



A. I. RICHARDS

B. Gaye

Mallowski. This was during the brief interlude between the death of  
 Mallowski's first wife and Audrey's return to Africa in 1938. Helen  
 the youngest of the four, to Audrey's compassion in  
 helping Mallowski's invalid wife, and to the refreshing sense of humour  
 (and of the ridiculous) she brought to the sister. She has also made it  
 clear that Audrey's encouragement and support continued long after  
 the other younger people in her life. Helen Wray adds: 'I could

© The British Academy 1993. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without the permission of the British Academy.

## Audrey Isabel Richards 1899–1984

IN THE EIGHT YEARS THAT HAVE ELAPSED since Audrey Richards died, several accounts of her life and work have appeared. I draw on them freely in compiling this further account. They also give an insight into the way she appeared to others, and I also draw on them for their multifaceted reflection of Audrey Richards—as a person.

Audrey Isabel Richards spent her girlhood in India. Her father, Sir Henry Richards, then a member of the Viceroy's Council, brought his family back to England in 1911 on his appointment as Professor of International Law at Oxford. Her mother, Mary Butler, came from a family that also provided Burma and the Indian United Provinces with Governors. Sir Richard Faber remarks of his aunt that she was brought up in a solidly middle-class atmosphere and in a firm tradition of academic and professional success. He adds that she 'had a strong sense of family feeling and never disowned this past, though her own views became distinctly progressive'.

I have the impression that in later years she sustained a distance between the family to which she was so obviously attached and other aspects of her life with its manifold relationships and sometimes scruffy characters. When, with decisive generosity, she became a guardian to three children, it was to the daughters of her academic mentor Bronislaw Malinowski. This was during the brief interlude between the death of Malinowski's first wife and Audrey's return to Africa in 1938. Helena Wayne, the youngest of the three, refers to Audrey's compassion in helping Malinowski's invalid wife, and to the refreshing sense of humour (and of the ridiculous) she brought to the sisters. She has also made it clear that Audrey's encouragement and support continued long after. 'Like other younger people in her life', Helena Wayne admits, 'I could

organize her books, tidy her kitchen and as she grew older help with her *mis-en scène*, but I have never felt that I gave her back a tithe of what she gave me and mine’.

Audrey boarded at Downe House School; Jo Gladstone (family friend and one-time student) refers to letters home indicating the influence that Olive Willis, its headmistress, exercised on the newcomer from India, and attributes to her something of Audrey’s own directness of manner. Certainly Audrey hated humbug. If she had a façade, though, perhaps it was gaiety. Over the years she acquired a store of anecdotes, observations and commentaries that fanned the sense of humour (and the sense of the ridiculous) she conveyed to others. She preferred wit to sentiment, and would notice the oddness in unique moments rather than dredge them for nostalgia. Audrey’s recollections of her Cambridge days at Newnham College show a characteristic determination to do things without regret. But one should not dwell on personality alone: from the excerpts I have read, and some of the anecdotes I have listened to myself, I also recognize a cultural style—a type of English banter (a term Rosemary Firth also uses in recollection) that gives privilege no more than its due and keeps persons person-sized.

Her three years at Newnham (1919–22) were spent reading for Natural Science. Audrey then took up shorthand and typing, skills which equipped her for a brief period as an amanuensis for the classicist Gilbert Murray. Becoming caught up in post-war repatriation schemes in Germany, she worked for eighteen months at a Friends’ Ambulance Unit Family Welfare Settlement, where she encountered deprivation, hunger and the need to assess nutritional status. This was the time (in Gladstone’s words) that she had to learn ‘the essentials of dietary management, daily minima, weaning and keeping records in situations of dietary shortfall’. I wonder whether it was not just the particular attention to hunger and diet that she was to carry forward into her anthropology but also her visualization of the way data might be arranged (there was no avoiding tabulation). Issues of ‘method’ were to loom large both in what she learnt from Malinowski’s synoptic charts and in what she later taught. I myself have a vivid recollection of the uncertainty of line with which she would break some complex situation down into its grid-like characteristics, as deceptively faint as her voice was on occasion deceptively small. At any rate, the Appendices of her monograph, *Land, Labour and Diet*, were to include the chemical composition of Bemba foods tested at the nutrition laboratories of King’s College Hospital, London; her interpretation of the Bemba Chisungu ceremony was to be summarized according to features rendered in both vertical and horizontal columns.

