International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research
www.socialsciencejournal.in
ISSN: 2455-2070
Received: 17-11-2025, Accepted: 16-12-2025, Published: 31-12-2025
Volume 11, Issue 6, 2025, Page No. 182-186

From evolutionism to postmodernism: A critical synthesis of major theoretical traditions in social anthropology

Ganesh Shrirang Nale Satarkar[1], Dr. Priyanka Sambhaji Jadhavar[2]
[1] Department of Sociology, Central University of Haryana, Mahendragarh, Haryana, India
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India

Abstract
Social anthropology has evolved through a rich and complex intellectual history marked by diverse theoretical paradigms seeking to explain human culture, society, and behavior. From early speculative frameworks to reflexive and interpretive approaches, anthropological theory reflects changing epistemological assumptions, methodological innovations, and political contexts. This paper offers a comprehensive and critical synthesis of major theoretical traditions in social anthropology, tracing their historical development, core assumptions, methodological orientations, and enduring contributions. Beginning with classical evolutionism, associated with thinkers such as Edward Burnett Tylor and Lewis Henry Morgan, the paper examines how unilinear models of social progress shaped early anthropological thought. It then explores diffusionism and historical particularism as reactions against evolutionary universalism, emphasizing cultural contact and historical specificity. Functionalist and structural-functional paradigms, notably advanced by Bronislaw Malinowski and A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, are analyzed for their focus on social integration and institutional stability. Structuralism, associated with Claude Lévi-Strauss, introduced a cognitive dimension by uncovering universal structures of the human mind. Subsequent developments—including culture and personality studies, cultural ecology, neo-evolutionism, and cultural materialism—expanded anthropology's engagement with psychology, environment, and material conditions. The paper further examines symbolic, cognitive, and interpretive anthropology, culminating in postmodern, poststructural, and postcolonial critiques that challenged objectivity, representation, and power in anthropological knowledge. Finally, theories of gender and ethnicity are discussed as transformative interventions that foreground identity, inequality, and agency. By integrating classical and contemporary perspectives, this paper demonstrates that social anthropology is not a linear progression of theories but a dynamic, dialogical field continually redefining its intellectual and ethical foundations.

Keywords: Social anthropology, evolutionism, diffusionism, functionalism, structuralism, culture and personality, cultural ecology, neo-evolutionism, cultural materialism, symbolic anthropology, cognitive anthropology, interpretive anthropology, gender, postmodernism, ethnicity

Introduction

Social anthropology emerged as a systematic academic discipline during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, shaped by colonial expansion, encounters with non-Western societies, and the rise of scientific rationalism in Europe. Early anthropologists sought to understand the diversity of human societies through comparative, evolutionary, and historical frameworks, often influenced by Enlightenment ideals of progress and reason. From its inception, anthropology has been characterized not by theoretical unity but by ongoing debates concerning human universals versus cultural particularity, social order versus conflict, structure versus agency, and meaning versus material conditions. Anthropological theory reflects its historical and intellectual contexts, responding to political, philosophical, and methodological shifts. Each theoretical tradition emerged both as a product of its time and as a critique of preceding approaches. As a result, anthropology evolved through paradigms such as evolutionism, diffusionism, functionalism, structuralism, and postmodern critiques, continually redefining its scope and purpose. Understanding anthropological theories is essential for grasping the intellectual genealogy of the discipline. More importantly, these theories retain contemporary relevance in addressing issues such as identity formation, inequality, globalization, power relations, and knowledge production. In a globalized world marked by cultural interaction and social transformation, anthropological theory provides critical tools for interpreting human behavior, social institutions, and cultural meanings in both local and global contexts.

