FLOWS, BOUNDARIES AND HYBRIDS: KEYWORDS IN TRANSNATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Ulf Hannerz

WPTC-2K-02

Department of Social Anthropology
Stockholm University

**FLOWS, BOUNDARIES AND HYBRIDS:
KEYWORDS IN TRANSNATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY[1]**

Ulf Hannerz
Department of Social Anthropology
Stockholm University

In Jorge Amado's novel *Tent of Miracles* (1971), that self-taught, streetwise ethnographer of Bahia life, Pedro Archanjo, is breakfasting on yams and couscous when he happens to come across a blue-eyed, wheat-blonde girl, Kirsi, who has just come ashore from a Swedish cargo ship. The ship toots for its lost passenger, then leaves without her, and Archanjo tells her that if the two of them make a man-child together, he will be the smartest and bravest man there ever was; either king of Scandinavia or president of Brazil. If the child would be a girl, on the other hand, there would be nobody to match her for beauty and grace.

We do not find out very much more about the girl Kirsi, who leaves six months later on another boat, and it is certainly purely coincidental that years after Amado's novel appeared, there would in fact be a Queen of Sweden with a partially Brazilian background. But of Pedro Archanjo we learn that he spent his early years traveling, and was in a way the son of Exú, mythical trickster and lord of the crossroads. The encounter between Kirsi and Pedro is an encounter of individuals as well as of races, continents, and cultures.

"In the neighborhood of Pelourinho," begins *Tent of Miracles*, "in the heart of Bahia, the whole world teaches and learns..." One should perhaps be a bit wary here, because the novel also very entertainingly, and quite devastatingly, portrays another encounter, that of local knowledge with international academic traveling theory. But it is true that in Jorge Amado's Bahia, anthropologists seem to find much of what they now often look for, in life and in ethnography.[2]

These days, rather than seeking out the comfortable intimacy of village life, we debate the cultural distance between ship and shore, and the ways of traversing that distance. Flux, mobility, recombination and emergence have become favored themes as globalization and transnationality frequently offer the contexts for our thinking about culture. We now look for test sites of theory where some, at least, of the inhabitants are creoles, cosmopolitans, or cyborgs, where communities are diasporas, and where boundaries do not really contain, but are more often interestingly crossed. Borderlands are often where the action is, and hybridity and collage are among our preferred words for characterizing qualities in people and their products.

But then the question arises what of this is actually new. I do not really want to engage here with any argument as to whether globalization is in itself a recent thing or not. The ancient Greeks certainly had their ideas of an ecumene, stretching from Atlantic Europe to distant East Asia; and the notion of an increasingly interconnected world has followed us fairly continuously from Prince Henry the Navigator to Marshall McLuhan, and beyond. Only this is hardly all just the same globalization; it needs, for one thing, to be periodized.[3]

What I will be more immediately concerned with here is the place of globalization in the history of anthropological ideas. In her inaugural lecture at Cambridge not so long ago, Marilyn Strathern (1995: 24) noted that as another *fin-de-siècle* approaches, "it sometimes

feels that we are closer to the beginning of the century than to the middle of it" - anthropologists have come back to questions of material culture and technology, and by way of the interest in globalization, they have also after a fashion returned to diffusion.

Perhaps the discontinuity of concerns is more real in the case of technology. With regard to cultural interconnections in space, and the ongoing reorganization of cultural diversity in the world, it may be true that they were not given much attention in that major current of the discipline inclined to depict cultures as stable or bounded. Yet I think it may be argued that they have never been durably absent from the concerns of anthropology, even if they have appeared in varied conceptual guises. The preoccupation with cultural diffusion which Strathern mentions as a characteristic of the last turn of the century was at least not long gone when American anthropologists got involved in a debate over whether "acculturation" was a fit object of study. Many decided it was, and so particularly from the 1930s to the 1950s this offered a somewhat ramshackle framework for a great deal of research activity. (And indeed Salvador was one of the places acculturation theorists like Melville Herskovits found good to think with, some sixty years ago.) Meanwhile across the Atlantic, the Malinowskians, after having defeated the diffusionists in academic battle, somewhat half-heartedly concocted their own guidelines for studying "culture contact".[4] The modernization and dependency theories of a slightly later postwar period were hardly really congenial for someone concerned with culture in its variations, nor was 1970s world system theory, but they, too, offered some stimulation for whoever might be inclined toward an anthropology of interconnectedness. And then again, in the last decade or so, globalization and transnationality have become a new research focus.

The way we talk now about culture in flux, about the zones where cultures meet, and about the agents and products of cultural mixing is certainly in some respects different from the anthropology of even ten years ago. Yet perhaps we can hear in it some echoes from this rather stop-go, on-and-off history of earlier anthropologies of interconnectedness, partly disconnected from one another over time. The changing language of anthropology may show some of what we remember, some of what is half-forgotten, and some of what has been reinvented.

Let me shift, then, from *Tent of Miracles* to another book. Some twenty years ago, Raymond Williams (1976), the British literary theorist and cultural critic, published a small volume named *Keywords*, with the subtitle *A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. In it, Williams explored a little over a hundred of the most central concepts of twentieth century discourse, in their historically accumulated complexity. It is interesting that a couple of decades ago, "globalization" was not among these keywords. Perhaps among Williams' choices, we could make our approaches toward it for example by way of "civilization", "imperialism", "humanity", "media" and "tradition". But had he lived to revise his book now, Williams might have thought that "globalization" belonged among his keywords.

In some small way, what I want to do here may remind of Raymond Williams' book, in that it is an inquiry into our vocabulary, an attempt to bring together some of the ideas and imageries it may evoke; experiences, visions and problem definitions which have become linked to it and which still have implications for our intellectul agenda. I will pick out a mere handful of those words anthropologists now find themselves using, not "globalization" itself, but words which tend to appear in one or other connection with it. The keywords of transnational anthropology on which I will concentrate my comments are "flows", "boundaries", and "hybrids". Like much of the recent vocabulary we are engaging with here, these are metaphorical, somewhat tentative notions, perhaps in a slightly longer run imprecise or ambiguous, and thus open to contestation. Such words may appeal to us as we try to take a fresh look at the world around us, because they seem to offer an immediate grasp of some central quality of whatever we are referring to. The metaphors may have little to do with any "native's point of view" (although

some natives may like them when they come across them, and others may not). Above all, they speak to our own previous experience, turning it into a provisional conceptual tool kit. But we may need to get beyond them, to elaborate on the points they make and to identify their ambiguities. I am reminded of Gregory Bateson's (1972: 73 ff.) classic essay on thinking about ethnological materials, where he suggested that in a first phase of reflecting on the Iatmul of New Guinea, he had found it useful to contrast, rather wildly, societies structured like jellyfish or sea anemones with those structured like earthworms or lobsters. From this hunch, he had then been able to move on to other more intellectually domesticated formulations. Perhaps in thinking about globalization, we are still in a phase of rather untamed words.

Flows, boundaries and hybrids, then; a few comments on their past and present places in our shifting habitats of meaning, sometimes in the history of anthropology, at other times in an interdisciplinary conceptual landscape. But then these three turn out to have in their immediate vicinity a number of other concepts of a similar nature, which may also require a passing remark.

