ These essays, which describe the thought of the ancient Near East,

have as their theme the view that in the ancient Near East, man did not experience the phenomenal world as an 'it' but as a 'thou'; or to use theological jargon, what was believed to be the divine was always experienced as immanent in nature and never as something transcendent. Curiously enough, Old Testament scholars have used this theory about how ancient Near Eastern man experienced the world of nature, not to explain, but rather as a foil to the ancient Hebrews. It has been argued that the Hebrews experienced the world of nature in a quite different way from their neighbours, and that in this lies their uniqueness.²¹ But in the whole operation, there has been a good deal of confusion between epistemology and psychology, and it has not been satisfactorily explained how the mental processes of the Hebrews came to be so different from those of their neighbours, quite apart from the questions of whether Cassirer's position is tenable and can be applied to the ancient Near East.

It is impossible to discuss primitive mentality without mentioning the influence of Frazer's theories of magic in Old Testament study. These are still widely held, in their most crudely causative form, by many Old Testament scholars. The latter are largely unaware of the recent emphasis by Social Anthropologists on the symbolic and expressive aspects of magic, nor has the obvious question been asked as to how life would have been possible if ancient peoples thought that like was affecting like all the time. Closely allied to causative views of magic has been the stress on the ritual theory of myth, and the magical (i.e. causative) function of myth and ritual performance. In this connection, diffusionism has also been strong. Certain schools of Old Testament scholarship have argued that in ancient Babylon, myth and ritual (magical) rites were performed, and that this must also have been true for the cities of ancient Israel by diffusion of a Babylonian culture pattern.

Terminology for social units.

If people know nothing else about the Old Testament, they know that there were once twelve tribes of Israel. But what is a tribe? This is a question which, as I understand it, could not be easily answered by anthropologists; and the truth of the matter probably is that the term tribe has been applied to phenomena of such complexity in the history of anthropology, that wrong comparisons have been made, and that a much more sophisticated terminology is required.²² Old Testament scholars seem to be much more confident than social anthropologists that they know what tribes and clans are, and the scholarly literature abounds with attempts to reconstruct the history of the tribes before their settlement in ancient Palestine, in spite of the fact that it is also widely conceded that in one sense many of the groups did not become tribes until after they had become settled. A further common mistake made in Old Testament study is to confuse the classifications and descriptions of social structure that would be made by a trained observer, with the terms for social structure used among the people observed. Thus, it is usually accepted that in order to understand ancient Hebrew social structure, all one has to do is to analyse the relevant Hebrew vocabulary, in spite of the fact that when this is done, a good deal of inconsistency and overlapping is found. It then often happens that a scholar puts forward a consistent scheme for interpreting the data, said to come from an 'early' period of ancient Israel's life, and the inconsistencies are then explained in terms of development or breaking down of the 'earlier' system.

I think that enough has now been said about the modern position of the use by Old Testament scholars of data from Social Anthropology. At this point, having been critical by implication about my colleagues and fellow-workers, I feel that I must come to their defence. If the picture that I have presented strikes the Social anthropologist as appalling, I hope that he will allow that the demands made on the Old Testament scholar are in fact enormous, involving as they do the mastery of several ancient Semitic languages, the classical languages and modern languages, not to mention Theology and Ancient History. Further, current Old Testament study is based on foundations that go back a long way, and the amount of reading to be done to become acquainted with the discipline as such is daunting. However, if I defend my colleagues, I do not necessarily excuse them. Whether we like it or not, we are going to have to recognise that in areas in which Old Testament study impinges on Social Anthropology, enough is going to have to be known about the latter by some Old Testament specialists to prevent false models from being employed. If Old Testament scholarship has to become even more fragmented and specialised within itself, this will be an inevitable outcome of the advance in knowledge.

This brings me briefly to the future. The most interesting thing about the future is that recently, one or two social anthropologists have shown an interest in the Old Testament. One thinks particularly of Professor Mary Douglas²³ and Professor Edmund Leach.²⁴ From the Old Testament angle, Douglas's contribution has been the more helpful, because she has done her Old Testament homework more thoroughly than Leach, although the latter's contributions are always stimulating, if nothing else.²⁵ If social anthropologists wish to write further about the Old Testament, it is very much to be hoped that they will seek the ready cooperation which would undoubtedly come from the Old Testament side.