Evolutionism

Classical evolutionism represents the earliest systematic theoretical framework in anthropology. Thinkers such as Edward Burnett Tylor, Lewis Henry Morgan, James George Frazer, Henry Maine, and John Ferguson McLennan argued that human societies evolve through universal and sequential stages, typically progressing from "primitive" to "civilized" forms. Culture was viewed as a cumulative phenomenon governed by rational laws similar to those of biological evolution. Tylor defined culture as a "complex whole" acquired by humans as members of society, establishing one of anthropology's foundational concepts. Morgan proposed stages of savagery, barbarism, and civilization based on technological and social criteria, while Frazer emphasized intellectual evolution from magic to religion and science. These scholars relied heavily on comparative methods using secondary data from travelers and missionaries. Despite its contributions, evolutionism was criticized for ethnocentrism, teleological assumptions, and lack of empirical fieldwork. It ranked societies according to Western standards and ignored historical and cultural specificity. Nevertheless, evolutionism laid the

groundwork for anthropology as a comparative science and stimulated later theoretical developments through critical reassessment.

Diffusionism

Diffusionism emerged in the early twentieth century as a reaction against the unilinear assumptions of evolutionism. Rather than viewing cultural similarities as results of independent invention, diffusionists argued that cultural traits spread through contact, migration, and borrowing. Cultural change, according to this perspective, was largely the outcome of historical diffusion rather than universal evolutionary stages. The Austro-German School emphasized the concept of *Kulturkreise* (culture circles), proposing that major cultural complexes originated in specific centers and diffused outward. The British School focused on migration and contact between societies, often emphasizing the transmission of specific institutions such as kinship or technology. The American School, influenced by empirical fieldwork, adopted a more moderate stance, recognizing diffusion while allowing for independent innovation within cultures.

Diffusionism shifted anthropological attention toward historical processes and inter-cultural contact, challenging the evolutionary assumption of parallel development. However, it was criticized for overemphasizing external influence and underestimating human creativity, internal social dynamics, and functional integration. In some cases, diffusionist explanations became speculative, tracing traits across vast geographical areas without sufficient evidence. Despite its limitations, diffusionism contributed to a more historically sensitive anthropology and prepared the ground for later culture-historical and regional studies.

Historical Particularism

Historical particularism, led by Franz Boas, marked a decisive break from grand evolutionary and diffusionist generalizations. Boas rejected the idea of universal laws governing cultural development and argued that each culture must be understood within its unique historical context. He emphasized that cultural traits are products of specific historical events, environmental conditions, and social interactions rather than stages of evolution. Boas strongly advocated rigorous fieldwork, linguistic competence, and detailed ethnographic documentation. He introduced the principle of cultural relativism, urging anthropologists to understand cultures on their own terms rather than judging them by Western standards. He also rejected racial determinism, demonstrating that biological differences do not account for cultural variation. Historical particularism played a crucial role in professionalizing anthropology, especially in the United States. Boas trained a generation of influential anthropologists who expanded the discipline through empirical research and theoretical diversity. While critics argued that the approach discouraged theory-building and overemphasized description, its insistence on methodological rigor and respect for cultural diversity fundamentally reshaped anthropology. It remains a cornerstone for ethical and empirical anthropological practice.

Functionalism

Functionalism is most closely associated with Bronislaw Malinowski, who conceptualized culture as an integrated and coherent system designed to satisfy the biological, psychological, and social needs of individuals. Rejecting speculative armchair anthropology, Malinowski emphasized intensive fieldwork and participant observation, most famously demonstrated in his ethnographic study of the Trobriand Islanders. He argued that cultural institutions—such as kinship, religion, economy, and law—should be understood in terms of the functions they perform in fulfilling human needs, including reproduction, subsistence, social cohesion, and emotional security. According to Malinowski, no cultural trait exists in isolation; rather, each element contributes to the stability and continuity of the social whole. For example, religious rituals function not merely as symbolic acts but as mechanisms for reducing anxiety and reinforcing collective values. Functionalism thus shifted anthropology toward empirical rigor and holistic analysis, establishing fieldwork as the discipline's methodological cornerstone. However, Functionalism was criticized for its ahistorical perspective, as it largely ignored processes of historical change, colonial intervention, and power relations. Critics also argued that by focusing on social stability and harmony, Functionalism underestimated conflict, inequality, and social transformation. Despite these limitations, Functionalism remains foundational for its methodological innovations and its emphasis on lived cultural experience.