Flows

It is not only anthropologists who talk about "flows" these days. Rather, the term has become transdisciplinary, a way of referring to things not staying in their places, to mobility and expansion of many kinds, to globalization along many dimensions. Scott Lash and John Urry (1994: 4, 12), social theorists, suggest that late twentieth-century societies are characterized by flows of capital, labor, commodities, information, and images; and thus economists, demographers, media researchers, geographers and others can all engage with flows.[5]

No doubt the rise to prominence of notions of flow in anthropology draws inspiration from such convergent usage elsewhere in the social sciences. When the new journal *Public Culture*, interdisciplinary but perhaps with anthropology at its center of gravity, appeared in 1988, the editors could declare that they wanted "to create an intellectual forum for interaction among those concerned with global cultural flows". And as one of them, Arjun Appadurai, proposed that one could see the "global cultural economy" as involving the five dimensions of ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, finanscapes and ideoscapes, one senses the parallels with comprehensive formulations such as that of Lash and Urry (Appadurai 1990; see also Appadurai 1995). "Flow", like several of the other keywords in question here, thus points toward a macroanthropology, a reasonably comprehensive view of the (relative) coherence and the dynamics of. larger social and territorial entities than those which the discipline have conventionally dealt with.

In anthropology's past there may never have been any very systematic use of a notion of flows, but neither is it a novelty of the last few years.[6] Let me offer two quotes from Alfred Kroeber, an ancestral figure who was not afraid to think about culture on a large scale. In this context, he would berate Spengler for neglecting "the interflow of cultural material between civilizations" (Kroeber 1952: 154). And he also noted that one should examine civilizations "not as static objects but as limited processes of flow in time" (Kroeber 1952: 404).

The reason why I juxtapose these two Kroeber quotes is that they demonstrate how the flow notion can really be used in two ways. It is the first of them that seems in line with the more conspicuous current usage, referring to the shift of something over time from one location to another, a territorial redistribution. This would indeed seem to be a way of bringing the idea of diffusion back in, without having to resort to the apparently still unfashionable term. The second is primarily temporal, with no necessary spatial implication.[7]

That double sense is really still with us. Some years ago, as I myself gave the flow concept a conspicuous part in my book *Cultural Complexity* (1992), I was actually primarily concerned

with the time dimension, with the processual understanding of culture. I wanted to emphasize that only by being constantly in motion, forever being recreated, can meanings and meaningful forms become durable. Taking process seriously can at the same time be seen as keeping people in the picture. To keep culture going, people as actors and networks of actors have to invent culture, reflect on it, experiment with it, remember it (or store it in some other way), debate it, and pass it on.

It was clearly this processual emphasis Johannes Fabian (1978: 329) also had in mind when he wrote playfully of "a liquidation, literally speaking, of the concept of culture" - more recently, it is true, some anthropologists have thought of liquidating the culture concept in a quite different sense.[8] And Fredrik Barth (1984: 80-82), working out an understanding of cultural pluralism in a town in Oman, was likewise engaging with culture in processual terms as he followed Firth in viewing culture as something that people "inherit, employ, transmute, add to, and transmit", and drew attention to conceptions of co-existing traditions in the work of Redfield and Marriott. Such concepts, he argued, "should serve to emphasize properties both of separability and interpenetration, suggested perhaps by an imagery of streams, or currents within a river: distinctly there, powerful in transporting objects and creating whirlpools, yet only relative in their distinctness and ephemeral in their unity."

But Barth approached the spatial sense of flow as well, in noting that the separability, coherence and contents of co-traditions could be explored in terms of their geographical distribution as well as social organization, history, and prospects. And certainly, as I devoted the last chapter of my *Cultural Complexity* to emergent concerns with global cultural interconnectedness, I too shifted partially to a view of flows as occurring in space - at one point referring to an imagined "global cultural flow chart" (Hannerz 1992: 221).

To what kinds of questions, then, does a notion of cultural flows draw our attention? I will point here to two kinds. As far as the spatial dimension is concerned, let us consider that flow chart. One fundamental fact about flows must be that they have directions. In the case of cultural flows, it is true, what is gained in one place need not be lost at the source. But there is a reorganization of culture in space.

Once upon a time, in anthropology, a handful of British diffusionists were inclined to view ancient Egypt as the source of much of world culture - an utterly extreme view, most commentators have since felt, of global center-periphery relationships. At present, in one global scenario of flows, perhaps a similarly dominant position may be taken up, figuratively speaking, by some combination of New York, Hollywood, and the headquarters of the World Bank. Here would be where flows originate. And if they reach everywhere, global cultural uniformity would be the final outcome.

For quite a long time now, certainly, such images of dominant centers have met with little sympathy among anthropologists. The group of American scholars (Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson 1954) who met in the 1953 Social Science Research Council "Summer Seminar on Acculturation" commented, for their part, that anthropologists, "in a sense of fairness and moral indignation", have been forever delighted to find evidence of cultural influence by the weak on the strong. A book title from 1937, *The Savage Hits Back*, by the German ethnologist Julius Lips, suggests that the roots of this enduring preoccupation within the discipline go further back yet. And from about the same time, there is Ralph Linton´s (1936: 326-327) classic, "100 % American". A "solid American citizen" goes through his morning routines, and as Linton follows him around, it turns out that hardly an object he uses is actually of American origin as a cultural invention; it is from India, Germany, China, the near East, and so forth. Yet as he considers the accounts of foreign troubles in his morning newspaper, the man thanks "a Hebrew deity in an Indo-European language that he is 100 percent American."

Many decades later, the theme is still easily recognizable. We are inclined to pay close attention not only to the active handling of cultural flows at the receiving end, but also to the multicentricity of flows, to crisscrossing flows, and to counterflows. As I read Amado's *Tent of Miracles*, I am attracted to its depiction of the continuing influence of old West African cultural currents from across the South Atlantic on the folk culture of Bahia. By now the theme resonates with more or less postmodernist perspectives in other disciplines as well, where the conception of the world is increasingly one of decenteredness (cf. Lash and Urry 1994: 4). Along related lines, Appadurai (1990: 6) goes as far as to argue that the new global organization of culture cannot be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models, even those which allow for multiple centers and peripheries.

I would still want to suggest some rather unexciting caution here. In a recent essay, Howell (1995) - commenting on a previous conclusion of mine that the balance between flows is uneven (Hannerz 1991: 107) - offers a variety of instances of counterflow in evidence against it. On a visit to London she finds exotic *bric-à-brac* in Camden market and sees an exhibition of contemporary African artists; at home in Oslo she finds encounter therapy groups drawing on Malayan techniques of dream interpretation.[9] I am not surprised - the kinds of examples of counterflow are already getting a bit predictable - but I think our credibility as commentators on contemporary human life will suffer unless we maintain some sense of the relative weight of things. Some net asymmetries of flow during the last century or so seem to me undeniable, involving for example the spread of some of those fundamental skills and central institutional forms which we refer to collectively as modernity; say, western-origin types of basic and higher education, administrative practices, or biomedicine (even when these are adopted in forms which are not exact copies of the original).

It is true that history accumulates currents of cultural flow into shifting patterns. This complex of asymmetries took shape in Europe centuries ago and, in accelerating in this century, has also in itself created some of the conditions for those later cultural counterflows and crisscross flows in space which by now we find so striking. I doubt, however, that we are at a point when it has become entirely impossible to tell centers and peripheries apart.

With regard to my other kind of questions about flows, I will return to my concern with time and process. Once I had started thinking in flow terms here, it occurred to me as I continued to look at variations in the organization of culture that this worked rather well as a root metaphor, in the sense of leading on to further elaborations. Not only does the idea of flow stand in opposition to static thought. It implies, moreover, that we may think of mighty rivers and tiny rivulets, separate currents as well as confluences, "whirlpools" (according to Barth, above), even leaks and viscosity in the flow of meaning.

