Introduction

Andrew Bank

Monica Hunter Wilson (1908–1982) was a prominent figure in that pioneering generation of social anthropologists who began their careers during the interwar years. South African-born ethnographers played a leading, perhaps the leading, role in what has nostalgically been called ‘the Golden Age of South African Ethnography’ within the British functionalist tradition. Yet her contribution as an anthropologist has been recognised only partially, mainly because of the narrow retrospective criterion by which intellectual significance has typically been judged.

In the standard narratives significance has been measured almost solely in relation to ‘theoretical innovation’ in what emerges as a story of stages of progress. Monica Hunter Wilson did make an important contribution to anthropological theory. She played a key role in reorienting the functionalist tradition away from the tribal study written in the ethnographic present towards the study of social change in Africa. Her foremost theoretical text, that short co-authored book The Analysis of Social Change: Based on Observations in Central Africa – written together with her husband, the anthropologist Godfrey Wilson, and published by Cambridge University Press in 1945 – was the first study to use ‘social change’ in its title. Partly because of its theoretical ambition, partly because of its war-delayed production, it had less impact on theory than its authors had hoped. It certainly had nothing like the long-term impact of that famous article in three parts, ‘The Bridge’, that had been published a few years earlier by her South African-born peer Max Gluckman (1908–1975). It is his extended ‘analysis of a social situation in Zululand’ that has come to be recognised as the moment when South African and African anthropology recognised the need to incorporate coloniser and colonised, European and African, into a wider, and what is now accepted

1 Thanks to Paolo Israel, Nancy Jacobs, Deborah James, Seán Morrow, Pamela Reynolds, Christopher Saunders and Lyn Schumaker for comments on an earlier draft of this essay. Special thanks to my co-editor for detailed commentary and fresh ideas on numerous draft versions.

as more modern, ethnographic framework. Gluckman later credited his one-time mentor Isaac Schapera (1905–2003) as the joint founder of this ‘one-society school’. I will challenge this androcentric narrative later in this introduction. For the moment I am interested in making a case for broadening the criterion by which significance may be judged, and presenting an argument for seeing Monica Hunter Wilson as an even more significant figure based on this wider conception.

To begin with, we should note that, like these famous male peers who worked from Manchester and London respectively in their mature years, she was an internationally celebrated scholar. Her global reputation was built on an impressive body of ethnographic work on the Pondo of South Africa and the Nyakyusa of south-west Tanganyika. Her four highly detailed ethnographies, all discussed below, were published between 1936 and 1959 by Oxford University Press in association with the International African Institute, and all but the last of these was reissued. Her best-known monograph remains that ‘precocious’ classic Reaction to Conquest: Effects of Contact with Europeans on the Pondo of South Africa, which first appeared with a glowing foreword by the former (1919–24) and future (1939–48) South African prime minister Jan Smuts when she was just 28 years of age. Recently it has been republished in a fourth edition as part of the International African Institute’s ‘Classics in African Anthropology’ series. It has been praised widely over the years, whether by ‘the founding fathers’ of British functionalism in the interwar years, Bronislaw Malinowski and Alfred Reginald Radcliffe-Brown, leading African nationalists and intellectuals like Oliver Tambo and A. C. Jordan, or latter-day social historians and novelists in quest of information about the history of African sexuality. Jonny Steinberg, for example, describes it as ‘one of the finest ethnographic monographs ever penned in South Africa’ and demonstrates the continued relevance of its arguments about African culture.
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She then published, after an extended delay associated with the tragic suicide of her husband in May 1944, a celebrated trilogy of monographs based on some fifty months of joint fieldwork, one of the most extensive periods in the field on record.\(^7\) **Good Company: A Study of Nyakyusa Age-Villages** came out in 1951 and was reissued in an American paperback second edition in 1963. **Rituals of Kinship among the Nyakyusa** appeared in 1957, followed by **Communal Rituals of the Nyakyusa** in 1959, the former being reissued by Oxford University Press in 1970.\(^8\) She also published at least two dozen articles during these, her most productive years as an ethnographer.\(^9\) Collectively her ethnographic writings made a substantive contribution to cross-cultural understandings of religion, ritual, symbolism and social change in both South and Central Africa. It is no coincidence that it was to Monica Wilson that Victor Turner dedicated his landmark study of symbolism published some years after her trilogy.\(^10\)

She also made a decisive contribution to African history, especially during her later years (see Chapter 9). International public recognition came in the form of a Rivers Memorial Medal for Fieldwork awarded by the Royal Anthropological Society in 1952, a Simon Biesheuvel Medal for Research granted in 1965, an invitation to deliver the Scott Holland lectures in Cambridge in 1968 and, in the very last years of her life and to her great joy, admission to the British Royal Academy.