Structural-Functionalism

Structural-functionalism, developed by A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and further advanced by Raymond Firth, Meyer Fortes, Fred Eggan, and Talcott Parsons, shifted analytical focus from individual needs to social structure. Influenced by Durkheimian sociology, this approach viewed society as an organized system of interdependent institutions—such as family, religion, politics, and law—that function together to maintain social order and equilibrium. Unlike Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown argued that the primary function of social institutions is not to satisfy individual needs but to ensure the continuity of the social system. Social roles, norms, and rules were seen as structural mechanisms that regulate behavior and sustain collective life. Kinship systems, for instance, were analyzed as enduring frameworks governing rights, obligations, and authority across generations. Structural-functionalism provided powerful tools for comparative analysis and clarified how social institutions contribute to systemic stability. However, it has been criticized for its conservative bias, as it tends to legitimize the status quo and underplay conflict, inequality, and social change. Its relative neglect of agency, history, and power dynamics limited its ability to explain rapid social transformations, particularly in colonial and postcolonial contexts.

Structuralism

Structuralism was introduced into anthropology by Claude Lévi-Strauss, who proposed that universal cognitive structures of the human mind underlie cultural diversity. Drawing inspiration from linguistics, Lévi-Strauss argued that culture operates like a language, governed by deep, unconscious rules. He emphasized binary oppositions—such as nature/culture, raw/cooked, life/death—as fundamental organizing principles shaping myths, kinship systems, and symbolic practices. Structuralism sought to move beyond surface-level cultural variations to uncover the deep

structures that generate cultural meaning. For Lévi-Strauss, myths across different societies were not random narratives but transformations of a limited set of universal mental patterns. His comparative analysis of mythologies demonstrated how societies resolve fundamental contradictions through symbolic systems.

This approach significantly broadened anthropology's intellectual scope, linking it to philosophy, linguistics, and cognitive science. However, Structuralism faced criticism for being overly abstract and detached from social reality. By prioritizing mental structures over historical context, material conditions, and lived experience, it often ignored issues of power, inequality, and change. Nonetheless, Structuralism remains influential for its emphasis on symbolic systems and its challenge to ethnocentric interpretations of culture.

Culture and Personality / Psychological Anthropology

The Culture and Personality school, also known as Psychological Anthropology, examined the relationship between cultural patterns and individual personality formation. Key contributors include Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Cora DuBois, Ralph Linton, Abram Kardiner, and John Whiting. This approach emphasized how enculturation and child-rearing practices shape personality traits within a society. Mead's studies challenged biological determinism by demonstrating cultural variability in gender roles and adolescence. Benedict proposed the concept of "cultural configurations," suggesting that each culture selects and emphasizes particular personality traits, producing characteristic cultural patterns. Kardiner integrated psychoanalytic theory, linking basic personality structures to social institutions. Culture and Personality research contributed significantly to understanding cultural relativism, socialization, and the diversity of human behavior. However, it was criticized for overgeneralization, methodological weaknesses, and the tendency to treat cultures as homogeneous entities. Later anthropologists also questioned its reliance on Western psychological models. Despite these critiques, the approach laid important groundwork for interdisciplinary dialogue between anthropology and psychology and deepened insights into culture–individual interaction.

Cultural Ecology and Neo-Evolutionism

Cultural ecology, pioneered by Julian Steward, examines the reciprocal relationship between culture and environment, focusing on how human societies develop adaptive strategies to survive within specific ecological settings. Steward rejected unilinear evolutionary models and instead proposed multilinear evolution, arguing that different societies follow distinct evolutionary paths depending on environmental constraints, subsistence patterns, and technological capacities. His work emphasized "culture cores"—those cultural features most directly related to subsistence and environmental adaptation. Neo-evolutionism emerged in the mid-twentieth century as a refined reintroduction of evolutionary thinking, most notably advanced by Leslie White and Marshall Sahlins. White emphasized energy capture and technological efficiency as key drivers of cultural evolution, proposing that cultural development could be measured by a society's capacity to harness energy. Sahlins, however, adopted a more nuanced approach, integrating culture, symbolism, and history into evolutionary explanations. Together, cultural ecology and neo-evolutionism moved anthropology away from deterministic and ethnocentric models toward context-sensitive, dynamic explanations of cultural change. Critics argue that these approaches sometimes reduce culture to environmental or technological adaptation, but their emphasis on complexity and variability significantly advanced anthropological theory.