For four years Audrey worked as a secretary to the League of Nations

Labour Department. In 1926 she went as a graduate student to the Anthropology Department of the London School of Economics, with which she was afterwards associated as a teacher for some years. The group of scholars who formed the Department of Social Anthropology, then under C. G. Seligman, and especially those graduates who attended Malinowski's seminar, were to be formative for the subject during its maturation in the 1930s. Among the first students were E. E. Evans-Pritchard and Raymond Firth, followed by Hortense Powdermaker and Isaac Schapera, then Audrey, Edith Clarke, Jack Driberg and Camilla Wedgwood, their successors including Meyer Fortes, S. F. Nadel, Godfrey Wilson and Phyllis Kaberry. Phyllis Kaberry, who later worked briefly as a research assistant to Audrey, was to become one of her life-long friends.

For Audrey the move was doubly formative. Not only did Malinowski supervise her work, a relationship that also became a personal friendship, but she remained true to principles of his teaching—especially those that broadly could be called functionalist—all her own life. As she defined the functional method in her 1943 obituary of Malinowski that appeared in the journal *Man*, it was a 'systematic technique for studying the inter-relationship of different aspects of a particular culture'. She was not uncritical; but it would also be true to say that she had little competitive stake in promoting the paradigms that followed. Richard Werbner draws attention to her 1941 review article on Evans-Pritchard's influential-to-be-monograph, *The Nuer*, most illuminating in this regard. It included an objection to tidying away the incongruities between different principles of grouping—rather, she argued, they should be acknowledged for the way they might reinforce one another, exist side by side or come into conflict. It amused her that both Evans-Pritchard and Gluckman found Malinowski's ethnography had too much in it for easy comparison with their own materials [the observation is recorded in her 1957 contribution to *Man and Culture*, an evaluation of Malinowski's work]. In fact, I suspect, she took from other anthropologists' models only what her own good sense would allow. So I suspect in turn that much of what Malinowski taught must have resounded with her already mature eye for what was practicable and important to study.

Given that one strand of his own work stressed the importance of recognizing biological need in social arrangements, Audrey's post-war experiences gave her a ready topic. Her Ph.D. thesis, subsequently published as *Hunger and Work in a Savage Tribe* (1932), was a library-based account. This did not, as one might imagine, deal with a single people, unless the south-eastern Bantu on whom she concentrates count as such; rather, it tried to lay out everything that had to be taken into account 'for a functional study of the nutritional system of a [any] savage

tribe'. She was pressed to publish, finishing it while she was in the field for the first time.

Overall, she spent more than two and a half years with the Bemba of Zambia (then Northern Rhodesia) between 1930–4. This fieldwork formed the basis for her two major contributions to anthropology: *Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia* published in 1939, and *Chisungu: A Girl's Initiation among the Bemba of Zambia* published after the interruption of the war in 1956. Fieldwork is often the moment at which the ethnographer, so evident to those on the spot, slips out of the view of other friends and colleagues: like their subjects, the person becomes known only by what he or she chooses to tell. In Audrey's case, however, her sister Gwynedd was with her for a while; Malinowski visited during her second trip (an important visit for him, given his own involvement in the International African Institute), and she made friends and colleagues there who carried over, so to speak, into her later life.

