

---

## UNIT 8 CLASSICAL THEORIES

---

### Contents

- 8.0 Introduction
- 8.1 The Beginning: Comparative Method and the Science of Society
- 8.2 Classical Evolutionary Theory
- 8.3 Classical Diffusion Theory
- 8.4 Historical Particularism
- 8.5 Neo-Diffusionism
- 8.6 Neo-Evolutionism
- 8.7 Summary
- 8.8 References
- 8.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

---

### LEARNING OBJECTIVES

---

In this unit, you will learn about the following perspectives:

- the beginning: comparative method and the science of society;
- evolutionary theory;
- diffusion theory;
- historical particularism;
- neo-evolution: multilineal evolution and cultural ecology; and
- neo-diffusion: culture area theory.

---

### 8.0 INTRODUCTION

---

Anthropology starts as the Science of Man (quite literally as almost all the early scholars were white men). By the sixteenth century, the understanding that humans as a species are part of nature and controlled by its laws like any other species, animals or plants; had taken its roots. Since humans and society were subject to the laws of nature, they could be studied by principles of natural science. In other words an objective, scientific study of society was possible. Although the human body was already an object of medical science, the position of human beings as a species in the schema of natural evolution, were matters that needed academic attention.

The most significant paradigm shift was from a religious perspective to a scientific or secular perspective. The scholarly approach was based upon ‘rationality’ and ‘evidence’; following an empirical methodology, where the physical evidence was complimented with deductive reasoning.

---

## 8.1 THE BEGINNING: COMPARATIVE METHOD AND THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY

---

Scientific method is based upon observation, experimentation and comparison. While inanimate objects can be easily subjected to, such as a process, humans in their society can only be observed to a limited extent and cannot be experimented upon. Thus, observation and comparison of already existing social phenomenon are the only methods that can possibly be applied to what was deemed to be a scientific study of society. The early scientific method was cast within Positivism implying that there is a truth that can be reached, if proper scientific investigation is carried out. Comparing society to a natural system also made possible the formulation of laws pertaining to society, in the same way as laws exist for the natural and physical world.

The comparative method was used by arm chair anthropologists to compare data collected from a wide range of societies and from a wide variety of sources. Although the sources from which the data was gathered, was not collected by the use of rigid scientific techniques, the scholars who analysed them, had used the power of their deductive reasoning to construct fairly rational schema and theories. Let us take the example of James Frazer, who wrote the magnum opus *The Golden Bough* that continues to be a classic. Frazer brought together data from a wide variety of societies of antiquity as well as those considered as tribal (or primitive) to give an extensive account of rituals and customs of people across the world. More importantly he compiled all the data to give his Laws of Magic based upon the Principle of Sympathy (here meaning association or likeness). According to this theory, most 'primitive' peoples believe that things that are alike or things that have a close association with each other also have an influence on each other. Thus the Law of Sympathetic Magic has two parts, the Law of Contagion and Law of Similarity. In many cultures, including India, people used to believe that a photograph or likeness can be dangerous because people can practice witchcraft using these likenesses. Similarly people offer food to the gods that become sacred (*prasad*) by becoming imbued with the sacredness that emanates from the deity. Thus, although Frazer formulated these laws to characterise what in those days was known as 'primitive' society, if we look around we find that these operate even today in most urban and modern societies in some form or the other. Like the belief people have in wearing gem stones for luck.

Frazer had also given his evolutionary schema of Magic, Religion and Science, saying that each of them dominate on epoch of human social evolution. However as is evident to all of us, such has not happened and elements of magic and religion prevail even as humankind is moving towards higher and higher scientific achievements. Frazer followed the schema given earlier by August Comte, of the Age of Religion, Age of Metaphysics and Age of Reason. For most white men of those times, the European Civilisation was the peak of achievement of mankind and it was possible because of the superior qualities of mind of the white men. Women were considered as equivalent to 'primitives' and children, with no mature faculties of reason. In this way the European conquest of the world also spread patriarchy around the world along with the concepts of 'primitive' and the idea that all things western were superior; and that modernity was equivalent to westernisation. As we know that even when academically the theories of evolution are no longer considered valid, these ideas linger and persist in the collective consciousness.