Yet as I have said somewhere else, when you take an intellectual ride on a metaphor, it is important that you know where to get off. If for some purposes you find it useful to think about culture as flow, then, no need to believe it is a substance you can pour into bottles. But perhaps there is another, more real risk in the imagery of flow that we must hurry to identify. Some have objected that it may make cultural process seem too easy, too smooth. Certainly we must not just understand it as a matter of simple transportation, simple transmission, of tangible forms loaded with intrinsic meanings. It is rather to be seen as entailing an infinite series of shifts, in time and sometimes in changing space as well, between external forms available to the senses, interpretations, and then external forms again; a series continuously fraught with uncertainty, allowing misunderstandings and losses as well as innovation. What the flow metaphor presents us with is the task of problematizing culture in processual terms, not the licence to deproblematize it, by abstracting away the complications.

Boundaries (borders, frontiers, beaches)

What I have in mind may become clearer as I turn to my second keyword. If "flow" suggests some sort of continuity and passage, after all, "boundaries" have to do with discontinuity and obstacles. I take a boundary to be a quite sharp line of demarcation. Something is either in or out. But what? Let me refer to Fredrik Barth again. The formulation of cultural pluralism in terms of co-occurrent streams which I quoted above was a critical reaction to a tendency he had discerned in anthropology to recast discussions of cultural pluralism in terms of ethnicity; and this Barth (1984: 80) saw as "an abdication and counsel of despair".

Barth has himself been one of the major theorists of ethnicity in anthropology, and I believe the word "boundaries" actually came into more frequent use in anthropology after the publication of his *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Barth 1969). In that volume, maintaining the analytical distinction between the social and the cultural - referring to people and their relationships, on the one hand, and meanings and meaningful forms, on the other - Barth emphasized that ethnicity is best seen as a matter of social organization, and suggested that there is no simple relationship between ethnic group membership and the distribution of cultural items among populations. In the normal case, ethnic group membership, as a matter of social identity, would be either one or the other; in or out. Here the boundary would be clearly demarcated. In large part this would involve selected cultural forms, dichotomously distributed and understood as emblematic of membership.[10] Yet it is important to realize that far from all cultural distributions among people and relationships need follow the same lines.

I think Barth's 1960s work did much to make us think of boundaries as something *across* which contacts and interactions take place; they may have an impact on the form and extent of these contacts, but they do not *contain* natural isolates. And the distinction between the social and the cultural was made so that the relationship between the two could be problematized.

It is instructive to compare Barth's view with the formulation, fifteen years earlier, by the acculturation theorists of the Social Science Research Council seminar (Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson 1954: 974 ff.). Acculturation, they wrote, "may be defined as culture change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems"; and "the unit of analysis in acculturation studies is...any given culture as it is carried by its particular society." Through such formulations, the distinction between the social and the cultural was mostly blurred. When the acculturation theorists turned to "boundary-maintaining mechanisms", these were defined as "the techniques and ideologies by means of which a system limits its participation in the culture to a well-recognized group." In fact, they seem to take much the same view as Barth would later, of boundaries as something channeling participation in social relationships. But the cultural systems talk of the 1950s turned group boundaries into boundaries of cultures without anyone giving it much thought.

This history may now be repeating itself. As the culture concept becomes increasingly popular in wider circles, there is again a strong tendency to focus attention on culture only as a group marker. In "identity politics", in debates over multiculturalism, in many contexts of "cultural studies", it becomes primarily a basis of group formation and mobilization, usually involving ascriptive memberships. Or, on the other hand, it turns into a tool of social exclusion, on the part of dominant majorities. There may be a preoccupation with cultural autonomy and the defense of a cultural heritage for its own sake, yet frequently this rhetoric of culture is closely linked to power and material resources as well.

We must be attentive to this particular strategy of linking the cultural to the social, to culture as "totemic capital", as Kearney (1991: 59) has aptly put it. Lash and Urry (1994: 4) argue that in our times, the economy is increasingly an economy of signs, as signs, not material objects, tend to become the major products. Yet we have not only an economy of signs, in that case, but also - if the two can be separated - a lively politics of signs, a politics of culture.[11] Our

interest in culture, however, need not be limited to those distributions of meanings and meaningful form which are emblematic, involving clear group distinctions. And thus the question is raised, in what other terms could one possibly think of cultural boundaries?

Turn back to our ethnographic miniature in *Tent of Miracles.* Amado has Pedro Archanjo and that girl Kirsi mostly gesturing to each other to begin with, and trying to guess what they are saying in their respective languages. Still they seem in a way to understand each other quite well. And while Kirsi was still in Bahia, it would seem she learned some of its dances rather successfully. Perhaps by the time she left, she was better at *lundu* than at Portuguese.

We could argue that when the cultural flow has somehow stopped somewhere, where there is a discontinuity in the distribution of meanings and/or meaningful forms among individuals and social relationships, then we have identified a cultural boundary. But where would it be with respect to Kirsi and Pedro Archanjo? Now you see it, now you don't. Think of it, perhaps, as a zigzag or a dotted line. Perhaps this is where we should just get off this particular metaphor. Alternatively, we might think about what are the units in terms of which we discern discontinuities, along the social as well as the cultural dimension.

Consider some history again. In 1954, the acculturation theorists of the SSRC seminar took a hard line against construing the culture concept at any other than a "broadly inclusive level" such as the "society"; otherwise, they warned, the analyst might ultimately be reduced to dealing with such particularized cultures as those of families and even individuals (Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson 1954: 974). Even some twenty years earlier, commenting on a first American memorandum on principles for acculturation research, that by (Redfield, Linton and Herskovits 1936), Gregory Bateson (1935/1972: 61 ff.) had actually taken a more flexible position. Bateson suggested that a notion of "culture contact" could be fruitfully extended to contacts for example between the sexes, between the old and the young, between aristocracy and plebs; even to include "those processes whereby a child is moulded and trained to fit the culture into which he was born".

If Bateson was thus in favor of considering smaller units along the social dimension, he was on the other hand critical of the tendency to disaggregate units along the cultural dimension; arguing, that is, in favor of the Malinowskian celebration of integrated wholes, against the breakdown into "traits" which at least the early American writers on acculturation seemed to have inherited from diffusionism.

By now my inclination would be not to take larger units for granted along either the social or the cultural dimension; to disaggregate first, before moving back (possibly) to larger-scale formulations. In the late twentieth century phase of globalization, many people have increasing experiential access to flows of cultural form which used to be localized elsewhere, as well as to that which we think of as belonging to our own locality. And some currents of culture are perhaps hardly identifiable as belonging to any particular place at all. As they engage with these varied currents of culture present in their habitats, individuals as cultural beings are probably now shaped, and shape themselves, to an increasing degree by peculiarities of autobiography, taste, and the cultivation of competences. Ascriptive group identities need not be all-important.

Cultural flows over distances are also getting increasingly polymorphous. Remember again Pedro Archanjo and Kirsi gesturing to one another, without knowing one another's languages, and Kirsi learning the dances of Bahia. As culture moves through such more specific currents as migrant flow, commodity flow and media flow, or combinations of these, a range of perceptual and communicative modalities are involved which probably differ importantly in the way they draw their own boundaries; that is, in their discontinuous distributions over people and relationships. In part, they may entail alien languages, or whatever else is like them in that mere exposure is not at all the same as understanding, appreciation, or any other sort of appropriation. But in other instances, a gesture, a tune, a shape, whether carried through

electronic media by way of communication satellites or by a stranger who has come ashore, could be somehow immediately grasped, so that a distribution is changed, a boundary transcended, promptly and with ease. To borrow a term from Dan Sperber (1985), different "epidemiologies" seem to be involved, and this would tend to dissolve "cultures" as distributional units.

