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I

I recollect very well my first meeting with Daryll Forde; it was in December 1937 at the house of Professor and Mrs. C. G. Seligman. I had, of course, heard of him, and I remember my surprise at his youthful, almost boyish, appearance, and his ebullient, self-assured manner—an appearance and a manner which hardly changed until the illness to which he finally succumbed set in. In the late afternoon I drove Forde to Oxford station to catch his train to Aberystwyth; and while we waited for the train we continued the discussion which had begun at lunch. We were both recently back from field research in West Africa, he from the Cross-River area of south-eastern Nigeria, and I from the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast. It was the time when, what later became known as African ‘lineage theory’ (cf. Fortes, 1970, ch. 3) was being thrashed out at Oxford in the wake of Evans-Pritchard’s Nuer studies. Forde was outside the circle of ‘functionalist’ social anthropology associated with Malinowski at the London School of Economics. Indeed, he was regarded by those of us who came from that circle as a human geographer with ethnological interests rather than as a social anthropologist. I was the more impressed, therefore, by his anthropological erudition; and as to our common interest in ‘lineage theory’ and West Africa, comparing our respective field observations raised all sorts of unexpected questions for me.

I saw more of Forde during the first two years of the war, when he was at Oxford working in the Foreign Office Research Department, and later I collaborated with him and others in the research project on the Native Economies of Nigeria under the direction of Miss (now Dame) Margery Perham (Forde and Scott, 1946).

However, it was not until after the war that I became more closely associated with Forde, when he moved to London as Professor of Anthropology at University College London and took over the directorship of the International African Institute from Sir Reginald Coupland; and it is his formidable
achievements on these two fronts that will be his lasting monument.

I saw him for the last time six months before he died, at the Symposium organized by Lord Zuckerman to commemorate the centenary of the birth of Sir Grafton Elliot Smith (Zuckerman, 1974). He was far from well and in pain. But as Zuckerman remarks (op. cit., p. 405) 'he spoke without a note and without hesitation', informatively and judiciously.

Daryll Forde had a trait that was at the same time endearing and exasperating. He was a sociable, indeed a gregarious, man apt to be what seemed tactlessly inquisitive about the private life and the problems, personal as well as professional and academic, of colleagues, students, friends, acquaintances, and staff. Generous and outgoing by nature, he made and kept friends easily. (His staff, by the way, both academic and secretarial, at the International African Institute as well as at University College London, were devoted to him even when he was driving them at his own energetic pace.) But Daryll was also the soul of discretion in matters of confidence, and completely without malice. He was, as the late Professor Nigel Barnicot, his colleague for many years at U.C.L., said in the moving address he gave at the memorial service for Forde, 'singularly free from guile' though 'capable of caustic comment' (Barnicot, 1973). It was perhaps not inconsistent with this curiosity about other people's lives and concerns that he was (outside the circle of his family and of his most intimate friends) at the same time reticent about his own private life and personal history. This was not only my impression. Max Gluckman, to whom he was very close in the last years of his life, and such intimate former students and close friends of his as Professor Robin Horton had the same experience (personal communications). His entry in successive editions of Who's Who and references in the obituary notices in Africa (October 1973), record that he was a Londoner by birth and the son of a clergyman, the Reverend J. B. D. Forde, and that he went to the Middlesex County School at Tottenham before going up to University College London to read for a degree in Geography. Family tradition depicts his father as a man of Victorian severity with whom Daryll never saw eye to eye, in contrast to his warm and affectionate mother. He was devoted to her throughout his life, telling in particular of how much he owed to her encouragement and care during his schooldays. He graduated in 1922, and was appointed to a lecturership in
Geography at University College London, which he held from 1923 to 1928. But he had already in his undergraduate days become interested in prehistoric archaeology, and he turned to research in this field for his postgraduate studies—to such effect that, as Professor Glyn Daniel reminds me (personal communication), ‘he was Franks Student of the Society of Antiquaries in 1924—an exclusively highest grade archaeological award’. He was also, incidentally, revelling in the post-war social and intellectual exuberance of the fringe-of-Bloomsbury student set to which he belonged, and amongst whom he made some lifelong friends, destined later to play leading parts in our scientific and cultural life.

Forde’s archaeological research was by no means inconsistent with his training and his ongoing work in human geography. Indeed, it set the pattern for his theoretical orientation and his research methods and interests for his whole career. As the title of his book _Habitat, Economy and Society_ implied (1934), and his Huxley Memorial Lecture thirty-six years later reaffirmed, it was a basic principle of Forde’s scholarly work that a people’s social system and cultural values can only be properly understood in relation to the ecological and economic constraints and opportunities presented by their historical and geographical situation.

Academic provision for teaching and research in archaeology and related disciplines hardly existed in British Universities in the early twenties. At U.C.L., what there was of it was being carried on in the Anatomy Department under the guidance of Sir Grafton Elliot Smith and his disciple W. J. Perry. Forde worked with them more as a junior colleague in their small and dedicated circle than as a graduate student. He could not help being influenced by their ideas but never to the extent of subscribing without reservations to their ‘Egyptocentric hyperdiffusionist’ theories as Glyn Daniel has dubbed them (Daniel, in Zuckerman, 1974). That he had a great regard for Elliot Smith is clear from his previously referred to remarks at the Centenary Symposium. But he took a line of his own in his archaeological studies from the beginning, influenced more by Gordon Childe, with whom he worked in his research on the European Megalithic Monuments which won him his archaeological spurs, and who became a lifelong friend. He was, however, through Elliot Smith, drawn into a wider circle of anthropologists and archaeologists and as he records (in Zuckerman, op. cit.) introduced amongst others to W. H. R. Rivers.
But what was more important was his meeting R. H. Lowie, who was in London for some weeks, in a number of informal discussion meetings in Elliot Smith's company (Zuckerman, op. cit., 470). This must have been in 1924 when, as Lowie remarks in his autobiography (1959, pp. 11 and 176) he travelled widely in Europe, spending some time in England. There is no record of what went on in these meetings with Lowie other than that 'the whole issue of independent invention versus diffusion', which was at the centre of ethnological and archaeological controversy at that time, was discussed and pronounced by Lowie to be an 'empirical one requiring close study of the data'. What is likely, however, is that Lowie struck a congenial chord in Forde; for in 1928 on completing his doctorate, he was awarded a Commonwealth Fellowship and went to Berkeley to work with Kroeber and Lowie.