**Reflection**

The ethnological or comparative method was used to develop theories where a large amount of data was compared. This data was collected from travelogues, missionaries, accounts given by traders and tourists, people who travelled across the world for various pursuits other than academics. Scholars of the caliber of Edward B. Tylor and Frazer, did try to separate the wheat from the chaff, yet most of it was only hearsay and could not be verified in any other way than by comparison and the frequent recurrence of the same or similar accounts.

**Check Your Progress 1**

1. Which aspects of human life did James Frazer deal with in his work *The Golden Bough*?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

2. Whose schema did James Frazer follow in his work?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

3. James Frazer was an arm chair anthropologist. Suggest if the statement is whether true or false.

.....  
 .....  
 .....

---

**8.2 CLASSICAL EVOLUTIONARY THEORY**

---

By the early twentieth century, two schools of thought began to predominate; these were the schools of Evolution and of Diffusion. Both of these schools of thought were coeval with each other and although they appear to be diametrically opposed, they did share thoughts and the evolutionists like Tylor had acknowledged that diffusion of traits does take place and the diffusionists too had a time sequence that was almost similar to the stage by stage evolution theory.

Let us first discuss the basic premises of the evolutionary school.

1. The evolutionists believed that societies move from lower to higher stage. Meaning thereby that evolution is progressive, going towards improvement.
2. They believed that there is only one Culture, with a capital C as described by Ingold (1986). The difference that we see in societies across the world is not because they have different cultures, but because they are at different stages of the *same* Culture.

3. Thus classical evolutionary theory is also a unilineal theory, a theory that believes that there is only *one line* for cultural progress.
4. The implications for this is that once the sequence of progress has been established, it will be but one more step to determine the next stage to which the society will progress. In other words if the sequences are worked out well, this should be a predictive theory as well.
5. The evolutionary theory is a meta theory, a theory that is generalised and all encompassing. In this sense it was a theory that in science would be one that established the order of things.

However, if you just reflect a little you will realise that there can be several criticisms of this theory. The evolutionists believed that evolution was progressive, but what was progress? How was it to be defined? What were the criteria by which a society could be put higher or lower in the scale of evolution? For the white, male scholars of the nineteenth century, the solution was simple. Any society that was closer to the western civilisation was higher or more civilised and those that appeared, both in appearance and technology to be at the farthest distance was the most 'primitive'. The coining of the term 'primitive' was simply an index by which the distance from western civilisation could be measured. Thus the Australian Aborigines were considered as one of the most 'primitive' societies because they Australian Aborigines had a physical appearance very far from that of the Europeans, and they also had a Stone Age technology. Emile Durkheim went to study them in order to write his *Elementary Forms of Religious Life* as he thought they represented the earliest and most elementary stage of human society. Sigmund Freud also took their example in his book *Totem and Taboo*.

The upper caste Indians on the other hand were considered very close to the Europeans and as pointed out by Trautmann, there was an initial phase of Indophiles who looked upon India as a great civilisation, quite close to Europe. But the situations changed with changing political relations.

Since patriarchy was the norm in western societies, the European colonisers considered matriline and matriarchy to be representatives of a lower scale of civilisation. Thus the famous scholar of this school, Bachofen, considered matriarchy or Mother Right to be a lower form of social order than patriarchy. Nineteenth century Renaissance led by scholars such as Francis Bacon had relegated women to a lower order incapable of rational thought. Thus according to Bachofen, the Mother right complex had all things of lower and negative value, like moon, night, wet, lower etc., it also had fertility and death associated with it. Since men alone had the ability to reason, any society led by women had to be inferior. Thus western patriarchy brought about civilisation and the conquest of the East by the West was a turning point of history when the world became truly civilised.