   What we may want to reach for here, for one thing, to get beyond metaphor and striking anecdote, is a more general understanding of cultural acquisition as a continuously ongoing process; an understanding which is pluralistic enough to take the variations in cultural form into account. And here, to return to a concern I expressed earlier, it hardly seems necessary to look at cultural flow in space (which is of course, more precisely, both in space and time), and its discontinuities, as sharply different from more localized flow in time. Whatever we may have learnt about the acquisition of culture more generally, along cognitive, motivational, situational, institutional and other dimensions, could be brought to bear on the study of passages of meanings and meaningful forms over greater distances, as diffusion is understood to be merely a matter of cultural acquisition spatially rearranged. Not that this kind of understanding of cultural process is fully developed, or without its own current controversies, even in the more conventionally delimited local contexts.[12] But it was hardly available at all to those old-style diffusionists of seventy, eighty or a hundred years ago, who were engaged in historical reconstructions and could only inspect the enigmatic traces of past cultural passages.
   On the question of boundaries, and the flows which shape them or dissolve them, one more comment should perhaps be made here. To the old diffusionists, cultures were, as one of them put it, "things of shreds and patches" (Lowie 1920: 441). Perhaps in this era of striking juxtapositions, we may seem to be approaching such a view again, only with a better understanding of how, and in what exact sense, they get to be that way. Now some might think that detailing diffusion, whether as a process or in its outcome, is an obscure academic game, even if our skills in playing are improved. It matters not at all if spaghetti came from China to Italy, or if the pajamas of Linton´s "100 % American" originated in India. What matters, such an argument goes, are local interpretations, local frameworks of meaning.
   Now obviously, for some purposes, the local frameworks are important, if perhaps no longer to everybody to quite the same extent (and the category of "local" must not in itself remain unexamined). Yet if we are now unhappy with more fundamentalist and exclusivist forms of culturespeak, it may not be a bad idea to insert other understandings of culture into the public conversation, making even local frameworks less parochial. I do not think Linton intended his vignette of the "100 % American" only as a curiosity. There is a sense of irony, a cultural critique here; in another period of some xenophobia and striving toward cultural closure, a view from a little further afar which drew attention to the continued flux and reorganization of the cultural inventory of all humanity, to crisscrossing commonalities, and to our forgetfulness of such things, need not just have been a plaything of the ivory tower. Neither is it necessarily so now.[13]

   Anyway, we may recognize some of the difficulties with the notion of a boundary, a sharp and more or less continuous demarcation line, when applied to the realities of cultural diversity, not least in the present. Perhaps it is partly due to these difficulties that alternative terms of discontinuity now seem at least as attractive in mapping culture, terms I can hardly ignore here. In a small bundle of geographical metaphors, "boundary" would seem to belong with "frontier", and with "borderland". These latter, however, are terms not for sharp lines, but for zones, where one thing gradually shifts into something else, where there is blurring, ambiguity and uncertainty.[13]

   I will say something about the frontier concept first. The American historian Frederick Jackson Turner's (/1893/1961) writings a hundred years ago set in motion a small, mostly

North American but for some time also transnational and comparative academic industry.[14] For Turner, the moving frontier had been a region of opportunity - forever more wilderness turning into free land, where pioneers were self-reliant but could also join together without the constraints of the traditions and inequalities they had left behind, without the burden of a heritage:

> The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought. It takes him from the railroad car and puts him in the birch canoe. It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin. (Turner 1961: 39)

Later critics have pointed out that Turner's frontier history could serve as an American myth, even as a symbolic tool of domestic cultural debate between the established East and the changing West. No doubt, from Turner to John F. Kennedy's 1960s New Frontier, the idea of the frontier has had largely favorable connotations in American culture, pointing toward the future, suggesting an environment of progress and opportunity which committed and able human beings can shape for themselves.

In the sense which Turner put into scholarly circulation, however, the frontier has at the same time stood for a particular historical form of globalization: the expansion and settlement of Europeans in other parts of the world. Inside Europe, Turner noted, a frontier would be "a fortified boundary line running through dense populations".[15] In Latin America, in Australia and in Southern Africa, just as in North America, the frontier was between what counted and what did not count; wilderness. If there were indigenous inhabitants there, to the extent that they entered into frontier imagery, they too were wild. Indeed, as Turner suggests, "the wilderness masters the colonist" as well. He is stripped of the superfluous baggage of civilization. The frontier, in this view, becomes primarily an ecological zone, rather more than one of a confluence of cultural streams.

When as scholars we face the "frontiers of knowledge", it is also this sense of the frontier as next to wilderness that takes hold of our imagination. On this side, the cultivated fields; on the other, the great unknown. And the sense of wilderness is still there as the idea of the frontier in the popular imagination now often shifts its locus, to urban life, to streets and alleys which seem beyond the reach of the organized centers of society. In other words, the urban frontier is an urban jungle. Other people one encounters there may really be beasts, and the law of the jungle is the survival of the fittest. (Pelourinho, Pedro Archanjo´s neighborhood in Salvador, seems for a while to have been a little like such an urban frontier, before its recent revival as a historical site and tourist attraction.)

But anthropology has also developed other understandings of the frontier. In his work on the highlands of Burma, Edmund Leach (1960), problematizing the conventional notion of political frontiers, described a zone in which cultures interpenetrated dynamically, through varied political, ecological, economic and kinship frameworks. And more recently, in a volume on *The African Frontier* (1987), the editor Igor Kopytoff has delineated a Subsaharan landscape where innumerable microfrontiers keep developing, not just at the outskirts of established societies but precisely in the interstices *between* them (and "interstices" is another recurrent term in this vocabulary of betweenness); where small groups of people meet to form the beginnings of a new society, having left their respective earlier homes for example after succession disputes or witchcraft accusations. In a pattern where centers and peripheries keep changing places, Kopytoff argues, frontiers in Africa have kept resynthesizing cultures,

although the main tendency in this case has been conservative, involving variations on enduring themes within a single ecumene.

Kopytoff takes Turner's frontier thesis as his point of departure, and he draws on classical Africanist ethnography while at the same time subverting its assumptions of stability and timelessness; but his emphasis on the meeting and mingling of people, in territories in-between, brings him, like Leach before him, closer to those colleagues in anthropology who have recently, in rather less conventional ethnographic settings, been more inclined to speak of borderlands. So let me turn to these.

Alvarez (1995: 451), reviewing the anthropology of the Mexico-United States border recently, has remarked that this has become "the model of border studies and borderland genre throughout the world"; a striking parallel, it seems, to the status of the American frontier as the somehow exemplary frontier. One observer of that border is Renato Rosaldo (1988), another is Michael Kearney (1991). It is interesting to compare them, for although the borderlands they write of are more or less the same, their emphases are different. Kearney's border is rather more that "real", political border, and around it is mostly a grim region, of predators and victims, one which fairly well matches that updated frontier imagery of the wilderness of cities. If it is not really under anyone's control, there is more of terror, and evasion. The key people are the "coyotes", who arrange the passage of illegal migrants from south to north. And Kearney reminds us that *El Coyote* is also, in indigenous Mexico and North America, a "supremely ambiguous and contradictory trickster and culture hero".

In Rosaldo's border zone, defined more by the poets than by the police (and consequently more metaphorical), the small-time hero is El Louie, a lumpenproletarian from the streets, playing with fashions and Hollywood images. The inhabitants here as well are typically migrants, minorities, the "undocumented". Yet he draws our attention not so much to the battle for survival, but to the border as a cultural zone "between stable places" - to its freedom, to people playing, to a dance of life. The border becomes a ludic space. Or, to remind ourselves of yet another current of anthropological thought, and moving from Frederick Jackson Turner to Victor Turner (e.g. 1974), an area of liminality.