This was a turning-point in his career. Though he was continuing his archaeological studies under the influence and guidance of Kroeber and Lowie, he embarked on anthropological field studies in living communities. Whenever Forde referred, in later years, to this period, it was not only with affection and respect for Kroeber and Lowie personally and academically, but with a tribute to what he had gained from his work with them—from what he described as his 'transatlantic noviciate' in the dedication of his monograph on Yakö marriage to them.

The Berkeley Department must have provided a congenial setting for this transition. Kroeber had also had first-hand experience of archaeological research both in the field and in the library, before devoting himself finally to what he later described as 'cultural anthropology' (the story is told at length in his biography by his wife Theodora Kroeber, pp. 143–54). Lowie, for his part, had begun his anthropological career as a museum man and had carried out his first field research among the Crow Indians in that capacity. Their approach to anthropology was eclectic and comprehensive, in conformity with the generally prevailing conception of the scope of what they thought of as the study of man—embracing, that is to say, the biological, archaeological, cultural, and social aspects of human development; it represented an ideal of anthropological scholarship to which Forde adhered throughout his career, as his presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Institute in 1948 testified.

Forde carried out two field trips in the American South-West, among the Hopi Pueblo dwellers of north-east Arizona and the Yuma of the Lower Colorado on the Mexican border.
Building on his training in geography and archaeology he concentrated on the native agricultural systems. The results were published in 1931.

In 1930, on being appointed to the Gregynog Professorship of Geography and Anthropology at the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth, Forde returned from the United States. He was only twenty-eight and former students of his at Aberystwyth tell of his youthful appearance and his exuberance and spontaneity which caused him to be mistaken for a Freshman undergraduate in his early days there. It is worth adding that he succeeded H. J. Fleure in the chair. Indeed, as Professor Daniel informs me, it was at the insistence of Fleure that he was flown back for the electors to interview him. He thus inherited the tradition of polymathous biological, archaeological, anthropological, and geographical learning we associate with the names of Peake and Fleure. Thus, as Professor Emrys Peters, of Manchester University, one of his former students at Aberystwyth, tells me (personal communication) ‘He did not teach geography as it was generally understood . . . archaeology figured largely in his teaching . . . (and) . . . his human geography was virtually straight ethnography;’ and, adds Professor Peters, ‘What I remember . . . was his avoidance of any suggestion of geographical determinism and his insistence on interposing history between man and his environments.’ He was an outstanding teacher, Professor Peters further remarks, with ‘an inimitable gift of reducing a mass of facts to a clear and intelligible order’—a tribute which his students of a later generation at University College London as well as his colleagues on the Executive Council of the International African Institute, often echoed. Forde later spoke warmly of his Aberystwyth period, to which he owed some of his most cherished friendships. Most intimate perhaps, was his partly professional but mainly personal friendship with that lovable, outspoken and original stalwart of non-academic anthropology, the late Lord (Roy) Raglan of Cefnilla.

Forde’s studies of the European Megalithic cultures had been published in a series of papers by the time he came to Aberystwyth and he was giving more attention to his ethnological studies. As his distinguished former pupil and successor Professor M. G. Smith puts it (1969, p. xx), he was concentrating on ‘the extensive comparative analysis of the relations between environment, ecology, and social organization based on a systematic review of relevant literature on societies selected to
represent all the major ethnographic and ethnological zones' which resulted in *Habitat, Economy and Society* (1934). But he found time to initiate some of his students into the arts of archaeological excavation, to collaborate with Childe in excavations at Earn's Heugh in Berwickshire (Childe and Forde, 1931–2), and to excavate an Iron-age site in Cardiganshire (see his interim reports, 1934–8). He began work also on the sociological side, investigating Welsh village life with the help of some of his students. Then in 1935, having discovered from his analysis of the available literature how inadequate were existing accounts of the indigenous economies of West Africa, especially among settled agriculturalists, he started field-work among the Yakô of Eastern Nigeria which led eventually to his post-war commitment to African studies.

A six months' spell of field-work in 1935 was followed by another in the summer of 1939, unfortunately cut short by the outbreak of the war. He had already published preliminary analyses of the economy and the kinship system of the Yakô which, when followed by the monograph on Yakô marriage in 1941, opened the way to the leading position in African studies he achieved after the war.