Our book makes the case that her importance relates as much to the nature of her engagement with African anthropology ‘from the inside’, as to the status of her texts within an international scholarly community. There are three ways in which the following essays recommend that we should think about Monica Hunter Wilson as a scholar who worked from ‘inside African anthropology’, the description we chose for the book’s title. First, as highlighted in Chapter 1 (see also Chapters 6 and 9), her

\(^7\) This is according to J. D. Y. Peel, ‘Wilson [née Hunter], Monica (1908–1982)’ in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). Thanks to Rebecca Marsland for alerting me to this reference.


\(^9\) See Chapter 5 in this collection for a list of her ten articles on the Nyakyusa, and the Bibliography for other essays.

missionary background and schooling gave her a detailed knowledge of an African language and culture (Xhosa) from her childhood, as she herself would emphasise in late-life reminiscences where she identified herself, in the first instance, as ‘a daughter of Lovedale’. This set her apart from all of her contemporaries in the British functionalist tradition, including all of her South African-born peers (Schapera, Gluckman, Meyer Fortes, Eileen Krige, Jack Krige, Ellen Hellmann) and Hilda Kuper (born in Bulawayo).

Second, Monica made a courageous decision to work as an anthropologist from within Africa with the coming of apartheid. This was, as Seán Morrow shows in Chapter 6, despite numerous highly prestigious job offers abroad, including approaches from Oxford and Cambridge. Her conscious choice to live and work as a social anthropologist committed to political change from within a country whose oppressive racially structured system of government made it a pariah state did have serious implications for her career. There is little doubt that she often felt an intense sense of intellectual isolation and that she would have gained much by relocating and becoming more closely integrated into the emerging international scholarly community of social anthropologists – as, say, Max Gluckman did when he took a post at Manchester University in the late 1940s, or as Isaac Schapera did when he took a position at the University of London in 1950, or as Hilda Kuper did when she left South Africa to take up a post at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) in 1963.12

The costs were personal as well as intellectual, something that tends to get obscured in the reminiscences of her former students who have been wont to present her as something of an Iron Lady, a woman fighting prejudice, intellectual sloppiness and bureaucratic inefficiency with stern and often steely demeanour. I am equally struck by the image of a vulnerable Monica Wilson presented by one of her many close friends from her undergraduate years at Girton College, Muriel Bradbrook, who had also enjoyed an impressive career as a writer and academic. Bradbrook remembered her friend, most of all, for the depth of her commitment to human rights in Africa, reflecting that she was ‘too sensitive to be called fearless’ and remembered that, ‘When in the seventies she stayed with me [in Cambridge], I could hear her crying out in her sleep very pitifully’.13


12 Significantly, her women peers, Eileen Krige and Ellen Hellmann (and Hilda Kuper for a time) did remain in South Africa during the apartheid era, but they did not have quite the same international recognition.

13 Transcript of a recording of Muriel Bradbrook, 1989, Girton College Archive, Cambridge, on the theme of ‘Strong-minded Dons’. On her commitment to human rights...
Third, and this is the burden of our case, she was a highly skilled collaborator, one who forged close, creative relationships with African research assistants and African researchers throughout her career as a researcher and teacher. These relationships began during her intense decade of fieldwork in the 1930s, first in Pondoland and East London, then in Bunyakyusa. Here her experiences were not too different from those of her peers who did fieldwork in southern and Central Africa around this time. They too forged close relationships with African interpreters in the field as Lyn Schumaker has forcefully demonstrated in the case of Max Gluckman in his later years as director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI) in Northern Rhodesia.14

It is her relationships with African students at Fort Hare Native College and the University of Cape Town (UCT) – the dimension of her work that we explore in Part 3 of this volume – that make her contribution arguably more unusual. It has long been recognised that she was a dedicated and highly successful teacher, training new generations of social anthropologists and social scientists in southern Africa. Her mentorship is associated especially with her extended period as chair of the Social Anthropology Department and head of the School of African Studies at UCT between 1952 and 1973. The talented students whom she trained during these decades included, in roughly chronological order, Berthold Pauw, Max Marwick, Peter Carstens, Peter Rigby, Archie Mafeje, Jean Comaroff, John Comaroff and Martin West. After her retirement she supervised Colin Murray and Pamela Reynolds, author of the concluding chapter of this volume. Her impact went well beyond social anthropology, as her son Francis, a highly respected and influential economist on whom she had a deep and lasting intellectual impact, has recently noted: ‘There were archaeologists, including Glynn Isaacs and Carmel Schrire; lawyers such as Godfrey Pitje and Fikile Bam; theologians such as Axel-Iva Berglund; and many others, including, informally, Victor Turner and Rhys Isaacs.’15