Again, it seems, "the savage hits back"; or if not quite the savage, at least someone who stands at some remove from the dominant center. We have indeed encountered the type in a number of memorable ethnographic portrayals over the years.[16] Eric Wolf's (1959: 238-241) mestizo, in *Sons of the Shaking Earth*, had to jettison much of whatever of the Spanish heritage might have reached Central American lands, for in the erratic rhythm of his life, "his chances of survival lay neither in accumulating cultural furniture nor in cleaving to cultural norms, but in an ability to change, to adapt, to improvise". He had to seem both more or less than what he was, and to be both more and less than what he seemed. Language could turn into a strategy where explicit meanings disguised implicit messages, and where speaking two contradictory tongues would be a way of confusing the uninitiated. And he enjoyed the play of fantasy because standing on the edge of society, he had also placed himself on the edge of reality. The mestizo's favorite, says Wolf, would be the great clown Cantínflas, "who in an eternal round of wish fulfilment steps nimbly around the traps of life with fancy footwork and hilarious doubletalk, traveling lightly through the social corridors".

There is one more contact zone metaphor that I should not ignore here. In his remarkable book on the ethnohistory of the Marquesas, in Polynesia, Dening (1980) develops an imagery of cultural "islands", and the "beaches" constituted around them through definitions of "we" and "they".[17] These are not beaches like present-day Copacabana, then, but rather those of Pedro Cabral or James Cook, more like borderlands. And one might compare Dening´s portrayal of "beachcombers" - "whatever they did on the beach, they had to carve out a new world for themselves" - with Frederick Jackson Turner´s of the frontiersman. Yet there is a

difference in that Dening gives full recognition to the fact that as they crossed the beach, they arrived not in a wilderness, but in "other worlds that were well-established and self-sufficient".

   To sum up, then, the landscapes of the interstitial zones seem lively but not entirely safe. If you survive and even prosper there, it is thanks to your own cultural, perhaps even physical agility. Part of this, some of our guides suggest, may be a matter of deculturating: stripping oneself of a cultural overload to achieve a greater freedom of movement. Yet deculturating too much, you risk becoming dehumanized, a dangerous beast. The freedom of the border zone is more creatively exploited by situational shifts and innovative combinations, putting its resources together in new ways, experimenting. In the borderlands, there is scope for agency in the handling of culture.

Hybrids, and other terms of mixture

On that note, we may turn to our third keyword, but only after looking back, momentarily, to earlier years again. Consider these lines:

> It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness, - an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength keeps it from being torn asunder.

This is from that pioneer Afro-American intellectual, W.E.B. DuBois´ *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903/1961: 16-17). There may be a feeling for agency here, but if so, it mostly concerns strength in the face of adversity. The dominant mood seems to be tragic. Something of this mood obviously continued as a theme for at least the first half of the twentieth century in much social and cultural commentary. In American sociology, a body of writings grew around the new concept of "the marginal man". The originator of the concept, Robert E. Park (1928/1964: 356), ancestral figure of Chicago sociology and more concerned than most other academics at the time with what we might now term a sociology of globalization, wrote twenty-five years after DuBois that "it is in the mind of the marginal man that the moral turmoil which new cultural contacts occasion, manifests itself in the most obvious forms."

   "Margins" obviously go with the vocabulary of borders, frontiers, and interstices, and the marginal man is also a part of the intellectual genealogy of contemporary understandings of cultural recombinations.[19] But something has clearly happened between his time and ours. Compare DuBois and Park to Salman Rushdie (1991: 394), commenting in a well-known passage on his famous and controversial novel:

> *The Satanic Verses* celebrates hybridity, impurity, intermingling, the transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings, cultures, ideas, politics, movies, songs. It rejoices in mongrelization and fears the absolutism of the pure. *Mélange*, hotchpotch, a bit of this and a bit of that is *how newness enters the world.*

There has been a shift of ethos, away from quiet pain or compassion, toward assertiveness and, indeed, celebration. Impurity and intermingling now offer not only an escape from DuBois´ "twoness", a possibility of reconciliation, it is a source - perhaps the most important source - of desirable cultural renewal.

The shift clearly took place earlier in the Brazilian world of scholarship and letters than in most places, and perhaps one could argue that this is where it was pioneered. Pedro Archanjo, from *Tent of Miracles*, and through him Jorge Amado, is surely a Rushdie forerunner; in the annals of artistic hybridity, it seems, Bahia comes before Bombay. And Gilberto Freyre's (1946, 1959) writings on Brazil as a meeting place of Portuguese, Amerindians and Africans, must surely be central to an intellectual and cultural history of hybridity - especially for its bold attempt to delineate not only a character type, or a mode of artistic production, but an entire new civilization, a level of what one may call macroanthropological ambition paralleled perhaps most closely here by Frederick Jackson Turner on the frontier. We should note, too, that while the "marginal man" was mostly a sociological creature, anthropology already at midcentury (rather predictably) tended to take another view. "The conjunction of differences in culture contact," wrote the members of the SSRC acculturation seminar in 1954, "provides a kind of catalyst for cultural creativity" (Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson 1954: 985). And in their somewhat laborious systems language, they concerned themselves with the conditions for the emergence, in contact situations, of "a genuine third sociocultural system through a process of fusion".

Anyway, here we are now, with hybridity, collage, mélange, hotchpotch, montage, synergy, bricolage, creolization, mestizaje, mongrelization, syncretism, transculturation, third cultures and what have you; some terms used perhaps only in passing as summary metaphors, others with claims to more analytical status, and others again with more regional or thematic strongholds. Mostly they seem to suggest a concern with cultural form, cultural products (and conspicuously often, they relate to domains of fairly tangible cultural materials, such as language, music, art, ritual, or cuisine); some appear more concerned with process than others.

It seems hybridity is at present the more favored general term; no doubt drawing strength, like "flow", from easy mobility between disciplines (but then several of the other terms are also fairly footloose). Despite its biologistic flavor, it has a strength not least in literary scholarship, due in large part to its presence in the work of Mikhail Bakhtin (1968). For Bakhtin, I take it, hybridity was above all the coexistence of two languages, two linguistic consciousnesses, even within a single utterance; commenting on one another, unmasking each other, entailing contradiction, ambiguity, irony; again, the trickster theme may seem not far away. As Homi Bhabha (1994) takes the notion into the cultural critique of colonialism, it comes to draw attention to the subversion, the destabilization, of colonial cultural authority. But as different commentators, from a range of disciplines, have taken it in different directions, with varied analytical objectives, hybridity is by now itself a term which is far from unambiguous.[19]

Let us have a quick look at some of the other words for mixture. "Synergy" may not have much of a past in anthropology; it has been pointed out that the concept shows up in some of Ruth Benedict´s lecture notes, from 1941 (Maslow and Honigmann 1970). But Benedict used it for situations understood as internal to cultures, where an "act or skill that advantages the individual at the same time advantages the group". At present, too, the term seems less popular in anthropology than among professionals in the growing field of intercultural communication, who use it to refer to the dynamic advantages of contacts and mergers between cultures. And of course, these interculturalists themselves often move in the borderlands of the world of business, where the idea of synergy tends to lend an attractive aura to mergers and takeovers. "Synergy", that is to say, has distinctly celebratory overtones built into it.

