

INTRODUCTION

Drawn from life: Mary Douglas's personal method

Richard Fardon

Mary Douglas (1921–2007) was the most widely read British anthropologist of the second half of the twentieth century. Her writings continue to inspire researchers in numerous fields in the twenty-first century.¹ This volume of papers, first published over a period of almost fifty years, provides insights into the wellsprings of her style of thought and manner of writing.

More popular counterparts to many of Douglas's academic works – either the first formulation of an argument, or its more general statement – were often published around the same time as a specialist version. These first thoughts and popular re-imaginings are particularly revealing of the close relation between Douglas's intellectual and personal concerns, a convergence that became more overt in her late career, when Mary Douglas occasionally wrote autobiographically, explaining her ideas in relation to her upbringing, her family, and her experiences as both a committed Roman Catholic and a social anthropologist in the academy. The four social types of her theoretical writings – hierarchy, competition, the enclaved sect, and individuals in isolation – extend to remote times and distant places, prototypes that literally were close to home for her. This ability to expand and contract a restricted range of formal images allowed Mary Douglas to enter new fields of study with startling rapidity, to link unlikely domains of thought (through analogy, most frequently with religion), and to accommodate the most diverse examples in comparative frameworks. It was the way, to put it baldly, she made things fall into place.

The previously uncollected essays anthologized here as 'a very personal method' present Mary Douglas's ideas biographically, and make available some sparkling writing that might be unfamiliar even to readers who know her work well.

Familiar feelings

The volume begins with an extensive late autobiographical lecture that reflects on the place of her academic work in the context of a long life. Its

opening sections on her Roman Catholic upbringing, and her debt to the grandparents responsible for the early care of herself and her sister while their parents were in colonial service in Burma, had initially been intended as the Preface to an uncompleted collection of essays on hierarchy for which Mary Douglas also wrote the essay 'Granny' as an Epilogue. 'Granny' is a tribute to the Protestant woman who undertook to her daughter-in-law, Mary and her sister Pat's dying mother, to bring them up as Roman Catholics; it is also a meditation on duty, commitment and constancy, as well as the way that the shape we have given our own life is discovered towards its end. In deference to her intentions, this collection uses these two pieces – 'A feeling for hierarchy' and 'Granny' – as its bookends. Mary's title for the opening essay was chosen carefully, as was her way with titles. Our deepest convictions strike us as 'natural', part of our fundamental disposition, hence what she first experienced as a 'feeling' she had towards hierarchy, a sense of importance only subsequently unpacked intellectually. The predisposition towards hierarchy, the welcome she always gave it, was part of a *habitus* into which she had been absorbed by early experiences against which she never rebelled for long.

This, however, was not the whole of Mary's family background. The next two pieces introduce her 'invincibly agnostic' father, a fanatical fisherman whose writings she edited, with filial duty, as well as increasing delight in the formal Edwardian essay, into the final book completed in her lifetime. Typical of Mary's facility in conjoining autobiography and anthropology is the essay on gender symbolism for fly fishermen that she composed while editing her father's papers. A familiar feeling then explored and understood academically.

The final occasional piece in this part offers a vignette of Mary and her artist sister, Pat, bringing their distinctive insights to a short sojourn with the circus that occurred just after the Second World War in which they both undertook war service. The sisters were close, similar in their stature and neat appearance, but in many respects entirely different. Mary, fond of wine and meaty food dishes served to entertain visitors around her dining table; Pat happier in solitude, and abstemious to a fault. Her daughter Jo (Joanna) feels her mother was the family prototype of the isolate in Mary's four social types.