The Unilineal theory was also unable to explain exactly why certain societies were more progressive and some were less. Although there was agreement to some extent among scholar about what came first and what came next; there never was a full agreement as these sequences were constructed speculatively. There was no real evidence or possibility of knowing from societies long extinct, as to what really happened. Thus Maine clashed with McLennan on the issue of whether matriline came first or patriline. Maine, a lawyer and proficient in languages and cultures of the East, was of the opinion that patriline came first and matriline came later quite opposite to McLennan and Bachofen who had the opposite sequence in mind.

Edward B. Tylor gave us a sequence of the evolution of religion. According to Tylor's definition, culture was something that everyone had, but only in different degrees of development. He also defined the earliest form of religion as Animism; a belief in the soul or the belief in a dual body of spirit and material body. He explained that since all humans have the same capacity for reflective thinking, the earliest humans must also have thought the way he (Tylor) was thinking. Thus Tylor speculated that the most primitive people must have pondered over the phenomenon of death and of dreams and invented a belief in soul to explain them. They must have thought that in dream, the soul leaves the body temporarily and wanders around, while in death it leaves it permanently. But since the soul appears to be the real source of life or *anima*, it is the most important part of any living being. All life is animated by the existence of a soul or spirit.

According to Tylor, from Animism, evolve other systems of beliefs like in the other world, in ancestors, in sacrifice and other rituals. Animism was followed by Naturism, Totemism, Polytheism till finally the ultimate stage of religion, namely Monotheism and the belief in a supreme God comes about. Thus Christianity, the religion of the Europeans of that time is seen as the highest form of religious belief.

In America, the evolutionary school is represented by the work of Lewis Henry Morgan, who is also regarded as the father of Kinship studies. According to Morgan societies move from being based on kinship to territory. Modern societies are based on the concept of territory based citizenship (*Civitas*) while earlier societies were based on membership through kin groups (*Societas*). He coined the terms 'descriptive' and 'specific' kinship systems, where according to him descriptive systems evolved into specific kinship systems. In contemporary times this has changed to 'descriptive' and 'specific' kin terms, rather than systems. The concept of a kinship system based on how kin are classified and named in any society was the contribution of Morgan.

Unlike other arm chair anthropologists of his time, Morgan had also done fieldwork among the Native American tribes (Iroquois) who lived in his backyard and was directly involved with them. He gave his famous sequence of Ethnical Periods, where instead of focusing on just one aspect of society, like the other evolutionists of his time; he gave the sequence for most social institutions, subsistence, family, political institutions and law. Each ethnical period, saw a particular stage of development of each of these institutions.

In spite of being Eurocentric, and speculative, the evolutionist brought about a definite change in conceptualising a universal humanity bound by a common possession, Culture. They thus, transcended the racism of their times to say that all human beings are one and all are capable of attaining the same level of culture. Their contributions in terms of defining specific institutions, giving names to customs and discovering the way society works is a part of the rich heritage of academic thought.

**Check Your Progress 2**

4. Give one of the premises of the evolutionary school.

.....

.....

.....

.....

5. Which school of thought believed that there is only one culture with a capital C?

.....  
.....  
.....

6. Who considered matriarchy or Mother right as a lower form of social order in his work?

.....  
.....  
.....

7. Which anthropologist is accredited with the sequence for evolution of religion and structured definition of culture.

.....  
.....  
.....

8. Lewis Henry Morgan represents which evolutionary school and among which Native American tribe he did his fieldwork?

.....  
.....  
.....

---

### 8.3 CLASSICAL DIFFUSION THEORY

---

According to the theory of Diffusion, there is not one but several cultures originating in different regions, which have then spread like the ripples on water. These cultures may meet at the edges and produce hybrid cultures. The diffusion school differs from the evolution school in two significant ways. Firstly they believe that cultures originate at the point of most creativity and favourable conditions and as they spread, they become diluted and inferior. Secondly there is not one but several Cultures in this world and each can be regarded as a specific regional complex of traits. Thus even though as already mentioned the two schools did not deny that both diffusion and evolution as a process happens, they differed in basic parameters. While one believed in progress the other believed more in deterioration of cultural traits and while one believed in a unilineal culture the other believed that there are multiple complexes.