Going back about equally far in anthropology is "transculturation", a term coined by the Cuban social historian Fernando Ortiz in his book *Cuban Counterpoint* (1947). Bronislaw Malinowski, who met Ortiz in Havana in 1939, wrote an introduction (dated 1940) to the book, stating that he had promised the author to "appropriate the new expression for /his/ own use, acknowledging its paternity, and use it constantly and loyally". It was, Malinowski felt, a

term much preferable to acculturation, which he thought fell upon the ear in an unpleasant way - "sounds like a cross between a hiccup and a belch" - and which, as he understood it, suggested a more one-sided cultural change. Transculturation, he agreed with Ortiz, was a system of give and take, "a process from which a new reality emerges, transformed and complex, a reality that is not a mechanical agglomeration of traits, nor even a mosaic, but a new phenomenon, original and independent". It hardly seems that at least some of Malinowski´s American colleagues actually understood acculturation very differently. In recent times, "transculturation" may have been made more popular again especially by Pratt´s (1992) use of it in her study of travel writing. And in postcolonial times, one of the attractions of this concept may be that it is in itself an example of counterflow, from periphery to center.

Perhaps, despite their somewhat different histories and emphases, it does not matter much which of these concepts one chooses, but that to which I have been most strongly drawn myself, primarily on the basis of my field experience in Nigeria, is "creolization" (Hannerz 1987, 1996: 65 ff.).[21] While I believe that the others mostly denote cultural mixture as such, and although "creolization" is no doubt sometimes also so used, I think this concept can be used in a more precise, and at the same time restricted, way.

The origins of the idea of "creole" people and cultural phenomena are in the particular culture-historical context of New World plantation societies, and some might feel that the notion should be left there; one could have a debate over this much like those over other concepts which have been taken out of particular areas to be used for more comparative purposes (caste, totem, taboo...).[22] In any case, the more expansive use has been an established fact for some time, particularly in sociolinguistics, and in analogy with creolist understandings there, I would argue that a creolist view is particularly applicable to processes of cultural confluence within a more or less open continuum of diversity, stretched out along a structure of center-periphery relationships which may well extend transnationally, and which is characterized also by inequality in power, prestige and material resource terms. Along such lines it appears to me possible to integrate cultural with social analysis, in a way not equally clearly suggested by many of the other concepts in this cluster, and thus also to pursue a more macroanthropological vision.[23] But again, this also means that creolization becomes a less general term, by referring to a more elaborated type. (And it may also suggest a social landscape which is rather more structured, not so much a frontier or a borderland.)

The identification of creole cultures draws attention to the fact that some cultures are very conspicuously *not* "bounded", "pure", "homogeneous", and "timeless", as in the anthropological tradition cultures have often been made to seem; and to the extent that the celebratory stance toward hybridity recurs here as well, it is also suggested that these cultures draw some of their vitality and creativity precisely from the dynamics of mixture (although the celebration here may be somewhat tempered by the recognition that the cultures are also built around structures of inequality). One objection occasionally raised against the creolization concept - and other related notions may be confronted with it as well - is that such an identification of creole cultures as a particular category might simply push those features of essentialism a step back, implying that the cultural currents joined through creolization were pure, bounded, and so forth, until they were thus joined.[24]

I do not find this implication inevitable. Drawing on the linguistic parallel again, there are a number of English-based creole languages in the world, but nobody would seriously argue that the English language is historically pure. (Remember 1066, and all that.) The claim need only be that in one particular period, some cultures are more creole than others, to the extent that the cultural streams coming together, under the given conditions and with more or less dramatic results, are historically distinct from another, even as they themselves may have

resulted from other confluences. At some point or other, we or our forefathers may all have been creolized, but we are not forever engaged in it to the same degree.

Finally, syncretism; again an old idea, although perhaps not a continuously highly visible one, used in and out of anthropology, but especially in the field of comparative religion, for example in the study of how, in Afro-American cultures, West African deities have merged with Catholic saints. [25] Recently there appears to have been some revival of interest, coupled with an interest in "anti-syncretism" - in a world where academics study non-academic lives and non-academics read academic texts, the leaders and adherents of some of the faiths involved are not particularly pleased with scholarship which appears to deny the authenticity and purity of their beliefs and practices (cf. Stewart and Shaw 1994, Palmié 1995). [26]

Conclusion: the words and the world

And that leads to a concluding comment. I began with three keywords of an emergent transnational anthropology, but I have ended up touching on rather more of them, out of the present and the past: acculturation, the frontier, the marginal man, diffusion... This is a vocabulary which spans the twentieth century and even a little more, and which also connects continents. At the same time, however, it brings globalization down to earth, and can help show its human face. It suggests that the world is not necessarily becoming all the same. There is struggle but also play. Tricksters thrive in the borderlands.

We need these words ourselves, and more of them, and sometimes new and more exact words, to map the changes, and we should remember old keywords and the past comments on them, to know from where we have come, and to sense if we have moved much forward. But they will not always be only our words; words known only to us. The present world is also one of increasing reflexivity, which for one thing means that lay people, ”natives”, take note of what scholars say about them, and sometimes speak back.

”Syncretism” is certainly not the only item in the vocabulary exemplified here on which the people somehow or other reported on might have opinions. We had better give some thought to how we relate to this fact. It could hardly be that if people do not think of culture as ”flowing”, or if for that matter they prefer to think of their ways of life and thought as pure, stable, and timeless, they should be allowed to veto those of our analytical, or at least proto-analytical, notions which suggest otherwise. The latter notions are not necessarily either validated or invalidated by coinciding or not coinciding with ordinary, everyday, ”native” usage.

We need to have a sense of which words, and ideas, and interests, are ours, and which are ”theirs”. But our vocabulary does not inhabit a separate world of its own either. For following in the steps of Raymond Williams and Pedro Archanjo, each a public intellectual in his own way, in no small part it must be by sharing their keywords with others, and arguing over their implications with these others, that those who make a vocation of the study of culture in an interconnected world can help bring about an informed public scrutiny of that world. There is more work to be done here.

Notes

1. This paper was presented in an earlier version as a plenary lecture at the twentieth biennial meeting of the Associacao Brasileira de Antropologia at Salvador de Bahia, April 14-17, 1996. I am grateful to the Association for the invitation and for its hospitality during the conference. The paper was written within the framework of the project on "National and Transnational Cultural Processes", based at the Department of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University, and the Department of Ethnology, University of Lund, and supported by the Swedish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences.

2. I am, of course, not the first anthropologist to draw inspiration from Amado; see DaMatta (1982).

3. For one important such effort, see Robertson (1992: 57-60).

4. Vincent (1990: 125), in her history of the anthropological study of politics, has noted that "what was distinctive about diffusionists such as Rivers, Hocart, Wheeler, Perry and Elliot Smith was their uncompromising insistence that anthropology study not only primitive or savage peoples but the whole world, ancient and modern, in its historical complexity." In the collection of papers on the study of culture contact in Africa resulting from 1930s work at the London School of Economics, Malinowski (1938: vii) - the "presiding genius", in the words of the editor, Lucy Mair (1938: v) - noted that "anthropology, which used to be the study of beings and things retarded, gradual, and backward, is now faced with the difficult task of recording how the 'savage' becomes an active participant in modern civilization, how the African and the Asiatic are being rapidly drawn into partnership with the European in world-wide co-operation and conflict." Much of the American work on acculturation occurred in the period between two major conceptual and theoretical statements, that by Redfield, Linton and Herskovits (1936) and that by Broom, Siegel, Vogt and Watson (1954). For an early and a late critique, see Bateson (1972: 61 ff., first published in 1935) and Murphy (1964).

5. See also for instance the leading urban sociologist Manuel Castells' (1989: 126 ff.) notion of a "space of flows", referring to the handling of information within and between dispersed organizations. Csikszentmihalyi (e.g. 1990) has at the same time popularized a quite different flow concept, referring to the experience of optimally rewarding activity. In anthropology, Victor Turner (e.g. 1982: 55 ff.) has related this understanding of flow to communitas and liminality, thus approaching some of our other concerns here - see the discussion of borderlands below.

