

Fieldwork and Footnotes

Studies in the History of
European Anthropology

Edited by

Han F. Vermeulen
and Arturo Alvarez Roldán



Fieldwork and footnotes

Doing fieldwork and writing ethnographic texts are the primary tasks for anthropological practice. What are the origins of this practice? How has anthropology evolved in the many national traditions in Europe? These studies, focused on the history of European anthropology, provide new responses to these questions, and reveal that anthropology/ethnology is much older than has been generally assumed. The editors and contributors believe that the history of anthropology is itself an anthropological problem and should be investigated as such. They provide an overview of current themes in the history of anthropology in Europe, the first such volume to appear in English.

The contributors examine a wide variety of anthropological impulses within Europe—from the seventeenth century to the late twentieth century. They explore key issues in the history of social and cultural anthropology in the UK, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Poland, Slovenia and Romania, and in Mexico by way of the influence of Spanish anthropologists. The importance of historical figures such as Lord Monboddo on the Orang Outang; Enlightenment and Romanticism in A. Bastian; H.J. Nieboer on slavery; and Malinowski and Witkiewicz on the conceptualization of culture is discussed. The differences between anthropology, ethnography and ethnology are explored, as is the problem of modernism and postmodernism with regard to the Malinowskian revolution.

Fieldwork and Footnotes reflects the great diversity of anthropological traditions in Europe, and provides an invaluable international, comparative framework which will make the book of great interest to historians of science as well as to anthropologists and ethnologists.

Han F. Vermeulen is Research Fellow at the Centre of Non-Western Studies, University of Leiden, The Netherlands.

Arturo Alvarez Roldán is Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Granada, Spain.

European Association of Social Anthropologists

The European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) was inaugurated in January 1989, in response to a widely felt need for a professional association which would represent social anthropologists in Europe and foster co-operation and interchange in teaching and research. As Europe transforms itself in the nineties, the EASA is dedicated to the renewal of the distinctive European tradition in social anthropology.

Other titles in the series

Conceptualizing Society

Adam Kuper

Revitalizing European Rituals

Jeremy Boissevain

Other Histories

Kirsten Hastrup

Alcohol, Gender and Culture

Dimitra Gefou-Madianou

Understanding Rituals

Daniel de Coppet

Gendered Anthropology

Teresa del Valle

Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge

Kirsten Hastrup

Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism

Charles Stewart and Rosalind Shaw

Fieldwork and footnotes

Studies in the history of
European anthropology

Edited by Han F. Vermeulen
and Arturo Alvarez Roldán



London and New York

First published 1995
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2003.

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

© 1995 Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán, selection and editorial matter; individual chapters, the contributors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-42657-6 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-73481-5 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0-415-10655-9 (hbk)

ISBN 0-415-10656-7 (pbk)

Contents

Notes on contributors	vii
Acknowledgements	xiii
Introduction The history of anthropology and Europe <i>Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán</i>	1
Part I The origins of anthropology in Europe	
1 Towards a prehistory of ethnography: early modern German travel writing as traditions of knowledge <i>Michael Harbsmeier</i>	19
2 Origins and institutionalization of ethnography and ethnology in Europe and the USA, 1771–1845 <i>Han F. Vermeulen</i>	39
3 Discovering the whole of humankind: the genesis of anthropology through the Hegelian looking-glass <i>Gheorghita Geana</i>	60
4 Enlightenment and Romanticism in the work of Adolf Bastian: the historical roots of anthropology in the nineteenth century <i>Klaus-Peter Koepping</i>	75
Part II Contributions to European anthropology	
5 <i>Orang Outang</i> and the definition of <i>Man</i> : the legacy of Lord Monboddo <i>Alan Barnard</i>	95

6	Beyond evolutionism: the work of H.J.Nieboer on slavery, 1900–1910 <i>Jan J.de Wolf</i>	113
7	Bronislaw Kasper Malinowski and Stanislaw Ignacy Witkiewicz: science versus art in the conceptualization of culture <i>Peter Skalník</i>	129
8	Malinowski and the origins of the ethnographic method <i>Arturo Alvarez Roldán</i>	143
Part III Anthropological traditions in Europe		
9	Sweden: central ethnology, peripheral anthropology <i>Tomas Gerholm</i>	159
10	The anthropological tradition in Slovenia <i>Zmago Šmitek and Boždar Jezernik</i>	171
11	Ethnography and anthropology: the case of Polish ethnology <i>Zbigniew Jasiewicz and David Slattery</i>	184
12	Historical anthropology and the history of anthropology in Germany <i>Nikola Susanne Bock</i>	202
13	Spanish social anthropologists in Mexico: anthropology in exile and anthropology of exiles <i>Enrique Hugo García Valencia</i>	219
14	A history of paradoxes: anthropologies of Europe <i>Thomas K.Schippers</i>	234
	Index	247

Contributors

Arturo Alvarez Roldán is Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Granada, Spain. He carried out archival research in Great Britain, obtained his PhD from Complutense University of Madrid and published on the history and epistemology of Darwinism and British anthropology. He conducted fieldwork on rituals, politics and working-class organizations in Western Asturias in Spain, co-authored *Rituales y Proceso Social: Estudio comparativo en cinco zonas españolas* (Madrid, 1991), and is currently engaged in a research project on the use of ‘designer drugs’ among Spanish youth.