Pat's illustrations appeared in many of Mary's books, including this one, the cover of which depicts the Brothers Grimm story of the 'The Golden Fish', one of three large murals that Pat Tew (later Novy) undertook for Pentley Park (now Templewood) Primary School in Welwyn Garden City (in 1950–51) as part of the commitment of Hertfordshire County Council to post-War educational provision and the programme of 'Art for All' in new-build schools between 1947 and 1953. In those heady days of renewal, a small proportion of the building budget (0.3%) was set aside for artworks, typically commissioned from young artists (like Pat, who had recently

graduated from the Slade School of Art). Welwyn Garden City was exemplary of progressive thinking about housing: founded in 1920 as the second Garden City in England, it had been designated a new town during the post-War reconstruction in 1948. ‘The Golden Fish’ is a traditional, if somewhat misogynistic, tale about greed: a poor fisherman lands a golden fish with the power of speech which he returns to the sea without condition. He is chided for this by his irascible wife who sends him back to plague the fish with ever more outrageous wishes, until, exasperated, it restores the family to its initial poverty. Pat has represented the fisherman, like her father, as an angler and fly fisherman. She commented at the time, ‘This is the version where the wife wants to be king, emperor, pope in turn and finally wants to control the sun and the moon. In the left corner is the husband showing his disapproval. He kept repeating “No good will come of this”, but of course, it was the emperor ordering him, he had to go back and ask for more’ (*Welwyn Hatfield Times*, Welwyn Garden City school murals revamp, 19 June 2011).² It’s a story attuned to Pat’s preference for modest demands upon life. Mary would note that, for all its attractions, powerlessness to influence events was one of the drawbacks of the isolate’s lifestyle. I suspect this is the kind of moral tale that would have been familiar to both sisters, furnishing artistic inspiration for Pat and evidence of personality types for Mary.

Thinking about Catholicism in Lele religious experience

Mary Douglas’s ethnographic experience in the Belgian Congo (later Zaire and now the Democratic Republic of Congo) was relatively brief by the standards of many of her fieldworker contemporaries. Yet the effect on her was enduring. Readers familiar with her writing about Lele historic religion, particularly the cult of the pangolin, or scaly anteater, might be unaware of her writings on the impact of missionization on the Lele. An early, ‘very toned-down’, contribution to the subject, in a volume edited by Adrian Hastings on religious minorities, is reprinted as the first chapter of the second part of this collection. If this essay was less outspoken than she later wished, it is nonetheless mildly critical if read attentively. Recalling it in the terms quoted above, she wrote on 4 May 2000 to Adrian Hastings in response to an essay he had sent her that, ‘My own idea about the not fully intended exclusion of Africans from this history [referring to Hastings’ editorial on the last three decades or so of African Christian Studies³, Ed.] is to put the finger on the idealist and intellectualist concept of Christianity which avoids or excludes any confrontation with how people normally use religion to solve their personal problems.’ This is a perspective associated

with earlier anthropologists' studies of historic African religions, notably the nexus of the occurrence of misfortune and the accusation of sorcery or witchcraft in an effort to fix responsibility for it. A brief return to Zaire in 1987 had made Mary Douglas aware of recent brutalities in the Church-led witch-finding movements among the Lele, excesses which she laid at the door of the Church's failure to answer people's needs. The second chapter in this part of the collection makes available for the first time her immediate reactions to this experience, written in the heat of the moment in 1988, a moderated version of which she only published a decade later (in 1999) after considerable persuasion by the then editor of the journal *Africa*, Murray Last (personal communication 2011).⁴ In part, her caution was to protect some of those involved, whom she thought vulnerable. Their names, however, can now readily be googled on the web, and even feature in an otherwise cursory French-language Wikipedia article.⁵ As Douglas saw it, 'The old religion was entirely monotheist, but the one, unique divine creator worshipped by the Lele ancestors, their grandfathers and fathers, was now set up in opposition to the Christian God. The Christians associated the deity of their pagan parents with the devil and his minions ...' (see note 4, Douglas 1999: 178). Rather than abjuring anti-sorcery movements and sorcery itself, as European missionaries had urged them to do, Lele cast their old religion as sorcery, and their priests embarked on 'Catholic anti-sorcery' (see note 4, 1999: 184).

This particular instance sparked a more general reflection that Douglas published for the wider readership of the Roman Catholic journal *The Tablet* in 1990. That the subject concerned her deeply is made evident by her return to it a little over a decade later, in 2001, in the course of a named lecture delivered to the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, when she advocated the inclusion of African deities in the Catholic worldview as a way of forestalling their demonization. Mary Douglas's Roman Catholicism was deeply held but for all that not necessarily in step with orthodoxy, and her opinions as a Catholic bore the impact of her anthropological beliefs as strongly as her anthropological opinions reflected her Roman Catholic beliefs.