In the opposite direction, there is, of course, much to be done by Old Testament scholars themselves. For example, they are best placed to examine the history of their discipline, and to expose the anthropological assumptions on which it is based. There will in future, however, be much for Old Testament scholars to learn from social anthropologists about such subjects as magic, ritual, myth and sacrifice. Also, there is a desperate need for an expert in kinship systems and cultural anthropology to examine, together with an Old Testament scholar, the kinship systems of the Old Testament, as well as the models used for the general interpretation of the life of the ancient Hebrews in their historical and cultural setting. It would be of importance if such an investigation discovered that in fact the evidence was insufficient to allow any firm conclusions to be drawn. After all, Evans-Pritchard has defined the task of Social Anthropology as the study 'of social behaviour, generally in institutionalized forms either in contemporaneous societies or in historical societies for which there is adequate information of the kind to make such studies feasible.'²⁶ It would do no harm, and immense good to Old Testament study to know more clearly, if necessary, the limits of what it can know about the ancient Hebrews.

John Rogerson

Notes

1. J. D. Michaelis Fragen an eine Gesellschaft gelehrter Männer die auf Befehl Ihro Majestät des Königes von Dänemark nach Arabien reisen. Frankfurt 1762.
2. The fullest account of the expedition in English is that by Thorkild Hansen Arabia Felix, London 1964. It is also treated in D. G. Hogarth The Penetration of Arabia, London 1905.
3. Carsten Niebuhr Beschreibung von Arabien Copenhagen 1772.
4. H. L. G. Paulus Sammlung der merkwürdigsten Reisen in den Orient 7 vols. Jena 1792 - 1803.
5. E. F. K. Rosenmüller Die Sitten der Beduinen-Araber. Aus dem französischen des Ritters Arvieux, Leipzig 1789.
6. Rosenmüller's edition of Arvieux p. ix.
7. C. G. Heyne Opuscula Academica Göttingen 1779, especially Vol. I, pp. 184-206; Vol. III pp. 1-30. The title of the essay in Vol. III is 'Vita antiquissimorum hominum, Graeciae maxime, ex ferorum et barbarorum populorum comparatione illustrata'.
8. J. G. Eichhorn in Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur IV 1779.
9. Biblical scholars of this period were familiar with polygenism theories, but rejected them in favour of monogenism.
10. 1st edition, Cambridge 1885.
11. cp. the review of Kinship and Marriage by Th. Nöldeke in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 40, 1886, pp. 148-187. Nöldeke expressed extreme hesitation about the use of the comparative method for the purposes of historical reconstruction, and also criticised Robertson Smith for using studies of 'primitives' in order to explain the Old Testament and ancient Arabic sources.
12. cp. the title of his book Reste arabischen Heidentums, Berlin (2nd ed.) 1927.
13. Chicago 1902; German edition Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients. Leipzig 1903.
14. For a brief account of the pan-Babylonian school, see H-J. Krauss Geschichte der historisch - Kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments, Neukirchen-Vluyn (2nd ed.) 1969, pp. 305 ff.
15. The most succinct presentation of the pan-Babylonian arguments can be found in H. Winckler Religionsgeschichtler und geschichtlicher Orient, Leipzig 1906.
16. The results of the most recent exploration of North Arabia are recorded in F. V. Minnett and W. L. Reed Ancient Records from North Arabia, Toronto 1970. The expedition was allowed to make surface explorations for one month in northern areas of Saudi Arabia.
17. A. Alt 'Der Gott der Väter' in Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament Stuttgart 1929; reprinted in Kleine Schriften Vol. I Munich 1959 pp. 1-78.
18. See my article 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: a Re-examination' in Journal of Theological Studies XXI 1970 pp. 1-16.
19. H. Wheeler Robinson The Cross in the Old Testament London 1955 p. 77.
20. H. Frankfort (ed.) The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man Chicago 1946; British edition Before Philosophy Harmondsworth 1949.
21. For an example of this sort of argument see G. E. Wright The Old Testament against its Environment London 1950.
22. See the symposium edited by June Helm Essays on the Problem of Tribe Washington 1968, where it is argued, among other things, that the word 'tribe' has lacked sociological rigour from the outset, and that it is an example of a technical term taken over from a pre-scientific period of scholarship.
23. For example in Purity and Danger. London 1966.
24. For example in Genesis as Myth and Other Essays. London 1969.
25. See my article 'Structural Anthropology and the Old Testament' in Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies University of London XXXIII 1970. pp. 490-500.
26. E.E. Evans-Pritchard Social Anthropology. London 1951. p.5.