Alan Barnard is Reader in Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. He conducted fieldwork in Botswana and Namibia and has published widely on the Khoisan peoples of southern Africa. His books include *Kalahari Bushmen* (a children’s book, 1993), *Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples* (1992), *A Nharo Wordlist, with Notes on Grammar* (1985), and, with Anthony Good, *Research Practices in the Study of Kinship* (1984). He is presently engaged in research on anthropological ideas in the Scottish Enlightenment and, with Jonathan Spencer, is editing an *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Social and Cultural Anthropology* for Routledge.

Nikola Susanne Bock is a PhD student in history, and works as assistant-director and production-assistant in documentary film in Hamburg, Germany. She studied history and German literature in Hamburg and (post-graduate) social and cultural anthropology in Padua, Italy. She published an analysis of peace discussions and pacifism during the Weimar republic (1991) and co-operated in the production of two European film projects, the first on landscape in Eastern Germany (1992), the second on Germany after the Wall

(1993). Her first film as director, *Beyond Babel* (1994), deals with the subjective experience of and with mental disorders and conflicts.

Enrique Hugo García Valencia is a staff member of the National Institute of Anthropology and History (INAH) in Mexico and collaborating with the Mexican Gallery in the British Museum (London). He obtained a PhD in anthropology from Manchester University (1986). His interests include: social organization, symbolic anthropology, ritual, political anthropology and the history of Mexican anthropology. He conducted fieldwork in the Gulf Coast of Mexico, which resulted in *San Miguel Aquazuelos: Estrategias de residencia* (1991).

Gheorghita Geana is Senior Researcher at the Centre of Anthropological Research, and Associate Professor of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Bucharest, Romania. He studied philosophy in Bucharest, conducted extensive fieldwork in Romania, was instructor of students' field practice during the years 1972–76, and obtained his PhD in Bucharest in 1977. His publications include articles on theoretical anthropology, world-view, kinship, ethnicity, demography (among them a note on 'Cultural Anthropology in Romania', *EASA Newsletter*, no. 3, 1990).

Tomas Gerholm is Associate Professor in the Department of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University, Sweden. His fieldwork in North Yemen resulted in the monograph *Market, Mosque and Mafraj: Social Inequality in a Yemeni Town* (1977). He has co-edited *The New Islamic Presence in Western Europe* (1988), in which his own contribution was a study of Western intellectuals converting to Islam. A study of Muslim intellectuals in the West will appear in A. Ahmed and H. Donnán (eds), *Islam in the Age of Postmodernity* (Routledge, 1994). At present he is engaged in research on the rise and fall of cosmopolitan Alexandria.

Michael Harbsmeier is Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Comparative Culture Studies at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark. He was born in Germany and studied anthropology at Københavns Universitet, where he co-founded the Centre for Research in the Humanities. He was *enseignant invité* in Paris, guest researcher in Bergen, and Jean Monet Fellow in Florence. He has published widely on travel accounts and the prehistory of anthropology, as well as on literacy and the cultural construction of social identity. His *Wilde Völkerkunde. Andere Welten in deutschen*

Reiseberichten der frühen Neuzeit was recently published by Campus Verlag, Frankfurt.

Zbigniew Jasiewicz is Professor of Anthropology and Ethnology at Adama Mickiewicza University in Poznan, Poland. He carried out field research in Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, and Kazakhstan, held the chair of the Polish team at the Center for Social Studies in Vienna (1973–83) and lectured in Britain, Germany, and the former Yugoslavia and USSR. Since 1975 he has been the Scholarly Secretary, and since 1987 Chairman of the Committee of Ethnological Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Prof. Jasiewicz is currently carrying out research into the family and its culture in Poland; the transformation of traditional culture of local peoples in Central Asia; the culture of Poles living in Kazakhstan.

Božidar Jezernik is Associate Professor at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. He studied in Ljubljana and attended post-doctoral courses at the London School of Economics. His principal works (in Slovenian) are: 'Struggle for survival: The way of life of Slovenes in Italian concentration camps' (Ljubljana, 1983); 'Sex and gender in extremis: An anthropological study of the German concentration camps Dachau, Buchenwald, Ravensbrück and Auschwitz 1933–1945' (Ljubljana, 1993). His recent research centres on cultural issues and the way of life in the Balkans.

Klaus-Peter Koepping is Professor of Anthropology at the Südasiensinstitut, Seminar für Ethnologie of the University of Heidelberg, Germany. He conducted fieldwork in Japan, Afghanistan and south Australia and was Baldwin Spencer Professor of Anthropology at the University of Melbourne, Australia (1985–90). He is the author of *Adolf Bastian and the Psychic Unity of Mankind* (Brisbane, 1983), (with Lam Lai Sing) of *New Interpretations of the Dream of the Red Chamber* (Singapore, 1973), *Religiöse Bewegungen im modernen Japan als Problem des Kulturwandels* (Cologne, 1974), and *Die neuen Religionen Japans. Traditionelle Denkmuster hinter revolutionärer Rhetorik* (Tokyo, 1990).

Thomas K. Schippers, was born in the Netherlands, and is now Professor of *ethnologie (anthropologie sociale et culturelle)* in Nice, France. He studied in Aix-en-Provence and in Paris at the *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales* (PhD 1983) and conducted fieldwork in France, Italy and French Guyana. His main interests are the perception of time, agropastoralism, identity, ethno-cartography and

the anthropology of Europe. He has published *Temps perçus, temps vécus* (Paris, 1987) on social life in southern France, and several articles on different aspects of the anthropology of Europe.