The concluding paper of this section⁶ also calls upon Central African ethnography to draw a contrast with contemporary western societies. The African case derives not from the Lele on this occasion, but from the writings of Anita Jacobson-Widding on the Buisi of southern Congo. Douglas's argument, a plenary address to the European Association of Social Anthropologists in 1994, had been delivered first as a 1989 Gifford Lecture at the University of Edinburgh under the title 'Claims on God'. As she notes, the argument did not entirely fit into the book of those lectures, *Leviticus as Literature*, that had been published in 1993, though parts of it appeared there. Nor does it surface fully in the lectures in honour of Aaron Wildavsky that were later co-authored with Steven Ney and published as *Missing Persons*.⁷ In keeping with the interests of their dedicatee,

that book concentrated more on political economy than on religion, and took up claims on the individual rather than on God. She does note, however, that, ‘African anthropology has many beautifully written examples of how exterior and interior persons are appointed with the furnishings for elaborate forms of social intercourse’ (Douglas and Ney 1998: 14), an evocation that allows her to highlight by contrast the prevalence of ‘*Homo oeconomicus*’ as a simple model of the rational individual susceptible to being held accountable for actions in ‘Western culture’. The argument of ‘Cloud god and shadow self’ triangulates ideas both of the person and of supernatural powers in ancient Israel, the contemporary West, and Central Africa, and does so with particular attention to less articulated concepts of godhood and personhood: images of emptiness or of protean substance – like fire, cloud or shadow – arguing that these provide scope for the religious imagination and, doing so, are affordances of religious experience and speculation. Cross-culturally these affordances, and hence the place and scope of religious imagination, will differ in both quality and extent.

Taboo and ritual

The two mid-career works *Purity and Danger* (1966) and *Natural Symbols* (1970)⁸ are Mary Douglas’s best known books. The gestation periods of the two differ: *Purity and Danger* has antecedents traceable at least to her second Lele fieldwork in 1953, when the germ of her notion of dirt as ‘matter out of place’ was set out in her fieldwork notes in terms very similar to those used in the book thirteen years later.⁹ *Natural Symbols* was composed in much greater haste – and annoyance – as a response in part to the reforms of the Second Vatican Council. Both were preceded in *New Society*, then a new magazine of wide circulation, by articles that overtly linked the soon-to-be-published academic works to contemporary issues that had caught Douglas’s attention. In the case of *Purity and Danger*, the link was made via a widely-reported suicide in Durham Cathedral¹⁰ that had required a complex ‘rehallowing’ of the Cathedral before it could be reopened. *Purity and Danger* was to culminate in a quite different series of self-willed deaths, including that of the Dinka master of the fishing spear buried alive in his old age because of the threat his declining powers and a natural death posed to his community. The title, ‘Taboo’, recalls that of a lecture series delivered by the Czech exile anthropologist, Franz Baermann Steiner, that Mary attended at the University of Oxford. In 1956, the series was published posthumously as a book of the same title, edited by Laura Bohannan, one of Mary’s Oxford contemporaries.¹¹ Its impact on Mary was profound, as she recalls in the memoir of him reprinted here.

The second article for *New Society*, under the forthright title ‘The contempt of ritual’, was an early version of some chapters of *Natural Symbols*,

written in the months immediately following the closure of the Second Vatican Council in December 1965. The title was reused when Mary was invited to deliver the St Thomas Aquinas's Day Lecture at Blackfriars at the University of Oxford. The fact of this lecture, published in 1968, largely being recycled into the early chapters of *Natural Symbols* goes a long way to explaining the tone of that book. The framing of the lecture is provided by its first three paragraphs, not replicated in the later book. The opening paragraph is worth drawing to particular attention as an uncompromising response to the Second Vatican Council:

The Church today is engaged in a great crisis of self-examination. It is looking at its claims, its traditional role, its theology. It is revising its rituals. This reforming effort is intended to bring Christian worship fully into the twentieth century. But, alas, the zeal for coming up to date proceeds without recourse to one of the most relevant critical techniques this century has produced, I mean sociological comparison. Hence some naïveté in the religious reformer about his own role. He seems not to suspect how much his views are the product of his secular environment. Nor does he consider whether the faithful are free to follow his proposals, though they also must be constrained by their own social environment. More important, he does not seem to foresee any difficulty in abolishing some forms of worship and retaining others. (originally 1968: 475, p.148 in this volume)