Writing on *Chisungu*, Raymond Firth notes that Audrey's eye for incongruity kept her from too smooth an account of the ceremonies that were put on for her benefit in 1931. Certainly she did not mind leaving loose ends; even relished them perhaps, for there was always more going on that could be observed and always more observed that could be explained. She used such incongruity to communicative effect. I think she found simple explanations of symbolic process suspect if only because they denied the multiple possibilities of symbolism to support and subvert at the same time. Indeed, in *Chisungu* she developed a methodological scheme for sorting out different kinds of observational understandings that became something of a landmark in the anthropological analysis of ritual.

But in the 1930s nutritionists were her immediate audience. Looking back on the stimulus of Malinowski's interest in biological process, Audrey was to refer to her first work (1932) as an analysis of the 'cultural conditions' in which nutrition is secured in human society; her second work (1939) took her into the sociology of a particular society and the particular 'problems' people made for themselves, here the Bemba experience of seasonal hunger. Gladstone's memoir contains interesting observations on the kind of nutritional data that Audrey collected, given scientific expectations at the time, and on the contribution of Lorna Gore-Browne. Gore-Browne was a Rhodesian resident, Bemba-speaker and dietitian who helped gather the materials that Audrey published in collaboration with Edith Widdowson, a biochemist at King's College Hospital, in 1937. Data had previously been compiled in Kenya, and were also being collected at home on the nutritional status of English children. A report by John Boyd Orr had come out in 1936, and he led an international group to which Audrey found herself contributing. Audrey's 1939 monograph accordingly

noted the conditions under which migrants worked and ate in the mining towns, and her tabulations included a comparison of Bemba village diet and Government rations. Yet this account had not been what she had initially had in mind, and it seems that some of the sampling and analysis was done after her return to London.

To see *Land, Labour and Diet* as a smooth development of her interests is to miss out the facts about the book's genesis that Audrey herself tells us. She had been planning an introductory monograph that she assumed would follow what was then the usual procedure of an outline account of the social structure, followed by such special aspects of the culture as space allowed. But she reversed this course of action 'for a practical reason'. She had become a member of the Diet Committee of the International African Institute, set up in 1935 to discuss the contribution of anthropological fieldwork to the study of nutrition. (The Committee included Raymond Firth and Drs McCance and Widdowson who analysed samples of Bemba foodstuffs sent to her from Zambia.) The material she had already collected seemed to provide a starting point for considering how best to collect and use information in the future; moreover, she was still in touch with Mrs Gore-Browne, who was on the spot in Bemba, and who was able to amplify her observations, send her further material and read the manuscript. (Audrey dedicated the volume to her.) Although she had never intended a full-scale investigation into nutrition, then, Audrey felt at least she could offer 'a short book describing, in the case of one particular tribe, the different sociological factors which directly determined food supply'. As she added: 'The book grew [to over 400 pages] after the fashion of its kind'. So did her practical commitments, and she sat on the Nutrition Committee set up by the Economic Advisory Council in 1937, as a direct result of a Colonial Office initiative to collect information as to the state of diet research in the British colonies. One of her close colleagues of the period was Lucy Mair, then at the London School of Economics as a Lecturer in Colonial Administration.

When war broke out, Audrey was lecturing at Witwatersrand University (she recalls among her fieldwork experience three months in the Transvaal in 1939). She returned to work on the Nutrition Committee for the London Colonial Office, serving in the office as a principal between 1942–4, working closely with Lord Hailey in the formation of the Colonial Social Science Research Council. She then became special lecturer and tutor in Colonial Studies at the London School of Economics from 1944–5 [to help in the training of local administrators], and Reader (1946–50). This was an exceptionally busy period, with numerous demands being made on her expertise. Letters of the time apparently express some of her frustration at being pulled in many directions.

Audrey opens her reflections on 'The colonial office and the organization of research' (*Anthropological Forum*, 1977) with this observation:

Those of us who contributed to the London School of Economics seminar on Anthropology and colonial policy were asked to consider a number of questions. How far were anthropologists working in British colonial territories under constraint by the Colonial Office or the colonial governments as regards the problems they tackled, the observations they were allowed to make, or their access to official documents? Perhaps even more important, how far were anthropologists influenced by their tacit assumptions that the Colonial Office policy was right in the territories in which they worked and how far did they consider themselves bound to assist in the implementation of such policies?