The influence that we track most closely, however, is her role as a trainer of, and collaborator with, young black anthropologists. She played a hitherto unrecognised role in fostering what might be described as a vibrant insider ethnographic tradition in South African anthropology of the mid-twentieth century, one which developed during a period in which

---


African anthropology more generally was highly cosmopolitan. It is in uncovering these collaborative relationships with African researchers – most notably Godfrey Pitje, Livingstone Mqotsi and Archie Mafeje – and the sometimes hidden ethnographies that were produced from them, that our study most profoundly challenges the sometimes essentialised retrospective construction of ‘colonial anthropology’ as the products of white outsiders studying African subjects. What these in-depth case studies of collaboration reveal, with their detailed attention to the complexities of social relationships and identities inside African anthropology during successive phases of the career of a single anthropologist, is that cultural knowledge production was much more complex than simple dualistic models allow. It is too often assumed that the standard format of the functionalist ethnographic study and the colonial contexts in which they were carried out implies that social anthropologists did broadly similar things in broadly similar ways in producing knowledge about bounded African ‘tribes’. What these case studies demonstrate is that Monica Hunter Wilson was just one of a wide cast of characters working from ‘inside African anthropology’ in Pondoland, Bunyakyusa, Middledrift and Langa across three decades, and that there was an enormous diversity of practice and approach, of subject positions and points of entry into the discipline – in all, a complex range of motivations and forms of dialogue about culture. The extent of African involvement and the complexity of these social identities and relationships question the utility of catch-all conceptual categories like ‘colonial anthropology’ or ‘anthropology’s hidden colonialism’.

Our book thus seeks to strike a balance between, on the one hand, a rigorous and much fuller archivally based reassessment of the scholarly contribution of a woman who was possibly the most significant South African-born social anthropologist of the twentieth century and, on the other, uncovering for the first time the life histories and intellectual contributions of a succession of African ‘interpreters’ (broadly defined) who worked with her ‘inside African anthropology’. This concept developed out of a centenary conference on Monica Hunter Wilson held between 24 and 26 June 2008 in the Hogsback, Eastern Cape. The conference

---

16 For an evocative sense of this cosmopolitanism, see Mwenda Ntarangwi, David Mills and Mustafa Babiker, eds., African Anthropologies: History, Critique and Practice (London: Zed Books, 2006). Other African anthropologists associated with this insider tradition include Z. K. Matthews and Absolom Vilakazi, both of whom are mentioned in later chapters.

brought together generations of her former students, from the late Livingstone Mqotsi, the first student researcher whose work she supervised in the mid-1940s, to Pamela Reynolds, who worked with her on a doctoral study in the last years of Monica’s life. The conference was opened by the highly lucid 86-year-old Mqotsi, who offered a moving tribute to the woman who had been his mentor all those years ago. Having passed through many phases of a life in politics and education within and beyond South Africa (see Chapter 7), he spoke most eloquently of how he had come to appreciate the profound impact that Wilson had exerted on his intellectual development from his first year at Fort Hare Native College.

The conference also showcased the work of different generations of scholars, most of whom are historians or anthropologists, who were involved in a sustained and ongoing engagement with the documents contained in the Monica and Godfrey Wilson Papers (Wilson Collection) at UCT. Before revealing some of the riches in this collection and explaining its history, I reflect on the recent upsurge of scholarly interest in the concept of the interpreter in African studies, on the ways in which our book seeks to challenge the standard male-dominated narrative about the history of anthropology in South Africa referred to above, and on the specific contribution that each of the chapters makes to furthering understanding of the collaborative relationships forged by one woman scholar inside anthropology in South and Central Africa.

The Interpreters

Our inclusive use of the concept of ‘the interpreter’ takes its cue from a public lecture that Monica delivered in Grahamstown in 1972, the year before her retirement. She began by pointing out that the first interpreters in the southern region of our continent were Africans, not colonists. These were the bilingual Christian converts who had learnt literacy and communicative skills on mission stations and then worked as translators. On the mission station of Lovedale where she grew up, there were generations of such interpreters in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. They included Jan Tzatzoe, Tiyo Soga and ‘the next generation [who] came from Fingo families, men like the Jabavus and Makiwanes – but there were also Xhosa proper like John Knox Bokwe and other Sogas besides the original Tiyo, who were orators and writers in both English and Xhosa.’