The central argument of *Natural Symbols*, a book addressed to anthropologists, concerning sociological insights into variation in socially shared attitudes towards the importance of ritual observances, begins life as an admonishment to Catholic reformers, and their inability to understand the lives of some of their parishioners. Douglas moves quickly to establish her counter-instance to the 'over-weaning rationality' and 'unwitting' Protestantism of reforming clerics. Bog Irishism is the devotional style of the 'perverse ritualist' who places more importance on the 'taboo' of abstention from meat on Fridays than on any other religious observance. The intention to replace this kind of ritualism with a self-conscious intellectual commitment is, Douglas argues, another step in the progressive decline of magical beliefs that must eventually come to include the communion sacraments and their transubstantiation. Adherence to embracing symbols, she goes on to argue, goes along with the social experience of membership of close and bounded social groupings, members of which exert pressure to conformity on one another. This is one quarter of what will become the four quadrant theory of cultural types in her later writing. By the end of the 1960s, we see the theory in an early and essentially binary stage which, with hindsight, is impeding development of the fourfold scheme. At this stage, Douglas still conceives of closed social groups in terms of the presence of social structure,

and all other social forms predominantly as its loosening or absence, rather than as types of structure in their own right. Residually, her argument also retains an evolutionist or at least developmental narrative (as it had in *Purity and Danger*), and is most thoroughly indebted to Emile Durkheim's schema of movement from mechanical to organic forms of solidarity, although she tends to conceive of this process in terms of a dissolution of social bonds rather than a reformation of them, as Durkheim had. A chink in this more or less unidirectional account is apparent in her search for 'primitive models' of anti-ritualism, which she finds in classic ethnographies of African pastoralists and hunters-gatherers, living in fluid social groupings, who are sceptical of magical efficacy. Within weak social groups, she generalizes, are found weakened responses to condensed symbols and reduced acceptance of the efficacy of ritual. The second part of the essay attempts to develop this insight into a fourfold model of social types, but the upshot is not entirely consistent and has a static comparative mindset, which will only later be transformed into a more processual and transactional direction by her collaborative works on conflicts internal to twentieth-century, western societies (see note 1).

For all their limitations, setting these essays and their broad concerns alongside the two famous academic books explains both why those books remained the point of departure for all her later work, and what concerns provided the impetus for that later work.

Contemporaries

Mary Douglas was generous in acknowledgement of the senior mentors from whom she borrowed ideas. The debt to Franz Steiner, which is obvious in her 1964 article on 'Taboo', named after his lecture series, pervades not just the argument of *Purity and Danger* but much of her later work, notably that on risk. Values are made real through dangers that can be unleashed in the guise of properties of the social and natural orders within which we live.

Douglas's respect for her teacher at Oxford, E-P or Sir E.E. Evans-Pritchard, was to be expressed at greater length in the short monograph on him that she wrote for the *Fontana Modern Masters* series.¹² There she attributed most of her later ideas to his inspiration, indeed too much so for the tastes of some reviewers. Writing for *The Tablet* in 1973, she particularly emphasized the contribution of E-P to the correction of a 'seductive and convenient error' particularly common among theologians and church historians in demonstrating that all human cognition is relative both to the entirety of experience and to the social circumstances of the experiencing subject. To have demonstrated relativity of this kind, she argued, was as momentous as the similar achievement in physics.

It is apparent that for all she owed to positive influences (like those of Steiner and E-P), Douglas's ideas were formed just as much in a negative dialectic with her contemporaries, particularly two of them, with whom she particularly disagreed, on some occasions more stridently than others. Her later work mellowed towards Claude Lévi-Strauss's structuralism, however the two short pieces reprinted here represent a reaction against what she saw as his lack of rigour in grasping local schemes of knowledge, and his lack of grounding in understanding institutional life, the qualities she had emphasized most in her appreciation of E-P's work, and that she knew were important to her own project. Similar criticisms, particular in relation to social grounding, were levelled at Clifford Geertz's brand of interpretation in cultural anthropology, thereby bringing the predominant strands of both continental European and American anthropology under a series of witheringly titled examinations from the vantage of a British social anthropological tradition that placed emphases on local knowledge, achieved through immersive fieldwork, and explanation by reference to broad encompassing concepts of social context.