As she says:

It is difficult for people to realise nowadays how ignorant the general public was in the 'thirties as to the nature of a social anthropologist's work. I was asked on arrival in Livingstone, then the capital, whether I wanted to measure the heads of the prisoners in the local jail or to visit a village in the Luangwa valley, where a district commissioner thought he had discovered a dinosaur's egg, but not about any problem that could conceivably be of administrative interest.

If there had been little government interest, there was even less support for anthropology before the war. However the change of policy that had brought the Colonial Social Science Research Council into existence (1944–66) meant that for the first time funds were available to stimulate research on development and welfare projects in the colonies. Audrey records that the new policy was at the request of natural scientists who wanted proper credence to be given to human problems. On the Council itself were an economist, educationalist, historian, journalist, lawyer, linguist and educational psychologist. Audrey, with her great experience, served as an anthropologist (1944–50), being primarily responsible for the creation of the East African Institute of Social Research. Margaret Read and Raymond Firth were also anthropologist members.

The continent of Africa itself, rather than simply 'doing good' in relation to African affairs [doing good, her phrase, simultaneously drew attention to the need and cut the response down to size], was one of the directions in which she was pulled. She went again to Africa in 1950, this time as the founding Director of the new East African Institute. This interdisciplinary venture, set up at what was then Makerere College, Uganda, was one of the research institutes financed by a CSSRC grant. Largely of her own doing, she referred to it as 'an experiment on a very large scale', and one that sometimes made her 'gasp in retrospect'.

Audrey may have found echoes of her first post-war work in this quite

different location. Although the problems—to do with the effects of wage labour on rural families, the conditions of migration, changing use of land, and so forth—were different, the sense of urgency might have seemed familiar. Certainly she stimulated a set of studies which one way and another all contributed to what indeed must count as a pioneering ‘experiment in applied research’ (her words). She also stimulated primary ethnographic research, for this she regarded as basic for any future work (there was no avoiding surveys). As she says, she was shocked

that governments should be proceeding so rapidly with plans for post-war development, economic as well as political, with such out-of-date material on the cultures of the peoples of the area, and such a paucity of basic data on village size, links between villages, local leadership, and the nature of political districts.

Her own account is a staggering one: she records that during the five years she was at Makerere she coordinated the work of 22 Fellows, along with a further 21 anthropologist Associates, who carried out some 27 ethnographic surveys, 4 linguistic surveys and 2 psychological studies, in addition to economic and urban studies and a large-scale survey of immigrant labour in Buganda, a fertility study for UNESCO, and a study of African leadership. Her own fieldwork of this period was also largely focused in Uganda (1950–6), though she was to make a return trip to Zambia in 1957.

Audrey used the phrase ‘applied anthropology’ without hesitation. She regarded primary ethnographic research as its natural base, even as she took it as a matter of commonsense that the application had to be of knowledge provided with ethnographic exactitude. An interim report that had appeared in *Africa* (1932) after her very first field trip assumed that enhanced field techniques enhance the possibility of the anthropologist’s work having ‘practical value’. In 1944, she surveyed the research programme of the then 15-year old International African Institute as an ‘experiment in applied anthropology’, linking the endeavour to Malinowski’s advocacy of the study of political systems, customary law, land tenure and economic activities as an essential adjunct of ‘practical anthropology’. Malinowski’s own detailed tomes (e.g. *Coral Gardens*) were cited as an inspiration to fieldwork *qua* fieldwork. She gave no sense that she thought the anthropological project could become otherwise, though she was only too aware of the fact that, from a government’s point of view, anthropological information might not just come ‘too late’ but also be ‘too much’. Given her own repeated insistence on the importance of ‘training’ anthropologists for the ‘problems’ they would encounter in societies undergoing rapid change, she would no doubt have regarded



things coming full circle the year she died. [In 1984, the ASA produced their 'Working Party Report on Training for Applied Anthropology'.]