Cultural Materialism

Cultural materialism, formulated by Marvin Harris, is a theoretical framework that explains cultural practices primarily through material conditions, including technology, economy, ecology, and modes of production. Harris divided culture into three analytical levels: infrastructure (material and economic factors), structure (social organization), and superstructure (beliefs, values, and ideologies). He argued that infrastructure exerts a determining influence over the other levels. Cultural materialism sought to make anthropology a scientifically testable discipline, emphasizing empirical verification and causal explanation rather than interpretive meaning. Harris used this approach to explain practices such as food taboos, religious rituals, and population regulation as rational responses to ecological and economic constraints rather than symbolic or irrational traditions.

While cultural materialism provided powerful explanations for cross-cultural regularities, it has been criticized for economic and environmental determinism. Critics argue that it underestimates human agency, symbolism, and the autonomous role of ideas. Nonetheless, cultural materialism significantly influenced anthropological debates by highlighting the importance of material conditions in shaping cultural patterns and by challenging idealist and purely symbolic interpretations of culture.

Symbolic Anthropology

Symbolic anthropology focuses on symbols, rituals, and systems of meaning through which societies construct and communicate social reality. Prominent contributors include Victor Turner, Raymond Firth, and Mary Douglas. This approach views culture as a symbolic system that must be interpreted rather than explained through causal laws.

Turner emphasized ritual processes, particularly concepts such as liminality and communitas, demonstrating how symbols mediate social conflict and transformation. Douglas examined symbolic classifications of purity and pollution, revealing how symbolic boundaries reflect social order and moral regulation. Firth combined symbolic interpretation with social analysis, bridging meaning and structure. Symbolic anthropology marked a shift away from materialist and functionalist explanations toward interpretive understanding, emphasizing how people experience and assign meaning to their social worlds. However, critics argue that the approach often neglects power relations, historical context, and material constraints. Despite these critiques, symbolic anthropology enriched anthropological analysis by foregrounding culture as a lived, meaningful, and communicative process.

Cognitive Anthropology

Cognitive anthropology investigates how cultural knowledge is organized, transmitted, and internalized within the human mind. Key figures such as Roy D'Andrade,

Stephen Tyler, and Ward Goodenough emphasized the study of mental models, classification systems, and shared cultural schemas. This approach conceptualizes culture as a system of knowledge rather than behavior or material artifacts. Goodenough defined culture as "what one needs to know to function appropriately in a society," highlighting competence over performance. Cognitive anthropologists employed methods such as componential analysis, ethnoscience, and linguistic modeling to uncover culturally specific categories and meanings.

By integrating anthropology with linguistics, psychology, and cognitive science, this perspective offered a systematic way to study meaning and cognition. However, critics contend that cognitive anthropology risks abstraction and may overlook emotion, power, and social practice. Nonetheless, it made important contributions by demonstrating that cultural differences are embedded in distinct cognitive frameworks.

Interpretive Anthropology and Deep Ethnography

Interpretive anthropology, most closely associated with Clifford Geertz, conceptualizes culture as a "web of meanings" spun by humans themselves. Geertz argued that the task of anthropology is not to discover universal laws but to provide "thick description"—a detailed, contextual interpretation of social actions and symbols.

Deep ethnography emphasizes immersion, reflexivity, and narrative richness to capture the lived experiences of social actors. Rather than seeking causal explanations, interpretive anthropology prioritizes understanding meaning from the native's point of view. Cultural practices such as rituals, performances, and everyday interactions are treated as texts to be interpreted. This approach transformed ethnographic writing and highlighted the role of the anthropologist as an interpreter rather than an objective observer. Critics argue that interpretive anthropology can be overly subjective and insufficiently attentive to material structures and power relations. Nevertheless, it remains influential for its emphasis on meaning, context, and human experience, offering a humanistic alternative to positivist models of social science.