Inclusion as conclusion

Mary Douglas's preferences, drawn from her life experience and bolstered by her theoretical practice, increasingly coalesced around the restatement of inclusive hierarchy, to which she devoted a good deal of her later writing (as we saw stated abstractly in the first piece of this collection). The implications of this social vision were explored in both their positive and negative consequences, often with reference to the model of the three types of social environment she saw as competitors to hierarchy: competition, isolation and enclave. The first piece in this Part looks at the dangers of exclusion from an economy increasingly integrated through knowledge; the second attributes the purblind reaction of some policy makers to the importance of eating together – both as a ritual and as a control on appetite – to their own anti-ritualism. An occasional essay dedicated to Michael Young asks what kinds of enclaved societies provide their members with the consolations of good deaths and, for the living, funeral ceremonies that support the resumption of normal life after bereavement.

There follows a short play about the clash of cultural styles that puts on paper the kind of dialogue between positions that Mary would often extemporize in explanations.¹³ The play was devised with a view to performance at a Ministry of Defence conference in 2002 where it would have presented the basic ideas of the Cultural Theory model applied to terrorism in a way that sought to engage an audience drawn from both the Ministry of Defence and the defence industries. As such it was designed for didactic as much as

dramatic impact: to make the audience familiar with ideas they might use subsequently to reassess their own work.¹⁴ Mary was particularly fascinated by the problems of leadership, decision-making, and defection within sectarian organizations. Questions of appropriate appearance are a recurrent theme in her scenario, perhaps inculcated by the emphasis on comportment in her convent education. The play was written in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks in the USA, around the same time as an academic article on terrorism that she co-authored with Gerald Mars (Douglas and Mars 2003, reprinted with postscript in Douglas 2013, see note 1); both accounts reinscribe the hierarchy/sect distinction within sectarian groupings: hence, the anthropologist character's discussion of more and less dangerous forms of sectarian organization. It is indicative of her wish to foreground the determining strength of social bonds upon personality that Mary Douglas suggested the eight characters in the play, four each in the hierarchical and sectarian settings, be played by only four actors, with the effect that each personality type is doubled.

The following essay returns us to Roman Catholicism as a specifically hierarchical setting. Mary's suggestion that women should play differentiated roles within the Church is consistent with her emphasis on complementarity as a characteristic of both classification and the organization of action in well-functioning hierarchical organizations. Two interviews with women almost complete the volume: the first, included in this Part, with Deborah Jones,¹⁵ responds to the question, posed specifically within the perspective of Catholic activism, of whether a scientific outlook, in this case a sociological approach to understanding the human condition, is reconcilable with religious faith. As the reader will note, this is exactly the note struck by Douglas's Aquinas Lecture delivered over three decades earlier, when she argued that a sociological approach was essential for moving from purely theoretical and theological towards practical considerations in religion. The passage of time finds her views on the fit between social contexts and the biases they impart to religious precepts and practices unchanged in any fundamental respect.

Epilogue

A second interview included here took place only two years later¹⁶ with the distinguished Canadian journalist and broadcaster, Eleanor Wachtel, host of a long-running literary programme, *Writers & Company*, for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Of several interviews that might have been included here, this one seems appropriate as an Epilogue because it reflects both the recognition of Mary Douglas as a significant public intellectual, a rare animal among anthropologists, and correspondingly draws from her a

particularly direct statement of her life's work. The volume is closed by Mary's meditation on her Protestant grandmother (May Twomey, née Ponsford), her mother's mother, an account she must have completed at the same time as she edited the fishing essays of her staunchly unbelieving father. This coincidence invites the thought that they were aspects of her family, and just as much components of herself, seen relationally, as the part tongue-in-cheek claim made in her Aquinas Lecture, to being a descendant of the Bog Irish.