Forde moved to Oxford in 1941, on secondment to the Foreign Office Research Department which was housed there. He served as Head of the United States section until 1943 when he returned to his post at Aberystwyth. But it was not to be for long. While he was at Oxford I brought him together with Radcliffe Brown whom he had met only casually before—and to whose theoretical position he had previously been anti-pathetic, to say the least;¹ unexpectedly, a warm friendship developed between them. When Radcliffe Brown went out to Brazil in 1942 as a cultural emissary of the British Council, he arranged for Forde to deputize for him as Head of the Institute of Social Anthropology at Oxford—Evans-Pritchard and I both being away in Africa at that time. Radcliffe Brown also played some part in the negotiations which led to Forde's appointment to the directorship of the International African Institute in 1946, and it was with Radcliffe Brown that Forde

¹ I speak from memory, but there is interesting testimony to this from Lowie. Writing about the response among anthropologists to his *History of Ethnological Theory* published in 1937 he says 'C. Daryll Forde was enthusiastic, stressing two points in his letter—the fact that I had for the first time given an intelligible picture of Boas's influence and that I had deflated A. R. Radcliffe Brown's pretentiousness' (Lowie, 1959, p. 141).
planned and co-edited *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage* (1950). The plan for the ethnographic survey of Africa, which was one of Forde’s major undertakings as director of the International African Institute, was thoroughly discussed with Radcliffe Brown, as I know from having been present myself, before it was finally launched. In the last year of his life Radcliffe Brown lived in London with a guest relationship to Forde’s department at U.C.L.; and it was Daryll and Evelyn Forde who watched over him compassionately in his dying hours.

When Forde arrived at Oxford I was in the midst of preparations to go out to Nigeria on an assignment to get together field data for the survey of the native economies of Nigeria which Miss (now Dame) Margery Perham was organizing. Knowing of Forde’s special interest in West African economic systems, I introduced him to Miss Perham who invited him to collaborate in the research project. The outcome was the book on the native economies of Nigeria (produced with the help of Richenda Scott) (Forde and Scott, 1946) which still ranks as one of the most important contributions to the economic history of Nigeria in the colonial period.

Forde’s move to London in 1944, to take up the Directorship of the International African Institute, and side by side with this, the newly established professorship of Anthropology at University College London to which he was elected in 1945, mark the beginning of what was to be the most distinguished part of his career. Ostensibly, the Chair and the Directorship were each supposed to be half-time jobs. In fact, as his former pupils and colleagues remark in the ‘Festschrift’ dedicated to him on his retirement from the chair (Douglas and Kaberry, 1969) and in their obituary tributes (*Africa*, 43. 4, 1973, 281–7; ibid. 44. 1, 1974, 1–10) the time, the energy, and the enthusiasm, he devoted to each would have taxed any full-time holder of either position to the utmost. When his frequent travels abroad, in Europe, to Africa and to the United States, sometimes in the interests of seeking funds for, or promoting the activities of the Institute, but often also in his academic roles as a visiting professor, or a member of an international congress —when these are taken into account, the tribute to the ‘bursting energy, the drive and the questioning and bustling mind of the man who guided the destinies of the Institute through nearly thirty difficult years,’ paid to him by Max Gluckman (*Africa*, 44. 1, 1974, p. 3) can be appreciated.
Forde took over the International African Institute twenty years after its foundation but when the high reputation and the international support it had commanded in the middle thirties had been almost extinguished by the war. The Institute’s journal *Africa* which ranked, before the war, as the premier medium for the publication of both scholarly and applied research in all branches of African social and cultural studies, had dwindled to pamphlet size. Book publication under the Institute’s auspices had been reduced to a trickle; its programme of field research had been abandoned; and most grievous of all, its model Executive Council, on which scholars from many countries and of the highest international standing, men like Professors Diedrich Westermann of Berlin, C. G. Seligman of the London School of Economics, and H. Labouré of Paris, missionary leaders like J. H. Oldham and former Colonial Governors and Pro-Consuls like Lord Lugard, served was of necessity disbanded.

Forde tackled the challenge of rebuilding the Institute with characteristic drive and determination. What he achieved has been described by several members of the Executive Council who worked with him over the years, as well as by Africanist scholars such as Professor Mary Douglas and Professor Ioan Lewis, and I can do no better than to quote from these obituary tributes. Having myself served on the Council for twenty years, I would particularly stress Forde’s skill in implementing the policies agreed to by the Council but in fact largely inspired by himself. He used to listen patiently to the endless debates of the Council in three languages, while shrewdly steering them in directions that fitted in with the long-term policies he envisaged. He wasted no time in taking action, whether this called for applications to Foundations or Government Departments or for approaches to individual scholars, civil servants, missionaries, university administrators, etc. etc. It was a task that called for all the diplomatic skill and powers of persuasion Forde could, when necessary, muster. The late Professor Max Gluckman, F.B.A., who worked closely with Forde as a Consultative Director of the Institute and was also, as I have earlier remarked, a close personal friend, describes Forde’s work at the Institute as follows:

Daryll Forde’s work at the Institute falls into two periods: first, he re-established the research and publications side, while developing the bibliographical and information services; and second, he seized the opportunity to develop scholarship in Africa itself, made possible by
increasing interest among scholars in Europe and America, and above all by the growth of universities and research institutes in Africa, institutions which flourished as African countries became independent. Forde was one of the first European scholars to see that these latter developments might need assistance from long-established institutions. With this in mind, he initiated the raising of funds from the Ford Foundation, to finance a series of seminars on specific topics of African interest. Each of these seminars, held at a university or research institute in Africa, was usually attended by a dozen members from the local institution and others in Africa, and by perhaps five from institutions in Europe and America. Aside from the discussion of specific problems, the seminars aimed to bring together scholars from all over Africa south of the Sahara, and also, since most of them were young, to enable them to meet older and more established scholars from the northern continents. These seminars were all successful in every sense; everyone who attended them, either as members in the limited inner circle, or as observers, learnt much from the discussions and gained greatly, in terms of personal friendship as well as professional colleague-ship, from the meetings.