Peter Skalník is Senior Lecturer in Social Anthropology at Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic; currently on leave as Czech ambassador to the Lebanon. He studied in Prague, Leningrad and Cape Town (PhD in Prague 1968), and conducted fieldwork in Slovakia, the Caucasus, Tuva in Central Asia, northern Ghana, southern Africa and Papua New Guinea. Since 1967 he has taught anthropology in Prague, Bratislava, The Hague, Leiden, Zurich, Cape Town, Durban. He is editor of *Outwitting the State* (Transaction, 1989), co-editor of *The Early State* and *The Study of the State* (Mouton, 1978 and 1981), and of *The Early Writings of Bronislaw Malinowski* (Cambridge, 1993).

David Slattery is Visiting Lecturer in Anthropology and Philosophy with the Central European University. He is a graduate of University College Cork, Ireland, where he took his BA in Philosophy and MA in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences. He carried out research for his PhD at St Andrews in Scotland into contemporary methodological problems in anthropological theory. He published in Polish journals on postmodernism and the application of Foucault's archaeological method to anthropology, as well as a critical study of the role of the subject in anthropology using Malinowski's Trobriand research (*The End of the Anthropological Self. Foucault in the Trobriand Islands*).

Zmago Šmitek is Associate Professor of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. His main interests are the history of ethnology, the anthropology of religion, cultures of Central Asia and the Indian subcontinent, and has conducted fieldwork in Slovenia and India. His principal works (in Slovenian) are: *A Call of Distant Worlds: Slovenians and non-European cultures* (PhD Ljubljana, 1986), *Bread and Politics: Chapters from the ethnology of the village Vitanje* (Ljubljana, 1987), *Paths to the horizon: An anthology of Slovenian travelogue covering non-European topics* (Ljubljana, 1988).

Han F. Vermeulen is Research Fellow at the Centre of Non-Western Studies (CNWS) at Leiden University, The Netherlands. He studied cultural anthropology in Leiden, conducted fieldwork in the Netherlands and north-western Tunisia, and specialized in the anthropology of North Africa and the history of anthropology. He

organized workshops on the history of anthropology in Munich (October 1991), Prague (August 1992) and Leipzig (October 1993). He is currently writing a book on the formation of ethnography and ethnology in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Europe.

Jan J.de Wolf is Reader in Cultural Anthropology at Utrecht University, The Netherlands. He holds degrees from Utrecht University (BA) and London University (MPhil and PhD) and conducted fieldwork in western Kenya. His special interests are the history of anthropology and oral literature. His recent publications on the history of anthropology, written together with Sjoerd Jaarsma, include entries on Dutch anthropologists in *International Dictionary of Anthropologists* (1991); 'Ethnographic data-gathering' in *Anthropos*, 1991; 'Colonial ethnography' in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 1992.

Acknowledgements

This book appears thanks largely to the European Association of Social Anthropologists. Since its origin EASA has provided a stimulus for European anthropologists interested in studying their own history, providing them with a small, independent place to exchange their ideas on this subject. We are grateful to the Executive Committees that have managed the Association until now for this support. This applies particularly to João de Pina Cabral from Lisbon and to Václav Hubinger from Prague. Our special thanks go to the contributors and participants in the Prague sessions. We are grateful to Fernando Estévez González (La Laguna, Spain) for initiating the workshop in Coimbra, and to Richard Jerábek (Brno, Czech Republic) for assistance in organizing the workshop in Prague. We are grateful for the support of Adam Kuper, who, next to launching EASA, stimulated the sessions from which this book resulted. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Marilyn Strathern for her intellectual and practical support for the project. We are indebted to Dirk Kolff and Reimar Schefold for criticisms and encouragement, and to Alan Barnard and James McAllister for valuable suggestions as to the publication of these studies. We are indebted to Heather Gibson at Routledge for facilitating this volume. Finally we appreciate the support provided by the University of Leiden and the University of Granada.

Han F. Vermeulen
Arturo Alvarez Roldán

Introduction

The history of anthropology and Europe

Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán

In 1962 A. Irving Hallowell stimulated a conference on the History of Anthropology sponsored by the Social Science Research Council in New York (Hymes 1962). Since then the history of anthropology has become an established field, especially in the United States, with the *History of Anthropology Newsletter* and a 'History of Anthropology' series, starting in 1973 and 1983 respectively, both edited by George W. Stocking, Jr. Although from the beginning promoters of the new subdiscipline attempted to create a single forum for historians and anthropologists (Stocking 1983), the history of anthropology has in fact increasingly become a specialty within the history of science rather than within anthropology.

In Europe the history of anthropology has not had as systematic a development as in the United States. Several books and collections have appeared, and four specialized journals covering the field are published in Europe,¹ but these are relatively new journals and the first initiatives to co-ordinate European scholars working in the field have been taken only recently. At the first conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), held at Coimbra, Portugal, in September 1990, a workshop on the 'History of European Anthropology' was organized for the first time.² Eight papers on the history of British, French, Georgian, German and Dutch anthropology were presented, three of which were published (Barnard 1992, Alvarez Roldán 1992, Herrero Pérez 1994). There was considerable interest in a conference whose participants were anthropologists, and not specialists in the history of ideas.