Notes

1. A companion volume to this, *Cultures and Crises: Understanding Risk and Resolution*, edited by Richard Fardon (Sage, 2013), collects essays written or conceived collaboratively in the last fifteen years of Mary's life that apply Cultural Theory.
2. www.whtimes.co.uk/what-s-on/welwyn_garden_city_school_murals_revamp_1_925844 (accessed 12 July 2011). For further details of the three artworks at Templewood School (another one of which, 'The Selfish Giant', is reproduced as the cover to the companion volume to this – *Cultures and Crises*, Sage, 2013), see <http://thedecoratedschool.blogspot.com/2011/03/three-murals-at-templewood-school.html>. A fourth Pat Tew mural, in Grange Junior School in Letchworth, depicts the local Robin Hood figure, 'The Giant of Weston', <http://thedecoratedschool.blogspot.com/2011/05/patricia-tew-mural-grange-junior-school.html>. 'The Decorated School Project' is an AHRC-funded network directed by Catherine Burke (University of Cambridge) and Jeremy Howard (University of St Andrews), who kindly involved me. The research of Soo Hitchin, who has animated efforts to preserve the Pat Tew murals, is acknowledged with particular gratitude. Mary's family has donated all royalties from the present collection to the restoration fund.
3. Adrian Hastings 'African Christian Studies, 1967–1999: Reflections of an Editor', *Journal of Religion in Africa*, Vol. 30, Fasc. 1 (Feb., 2000), pp. 30–44. The pertinence of the riposte is an open question since, (1) Hastings' article addressed the relative absence of African *academic* commentary in the most recent period, and (2) literature on the growth of Pentecostal churches took precisely the line Mary espouses here.
4. The revised version of this chapter was published as Douglas (1999) 'Sorcery accusations unleashed: the Lele revisited 1987', *Africa*, 69(2): 177–93.
5. 'Les Leele ont subi une action anti-sorcellaire appelée *mupele* en 1980. L'abbé Minengu, du diocèse d'Idiofa, a sillonné la région et a, par la force, interdit toute pratique liée à ce qu'il considérait comme de la sorcellerie. Les cultes traditionnels ont été vilipendés et quasiment éradiqués. Les rites traditionnels ont été interdits, les objets de divination «itumba» ont été confisqués ou brûlés sur des *feux d'amour*. Le traumatisme est encore présent dans les esprits des anciens, dont certains ont été menacés physiquement. À part quelques tambours utilisés dans les églises pendant les cérémonies religieuses, il ne reste pratiquement aucun objet ancien. Un «ratissage» des œuvres d'art, destiné à un marché commercial, a contribué à la disparition des artefacts' (<http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leele> – accessed 12 July 2011). Douglas's essay distinguishes the first phase of anti-sorcery, as above called *Mupele*, from a second, *L'Action de l'abbé*, culminating in the third and most intense phase coinciding with a young Lele

priest, who had been ordained in 1976, being posted to the Mission station at Banga in the south of Lele country. This priest toured, together with his choir, when invited by villagers to purge them of sorcerers (Douglas 1999: 184–185). The priest, the Abdon Minengu cited in the Wiki article, is a Lele from the Province of Bandundu, who had been ordained on 22 August 1976 in the Diocese of Idiofa (http://myreader.toile-libre.org/uploads/My_4e3bd1b8a2ead.pdf). Following his anti-sorcery activities, apparently he was summoned to Rome. At some point he moved to Kinshasa where, according to online sources, he remains active: thus, Tuesday 27 January 2009 found the Abbé Abdon Minengu at his residence in Limete Funa where he hosted a pre-funeral period of mourning for the singer Virginie Mamiyamba, who had been a member of the group ‘Leele Folk’ of Séraphin Mangila, also known as ‘Sera X Or’, as well as a performer in Catholic choirs (<http://kikimafri.over-blog.com/160-index.html>). During 2010–11, and probably also before this, he was posted as an army chaplain (*aumônier*) to the military barracks of the FARDC (*Forces Armées de la République Démocratique du Congo*) near the airport in Kinshasa (see item 137 at: http://myreader.toile-libre.org/uploads/My_4e306e5f4b0d1.pdf). Informants in Kinshasa told Joseph Trapido, who kindly asked on my behalf, about a well-known priest of the same name from the Ndolo military barracks who had held charismatic meetings on private premises in the Type-K Ndolo Market district of Kinshasa. Mary mentions his considerable personal charisma in the context of his earlier witch-finding career, and his role in the Catholic Charismatic movement when she met him in 1987.