One school of diffusion, the Egyptologists, did believe that all culture originates in Egypt, but they did not have much lasting influence, as their speculations were too far- fetched. Thus Perry and Elliott-Smith did not last for long but the German school of Graebner and father Schmidt, had a longer lasting influence as they put forward a theory of multiple origins and the radiation of cultures outwards from these centers. They also conceived culture as a configuration of traits, culture circles (*kulturkreis*) that diffused together. This foreshadowed the notion of cultural configuration and

trait –complexes, as developed in the American School. Graebner also put forward the idea that diffusion was not a mechanical process of adding on cultural traits but that the pattern of the receiving culture would also determine which cultural traits would be accepted and which ones rejected or modified. This again is reflected in the theories of Acculturation developed later in America.

The construction of these culture circles were however largely speculative and based on ill-informed data from various sources. The classical school of Diffusion thus had less influence than the classical evolutionary school. In fact the comments that Tylor made about diffusion of traits were more acceptable. The amazing similarity in prehistoric tools all over the world was attributed by Tylor to the process of diffusion rather than to independent origin. Tylor (1879) however warned of deriving diffusion from superficial resemblances. If there are similar conditions existing in two different cultures from which similar developments are possible then the similarity may be due to independent origins rather than diffusion.

**Check Your Progress 3**

9. Name the three schools that propounded the theory of Diffusion.  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....
10. Who attributed the similarity of prehistoric tools all over the world to diffusion rather than independent origin?  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

---

**8.4 HISTORICAL PARTICULARISM**

---

The American School of Historical Particularism was founded by Franz Boas, who being of German origin derived his theoretical insights from the German school of diffusion as well as from the Gestalt Psychology. He understood the importance of history in other words of the process of contextual social transformation rather than the generalised process of evolution. The American experience of colonisation was different from that of the British in Africa and India. The Native Americans were a dispersed and depopulated lot and the impact of history was evident as the anthropologists were often faced with the prospect of having to interview the last remaining representative of a tribe; and often had to make do with remnants of material culture, stories passed down and myths and folklore, when most members of the tribe were dispersed or dead. Boas spent most of his academic life in collecting and classifying these materials under the apprehension that they were going to be lost forever. Since history refers to the particular and not the general, according to Boas, there is not one Culture, but many cultures, each historically derived and specifically located and the product of minds of people in different locations. Thus both regional environments and the minds of the people who make up that culture, were factors influencing how a culture shaped up. Culture was also rooted in its material existence and not a sequence of ideas building upon ideas, as postulated by Tylor. In other words, Boas, had a more materialistic perspective on culture, and a

situational one, unlike Tylor's ideational view of culture as a purely mental phenomenon.

**Reflection**

**Gestalt psychology** is a philosophy of the German school of thought. That believes in the human mind and behaviour as a whole. The central principle of Gestalt psychology is that the mind forms a global whole with self-organising tendencies. Gestalt psychology proposes a unique perspective on human perception. As the Gestalt psychologists say; we don't just see the world, we actively interpret what we see, depending on what we are expecting to see.

From this historical and contextualised perspective on culture, American Anthropology was able to branch out in many directions, it developed into branches of historical anthropology, ecological, medical and psychological anthropology as well. Thus Boas gave importance to the role of individuals in shaping of cultures. Culture was not something that evolved on its own, but a cultivated process that individuals created and also changed, in the context of history that played out in a specific environment. Individuals were not the same across the world but each people had their mindset that was the product of their history and environment. Thus Boas wrote his famous work on *The Mind of the Primitive Man* and also wrote books on primitive art, etc., that clearly established the unique nature of different cultures. Foreshadowing the culture-personality school, Boas advocated that the structure and organisation of the human mind is similar but its manifestation varies according to human experience that is different in different cultures. Thus Boas put forward a theory that was ideographic and not nomothetic like that of the classical evolutionists; in other words his was a theory of the particular and not the general. History does not have laws, it has incidents, many of which are unique and therefore the name Historical Particularism for the theory put forward by Boas.