Anthropology and Gender

Anthropology and gender emerged as a critical response to the androcentric biases embedded in earlier anthropological theory and ethnography, which largely privileged male experiences and perspectives. Feminist anthropology challenged the assumption that gender roles were biologically determined or universally structured. Scholars such as Leela Dube, Renato Rosaldo, Marilyn Strathern, and Zora Neale Hurston played pivotal roles in redefining gender as a culturally constructed and relational category. Leela Dube's work on kinship and family in South Asia demonstrated how gender relations are embedded within social structures, rituals, and ideologies. Strathern questioned Western assumptions of individuality and gender, showing how personhood is culturally constituted. Rosaldo emphasized the symbolic and political dimensions of gender, while Hurston's ethnographic writings foregrounded Black women's voices and experiences. This approach reshaped anthropology by reinterpreting kinship, power, labor, and identity through a gendered lens. Feminist anthropology also emphasized reflexivity and ethics, highlighting the positionality of the researcher. Critics argue that early feminist anthropology sometimes universalized women's oppression, but later scholarship embraced intersectionality, making gender analysis central to contemporary anthropological inquiry.

Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, and Postcolonialism

Postmodernism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism represent influential critical turns that transformed anthropological theory by questioning objectivity, representation, and authority. Thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Pierre Bourdieu profoundly reshaped anthropological epistemology. Foucault's analysis of power–knowledge relations revealed how discourses produce social realities rather than merely describing them. Derrida's method of deconstruction challenged fixed meanings and binary oppositions, exposing instability within texts and ethnographic narratives. Bourdieu introduced concepts such as habitus, field, and symbolic capital, bridging structure and agency while highlighting subtle forms of domination. Postcolonial critiques exposed anthropology's historical entanglement with colonial power and challenged Western dominance in knowledge production. These perspectives encouraged reflexive ethnography, polyvocality, and ethical accountability. Critics argue that excessive relativism and textualism risk undermining empirical analysis. Nevertheless, these approaches expanded anthropology's critical scope, making it more self-aware, politically engaged, and attentive to marginalized voices.

Ethnicity

Theoretical approaches to ethnicity shifted anthropology away from viewing ethnic groups as fixed, biologically or culturally bounded entities toward understanding ethnicity as a dynamic social process. Influential thinkers such as Fredrik Barth, Max Weber, and Jeffery emphasized boundaries, interaction, and identity construction. Weber conceptualized ethnicity as a form of subjective belief in shared descent, highlighting its social rather than biological basis. Barth revolutionized ethnicity studies by arguing that what defines ethnic groups is not shared cultural traits but the maintenance of social boundaries through interaction. Ethnic identities persist not because of cultural homogeneity but because of boundary-making practices such as endogamy, symbolism, and political mobilization. This perspective highlighted the role of power, context, and historical change in shaping ethnic identities. Ethnicity is thus understood as situational, negotiated, and often instrumental. Critics caution that excessive emphasis on fluidity may obscure structural inequalities and material constraints. Nonetheless, boundary-based theories of ethnicity remain central to understanding nationalism, migration, and identity politics in contemporary societies.

Conclusion

Anthropological theory represents a cumulative yet contested intellectual tradition, evolving through continuous debate and critique. From classical evolutionism to postmodern and postcolonial perspectives, each theoretical paradigm has expanded anthropology's analytical capacity while simultaneously revealing new limitations. No single theory offers a complete explanation of human social life; instead, each contributes partial insights shaped by its historical and intellectual context. Contemporary

anthropology thrives on theoretical pluralism, integrating materialist, symbolic, interpretive, feminist, and critical approaches. Increased emphasis on reflexivity, ethics, and power relations has made the discipline more self-conscious and socially engaged. Anthropologists today address complex global issues such as inequality, identity politics, migration, environmental crises, and knowledge production. Rather than seeking universal laws, modern anthropology values contextual understanding and methodological diversity. This openness ensures the discipline's continued relevance in a rapidly transforming world. By critically engaging with its own past while embracing new perspectives, anthropology remains a vital field for understanding the complexities of human culture, society, and meaning.