Social anthropologists and missionaries were the heirs of these African interpreters, with their concern ‘to mediate ideas, law, custom,
symbolism’. In her view the ‘essential qualities’ of the ‘true interpreter’ were the ability to listen and to ‘establish trust’ in conditions of underlying suspicion (see also Chapter 10). Youth could be an advantage. She then pointed to recent anthropological studies in Africa and beyond that had explored the role of intermediate individuals and social groups. Here she mentioned work on headmen in Central Africa by the scholars of the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI), the studies in Mexico by the sociologist Eric Wolf and his coining of the concept of the ‘cultural broker’, as well as Clifford Geertz’s research on Muslim teachers in Javanese villages who acted as mediators between the local and the outside world. She also mentioned the ‘brilliant’ work of Elizabeth Colson on patron–client relations in Zambia, suggesting that the ‘patrons’ in her study resembled ‘cultural brokers’. Women played an important role as mediators, especially in South Africa where many were employed as domestic servants.

This interest in intercultural and interpersonal relations was unfashionable in southern African studies of the later 1970s and 1980s, but there has been an explosion of literature on interpreters during the last decade. The first of her cast to attract renewed attention were British missionaries. Here the work of her former students Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff on missionaries working among the Tswana, published in 1991, provided one of the fullest attempts to apply anthropological concepts to the missionary encounter in southern Africa. The work of social anthropologists as interpreters came under increasing scrutiny in the wake of anthropology’s self-reflexive turn, and the history of social anthropology has now emerged as a dynamic subfield in southern African studies. This literature has a biographical slant, partly because the main source materials are either monographs or private papers of individual anthropologists. Patrick Harries’s incisive analyses of the intellectual milieu and interpretations of Tsonga culture by the Swiss missionary ethnographer Henri Alexandre Junod (1863–1934) and his peers is the closest we have come to ‘anthropological biography’, a field that has long flourished


20 For a recent collection of essays reappraising and revisiting the work of Elizabeth Colson, see Chet Lancaster and Kenneth P. Vickery, eds, The Tonga-Speaking Peoples of Zambia and Zimbabwe (Lanham, MD: University Press of America).


23 Patrick Harries, Butterflies and Barbarians: Swiss Missionaries and Systems of Knowledge in South-East Africa (Oxford: James Currey, Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2007);
in the United States in particular. Later recent scholarship has dealt with late-nineteenth-century ethnographic research in the region with extensive literatures on the Zulu cultural studies of the Natal government administrator and oral historian James Stuart and his research assistants and on the !Xam and !Kung collaborative research of Wilhelm Bleek and Lucy Lloyd. There have also been detailed studies of missionary and official government ethnography, the complex and changing role of


photography in the construction of anthropological knowledge, and the highly productive cultures of work that developed at anthropological research institutes, notably the RLI in Central Africa, but also the East African Institute for Social Research at Makerere University.

The ‘Official’ History of Anthropology in South Africa

It is no surprise that the ‘official’ history has been overwhelmingly male-dominated. This applies not only to physical anthropology, where women were on the margins, but to social anthropology, a discipline in which they played a central if not leading role in the region. The bias is well illustrated by the way the influential standard overview, David Hammond-Tooke's *Imperfect Interpreters*, creates its canon. The founder figure in this official version is that author's former supervisor Isaac Schapera, who had been trained by the two ‘founding fathers’ of British functionalism, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown, who ‘established’ the discipline of social anthropology in South Africa during his five years at UCT between 1921 and 1925, and Bronislaw Malinowski, whose seminars Schapera had attended in London between 1926 and 1928. Schapera developed the new discipline when he took up a post initially as a researcher and then in 1934


31 W. David Hammond-Tooke, *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa’s Anthropologists, 1920–1990* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 2001, 1997, 2nd edition). His analysis of the contribution of women scholars in a field in which women were very well represented is effectively confined to one out of the book’s nine chapters (Chapter 3: The ‘Great Tradition’: The Ethnographic Monograph) and no more than twenty of the 190 pages in the main text (Agnes Winifred Hoernlé, 35–38; Monica Hunter Wilson, 77–83; Eileen Krige with Jack Krige, 84–87; Hilda Kuper, 88–90; Ellen Hellmann, 143–144; Mia Brandel-Syrier, 155).

32 The classic text setting out the case for the theoretical revolution of these two founding fathers of British functionalism is Adam Kuper, *Anthropologists and Anthropology: The