Yet Boas also followed the German school of Diffusion and culture circles, in that the American School, and the students of Boas, like A.L. Kroeber and Clark Wissler etc., believed in cultural diffusion and culture areas. Such theories did talk about some generalisations that were middle level and not sweeping generalisations as we come across among the evolutionists. The American school was also more focused on collection of field data and documentation of the same. Another student of Boas, Ruth Benedict, put forward the theory of Cultural Configuration that visualised a culture to be more than the sum of its parts. Thus Benedict talked about the character of a cultural whole, a configuration, like the personality of a person. A configuration was supposed to be an overall ethos, a concept derived from Gestalt psychology, where a personality has an overall essence that cannot be described in terms of discrete entities but can only be felt as an overall quality. Like if one looks at a painting, one gets an overall impression, that is conveys joy or sorrow or celebration or depression. Similarly individuals are more than the sum of their characters and people come across as overall personalities where one cannot pin point to any one or even a collection of characters. Benedict theorised that cultures too are more than the sum of their parts, and have an essence or ethos, like an individual. Her theory developed into the notion of National Character studies that were popular for a while and even today people refer to the 'American' character or the 'Indian' character.



**Check Your Progress 4**

11. Who founded the American School of Historical Particularism?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

12. Name the different fields of study that were taken up by the American School of Historical Particularism.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**8.5 NEO-DIFFUSIONISM**

It was Kroeber to whom we can look for further developments on the concept of Diffusion. Like Benedict, Kroeber had also talked about the ethos and eidos of culture, the overall character (ethos) and the components (eidos). He had also discussed about the relationship between culture and environment; saying that under certain favourable conditions a culture can develop into a climax culture, which then radiates outwards. The radiation is always a process of dilution and as cultures come into contact with other cultures at the edges of their radiation, they tend to form hybrid cultures. The Culture Area theory developed by Kroeber, led later to the establishment of regional school of studies; the underlying hypotheses being that cultures have an association with space and different regions of the world do have their own cultural specificities. Ruth Benedict too had given her theory of National Culture, that had found a lot of popularity but the theoretical premises were different; they were based on the premise of cultural configuration. The culture area theory was derived from historical particularism and also the concept of ethos, as given by Kroeber.

Otis T Mason and Clark Wissler also had an ambitious plan to trace the cultural areas across the world, beginning from North America, but because of the practical difficulties of trying to locate the center and the time and rate of diffusion, they could not carry this project forward.

Diffusion or the spread of cultural traits from one region to another is an undeniable process. Many critical aspects of culture, such as methods of food production, technology and even items of food and clothing have spread across the world through travel, trade and migration of populations. Whenever a culture is politically dominant over another culture, whether by the process of conquest or by any other means, traits from the superior culture is voluntarily accepted by the people of the marginal culture, as by the Indian people who accepted the culture of the British after colonisation. Even today because of economic domination, the culture of the USA is spreading rapidly across the world. Diffusion is distinguished from a similar process called acculturation which takes place when two cultures come directly into contact. Some like Herskovits have used time as a distinguishing character. While the process is taking place it is acculturation and when it has been accomplished, that is when the

traits have become established in the new culture, it can be said that diffusion has taken place. In other words the process is acculturation and the end product is diffusion.

Earlier Mason and Wissler had tried to access the antiquity of a diffused trait by the time it had taken to diffuse, but in contemporary times, the enhanced technology of internet and satellite communication has made almost instant diffusion possible and the final result of rapid and large scale diffusion is what we call globalisation. Today the entire world is like one huge mass culture, yet the very threat of loss of identity in this globalised world has made many cultures go into regression or into a process of revitalisation of tradition.

---

## 8.6 NEO-EVOLUTION

---

The classical evolutionary school had faced rejection because of their Eurocentrism and flawed methods; but by the fifties, and after the World Wars, the idea of evolution again began to reappear in the minds of the scholars.

The major theories were given by Marshall Sahlins and Elman Service, Leslie White and Julian Steward. All of them tried to combine the processes of history and evolution to say that while there are particular processes of historical transformation, there are also larger more generalised meta- processes of evolution. All these scholars attempted to make the identification of the process of evolution more methodologically rigid as the earlier evolutionists were accused of speculation and bias.