Now in her late fifties, she returned not to London but to Cambridge in 1956, taking up a Research Fellowship at Newnham College where she subsequently became Vice-Principal. She also became the first Director of the Centre for African Studies, although neither title nor centre was formally ratified till 1965, and was Smuts Reader in Anthropology until her retirement from both posts in 1967. This was the year (1967) that she was elected to the British Academy. It was a period during which some of her most interesting essays were written, including reflections on high office, and a period in which she herself was honoured in diverse ways. From anthropology she had already received the Wellcome Medal in 1941, and the Rivers Memorial Medal in 1945. Following the CBE (1955), she became President of the Royal Anthropological Institute (1959–61), and President of the African Studies Association (1963–6), both of which elicited memorable addresses. Her retiring Presidential Address for the latter (1966) draws attention to the oddity of there being African Studies Institutes at African universities; English studies she could understand, and wonders if there would ever be such Institutes in Africa. She refers to the popularity of a series of lectures on 'the anthropology of the English' that she once gave in the Rand mining towns.

Werbner remarks that it was her own wider personal experience of public administration, both government and academic, which gave 'such a ring of authenticity to her descriptions of the political culture of palace politics, elitist councils, and colonialism'. The works he cites are largely from this period: her famous 'African kings and their royal relatives' in the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (1961), 'Traditional values and current political behaviour' in Lloyd Fallers' edited volume *The King's Men* (1964), and her Henry Myers Lecture on kingship, 'Keeping the king divine' in the *Proceedings of the RAI* (1969).

There is no doubt about the loyalty she commanded herself. Sandy Robertson refers to Audrey's talent for instigating and managing collaboration. He cites the collection of essays on *East African Chiefs* (1960), 'a model of intellectual coherence', and the EAISR venture *Economic Development and Tribal Change* (1954) which tackled labour migration on a regional scale; she also co-authored or co-edited works, including *Councils in Action* with Adam Kuper (1971). The same can be said of her later collaborative enterprise in the English village of Elmton. Here, gently introducing them to the terrors of knocking on people's doors, she held together a motley assortment of undergraduate students enquiring into people's family histories. For her, perhaps, this was a way of managing the flood of information that came her way as a resident. I think she also

just wanted to share the opportunity that living in the village afforded. Her entry under 'Fieldwork' in the ASA Annals of this time laconically notes, 'UK Elmdon, Essex 1962—(intermittent)'.

In the memorial volume of *Cambridge Anthropology*, Jean Robin describes her encounter with Audrey in East Africa, where she was first her personal secretary and then Secretary to the East African Institute. Much later (1972 onwards), she found herself working with Audrey again, this time putting a geographer's order on the demographic materials which Audrey's intermittent study of the Essex village, Elmdon, had produced. In addition to the slim volume they jointly wrote for Elmdon residents (*Some Elmdon Families*, 1975), Robin was to write her own account of changing village fortunes. At this time, Audrey had moved into the cottage attached to her house in Elmdon, the former done up for her by Lady Martin and the latter once Elmdon's grammar school, and she was living for much of the year in a flat in Cambridge. It was from here that she set in train two major tidying up exercises: to get some of her never-published Bemba materials in order and to publish the rest of the Elmdon data. In 1977, Marianne Leach checked and added to much of the genealogical record, while Frances Oxford, living in Elmdon, was updating family histories.

Initially a teaching project devised by Edmund Leach and herself, and starting off in 1962 with a small cohort, altogether she introduced some twenty students to her neighbours in Elmdon between 1962–75. Many came for short periods, though others conducted surveys and investigated specific topics more thoroughly: their names are to be found in Audrey's Foreword and my own Preface to *Kinship at the Core*. [I was a third-year supervisee of Audrey's, and had been in Elmdon in that first cohort; in 1976–7 I found myself living a few minutes away from her Cambridge flat, and it seemed natural to be paying her visits, natural to offer to write a couple of chapters for the book she had in mind, and it was a mark of her grace, among other things, that in the end she made it seem natural that while Robin focused on the historical record I should take over writing the anthropological account with the help of Marianne Leach. In fact, Oxford and I managed to get more charts and tables out of those 300-odd residents than I did in my general ethnography of 40,000 Hageners, where my principal reference groups were four times the size of Elmdon: 27 as opposed to 24 tables to be precise. I only say this to keep in character—I heard long afterwards that Audrey thought I was too 'mathematical'.]