Gluckman continues that he has begun with the Seminars ‘though the first was held only in 1959, fifteen years after Forde became Director, because they exemplify sharply Forde’s determination . . . to assist in the development of scholarship about Africa where it was most important—in Africa itself’. Moreover, the organization of the Seminars required an immense amount of work and at the end a great persistence in arranging the publications of the papers. Referring to the Ethnographic Survey of Africa which Forde launched in 1945 (largely with the help of a grant arranged through the then British Colonial Office) Gluckman notes that nearly sixty volumes had appeared by the time of Forde’s death, some in French but most in English, covering an enormous range of African societies south of the Sahara. He refers also to the efficiency and clarity of mind Forde deployed as editor of Africa and of the subsidiary journal African Abstracts which he started in 1950. Forde’s editorial activities were exacting and could only have been carried out by someone who, as Gluckman relates, ‘remained a general anthropologist, keeping abreast in archaeology and genetics, as well as in social and cultural anthropology’—and who likewise kept in touch with current political, economic, and educational developments in what was at that time still colonial Africa.

A similar tribute is paid to Forde by Madam Germaine Dieterlen, the distinguished doyenne of French Africanist
ethnography and a devoted friend of his as well as a long-standing member of the Executive Council. I quote (Africa, 44.1, 1974, p. 5): ‘Dans le domaine des études sur les langues et les cultures africaines, la recherche scientifique, et tout ce qu’elle implique ou promet, a perdu cette année l’un de ses plus remarquables animateurs en la personne de notre ami, le regreté Professeur Daryll Forde.’ She goes on to emphasize Forde’s achievements in making the Institute ‘un foyer international d’études’ in matters African and in particular in bringing together Francophone and Anglophone Africanists from all parts of the world. She also comments at length on the importance of the Seminars which Forde organized in collaboration with African Universities and Research Institutes and on the important service rendered to all branches of African studies, as well as to those engaged in practical tasks in Africa, by the information centre Forde maintained at the Institute. Above all, she pays tribute to Forde’s achievements in building up, over the years, regular and fruitful collaboration between Francophone and Anglophone specialists in various disciplines concerned with Africa. This included plans for co-operation in field research, arrangements for the exchange of students, and the organization of reciprocal visits by teachers and senior research personnel and a programme of translations of important publications from French into English and vice versa. The organization of regular interchange and collaboration with French Africanists was one of Forde’s main ambitions, next only to his labours to bring African scholars and leading personalities on to the Council of the Institute; and it is gratifying to record that most of these objectives were well within the Institute’s grasp at the time of his death.

This is not the whole tale of Daryll Forde’s achievement as Director of the International African Institute. ‘There is no single individual to whom African research owes so much as Professor Daryll Forde . . .’ is how Professor Mary Douglas begins the obituary notice she contributed to the Bulletin of the African Studies Association of the United Kingdom, 1973–4. But I want to turn now to the other side of Forde’s London commitment, his activities as Professor of Anthropology at U.C.L. His first task was to create a department, starting more or less from scratch; for anthropology had, before the war, had only the merest foothold in University College in the Department of Anatomy. The Department Forde envisaged was to include all the main anthropological disciplines, in accordance with his
theoretical position. He began, like all of us who were engaged, immediately after the war, in establishing anthropological studies in the Universities of this country, with a handful of students many of whom had seen war service.

Looking back now one can see what an advantage this was. For these were mostly students who were attracted to anthropology as a result of experience abroad in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. During the war, moreover, it had been discovered that expert knowledge of the peoples of our then Colonial and Imperial dependencies was singularly deficient, as had indeed earlier been revealed, for Africa, by the famous Hailey Survey (1938). For the first time generous funds for research in these lands became available through the Colonial Social Science Research Council, and the Treasury. Forde's new Department, in common with other such Departments in the other Universities, benefitted from this and he was able to find opportunities for field research for his best students from the beginning. By 1950 he had built up a flourishing Department with a distinctive curriculum of undergraduate teaching and a growing intake of postgraduate students. Africa, and in particular West Africa, remained at the centre of his interests. Staff with similar interests was recruited and the research students, who soon included graduates of overseas and foreign universities, were steered towards field research in Africa.

This is not the place to record the wealth and scope of the field studies Forde and his colleagues initiated. It is enough to say that they were aimed very largely at filling important gaps on the ethnographic map of West Africa and at extending the range of the Department's theoretical interests. The contributions to the 'Festschrift' edited by Douglas and Kaberry give some indication. No fewer than sixteen different African societies are dealt with in these essays which apart from their regional reference, represent a range from kinship and politics and economics to problems of history, of religion, of law, of art, and of symbolism—and to round the book off, two palaeo-anthropological studies.

Forde never attempted or even aspired to build up a 'Fordeian' school. His interests were too wide for this. Professor M. G. Smith in his foreword to the 'Festschrift' writes as follows: 'As a teacher, Forde presented us with the full range of contemporary approaches in social and cultural anthropology. . . .
Setting all these perspectives in their appropriate intellectual contexts he showed us their strength and limitations and
emphasized the relevance of ecology, technology, demography, and history to social and cultural analyses' (op. cit., Douglas and Kaberry, p. xix). Similarly, Professor Robin Horton, like Professor Smith one of Forde's most distinguished early pupils, comments (Africa, 44. 1, 1974, p. 9) 'He was too honest to dress up even his best ideas in the sort of rhetoric that creates an emotional following'—and, I might add, too eagerly interested in other people's ideas and too ready to help them to clarify and expound, and perhaps most of all provide the empirical evidence for, their views, to insist on his own.