6. For examples of varied uses, see Watson's (1970) and Vincent´s (1977) conception of "society as organized flow", or Adams' (1975: 114 ff.) comments in the context of a discussion of energy. The brief formulation by Mintz and Price (1992: 32 ff.) on the flow of culture in the early formation of African-American culture, within the plantation context, is somewhat reminiscent of Barth's as discussed below, not least in its program of close attention to both culture and social relationships.

7. In an instance of a more elaborated use of the temporal metaphor of flow, Kroeber (1952: 405) also remarks that "our Dark Ages are not really a reversal, a retracing, of a current of flow. They mark the cessation of flow of one civilization; a consequent slack water and

hesitation of confused fluctuating drift; and then the gradual and slowly increasing flow of a new Western civilization - new precisely because the set of its current is in a new direction."

8. See e.g. Abu-Lughod (1991) and Ingold (1993).

9. Perhaps I may add that Howell (1995: 172), after quoting me in a somewhat jumbled fashion, seems to suggest that I disregard the continued significance of a flow of meaning in face-to-face relationships. Such an interpretation of any of my work is entirely fallacious; see for instance some other pages in that article which Howell quotes in her own way (Hannerz 1991: 113-114).

10. Cohen (e.g. 1986, 1994), another prominent writer on "boundaries", is also concerned primarily with the symbolic demarcation of social identities.

11. More recently, Barth (1995: 65; see also Barth 1994) has commented on current discourses on cultural identity that they "provide an extremely fertile field for political entrepreneurship; they allow leaders and spokesmen to claim that they are speaking on behalf of others; they allow the manipulation of media access; and they encourage the strategic construction of polarizing debates that translate into battles of influence. Such battles create hegemony and reduce options; they disempower followers and reduce the diversity of voices." It is interesting to note Verdery´s (1994: 56) comment here - "from the point of view of anthropology in the field of disciplines, a Barthian critique of multiculturalism is risky. To see identity politics as misguided and resting on unacceptably essentialist foundations could serve to marginalize anthropology, as its message is seen to obstruct developments that are backed by powerful forces in the world economy. In an era when disciplinary identites and boundaries (and their associated resources) have become as evanescent as in the most fluid ethnic systems, such marginalization should not be considered lightly." See also e.g. Terence Turner (1993) on multiculturalism, mostly in the American context, and Stolcke (1995) on cultural fundamentalism in Europe; and Robertson´s (1992: 83) comment that the growth of the field of "cultural studies" seems entirely in line with Wallerstein´s (1990) view of culture as an ideological battleground of the world system.

12. I would imagine that a view of diffusion (and related cultural processes with a spatial dimension) as cultural acquisition could draw inspiration in different ways for example from Bloch's (e.g. 1992) explorations of connectionist theory, Lave and Wenger (1991) on situated learning, Schudson's (1989) discussion, drawing on media studies, of cultural efficacy, Urban's (1993: 220 ff.) contrast between lateral and vertical culture, or Turner's (1994) critique of the notion of shared practices.

13. Interestingly, Raymond Williams (1985: 177) has a perhaps quite independently invented version of a "100 % British" which carries such an antiparochialist message.

14. It is true that not every language allows these distinctions, but in American English the words carry different historical and symbolic loads; and such is its power as a world language that these are often understood elsewhere as well. See also some comments by Cohen (1994: 62-63).

15. See for example Leyburn (1935), Hofstadter and Lipset (1968), Hennessy (1978) and Velho (1979).

16. For a recent discussion focusing rather more on such frontiers, and largely in political terms, see Anderson (1996).

17. Apart from Wolf´s mestizo, as another example from the history and ethnography of cultural borderlands, take Christopher Waterman's study of *jùjú*, a West African popular music emerging in the eras of colonialism and early postcolonialism. Popular cultural styles in Africa, argues Waterman (1990: 8-9), "have rarely trickled down from the Western-educated elites or bubbled up from an autochtonous wellspring"; they are more often pioneered by an intermediate, cosmopolitan layer of artisans, laborers, sailors, railway workers, drivers, teachers and clerks. These are the people who are "characteristically adept at interpreting multiple languages, cultural codes, and value systems, skills which enable them to construct styles that express shifting patterns of urban identity." And among them, then, are the musicians - "highly mobile and positioned at important interstices in heterogeneous urban societies, they forge new styles and communities of taste, negotiating cultural differences through the musical manipulation of symbolic associations".

18. For a consideration of the anthropological notion of "islands", see also Eriksen (1993).

19. For a few examples from a generation of writings on marginality, see Stonequist (1937), Green (1947), Riesman (1951) and Golovensky (1952).

20. For attempts at overview of the idea of hybridity, see Nederveen Pieterse (1994), Young (1995) and Papastergiadis (1995); and for a discussion of Bhabha's understanding of hybridity, see Purdom (1995). For a recent critical discussion of the idea of mestizaje, see Klor de Alva (1995). The notion of "third cultures", apparently appearing first in an attempt to conceptualize interactions between expatriate Americans and postcolonial Indians (Useem 1963), has since then appeared with some regularity in the field of intercultural communication studies, and occasionally elsewhere (e.g. Featherstone 1995: 90-91).

21. For some of the other discussions of creolization in culture which I have found useful, see e.g. Fabian (1978: 317), Drummond (1980), Jackson (1989) and Barber and Waterman (1995).

22. Perhaps Mintz (1996: 300-303) would prefer the more limited usage, although I find his argument a little ambivalent. I find quite puzzling his conclusion that "creolization" in its current, not exclusively Caribbeanist, usage somehow refers to "the end of culture", or simply to modernization. At least in my own writings, to which Mintz refers, this is surely not the case.

23. As Mintz (1996: 309) finds my analogy between linguistic and cultural dimensions in creolization at the level of cultural form "insouciant" - as it may be in the sense that the passage he quotes is a very general statement - he disregards the central fact that I find much of my inspiration in creolist thought in its attention to the social dimension. This should be clear in earlier writings as well, but I have tried to make it especially clear in Hannerz (1996: 65 ff).

24. Friedman (e.g. 1994: 208 ff.) is thus apparently convinced that a creolist argument must be "confused essentialism".

25. For a recent discussion of conceptions of syncretism from a current anthropological perspective, see Droogers (1989).

26. An interesting twist to the debate is contributed by that expansive policy of the Roman Catholic Church which, by way of a concept of "inculturation", favors the indigenization of its eternal, transcendent message through openness to local cultural forms (Angrosino 1994).

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1991. Writing against Culture. In *Recapturing Anthropology*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Adams, Richard N. 1975. *Energy and Structure*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Alvarez, Robert R., Jr. 1995. The Mexican-US Border: The Making of an Anthropology of Borderlands. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24: 447-470. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Amado, Jorge. 1971. *Tent of Miracles*. New York: Knopf.

Anderson, Malcolm. 1996. Frontiers. Cambridge: Polity.

Angrosino, Michael V. 1994. The Culture Concept and the Mission of the Roman Catholic Church. *American Anthropologist*, 96: 824-832.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2): 1-24.

_____. 1995. The Production of Locality. In *Counterworks.* Richard Fardon, ed. London: Routledge.

Barber, Karin, and Christopher Waterman. 1995. Traversing the Global and the Local: Fújì Music and Praise Poetry in the Production of Contemporary Yorùbá Popular Culture. In *Worlds Apart*. Daniel Miller, ed. London: Routledge.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1968. *Rabelais and His World*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Barth, Fredrik. 1969. (ed.) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

_____. 1984. Problems in Conceptualizing Cultural Pluralism, with Illustrations from Somar, Oman. In *The Prospects for Plural Societies*. David Maybury-Lewis, ed. Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society.