If she felt an obligation to her field data on Elmdon, there were also obligations to Bemba outstanding. What was on her mind were royal rituals, including mortuary rites, and it was a great relief to her that Piers Vitebsky was prepared to take this on. Like everything else, this

anthropological exercise could never be the complete account. Indeed, she ensured this was the case by a new and ambitious plan—it could not possibly be carried out—to write a joint book on the entire phenomenon of Bemba chiefship. But what was ‘complete’ about her final years was the circle of those around her, friends and colleagues who popped in, whom she regaled still with stories, who as her once ward recalled would be pleased to be asked to tidy up or shop. The faces changed over the years, and her immediate companions in Bloomsbury or Kampala were not the same as those in Cambridge; but the circle was the same. Her capacity to be surrounded, so to speak, and to animate those thus around her—that remained in place.

An item that seems to have escaped the bibliography of her works splendidly compiled by Tanya Luhrmann is a review of Malinowski’s posthumous diary (‘In darkest Malinowski’, *The Cambridge Review*, 19 January 1968). I mention Audrey’s review for two reasons.

The first is to reflect again on an impression of mine. Gladstone refers to my remark in an earlier obituary notice concerning the way, towards the end of her life, Audrey strove to complete her writings. I say there that her own acknowledgement of incompleteness may have been in part due to the fact that, honoured as she was, honour enough had not been done. It was an oblique way of referring to the impression that others have at times been angry on her behalf. Indeed Gladstone delivers a public rebuke on the establishment (‘There must have been a chair of ethnography for her at *one* campus at some point between 1939 and 1959’), though that particular issue has to be put into the context of her own decision in 1950 to go to East Africa, and a colleague adds that Audrey once described her FBA as the only honour of which she was really proud. But I think now that my remark also trivializes what was perhaps a more fundamental, and creative, kind of acknowledgement. Malinowski’s Diary sent her back to her own:

I do not think that Malinowski bluffed his students when he talked with such enthusiasm of his field-work, I think his recall was entirely selective, and I think so because I find I do the same myself, that is to say I glamourise my time spent in African villages. Re-reading my own field diary recently, I was surprised to find that in spite of a style that is stodgier and definitely more Anglo-Saxon than Malinowski’s, there is a sense of constant failure. Do we repress this sense of failure, consciously or unconsciously, in our subsequent books and lectures; or do we merely fail to record our successes in our diaries? For there are successes!

She is speaking of herself as a young woman of 32 or 33: what she records there is surely the incompleteness of a questing mind. An ethnographer can never, in the end, get everything down, and should know it. It is the acknowledgement that is important. One is, after all, oneself, person-size. I suggest that some of Audrey's humorous asides about herself reflect the very prescription she once advocated for comparative analysis—one could call it methodological humility.

Elsewhere, she described the neutrality with which she strove to steer the many research enterprises undertaken in East Africa past the double snares of too little and too much involvement in the colonial administration. Of herself too, I think, she neither expected too much nor too little, a kind of neutrality or humility towards her own person, an open curiosity as to how she would react in this or that situation. Hence, the ever-changing drama that events held for her, and hence too the freshness with which she unhesitatingly played back her own insights to those around her. Contradictions did not have to be smoothed over and 'misunderstanding' was an ever-present possibility in relationships. As one colleague recalls, she could be by turn delightful, maddening, generous, unkind, witty—but never, never boring. She had the rare gift of not standing in the way of her own line of vision.