As a teacher, Forde deployed an encyclopedic knowledge of the literature of anthropology and related disciplines, and not only with reference to Africa. As Robin Horton relates (loc. cit., p. 8) 'Perhaps the best way to see Daryll at work was to attend departmental Seminars. To these he brought a range of information and interest unequalled by anyone else around him. Whatever the cultural area one talked about, he was informed about it. Whatever the human discipline one invoked, he was versed in its methods and first principles'. This was to some extent a fringe benefit of his editorship of Africa and of the other publications of the International African Institute, as well as of his particular concern to strengthen the links between Anglophone and Francophone Africanist scholars.

II

'Daryll Forde was not a prolific writer, but everything he published was carefully thought out, original and influential'. This is how Nigel Barnicot summed up his assessment of Forde's scholarly work (Africa, 43. 4, 1973, p. 285). For my part, the outstanding quality of Forde's work is, firstly, his honest and scrupulous regard for the facts of observation, both his own and those of others whose data he uses and, secondly, the care he takes, in formulating generalizations or theoretical conclusions, to be faithful to the data. There is a gratifying absence of the 'rhetoric' which Horton notes above, and a strict avoidance of the tendentious. In these respects Forde (perhaps because he never went to a Public School or Oxbridge) contrasted distinctly with some of his most illustrious contemporaries.

As most commentators on his work have remarked, one of Forde's major contributions to anthropological method was his early and systematic use of statistical and numerical data to test and support his descriptive analyses. He made a point, for
instance, of taking into account the demographic variables in family and social relations at the level of field observation, thus helping to crystallize a trend that was just beginning.

Forde's publications fall into three groups. There are, firstly, the archaeological publications which began with *Ancient Mariners* (1927) and ended with the report on the excavation at Earn's Heugh in 1931–2. *Ancient Mariners* is a short popular book, really an extended essay of around 30,000 words. It gives an account of the supposed evolution of sailing craft from the dug-out canoe to the Egyptian, Polynesian, and possible prehistoric Aegean ocean vessels. Diffusionist features, showing the influence of Elliot Smith and Perry run through it but there is also a note of caution about them. The style is fluent, the exposition precise, and the bibliography well chosen. It appeared in a series edited by Elliot Smith and was presumably undertaken as a potboiler.

The serious archaeological papers that follow, apart from the excavation reports, all deal with different aspects of Forde's studies of the Megalithic Cultures of Europe. As a layman in this field, I am not competent to express a judgement on these papers though I am bound to add that I do not think that anyone reading them could fail to be impressed by the exemplary scholarship, the lucidity of the analysis, and the meticulous illustrative material. The paper on 'The Early Cultures of Atlantic Europe' (1930), for example, seems to me to foreshadow very clearly in its methodology and its procedures of analysis Forde's later anthropological work. In its exhaustive evaluation of source material, its critical appraisal of rival theories, and its judicious conclusions about, for example, historical processes that might explain the data, one is reminded of the way Forde later handled his ethnographic field material. Experts had a high regard for these researches and still consider them to be of outstanding importance as is noted by Professor Smith in a footnote to his previously cited foreword to *Man in Africa*. 'It is worth recording', he writes (p. xxiv) 'that Professor Forde's very early published works on megaliths (1929–39) presented a new view of the archaeological evidence that has become classic, and remains the basis of current archaeological interpretations' and he refers to Glyn Daniel's *The Megalithic Builders of Western Europe*, 1963, as his source. Professor Daniel in a personal communication to me confirms this high praise. Commenting on Forde's paper on 'Early Cultures of Atlantic
Europe' he says that 'It was overshadowed by Childe's *Dawn* (1925 onwards) but it was the new prehistory of Europe.' This paper he adds 'was as good as Childe and Fleure and Peake... and made an outstanding contribution to prehistoric archaeology in the late twenties.'

The second group of publications marks the beginning of Forde's turning to anthropology in the stricter sense. The papers on Hopi agriculture (1931) and on the Yuma indicate very clearly the specific interests, research methods, and theoretical orientation that were later to be developed in depth in Forde's Yakō studies. The Hopi paper ranks as a unique study for its time, a model of its kind, and still not superseded. It was based on only eight weeks of field research but manages to outline every significant aspect of the agricultural system of the region, the emphasis being, however, on their ethnographical and not their limited economic context. Thus after outlining the ecological parameters Forde analyses the village, clan, and lineage organization in relation to the ownership and use of land. It is of interest that he pays particular attention to apparent anomalies in the transmission of land rights that are formally controlled by strict rules of matrilineal inheritance and relates these to irregular economic arrangements and demographic chance. The kernel of the lineage theory as it was later developed in the Yakō studies is clearly evident here.

It is likewise with Forde's account of Hopi crops, their planting and harvesting, the calendrical observances by which their agricultural cycle is regulated, and finally the religious and magical rituals associated with it. Excellent maps, diagrams, and genealogical tables illustrate the paper.

The Yuma study follows similar lines; and both studies are incorporated in *Habitat, Economy and Society*, 1934.