This interest was even greater during the second workshop of the same title, held during the second biennial EASA conference in Prague, in August 1992. During two sessions, eighteen papers and a historical film on Sir Raymond Firth were presented.³ Of these papers, fourteen

2 *Introduction*

have been selected for publication in this volume, while two other papers were published separately (Jerábek 1992, Stagl 1994). We decided to publish this selection as an EASA Monograph for two reasons. First, we wanted to prevent the dispersion of papers in journals, which militates against the emergence of the ‘history of anthropology’ as a domain in its own right. The other reason for publishing a selection of the papers together is that they are the results of important new research from varied countries in Europe, and reveal a diversity of research traditions and a liveliness of both these traditions and of historiographical research which is promising and stimulating.

One of the essential differences between this attempt to professionalize the history of anthropology in Europe and the attempt originating in the USA in the 1960s is that here it is practising anthropologists and not professional historians who are taking the responsibility of writing their history. It seems that anthropologists are no longer prepared to consider themselves passive subjects in a history written by others. We share with Adam Kuper (1991) the opinion that this opens new perspectives for the subdiscipline, since the practitioner may have advantages over the outsider in writing the history of anthropology.

But while the history of anthropology can have great relevance for current anthropological debates, it is also necessary to establish it as a domain of inquiry in its own right, in order to gain practitioners’ confidence. It is our view that histories of anthropology can be written by and addressed to anthropologists. This should not be understood, however, as a defence on the part of anthropologists simply wishing to retain historical knowledge of their own practice within the boundaries of their discipline. The enterprise can enrich both anthropology and history, in the same way as works written by and addressed to professional historians. We hold with George Stocking to ‘the ideal of a history of anthropology which is both historically sophisticated and anthropologically informed’ (Stocking 1982a:xviii). Therefore we expect that this book on the history of European anthropology will be welcomed both by historians of science and by active anthropologists.

The book is divided in three main parts. The first presents studies which deal with the origins of anthropology in Europe; the second discusses individual contributions to European anthropology; and the third focuses on anthropological traditions in Europe.

The four chapters in [Part I](#) present the results of current research on crucial episodes in the development of anthropology in Europe. Michael Harbsmeier offers an overview of the prehistory of ethnography in early modern travel literature in the seventeenth and

early eighteenth centuries. Han Vermeulen traces the origins and formation of the concepts ‘ethnography’ and ‘ethnology’ in the late eighteenth century, and their institutionalization in ethnographical museums and ethnological societies in the early nineteenth century. Gheorghita Geana focuses on the discovery of the ‘whole of humankind’, by looking at the genesis of (social/cultural) anthropology through the Hegelian looking-glass. Klaus-Peter Koepping identifies the roots of an epistemological contradiction with which the science of humankind is still struggling—between the Enlightenment search for universal laws and the Romantic quest for particularity—in the work of Adolf Bastian of the mid-nineteenth century.

Part II presents studies on contributions made by individuals to the development of anthropology in Europe, and focuses on well-known and lesser-known figures in the history of anthropology. Alan Barnard shows the legacy which derives from one form of ‘noble savage’ in the Enlightenment: the *Orang Outang* as conceived by the Scottish judge Lord Monboddo. Jan de Wolf contextualizes the work of the Dutch ethnologist H.J. Nieboer on slavery (1900–10), which moves beyond evolutionism towards (early) functionalism. Peter Skalník makes a detailed analysis of the relationship between the Polish writers Malinowski and Witkiewicz in terms of the difference between science and art in the conceptualization of culture. Arturo Alvarez Roldán analyses how Malinowski invented the ethnographic method of participant observation in the early twentieth century, by making a historical comparison of the ethnographic experience of this author in Mailu and his subsequent work in the Trobriand Islands.

The chapters which make up **Part III** deal with the study of anthropological traditions or research programmes in various countries. The last publications on this subject appeared more than ten years ago (Diamond 1980; Gerholm and Hannerz 1982). The list of these traditions does not seek to be exhaustive. Instead, it serves to draw attention to the many-coloured picture of anthropological traditions in Europe. Tomas Gerholm applies centre/periphery concepts to the disciplines of ethnology (or folk-life studies) and anthropology in Sweden. Zmago Šmitek and Božidar Jezernik trace the lines that (cultural) anthropology of extra-European countries has followed in Slovenia, alongside the study of Slovenian folk culture. Zbigniew Jasiewicz and David Slattery outline the dynamics of the history of Polish (cultural and social) anthropology and ethnography (or folk studies) that determined the shape of ethnology in Poland. Nikola Bock discusses the reasons why historical anthropology (seen as a special branch of history) appeared so late in the landscape of science in

Germany, and explains this by drawing on the pre- and post-war history of ethnology. Hugo García Valencia deals in his chapter with the development of Latin American anthropology by Spanish anthropologists exiled in Mexico. This last part of the book is concluded by a contribution by Thomas Schippers on the history of the research traditions meeting in the anthropology of Europe today.

At least three important problems are dealt with by the authors published here. First, the origins of anthropology and the problem of periodization. Second, the problem of modernism and post-modernism in regard to the Malinowskian 'revolution'. And third, the position of ethnology and ethnography within European anthropology. We shall discuss these problems in this order.