References

1. Barth F. Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1969.
2. Benedict R. Patterns of culture. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1934.
3. Boas F. The mind of primitive man. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1911.
4. Bourdieu P. Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
5. Douglas M. Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo. London, UK: Routledge, 1966.
6. DuBois C. The people of Alor: A social-psychological study of an East Indian island. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1944.
7. Derrida J. Of grammatology (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
8. Eggan F. Social anthropology and the method of controlled comparison. American Anthropologist,1954:56(5):743–763. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1954.56.5.02a00020
9. Fortes M. The web of kinship among the Tallensi. London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1949.
10. Firth R. Elements of social organization. London, UK: Watts, 1951.
11. Foucault M. The archaeology of knowledge. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1972.
12. Frazer JG. The golden bough: A study in magic and religion. London, UK: Macmillan, 1890.
13. Geertz C. The interpretation of cultures. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1973.
14. Goodenough WH. Cultural anthropology and linguistics. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Language in culture and society. New York, NY: Harper Row, 1964, 36–39.
15. Harris M. Cultural materialism: The struggle for a science of culture. New York, NY: Random House, 1979.
16. Hurston ZN. Mules and men. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott, 1935.
17. Kardiner A. The individual and his society. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1939.
18. Lévi-Strauss C. Structural anthropology. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1963.
19. Linton R. The study of man. New York, NY: Appleton-Century, 1936.
20. Maine HS. Ancient law. London, UK: John Murray.
21. Malinowski B. Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London, UK: Routledge, 1922.
22. Malinowski B. A scientific theory of culture. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.
23. McLennan JF. Primitive marriage. Edinburgh, UK: Adam and Charles Black, 1865.
24. Mead M. Coming of age in Samoa. New York, NY: William Morrow, 1928.
25. Morgan LH. Ancient society. New York, NY: Henry Holt, 1877.
26. Parsons T. The social system. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1951.
27. Radcliffe-Brown AR. Structure and function in primitive society. London, UK: Cohen West, 1952.
28. Rosaldo R. Ilongot headhunting, 1883–1974: A study in society and history. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1980.
29. Sahlins M. Culture and practical reason. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
30. Sahlins M. Stone age economics. Chicago, IL: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.
31. Steward JH. Theory of culture change: The methodology of multilinear evolution. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1955.
32. Strathern M. The gender of the gift. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988.
33. Turner V. The forest of symbols. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.
34. Turner V. The ritual process. Chicago, IL: Aldine, 1969.
35. Tyler SA. Cognitive anthropology. Anthropological Quarterly,1969:42(1):3–17.
36. Tylor EB. Primitive culture. London, UK: John Murray, 1871.
37. Weber M. Economy and society (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978.
38. White LA. The science of culture. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, 1949.
39. Whiting JWM, Child IL. Child training and personality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1953.
40. D'Andrade R. The development of cognitive anthropology. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
41. Dube L. Seed and earth: The symbolism of biological reproduction and sexual relations of production. Contributions to Indian Sociology,1986:20(1):22–53.
42. Eriksen TH. Ethnicity and nationalism. London, UK: Pluto Press, 2002.
43. Kuper A. The invention of primitive society. London, UK: Routledge, 1988.
44. Marcus GE, Fischer MMJ. Anthropology as cultural critique. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
45. Ortner SB. Is female to male as nature is to culture? Feminist Studies,1974:1(2):5–31.
46. Said EW. Orientalism. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1978.
47. Stocking GW. Race, culture, and evolution. New York, NY: Free Press, 1968.
48. Wolf ER. Europe and the people without history. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1982.
49. Geertz C. Works and lives: The anthropologist as author. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988.
50. Harris M. The rise of anthropological theory. New York, NY: Crowell, 1968.