Originally intended as an introductory undergraduate textbook, this book in fact established Forde's position as the leading exponent in this country of a broad ecological approach as a basic discipline in anthropological studies. Forde's methods are comparative but his units are total societies not isolated items of culture, economy, or social organization as in the classical works of Frazer and Tylor; and his concern is with the principles underlying different patterns of response and adaptation to environment and resources at the different levels of social and economic life represented in his sample. I am indebted to Professor Alfred Harris of Rochester University, New York, for the following appraisal of the present status of Forde's
book. Speaking with the authority of his great experience in the field of ecological anthropology and of African studies, Professor Harris writes:

_Habitat, Economy and Society: A Geographical Introduction to Ethnology_, was first published in 1954 and ever since has been in print continuously, on both sides of the Atlantic. Bearing the impress not only of his initial training as a geographer but of his ethnographic work among the Hopi, the book may justly be called a classic. Forde effectively disposes of racial and environmental 'determinism' in a brief Introduction, which is followed by sketches of a selected set of societies, admirably chosen, to represent his 'Food Gatherers', 'Cultivators' and 'Pastoral Nomads'. The book closes with a long section entitled 'Habitat and Economy'. Forde made excellent use of the best sources available in preparing his ethnographic accounts, each of which deals carefully with habitat, food production (the major part of 'economy', in Forde's terms) and social organization, and with the interrelations of these. The sketches are in a very real sense ecologically oriented, and in this as in other respects Forde was in advance of his contemporaries. In his final section, many of the problems briefly noted when dealing with individual societies are considered more fully and in general terms. While his range is topically great, Forde is consistently concerned with functional relations—with internal and external relations; and with invention and diffusion and with history. In his discussion, he stresses matters which continue to be of interest: the diversity encountered among food gatherers, the origin and spread of cultivated plants and domesticated animals, and many aspects of techniques and technology. Forde adverts to social organization through the entire section. Some of the questions touched upon are only now being fully worked out. _Habitat, Economy and Society_ is throughout concerned with the formulation of problems and their resolution; and the complex interweaving of synchronic relations and historical developments (with the former given priority) has been of critical importance in maintaining interest in the book, which can also be read as an outline of the themes that dominated all of Forde's later work.

A similar appreciation of this book has been expressed to me by Dr. G. I. Jones (personal communication) who used it for many years in his lectures and seminars on subsistence economies in the Department of Social Anthropology at Cambridge, 'Some of his chapters', Dr. Jones remarks, 'are still the best all-round summary of the economy and ethnography of these peoples'; and Professor Daniel says: 'I think archaeologists should remember him for something else; his _Habitat, Economy and Society_ was the first book of its kind that gave them a really archaeological-ethnographical background. There had been
nothing before except Sollas’s *Ancient Hunters*’ (personal communication).

However, there can be no doubt that Forde himself attached most importance to the Africanist researches and studies of his last thirty years, above all to those based on his own field researches in south-eastern Nigeria. When he was pressed by the Council of the International African Institute to put together in one book his Yakó papers, he selected nine of the major studies (other than the monograph on Yakó marriage, 1941) from among the twenty-odd papers on Yakó economy and society he published between 1937 and 1968; and he omitted all the more general papers—such as, for instance, his presidential addresses to Section H of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1947 and to the Royal Anthropological Institute in 1948 and 1949 though these draw largely on Yakó and other Nigerian ethnography.

It should be remembered that in addition to his Yakó studies Forde also edited and directed the production, in French as well as in English, of the Ethnographic Survey of Africa, and himself took the responsibility for two of the most difficult survey volumes. Of the volume on the Yoruba-speaking peoples, Dr. Jones comments (in the personal communication to me) that it ‘still remains, despite very obvious shortcomings [due to the paucity of field material on certain topics, M. F.] the only comprehensive account of this people that we have got’. Of the other volume on the Ibo- and Ibibio-speaking peoples of south-eastern Nigeria, in which Dr. Jones collaborated with him, the same can be as emphatically stated. The series as a whole (some of the volumes are virtually monographs by anthropologists with recent field experience in the areas) is universally acknowledged among Africanists as an indispensable tool for planning new researches.

Before considering more closely Forde’s Yakó studies let me note also his gift for, and versatility in bringing coherently together and extracting essential trends from, large ranges of disparate data. This comes out well in the dozen or so papers, mainly on African subjects, which he contributed to conferences and symposia, many of them being international and interdisciplinary. Thus his paper on ‘Applied Anthropology in Africa: British Africa’ which he contributed to the Wenner-Gren symposium on *Anthropology To-day* published in the book with that title (1953) is characteristic. It reviews recent research work, sponsored by the International African Institute,
the British and other Colonial Governments, Foundations, Universities, etc., as well as relevant policy documents and reports of governmental and other agencies and authorities, historical material, reports of missionaries, welfare, and judicial commissions, sources of finance for research for the whole of Africa over the previous seventy to eighty years and so on; and the conclusion of this massive inquiry is consonant with the influence in the direction of applied anthropological research he wielded as Director of the International African Institute. He writes (p. 861)

Whatever the bias in these directions [i.e. as to the relative importance of studies of traditional social systems and studies of emerging urban and industrial communities. M. F.] it is common ground that the quality of the service which social anthropology can render to colonial administrations is dependent on its own theoretical achievements, since all attempts to understand and to handle wisely a given practical social problem depend on the extent to which the facts can be established and analysed in relation to a more general body of sociological knowledge. This being so, any wholesale diversion of funds for field enquiries and publication to narrowly prescribed short-term investigations would not only retard the scientific development of social anthropology but would be against the long-term interests of Colonial administrations.

There could be no better summary of the principles according to which he combined the roles of his Professorship of Anthropology at University College London, and of the Directorship of the International African Institute.