THE ORIGINS OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE PROBLEM OF PERIODIZATION

It is, perhaps, symptomatic that George Stocking, the doyen of historians of anthropology, has not systematically approached the problem of periodizing the history of anthropology, which, although difficult, seems to be vital to the field. Stocking has written about specific episodes, such as classical evolutionism of the nineteenth century, the concern of his *Victorian Anthropology* (1987), but for the rest restricted himself to identifying three 'paradigmatic traditions' in the history of anthropology: the biblical or 'ethnological', the developmental or 'evolutionist' and the polygenetic or 'physical anthropological' (1990).

The question of the origins of anthropology remains unresolved because of the lack of agreement on the criteria that should be taken into account to determine the starting points of anthropological thought and ethnographic studies. These attempts have been criticized as 'presentist' (Stocking 1982b). However, criteria are necessary, since a history of anthropology without any epistemological commitment, if possible at all, would result in a blind history that creates confusion. That is partly the situation in the field: a variety of periods and circumstances under which the formation of the discipline is supposed to have taken place have been put forward. Some scholars argue that the Greeks, Romans and Arabs were the first in formalizing anthropological knowledge about human culture (Mühlmann 1948; Hymes 1974; Darnell 1974; Honigmann 1976; Palerm 1982). Other authors suggest that anthropology emerged either in the Renaissance (Cocchiara 1948; Rowe 1965; Hodgen 1964; Darnell 1974) or in the Enlightenment (Evans-Pritchard 1951 and 1981; Foucault 1966; Harris

1968; Moravia 1970; Duchet 1971; Diamond 1974; Voget 1975; Copans and Jamin 1978; Llobera 1980).⁴ A third group of historians recognize the existence of anthropology only from the nineteenth century onwards when the discipline achieved professional status (Penniman 1935; Lowie 1937; Burrow 1966; Mercier 1966; Poirier 1968 and 1969; Service 1985). Next to the interest in origins, there is an increasing tendency among historians of anthropology to concentrate on 'modern' anthropology, from the early twentieth century onwards (e.g. Kuper 1977, 1983).

Pluralism may be profitable for the history of anthropology and we have attempted to preserve it in this volume. Our intention has certainly not been to favour any specific approach to the problem of the origins of anthropology, but pluralism does not necessarily mean 'eclecticism'. In order to assess the validity of each particular approach to this problem, it is necessary first to know the underlying criteria to every option. There have been at least four different approaches to the genealogical problem of the origins in the historiography of anthropology.

First, a 'problem' orientation. This approach takes as the marker for the rise of anthropology the posing of specifically anthropological problems. Anthropology is taken to have begun when certain authors framed certain questions and made some efforts to answer them. This orientation is represented in this book by Geana, Koepping and Barnard. From a Hegelian perspective, Geana states that a scientific discipline emerges only when its object becomes perceived as a whole. Following Hegel, the history of anthropology may be divided in two phases: conceptual and preconceptual. Anthropology reached its conceptual phase in the mid-nineteenth century. But first it had to surpass its preconceptual phase, in which the great anthropogeographic discoveries between the mid-fifteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries were the most important events. The object of anthropology—humankind—was conceived as 'a whole' at the same time as the whole planet was discovered.

According to Koepping, the central problem in anthropology is its inner epistemological contradiction: the combination of cultural relativism with an aspiration to find universal explanations. The roots of this contradiction lie in two currents of thought, namely those derived from the Enlightenment and those derived from Romanticism. The work of Adolf Bastian, particularly his notions of elementary ideas (*Elementargedanken*) and of folk-ideas (*Völkergedanken*), can be seen as one of the first attempts to combine both currents and to overcome the fundamental paradox in the study of humankind.

The debate about the definition of ‘man’ that took place in the eighteenth century enables Barnard to reclaim Lord Monboddo as one of the founders of social anthropology. Monboddo examined the definition of the species ‘man’ in light of the philosophy of Aristotle, speculations on the origin of language, the existence of feral children, of travellers’ tales and of scientific descriptions of the speechless race known as the *Orang Outang*. Monboddo’s significance lies in ‘the exploration of the relation between the categories *Man* and *Orang Outang* in terms of language, political organization, material culture and capacity for learning’. His legacy is ‘a paradigm for probing the common humanity at the root of all cultures’.

Second, there is a ‘conceptual’ orientation to the origins of anthropology. This orientation pays attention to the formation and distribution of concepts of the discipline, as well as to its names and their transformation. Following this orientation, Vermeulen advances the thesis that anthropology in the form of ethnography and ethnology originated in the late eighteenth century when concepts were coined to represent a ‘science of nations and peoples’. He observes that by the time these concepts were established in ethnological societies (1839–43) they had been given a different meaning.

Third, there is a ‘professional’ orientation, which stresses the importance of academic and professional institutions in establishing the discipline. This orientation is not represented in this volume, but on the contrary is criticized by some of the contributors. Harbsmeier states that travel accounts from the early modern period (the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) constitute an important chapter in the ‘prehistory of anthropology’. Such accounts often contain crucial ethnographic information, but can also be fruitfully interpreted as ‘involuntary self-descriptions’ of the travellers themselves and of their contemporary readers. Vermeulen points out that the period of professionalization must be seen against the background of the preceding period of ‘conceptualization’.