6. I am indebted to Paul Richards for his advice on including this paper, and more generally for discussions of Mary Douglas’s work while he and Perri 6 worked together on an online annotated Oxford bibliography of Mary’s writings, as well as a booklength account of her ideas.
7. Mary Douglas & Steven Nay (1998) *Missing Persons: A Critique of the Social Sciences*, Berkeley, CA and London: University of California Press; New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
8. Douglas (1966) *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Douglas (1970) *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, London: Barrie & Rockliff/Cresset Press.
9. Richard Fardon (2010) ‘Margaret Mary Douglas 1921–2007’, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 166, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows*, IX: 135–58, see particularly pp. 150–1.
10. According to the online listing, there is a file in Durham Cathedral Archives, Additional Ms 223, March 1964. ‘File about George Edward Hopper’s suicide in Durham Cathedral on 3 March 1964, the closure of the Cathedral and its reconciliation and rehallowing on 5 March, including newspaper cuttings, notices, legal papers and the service paper’ (<http://endure.dur.ac.uk:8080/fedora/get/UkDhU:CathedralCatalogue.001/PDF>, see page 162). George Hopper, a middle-aged and unemployed man, had slit his throat with a razor after climbing the high altar.
11. Franz Steiner’s (1956) *Taboo*, London: Cohen & West, reissued in (1999), *Taboo, Truth, and Religion*, edited by Jeremy Adler and Richard Fardon, Berghahn: Oxford, from which Mary’s memoir derives.
12. Douglas (1980) *Evans-Pritchard*, Glasgow Fontana Modern Masters.
13. Frank Hendriks tells me that his own use of a dramatized device to introduce contending views of democracy, in *Debating Democracy: A Vital Theory of*

Democracy in Action, Oxford University Press, 2010, is coincidental, since Mary had not discussed her play with him. The conversational style of posing problems, however, is something the two authors share and may reflect working conversations among members of the Cultural Theory network.

14. The play was written for AKT Productions Ltd., a provider of theatre-based learning and scenario resources, one of the founding Directors of which, Tim Bannerman (the T in AKT), is a relative of Mary's husband, Jim (Tim's mother and Jim having been first cousins). Tim had suggested in conversation with Mary that her ideas might be of potential interest to the Ministry of Defence. The 2002 DEFCON conference event did not attract sufficient interest to take place, and the scenario was never performed (personal communications from Andy Powrie and particularly Tim Bannerman, Directors of AKT, 18–19 July 2011; 9 August 2011; 15–16 February 2012). See www.aktproductions.co.uk/default.aspx?p=1&s=0. Copies of relevant papers provided to the author by Tim Bannerman.
15. As Deborah Jones kindly amplified in response to my enquiries, the interview took place during the Annual General Meeting and Conference of the Catholic Biblical Association held at Newman College, Birmingham, between 16 and 18 April 1999, where Mary delivered a paper on 'The compassionate God and his animal creation: rereading Leviticus' that amplified her book published later that year (1999 *Leviticus as Literature*, Oxford University Press; the paper was published in M. O'Kane (2002) (ed.), *Borders, Boundaries and the Bible*, Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 61–73). Both the paper, and the book on which it was based, turned one of the most famous arguments of *Purity and Danger* on its head: rather than being unclean or impure, the pig in Jewish thought had been the object of divine compassion. Mary and Deborah sat in an empty classroom where Deborah recorded the interview in an atmosphere which she describes as 'very business-like' and 'coolly efficient', an evocation of mood consistent with Mary's comment to Adrian Hastings (quoted above) of feeling out of step with mainstream Catholic opinion. Deborah Jones was deputy editor of *Priests & People* from 1991 to 1996 and again from 1999 to 2004 when it became *The Pastoral Review* (personal communications 19 & 20 July 2011). At the time of writing, she is General Secretary of Catholic Concern for Animals and editor of *The Ark*.
16. Although published in 2003, the interview took place in Mary's home in 2001 just after her eightieth birthday (which means shortly after 25 March).