This is the second reason for quoting from her review. One of her anecdotes frames that point nicely:

I myself sitting in what I hoped was the conventional pose of poker-face and blank psycho-analytical, shock-proof visage, was startled by an informant in an area where religious factions were political factions and political feeling ran high. My visitor suddenly shouted 'You! You say you are not a Protestant, not a Catholic and not a Muslim. There isn't such a person!' and he stumped off.

The only person visible had to be Audrey 'herself'. I have tried to suggest something of the way Audrey appeared to diverse friends and colleagues. How she appeared to herself is another matter. But she had the great capacity of being herself entertained in sharing such moments of unencumbered vision.

MARILYN STRATHERN

*Fellow of the Academy*

*Note.* I am most grateful to Rosemary and Raymond Firth for their comments on this account. I should add that I have not been able to check all the dates that appear in this memoir, and some may have wandered a bit. Audrey is probably one of the culprits. The *Who's Who* that appeared the year before her death, and on information presumably given by her, contradicts the dates for the Smuts

Readership that appeared in the ASA Annals on information also presumably supplied by herself. They overlap with a third set of dates given in the Introduction to *The Interpretation of Ritual*, again I surmise on Audrey's information. [These happen to be checkable, but I make the point because there are bound to be discrepancies between different accounts.]

*Selected accounts of Audrey Richards' life and work*

- Ardener, Shirley (ed.) (1992), *Persons and Powers of Women in Diverse Cultures*, Oxford: Berg. One of the first acts of the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research on Women, established by Shirley Ardener and her colleagues in Oxford in 1983/4, was to instigate a series of public lectures in honour of Audrey Richards, Phyllis Kaberry and Barbara Ward. This volume marks the first half decade. Accounts of the three scholars are followed by bibliographies and by essays first given as lectures in their honour, in the case of Audrey Richards by Jean La Fontaine ('The persons of women', 1985) and Pat Caplan ('Engendering knowledge: the politics of ethnography', 1988). [Also see under Hastrup.]
- Firth, Raymond (1985), 'An Eye for Incongruity: Audrey Richards in Light Mood', *Cambridge Anthropology*, 10: 18–29. Raymond Firth draws on, among other things, letters exchanged over a 50-year friendship.
- Firth, Raymond (1985), Obituary: Audrey Richards, *Man*, 20: 341–4.
- Firth, Rosemary (1985), 'An Unusual Friendship', *Cambridge Anthropology*, 10: 29–31. Rosemary Firth dwells on some of the memories of her long friendship with Audrey, and comments on the inspiration of her commonsense. She adds: 'I wonder if some reference could be made to Audrey's lavish personal hospitality, which was a strain on a single, busy professional woman. She once said to me "Of course what I need is a *wife* to do these things for me!"'
- Gladstone, Jo (1986), 'Significant Sister: Autonomy and Obligation in Audrey Richards' Early Fieldwork', *American Ethnologist*, 13: 338–62. This account includes an annotated bibliography, references to nutritional studies related to those of Richards' over 1926–54, and selected readings in nutritional biology since 1956. It focuses on Audrey Richards' contributions to nutrition and on the academic context of dietary studies in the 1930s.
- Gladstone, Jo (1992), 'Audrey I. Richards (1899–1984): Africanist and Humanist', in *Persons and Powers of Women in Diverse Cultures*, ed. Shirley Ardener, Oxford: Berg. Gladstone's appreciation draws not just on published material but from Audrey's letters to her mother and to her sister Gwynedd, as well as field correspondence with Bronislaw Malinowski, and letters in possession of Helena Wayne and Raymond Firth.
- Hastrup, Kirsten (1992), 'Hunger and the Hardness of Facts: a Tribute to Audrey Richards'. The 3rd Audrey Richards Commemorative Lecture, Oxford, 1992. (Not yet published.) I cite this for the sign it points in the direction of a recently revived interest in 'nutritional anthropology'. Hastrup's lecture concerns scientific, cultural and personal issues in interpreting hunger, and draws directly from Audrey's conceptualization of problems. While this is certainly interesting on its own, it is also the case that a former Richards