Fourth, there is an ‘epistemological’ orientation. In this approach, anthropology is considered as a science that in order to exist requires that its theories and methods are accepted by a community of anthropologists. Although anthropology probably never had any ‘paradigms’ in the specific sense given to the term by Thomas Kuhn (1962, 1970), it might be possible to speak of the existence of ‘quasiparadigms’ in the history of anthropology, as opposed to Kuhnian pre-paradigms. These quasi-paradigms, comparable to Foucault’s *epistèmes*, indicate the emergence of anthropology as a social science. From this point of view it makes sense to distinguish

between a history and a prehistory of anthropology, as do Harbsmeier and Vermeulen. Malinowski's development of the ethnographic method in the field and its importance to the quasi-paradigmatic main line of inquiry in anthropology is stressed by Alvarez Roldán.

Among the essays presented here, there is a consensus on the main stages that a chronological scheme of the history of anthropology should cover: a prehistory of ethnography (Harbsmeier), the origins of anthropology and ethnography in the late eighteenth century (Barnard, Vermeulen), the rebirth of anthropology in the nineteenth century (Geana, Koepping, Schippers), the constitution of modern anthropology in the early twentieth century (de Wolf, Skalník, Alvarez Roldán).

MODERNISM AND POSTMODERNISM WITH REGARD TO MALINOWSKI

Although Malinowski is probably the anthropologist to whom historians of anthropology have devoted most attention, two new contributions are included in this volume. At first sight, the chapters by Skalník and Alvarez Roldán are contradictory since the former emphasizes the importance of Malinowski's life experience to his subsequent work, and the latter denies these influences. According to Alvarez Roldán, Malinowski became one of the key figures in the development of a modern research programme in anthropology, by discovering a method *in the field*. Skalník states that such a programme was reductionist in comparison with the understanding of culture proposed by Malinowski's Polish friend Witkiewicz. Witkiewicz's conceptualization of culture evokes the well-known conception suggested by Clifford Geertz in 'thick description' (1973), and some authors have asserted that this conceptualization lies at the roots of anthropological postmodernism. It seems that here again the debate between modernism and postmodernism arises, taking Malinowski's life and work as a starting point.

The debate about postmodernism does not seem to be concluded in anthropology. In current Polish anthropology a rising interest in postmodernism, more particularly in Rorty, is observed (Jasiewicz and Slattery). 'Textualism' and 'ethnographic authority' have been two of the key issues introduced into anthropological debate by postmodernists. According to some postmodern anthropologists 'ethnographic authority' derives from the style of writing, which in the case of Malinowski was realist (Clifford 1983, 1988; Marcus and Cushman 1982; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1986;

Geertz 1983; Van Maanen 1988). In a recent paper Joan Bestard (1993) states that the characterization of modern ethnographies as realist texts by postmodern anthropologists can be understood only by setting up these kinds of ethnographies against postmodern ones. Bestard argues that Malinowski's monographs are a cultural product of the anti-realist modernist intellectual and artistic movement arising in Central Europe at the end of the nineteenth century. In this sense Witkiewicz's conceptualization of culture would be as modernist as Malinowski's, and Skalník points to the influence of the movement of Young Poland on both.

It does seem doubtful that the authority of Malinowski's ethnographies depends on their 'realistic' style. What then is the basis of their authority—if there is any? In his chapter, Alvarez Roldán suggests that Malinowski's ethnographic authority has to do with the epistemological concept of validity. In order to write valid ethnographies the anthropologist needs valid tools, valid data, inferences and explanations. According to Alvarez Roldán, Malinowski was one of the first anthropologists who became conscious of the validity problem and attempted to resolve it by suggesting important canons for doing ethnography (see also Sanjek 1990).

The comparison of Malinowski with Nieboer, whose comparative study of labour relations is contextualized by Jan de Wolf in this volume, reinforces Skalník's thesis that Malinowski's functionalism was not the result of his fieldwork but a theoretical framework he took to the field. By formulating general laws about the relations between land, labour and capital, Nieboer abandoned the evolutionary path of his tutor Steinmetz and adopted a functionalist perspective in analysing slavery. This proves that functionalism was not an invention of Malinowski in the Trobriand Islands, but part of the *Zeitgeist*. It also proves that Malinowski's revolution in method did not rest on his discovery of functionalism.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY IN EUROPE

'Anthropology' is used in this volume as a general term for a group of studies including ethnology, ethnography, social and cultural anthropology, folklore studies and biological anthropology. This broad definition is necessary to do justice to the wide range of the chapters, covering aspects of the diverse anthropological traditions that have been, and in most cases still are, present in Europe. This is not meant as an attempt to define what anthropology *is*, but as an attempt to pay attention to answers that have been given in the past (see, for instance,

the definition by Kollár quoted by Vermeulen, the Hegelian definition presented by Geana, and the redefinition by Bastian quoted by Koepping). In fact, the recent definition given by David Schneider of anthropology as the study of culture defined as a system of symbols and meanings which have to do with 'ways of living life' (Schneider 1993) is a nice synopsis of discussions in Swedish and European ethnology in the mid-1930s (see Gerholm and Schippers in this volume).