Sahlins said that we can identify two kinds of evolution, General and Specific. The General evolution can be compared to the trunk of a large tree that shows overall growth, and for cultures it can be seen in the increased level of complexity of cultures, over the centuries of development of human civilisation. However Sahlins was clear that this increased complexity, if only in organisational attributes and is no indicator of superiority of a culture. The process of specific evolution refers to the adaptations of cultures to their environments, that show a large range of variability and gives rise to the variations in cultures depending upon their different habitats and historical conditions. Sahlins compares specific evolution to the branches of a tree.

The difference between a so-called higher civilisation and a more simple one lies in the difference between what Sahlins has called adaptability as compared to adaptation. Adaptability is the ability to adapt to a higher range of situations, and enables a culture to undergo Adaptive Radiation. In the process of general evolution, some cultures acquire the technology for adaptive radiation that enables them to establish domination over other cultures; like the colonisation of the world by the Europeans that was made possible by their acquisition of gun powder and superior technologies of navigation. Adaptive Radiation is not necessarily something good for humanity as it often involves war and conquest enabling some culture to dominate over others and spread itself around the world.

Specific radiations can be very effective and functional but often get ousted or destroyed by more adaptive cultures, as their very functional adaptation to specific environments prevents them from spreading. For example the Inuit of Alaska and parts of Greenland are very adapted to their surroundings but would find it difficult to adapt to other environments. But an invention like electricity will enable a culture to adapt to a variety of habitats and thus enable them to spread over a wider region.

Leslie White was deeply influenced by the unilineal evolutionary theory of Tylor, and like him, also believed in progressive evolution. While accepting most of the basic

premises of Tylor, White pointed out that Tylor failed in identifying the real cause of change in societies. Following the principle of cultural relativism put forward by the American School, White agreed that no culture as a culture was superior or inferior. But the transformation of technology and the amount of energy that a culture could harness, was an indication of its evolution or attainment of a superior stage. According to White the amount of energy that a culture could use indicated its standard of living, and all humans aspired for higher standards of living. His theory became famous as Energy and the Evolution of culture. White gave some mathematical formulas to exactly measure the amount of energy that a culture could use. But when it came to the empirical application of his theory, it was found to be methodologically impossible.

Human cultures are too complex to be dealt with in such a simplistic fashion. Yet White was effectively able to point to the difference between history and evolution and to show that the classical evolutionists had confused between the two.

The most effective of all the neo-evolutionist theories was that given by Julian Steward. He modified the concept of culture, as uniform or all cultural traits being evenly placed to a layered concept, with a core and a periphery. His theory is also known as the theory of Cultural Ecology. He combined the functional model with the cultural historical one to produce a model of culture, where the core was in a functional interdependent relationship with certain elements of the habitat. This core was thus defined in terms of the techno-economic aspects of a culture. In terms of the core aspects of a culture, one could create a typology as there are not many different types of adaptations of societies in the world. Since each culture is also unique, this specific nature of a culture is a result of its history, by which the peripheral aspects of the culture assume a specific character for each culture. These two aspects of culture change in different ways.

The core has a dialectical relationship with the environment. As the technology of the core acts upon the environment, the latter changes, thus creating a need for changes in techno-economic aspects. Further changes in technology create more transformation in the habitat, and pushes the system forward. Since there are only some known types of habitats in the world, Steward put forward the theory of Multilinear Evolution. He postulated that one could empirically establish the exact line of evolution of cultures in specified regions, but each stage needs to be verified through the collection of empirical evidence, even from the past.

Steward called his theory of Culture Change, both a theory and a methodology and he insisted that every aspect of every relationship should be established empirically and there should be no scope for speculation. His was an inductive theory and it helped to prepare classifications of modes of subsistence that we are still using. We can now classify societies based on their culture core that is the basic units of their techno-economic adaptation, without referring to the peripheral cultural elements that make each culture unique. For example all hunters and food gatherers have some core features in common but each is also a unique culture contextualised in its own setting. The Paliyans of South India and the !Kung San of Kalahari have common characters in terms of technology and basic features of social organisation that are integral to their foraging economy but are otherwise quite distinct in their cultures as far as other features not directly related to their economy is concerned.

