

concern for representation, it is not pre-occupied with the issue of 'typicality' in the choice of sample villages. In their study of village survey methodologies, Lipton and Moore (1972) identify two general objections to surveys based on village types. One has to do with the village as being a proper 'behavioural unit'; the other is related to village types ignoring the 'external environment' of village society, that is, the contextual aspects of internal village changes (Lipton and Moore, 1972:9-10). By 'appropriate behaviour unit' is meant that villagers' behaviour may not often be determined by factors solely bounded by the village system. To that extent, this issue is related to the second, contextual objection. To the extent that there is an issue as to the appropriateness of attributing villagers' behaviour to a particular type of village system and our ability to generalize from it to other units within the same taxonomy, the matter becomes subject to empirical investigation. In that case, the problem has a distinct circular angle to it.

As far as the contextual environment is concerned, this study has attempted to avoid the opposite problem: an excess of contextualization. In particular, I have tried not to replicate and subsume at the village level, structural features of the rural sector that I have described and analyzed from the general statistical data. The village unit cannot be treated as the reduced, micro-organism of aggregate rural society. Rather, it is seen here as the crucible which, in the words of Keydar, mediates and articulates the linkages of the agrarian structure to that of the peasant household, and other village inhabitants.

In discussing the choice of Zbeidat for conducting a household survey (Introduction to Chapter 11), I mention another sense in which the notion of 'typicality' appears, sociologically speaking, as a false issue. If we are referring to a proper quantitative taxonomy of village