In this context, a comparison of the famous 'four-fields' approach in Northern America with the approaches current in Europe is revealing. Schneider suggests that the separation of biological anthropology and archaeology from social and cultural anthropology would be 'highly desirable, perhaps even necessary'. In Europe, this situation has been the case for a long time. Physical anthropology and archaeology do not play a role in the curriculum of the humanities and/or social sciences anywhere in Europe. Therefore, in Europe the opposition is not between social and cultural anthropology on the one hand and biological anthropology and archaeology on the other (as Schneider suggests for North America), but between anthropology (be it cultural or social) and ethnology (or ethnography or 'folk studies', in whatever kind of denominations).

The four fields that Schneider mentions, however, do not correspond to the divisions set out by Boas, Powell and Brinton.⁵ Particularly linguistic anthropology, so vital for the formation of ethnography in the eighteenth century, is overlooked in Schneider's scheme, whereas ethnology is equated with social and cultural anthropology. Historically, however, the rise of social anthropology in the 1920s must be seen as a reaction to ethnology as practised earlier (cf. Malinowski discussed by Skalník in this volume and Radcliffe-Brown quoted in Barnard [1992:14]).

In addition, the chapters in this book suggest that ethnology and ethnography as 'folk' or 'national' studies have remained very much alive in Europe and dominate in the Eastern parts of the continent. While social and cultural anthropology dominate in the Western, Northern and Southern parts of Europe, ethnology and ethnography are still in existence there as well, although they have been renamed several times.

In Scandinavia, particularly in Sweden, ethnology (or *folklivsforskning*) has a strong history and remains central to the tradition of 'folk-life research' in Europe. It developed in opposition to 'general and comparative ethnography', which was practised in museums and universities. This term was abandoned in the late 1960s and early 1970s

in favour of social and cultural anthropology, but in spite of the change in terminology, anthropology in Sweden remained rather peripheral to the American, British and French ‘mainland’ of social and cultural anthropology (Gerholm).

In Poland, ethnography was strongly restricted to *ludoznawstwo* (or folk studies), although there were ethnographic studies of extra-European cultures which formed a link between *etnografia* and *antropologia*. The opposition between *etnografia* (folk studies) and *antropologia* was influenced by the communist ‘ideologization’ of Poland, which resulted in ethnology losing its independence and its transformation into ‘historical and descriptive ethnography’. It was only in the mid-1970s that (social or cultural) anthropology was allowed to return to ethnology, and even more recently, after the fall of communist power, that it could be added to the title of several institutes (Jasiewicz and Slattery).

The same development occurred in Slovenia, where it was denied that there ever was a (cultural) anthropological tradition. Instead, it was supposed that in Slovenia only an ethnographical tradition exists, which was concerned with *narodninstvo* or ‘knowledge of the nation’. The chapter by Šmitek and Jezernik was written to prove otherwise. They point to a line of authors indicating that there was an anthropological tradition in Slovenia, which started in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with travel accounts and continued into the twentieth century until it was abandoned in favour of ethnography as a ‘national science’.

The influence of Soviet ethnographers on research traditions in Eastern Europe has not been sufficiently documented yet. Although studies have been published on the beginning and the end of ‘Soviet ethnography’ (Slezkine 1991, Tishkov 1992), as well as volumes on the ‘state of the art’ of ethnology and (physical) anthropology in the Soviet Union (Bromley 1974, Gellner 1980), the vital period of Soviet influence in the 1950s and 1960s still needs to be described (but see Jerábek [1992] on the situation in the Czech region and Buhocia [1966] on the situation in Romania). It appears that the Soviets were strongly opposed to Western ‘ethnology’ which was seen as an imperialistic science and which was discarded in favour of an ethnography which should study both non-European and European peoples, i.e. should include ‘folk studies’ or *narodovedenie*. By this definition they remained faithful to the roots of ethnography as formulated in the eighteenth century.

The problem of external influences also arises in the case of historical anthropology, a branch of history which was able to establish

itself in Germany only with great difficulty and without the help of social history or ethnology. Nikola Bock observes that the terms with which the subject was disregarded, namely ‘irrational’, ‘subjectivist’ and ‘total’, are similar to the terms used to blame German *Volkskunde* for its involvement with National Socialism. By drawing on recent research on the rather tight relationship between the ethnological sciences (*Völkerkunde* and *Volkskunde*) in Germany and National Socialism, she argues that the opposition to historical anthropology was related to unresolved experiences. The terms used ‘still seem to be frightening to German scholars working in the humanities today, dedicated as they are to preventing new “irrational” fascism by reinforcing rational and structural explanations of human behaviour and social life’.

The same subtlety in argument is displayed by García Valencia, who concentrates on the construction of social anthropology in Mexico with the help of Spanish exiled anthropologists. In a detailed discussion García Valencia compares the development of anthropology in Spain and Mexico and observes that the ‘holistic model’ in Mexico, derived from the tradition of anthropology and folklore developed in Spain from the second half of the nineteenth century, broke down in the 1960s to give way to ‘a more specific one, namely social anthropology’.

The book is closed by an analysis of Thomas Schippers, who discusses the history of ethnology (folklore studies) vis-à-vis social and cultural anthropology in Europe between 1920 and 1980. He observes that at least three types of anthropology have been applied to the study of European societies after the Second World War: a social anthropological orientation (mainly in France and Britain), a cultural anthropological orientation (mainly in the USA), and an ethnological orientation that continued ‘the variety of disciplines more or less federated within the European Ethnology project founded by Sigurd Erixon (in the 1930s)’. It would seem that these orientations have something to learn from one another’s history and results, particularly when they are concerned with the same social groups and local cultures.