Thus neo-Evolutionists tried to improve upon classical evolutionists mainly in terms of method. They tried to replace the speculative nature of classical evolution by empirical and verifiable methods.

**Check Your Progress 4**

13. Name the anthropologists who postulated major theories on Neo-Evolutionism.

.....  
.....  
.....

14. Whose theory on neo-evolutionism is also known as Cultural Ecology?

.....  
.....  
.....

15. Who was inspired by E.B. Tylor’s theory of unilinear evolution?

.....  
.....  
.....

---

**8.7 SUMMARY**

---

The classical theories have their own place in the study of social and cultural anthropology. These theories were the starting point from which the emphasis on theorising a particular event came up. Though these theories are no longer of prime importance yet they built the foundation for the anthropological thoughts. These theories brings into focus how the study of society and culture from the Victorian era had changed over the passage of time, the anthropologists have moved forward from the speculation on cultural evolution and the spread of culture diffusion to the more relative aspects in the present era. We have seen that the history of anthropological theories has involved a transition from a diachronic perspective to synchronic perspective which further moved on to interactive perspective. Moving from these classical theories we will discuss functionalism, structural-functionalism neo-functionalism and conflict theories in detail in the next unit.

---

**8.8 REFERENCES**

---

Benedict, Ruth. (1934). *Patterns of Culture* (reprint 1961) Boston: Houghton Mills.

Boas, Franz. (1938). *The Mind of the Primitive Man*. New York: Mac Millan.

Bohannan, Paul and Marc Glazer. (1973). *High Points in Anthropology*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.

Driver, Harold. E. (1973). “Cultural Diffusion” in Raoul Naroll and Frada Naroll (ed) *Main Currents in Cultural Anthropology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. pp 157-183.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1981). *A History of Anthropological Thought*. London: Faber.

Fried, Morton. (1967). *The Evolution of Political Society*. New York: Random House.

- Honigman, John. (1976). *The Development of Anthropological Ideas*. Florence, Ky. USA: The Dorsey Press.
- Ingold, Tim. (1982). *Evolution and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroeber, A.L. (ed.). (1953). *Anthropology Today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leaf, Murray. J. (1979). *Man, Mind and Science*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Naroll, Raoul and Frada Naroll. (1973). *Main Currents in Cultural Anthropology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Sahlins, Marshall. D. and Elman. E. Service. (ed.) (1960). (reprint 1973) *Evolution and Culture*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Steward, Julian. (1955). *Theory of Culture Change*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Trautmann, Thomas. (1997). *Aryans and the British in India*. California: University of California Press.
- White, Leslie. A. (1943). "Energy and the Evolution of Culture". *American Anthropologist*. 45( 3): 333-336.

---

## 8.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

---

1. James Frazer in his work *The Golden Bough* gave an extensive account of the rituals and customs of people across the world.
2. August Comte.
3. True.
4. Please see section 8.2 where five premises of the evolutionary school are given. You can write any one of them.
5. The evolutionary school of thought believed that there is only one culture with a capital C.
6. Johann J. Bachofen.
7. Edward B. Tylor.
8. Lewis Henry Morgan followed the American evolutionary school, his fieldwork was among the Iroquois, a Native American tribe.
9. The three schools that propounded the theory of Diffusion are:
  - a. The Egyptian School,
  - b. The German or *Kulturkries* and;
  - c. The American School of Diffusion
10. Edward B. Tylor.
11. Franz Boas.

## **Theoretical Perspectives**

12. The different fields of study that were taken up by the American School of Historical Particularism were historical, medical, ecological and psychological anthropology.
13. Marshall Sahlins, Elman Service, Leslie White and Julian Steward.
14. Julian Steward's theory on neo-evolutionism is also known as Cultural Ecology
15. Leslie White was influenced by E. B. Tylor's theory of unilinear evolution.