- Lecturer, Pat Caplan, is now the anthropological arm of a major interdisciplinary research project on 'The nation's diet' (UK), while this same year (1992) sees the completion of Henrietta Moore and Megan Vaughan's book on *Gender, Nutrition and Agricultural Change in Northern Zambia, 1890–1990*, which deals with, contextualities and carried forward Audrey's own work among the Bemba.
- La Fontaine, Jean S. (ed.) (1972), *The Interpretation of Ritual: Essays in Honour of A. I. Richards*, Tavistock Publications. This collection of essays by colleagues and students forms a tribute to her argument, explicit in *Chisungu* but as Werbner points out also indebted to Malinowski's 1916 account of 'Baloma', that symbolic behaviour is multiple in significance. The Introduction by her distinguished pupil and also a President of the RAI, Jean La Fontaine, includes a sketch of her life; Philip Gulliver contributes a bibliography of her principal writings. The essays themselves are an important collection in their own right, one of the most successful *festschrift* I know.
- La Fontaine, Jean S. (1985), Introduction to memorial issue of *Cambridge Anthropology* (Vol 10). The issue includes short recollections from Sir Richard Faber, Anne Robson, Jean Robin, Anne Tweedie-Waggot, Jo Gladstone, Ruth Longman, Tanya Luhrmann. Some of the other pieces are noted separately. Ray Abrahams and Malcolm Ruel contribute ethnographic and interpretive essays.
- Luhrmann, Tanya (1985), 'A Bibliography of Audrey Richards', *Cambridge Anthropology*, 10: 92–6, reproduced in Ardener, 1992. This amplifies Gulliver's earlier bibliography in La Fontaine's edited collection, and includes an independent trawl of relevant journals. One is reminded that Audrey lived in the days before institutional resource bases had to be fed with processed curricula vitae.
- Robertson, A. F. (1985), 'Audrey Richards, 1899–1984: An Appreciation', *African Affairs*, 84: 136–8. A colleague in Uganda and Cambridge, Robertson was Audrey's successor both as President of the African Studies Association and as Director of the Cambridge African Studies Centre.
- Schneider, David M. and Kathleen Gough (eds) (1961), *Matrilineal Kinship*, Berkeley: University of California Press. The results of a seminar held in 1954 directly stimulated by Audrey's work (the book is dedicated to her). Much later, Audrey told La Fontaine that she had been sent to study the Bemba because both nutrition and matrilineal organization were felt to be suitable topics for a woman. She didn't, La Fontaine remarks, take it as a compliment. It was also thought appropriate for her as a woman to study women. However, as she had to report, she found as many men as women in Bemba. Despite the setback, Audrey's contribution to the analysis of matrilineal kinship systems acquired the status of a classic: this book acknowledges the 'major advance' of her comparative essay, 'Some Types of Family Structure amongst the Central Bantu', in *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*, edited by A. R. Radcliff-Brown and Daryll Forde (1950).
- Strathern, Marilyn (1984), Obituary: Audrey Richards: *RAIN* 64 (October) 11–12.

- Wayne, Helena (1985), 'Audrey: Some Recollections', *Cambridge Anthropology*, 10: 14–17. These personal recollections complement an earlier study which appeared in the *American Ethnologist* (1985) on the influence of various women on Malinowski's life and works which gives a special place to Audrey.
- Werbner, Richard (1979), 'Audrey Richards', *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 18, Biographical Supplement: 658–60. Werbner, writing as a fellow Africanist, includes a list of her major works to that date and a supplementary bibliography of other writings.
- Vitebsky, Piers (1985), 'The Death and Regeneration of a "Divine King"', *Cambridge Anthropology*, 10: 56–91. The subtitle is self-explanatory: 'A Preliminary Account of the Mortuary Rites of the Paramount Chief (Citimukulu) of the Bemba of Zambia, based on the unpublished fieldnotes of Audrey Richards'.