One of the merits of assembling data from a variety of research traditions in one continent is that changes in one tradition may be revealing for changes in another. This applies particularly to changes in terminology which suggest paradigmatic shifts ‘hidden’ behind them. Thus, the coining of the new terms *Ethnographie* and *Völkerkunde* around 1770 in the Germanic countries implied a shift in interest from the study of customs and *mores* to the study of nations

or national cultures; the subsequent change from a science of nations to a ‘science of human races’ which occurred around 1840 (Vermeulen) foreshadowed the abolition of the ethnological societies and their transformation into anthropological societies in England and France in the 1870s and 1880s (Stocking 1971). The change of name at the London School of Economics in 1927, when the Department of Ethnology was renamed Department of Anthropology (Skalník), marked the bipartition between (diffusionistic) ethnology and the social anthropology of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski. The rise of social anthropology, and its growing tendency to specialize on extra-European societies, then influenced the emergence of the new subject ‘European Ethnology’ in Sweden and in international forums around 1935/37 (Schippers, Gerholm), as an alternative to the older terms *Volkskunde* and folklore studies—and in contrast to *Völkerkunde* translated as ‘non-European ethnology’ (Jerábek 1992), ‘foreign ethnology’ (Jasiewicz and Slattery) or ‘overseas anthropology’ (Schippers).

After the Second World War the old and familiar term ethnology as the name of departments and curricula was traded in for social anthropology or cultural anthropology in the Netherlands (early 1950s), France (1960) and Sweden (late 1960s). In Eastern Europe in the 1950s the term ethnology was replaced by ethnography, accompanied by folkloristics. This last development was reverted only after 1989/90, when, due to the collapse of communism, departments changed their names back to ‘Ethnology’ (Bratislava, Slovakia) or to ‘European Ethnology’ (Brno, Moravia), or added the subject of ‘cultural anthropology’ (as in Ljubljana, Slovenia, and in Poznan, Poland).

These examples show that it is essential for historiographic purposes to pay attention to the specific terms used, as well as to changes in meaning and scope, which are often related to (paradigmatic) shifts in theory and method. This corresponds to our conviction that the history of anthropology *is* an anthropological problem and should be developed as such, by describing developments from within and by historicizing and contextualizing as much as possible.

Doing fieldwork and writing ethnographic texts still seem to be the primary tasks of anthropological practice, which should be accounted for in the history of anthropology. The title of this volume *Fieldwork and Footnotes* refers to these two aspects of scholarship in their European guise (as clearly appears in the chapters of Alvarez Roldán and Schippers).

We believe it is important to record and reflect on the enormous

diversity of anthropological impulses within Europe, which have come to their present form through time and which are constantly being adapted to meet new requirements. Therefore it is vital to pay close attention to the specific terms used to designate the field(s), to changes in terminology, as well as to changes in the functions that these approaches have in the societies in which they are being developed. We invite readers of this book—practising anthropologists as well as historians of science—to discover this *diversity* and *specificity* in the following chapters on the history of anthropology in Europe.

NOTES

- 1 *History and Anthropology* (London 1984), *Gradhiva: Revue d'histoire et d'archives de l'anthropologie* (Paris 1986), *History of the Human Sciences* (London 1988) and *Boletín de Historia de la Antropología* (La Laguna, Spain 1988).
- 2 The workshop in Coimbra was organized by Fernando Estévez González (La Laguna, Spain) and Arturo Alvarez Roldán (Granada, Spain). A call for papers was published in the very first *EASA Newsletter*, no. 1 (October 1989), p. 8.
- 3 A report on the workshop in Prague was published in *EASA Newsletter*, no. 8, October 1992, pp. 10–11 and in the *History of Anthropology Newsletter*, XIX (2), December 1992, p. 21. A direct result of the sessions in Prague was the establishment of the 'History of European Anthropology Network' (HEAN), an EASA network with the aim of organizing meetings and of facilitating communication between scholars working on the subject. The secretarial address of HEAN is: Dr Jan de Wolf, Department of Cultural Anthropology, Utrecht University, PO Box 80.140, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands. At the third biennial EASA conference in Oslo (June 1994) a workshop on the history of European anthropology was held for the third time, this time under the auspices of HEAN.
- 4 The French volumes edited by Rupp-Eisenreich (1984) and Blanckaert (1985) contain contributions which fall into both categories.
- 5 See the discussions on the four-fields approach in *Anthropology Newsletter*, October 1992–January 1993.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alvarez Roldán, Arturo (1992) 'Looking at anthropology from a biological point of view: A.C.Haddon's metaphors on anthropology', *History of the Human Sciences*, 5(2):21–32. Spanish version in *Antropología*, 1 (1991): 43–60.
- Barnard, Alan (1992) 'Through Radcliffe-Brown's spectacles: reflections on the history of anthropology', *History of the Human Sciences*, 5(2):1–20.
- Bestard, Joan (1993) 'Malinowski: entre Kraków e Icod. El modernismo polaco y las etnografías 'modernistas' (Malinowski: Between Cracow and Icod. Polish modernism and modernist ethnographies), in Joan Bestard (ed.),