Forde was never, as I noted earlier on, associated with Malinowski or Radcliffe Brown, and he never explicitly took up a ‘functionalist’ position. Indeed, as a member of the research group attached to Elliot Smith and Perry, and later as a student at Berkeley under Kroeber and Lowie, he would have been regarded as belonging to the anti-functionalist movements of the twenties and thirties. But his ethnographical studies in Nigeria, and such comparative essays as the ones from which I have just quoted, are as ‘functionalist’ as any of the contemporaneous researches of that allegiance. That was due not to conversion to a prevailing theoretical doctrine but to the experience of field-work and his intellectual integrity. Thus, in his introduction to the symposium on African cosmological and moral ideas and beliefs he edited under the title of African Worlds (1954), he writes approvingly (p. x) as follows:

The contributors to the present volume have attempted, for the African peoples they have studied, to show this intricate interdependence
between a traditional pattern of livelihood and accepted configurations of social relations and dogmas concerning the nature of the world and the place of men within it;

and again (ibid., p. xii)

But while beliefs in supernatural action and in human ability to control it through prayer and sacrifice, rite, and spell, have their foundations in universal features of human psychology, the forms they take, the context in which they are invoked, are related to the rest of the cultural pattern and to the social system,

nor is there any allusion in this 'introduction' to possible diffusionist or historical connections between any of the belief systems described by the contributors inter se or with outside sources.

The functionalism imposed on Forde—as it has been on so many other soi-disant objectors—by the discipline of field research is, however, best shown in the Yakō studies by which, it is clear, he would most have wished to be remembered. This is already evident in the first major study of the series, his monograph on Yakō marriage and the family. It begins with a concise description of the double descent system (the elucidation of which in its total social and economic context in later papers was Forde's major theoretical achievement) the age-set structure, the residence patterns, and the economic organization of the Yakō village of Umor. Then comes a stage-by-stage description of the pattern of marriage, starting from adolescent age-group sexual play through individual courtship and betrothal, the clitoridectomy ceremony for the bride, her first pregnancy, leading up to the establishment of the conjugal, patrilocal home and its economic organization, and concluding with a discussion on the termination of marriage by death of a spouse or divorce. As was foreshadowed in the Hopi studies and was more richly developed later, Forde analyses and carefully documents the ritual and legal formalities, relating them item by item to economic and demographic variables. His methods of statistical verification here find their first application. To take but one example, Forde's combination of statistical and conceptual argument in the analysis of Yakō bride-wealth transactions has never been superseded as a model for an investigation of problems of this kind. The explanation he proposed in terms of the balance between paternal domestic authority and avuncular legal right remains central to all later hypotheses about bride-wealth in matrilineal marriage.
A particularly interesting contribution of this monograph was the demonstration that Yakō polygyny, limited as it was, depended upon the augmentation of the supply of marriageable women by the purchase of girls from neighbouring tribes and, in connection with this, Forde's analysis of the institutions of adoption and fosterage as practised by the Yakō. It is worth noting that twenty-five years later the subject of fostering and adoption in the tribal societies of West Africa has come prominently to the fore again, in Dr. E. N. Goody's studies in Northern Ghana (cf. her paper on 'Delegation of Parental Roles in West Africa and the West Indies' in Changing Social Structure in Ghana edited by Jack Goody, International African Institute, London, 1975). The distinction Forde sketched between fostering as a phase of child rearing which does not change the beneficiary's kinship or, consequentially, legal status, and of adoption as necessarily entailing such a change of status, remains the key to the understanding of how the difference is reflected in the customary norms and practices described by Dr. Goody.

I have dwelt at some length on this monograph because in it are set out the main topics and methods of analysis Forde followed in all his Yakō studies. These fall into three groups, First come the papers on the Yakō economic system, which depends on the cultivation of the yam and the exploitation of the oil-palm and other forest products. Forde deals at length with the organization of production, distribution, and consumption. He describes the technology of farming, the division of labour between the sexes, the distribution of farms by size and by ecological situation, the principles of lineage ownership and family usufruct, and the eventual disposition of all economic products. It is easy to see from the charts, diagrams, and statistical tables what an immense amount of detailed field-work was here entailed. In these studies again we meet with the theme of the double descent system.

This theme dominates the second group of papers. Placing this descent system in its kinship context, on the one hand, and in its context of local organization and the political system on the other, Forde develops a model that is now accepted as the paradigmatic example of such systems in Africa. Forde shows that the complementary opposition between the localized patrilineal groups and the dispersed matrilineal groups operates at all levels of Yakō social structure, most tangibly in the allocation of rights over land and residence sites which are vested in
patrilineal groups, whereas rights over consumable wealth such as money and livestock are vested in the matrilineal groups. Murder was an injury against the victim's patrilineal clan which might seek to avenge it, but if compensation was agreed, this went to his or her matrilineal clan.

It is to this group that the paper which is generally recognized as Forde's most original and most fundamental contribution to social anthropology belongs. This is the paper on *Fission and Accretion in the Patrilineal Clans* (1938). In this study, notable alike for its meticulous workmanship and its analytical penetration, Forde breaks new ground in what was then emerging as lineage theory by exhibiting lineage structure as a developmental process through time. Here again he provided a model for later theoretical advances as I have already suggested. (cf. Fortes, 1970, chapter 3).

Next in importance, it would be generally agreed amongst Africanists, are the papers in this group which delineate the complex interlocking of ritual, age-set, and lineage offices from which is built up the organization of judicial and executive authority in village affairs. This brought to notice a type of African polity that had, previously, hardly been known about or understood, and that has since been shown to be characteristic of a number of Cross-River tribes.

The third group of papers is concerned with some of the ritual institutions and religious beliefs of the Yakọ, about which Forde regretfully states that he was able to get only a limited knowledge in the time at his disposal. His Frazer Lecture of 1958 and his Simon and Munro Lectures at Manchester and Edinburgh in 1960 and 1961 deal with topics in this field. And here, too, he develops novel and suggestive arguments based on exact ethnographic observation, relating to the part played by cosmological and religious institutions in the life of the individual as well as in that of the community. A point he particularly stresses, and one that is apt to be overlooked by others, is that religious and magical ritual is concerned with real and justifiable anxieties and hopes about such matters as health and disease, food supplies and procreation, and the smooth working of the social system. Thus, characteristically, he shows by means of a sample study of the marital histories of a group of women that there is a high incidence of sterility, miscarriage, and neo-natal death and that this makes objective sense of the tendency of the women to resort frequently to one particular fertility fetish. On the same lines he shows that there
is available to Yakô a diverse range of ritual procedures and facilities to cope with the crises that are bound to occur in the course of a normal life, and he explains why there is no necessary consistency between the different ritual choices open to the individual. It enables people to try different ritual measures, in the same way as we resort to second and third medical opinions, the more hopefully if they are not in agreement with one another.

The problems due to the inconsistencies and stresses that are liable to arise in the social structure of tribal societies, as a result of modern economic and political changes, greatly interested Forde. A number of his publications record lectures and contributions to symposia concerned with such contemporary issues as the effects of urbanization, of the modern market economy and of the political changes imposed on tribal societies by colonial governments on their social life and their religious and moral ideas. He approached these problems as an anthropologist, as for instance in his Lugard Memorial Lecture of 1967, convinced of the value of the empirical, functionalist approach (as he describes it in one of his popular articles) urging the necessity of taking into account the contexts and interconnections of all institutions and practices under investigation. Throughout he maintained his ideal of a Science of Man which must take cognizance of all the dimensions of human existence biological, psychological, historical, and cultural.

If Forde was, as Barnicot whom I have quoted earlier implied, less prolific than he himself would have wished, there is no doubt that the published work he left will give him a distinguished place in the history of modern British anthropology. Horton says (1974, loc. cit., p. 9) that ‘perhaps the best fruit of his thinking ended up in other people’s work’. This is no idle tribute. Innumerable articles published in Africa under Forde’s editorship bear the imprint of ideas and suggestions he offered, as do many of the books and papers of his former pupils, colleagues, and friends. The collective works he initiated and edited in order to fill gaps in the comparative conspectus of African social systems and cultural patterns are excellent examples of this. There is the collection of studies on West African Kingdoms in the Nineteenth Century (1967) which he edited with Dr. P. M. Kaberry, and which drew attention to the remarkable field material bearing on kingship in West Africa, and thus on such traditional problems as that of the divine kingship, that has accumulated since the war. African Worlds
(1954) served equally to highlight aspects of African culture that had received insufficient attention among British and American anthropologists, many of whom it introduced for the first time to the Dogon studies of Marcel Griaule and his colleagues in France. He played a similar part in promoting what has come to be called ‘modern studies’ in Africa as, for instance, by his editorship of the Unesco Review of Industrialization and Urbanization in Africa South of the Sahara (1956).

Forde received many academic honours. He was awarded the Wellcome Medal (1940), the Rivers Memorial Medal (1956), and the Huxley Memorial Medal (1970) of the Royal Anthropological Institute. He was President of the Royal Anthropological Institute from 1947–9 and President of Section H of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1947. The Frazer Lecture he gave at Liverpool in 1957, the Simon Lecture he gave at Manchester in 1960, and his Munro Lectures at Edinburgh in 1961 have been referred to earlier. He was elected a Fellow of University College London in 1949 and to the Fellowship of the British Academy in 1966. He enjoyed visiting and felt much at home in the United States. He returned to Berkeley as a Visiting Professor in 1949, and again in 1956; and he served in the same capacity at Yale in 1953 and at Harvard in 1962. He was for many years one of the Vice-Presidents of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences and took a leading part in the International Congresses organized by the Union.

Forde was twice married and had two sons by his first wife. His widow, Dr. Evelyn Forde, shared his taste for travel, for social occasions, and for the international gatherings at which Daryll was often at his most exuberant, and kept open house for their many anthropological and Africanist friends.

*Man in Africa* includes a bibliography of Forde’s major writings up to 1968, and his publications on African subjects are, with some minor exceptions, listed in *Africa*, 43, 4, 1973, pp. 286–7, and include references to publications after 1968.

M. G. Smith concludes his Foreword to *Man in Africa* (p. xxiv), thus: ‘We simply wish to honour a man who has employed his varied talents selflessly and without cause for many years in the service both of scholarship and humanity; one who has never failed to give generously of his ideas, experience, energy, and time to [combined, I would add, with an abiding interest in and concern for, M. F.] all who have had the fortune to work with him in any capacity.’ I can think of no better epitaph to
commemorate Daryll Forde’s life work. He died in harness, attending to the affairs of the International African Institute until the last day of his life, undaunted by illness and pain.

This Memoir was to have been a joint contribution by Professor Max Gluckman and myself. His lamented death not only deprived me of his help, but also, I regret, delayed the completion of the task that thus devolved on me alone. I am the more grateful for the assistance I have had from Dr. Evelyn Forde, Professor Glyn Daniel, Professor Emrys Peters, Professor Robin Horton, Professor Mary Douglas, Dr. G. I. Jones, Professor Alfred Harris, and others. I am indebted to the International African Institute for permission to quote from the obituary notices published in *Africa*, and to Professor Douglas and Dr. Kaberry for permission to quote from *Man in Africa*. I am indebted, also, to the Leverhulme Trust for a grant towards secretarial assistance required for the preparation of this Memoir.

Meyer Fortes
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