_____. 1994. Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis of Ethnicity. In *The Anthropology of Ethnicity*. Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers, eds. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

_____. 1995. Other Knowledge and Other Ways of Knowing. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 51: 65-68.

Bateson, Gregory. 1935/1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bloch, Maurice. 1992. What Goes without Saying: The Conceptualization of Zafimaniry Society. In *Conceptualizing Society*. Adam Kuper, ed. London: Routledge.

Broom, Leonard, Bernard J. Siegel, Evon Z. Vogt and James B. Watson. 1954. Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation. *American Anthropologist*, 56: 973-1000.

Castells, Manuel. 1989. *The Informational City*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cohen, Anthony P. 1986. (ed.) *Symbolising Boundaries*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

_____. 1994. Boundaries of Consciousness, Consciousness of Boundaries: Critical Questions for Anthropology. In *The Anthropology of Ethnicity*. Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers, eds. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. 1990. *Flow*. New York: Harper & Row.

DaMatta, Roberto. 1982. Dona Flor e seus dois maridos: A Relational Novel. *Social Science Information*, 21: 19-46.

Dening, Greg. 1980. Islands and Beaches. Chicago: Dorsey

Droogers, André. 1989. Syncretism: The Problem of Definition, the Definition of the Problem. In *Dialogue and Syncretism*. Jerald Gort, Hendrik Vroom, Rein Fernhout and Anton Wessels, eds. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Drummond, Lee. 1980. The Cultural Continuum: A Theory of Intersystems. *Man*, 15: 352-374.

DuBois, W.E. Burghardt. /1903/1961. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Greenwich, CN: Fawcett.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1993. In Which Sense Do Cultural Islands Exist? *Social Anthropology*, 1: 133-147.

Fabian, Johannes. 1978. Popular Culture in Africa: Findings and Conjectures. *Africa*, 48: 315-334.

Featherstone, Mike. 1995. *Undoing Culture*. London: Sage.

Freyre, Gilberto. 1946. *The Masters and the Slaves*. New York: Knopf.

_____. 1959. *New World in the Tropics*. New York: Knopf.

Friedman, Jonathan. 1994. *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.

Golovensky, David I. 1952. The Marginal Man Concept: An Analysis and Critique. *Social Forces*, 30: 333-339.

Green, Arnold W. 1947. A Re-examination of the Marginal Man Concept. *Social Forces*, 26: 167-171.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1987. The World in Creolisation. *Africa*, 57: 546-559.

_____. 1991. Scenarios for Peripheral Cultures. In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*. Anthony D. King, ed. London: Macmillan.

_____. 1992. *Cultural Complexity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

_____. 1996. *Transnational Connections*. London: Routledge.

Hennessy, Alistair. 1978. *The Frontier in Latin American History*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1968. (eds.) *Turner and the Sociology of the Frontier*. New York: Basic Books.

Howell, Signe. 1995. Whose Knowledge and Whose Power? A New Perspective on Cultural Diffusion. In *Counterworks*. Richard Fardon, ed. London: Routledge.

Ingold, Tim. 1993. The Art of Translation in a Continuous World. In *Beyond Boundaries*. Gísli Pálsson, ed. London: Berg.

Jackson, Jean. 1989. Is There a Way of Talking about Culture without Making Enemies? *Dialectical Anthropology*, 14: 127-143.

Kearney, Michael. 1991. Borders and Boundaries of State and Self at the End of Empire. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 4: 52-74.

Klor de Alva, J. Jorge. 1995. The Postcolonization of the (Latin) American Experience: A Reconsideration of "Colonialism," "Postcolonialism," and "Mestizaje." In *After Colonialism.* Gyan Prakash, ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kopytoff, Igor. 1987. (ed.) *The African Frontier*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kroeber, A.L. 1952. *The Nature of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lash, Scott, and John Urry. 1994. *Economies of Signs and Space.* London: Sage.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leach, Edmund R. 1960. The Frontiers of "Burma". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 3: 49-68.

Leyburn, James G. 1935. *Frontier Folkways*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Linton, Ralph. 1936. *The Study of Man*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lips, Julius. 1937. *The Savage Hits Back*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.

Lowie, Robert. 1920. *Primitive Society*. New York: Liveright.

Mair, Lucy P. (ed.) 1938. *Methods of Study of Culture Contact in Africa*. International African Institute, Memorandum XV. London: Oxford University Press.

Maslow, Abraham H., and John J. Honigmann. 1970. Synergy: Some Notes of Ruth Benedict. *American Anthropologist*, 72: 320-333.

Mintz, Sidney W. 1996. Enduring Substances, Trying Theories: The Caribbean Region as *Oikoumenê. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 2: 289-311.

_____, and Richard Price. 1992. *The Birth of African-American Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Murphy, Robert F. 1964. Social Change and Acculturation. *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, ser. II, 26: 845-854.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 1994. Globalisation as Hybridisation. *International Sociology*, 9: 161-184.

Ortiz, Fernando. 1947. *Cuban Counterpoint*. New York: Knopf.

Palmié, Stephan. 1995. Against Syncretism: 'Africanizing' and 'Cubanizing' Discourses in North American *òrìsà* Worship. In *Counterworks*. Richard Fardon, ed. London: Routledge.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. 1995. Restless Hybrids. *Third Text*, 32: 9-18.

Park, Robert E. /1928/1964. *Race and Culture*. New York: Free Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes*. London: Routledge.

Purdom, Judy. 1995. Mapping Difference. *Third Text*, 32: 19-32.

Redfield, Robert, Ralph Linton and Melville J. Herskovits. 1936. Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38: 149-152.

Riesman, David. 1951. Some Observations Concerning Marginality. *Phylon,* 12: 113-127.

Robertson*,* Roland. 1992*. Globalization*. London: Sage.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1988. Ideology, Place, and People without Culture. *Cultural Anthropology*, 3: 77-87.

Rushdie, Salman. 1991. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Granta.

Schudson, Michael. 1989. How Culture Works: Perspectives from Media Studies on the Efficacy of Symbols. *Theory and Society*, 18: 153-180.

Sperber, Dan. 1985. Anthropology and Psychology: Towards an Epidemiology of Representations. *Man*, 20: 73-89.

Stewart, Charles, and Rosalind Shaw. 1994. (eds.) *Syncretism/ Anti-Syncretism*. London: Routledge.

Stolcke, Verena. 1995. Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe. *Current Anthropology*, 36: 1-24.

Stonequist, Everett. 1937. *The Marginal Man*. New York: Scribner's.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1995. *The Relation*. Cambridge: Prickly Pear Press.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. 1961 /1893/. The Significance of the Frontier in American History. In *Frontier and Section*. Ray A. Billington, ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Turner, Stephen. 1994. *The Social Theory of Practices*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Turner, Terence. 1993. Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology that Multiculturalism should be Mindful of it? *Cultural Anthropology*, 8: 411-429.

Turner, Victor. 1974. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Urban, Greg. 1993. Culture's Public Face. *Public Culture*, 5: 213-238.

Useem, John. 1963. The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture. *Centennial Review*, 7: 481-498.

Velho, Otávio G. 1979. The State and the Frontier. In *The Structure of Brazilian Development*. Neuma Aguiar, ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Verdery, Katherine. 1994. Ethnicity, Nationalism, and State-making - *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*: Past and Future. In *The Anthropology of Ethnicity*. Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers, eds. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Vincent, Joan. 1977. Agrarian Society as Organized Flow: Processes of Development Past and Present. *Peasant Studies*, 6: 56-65.

_____. 1990. *Anthropology and Politics*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1990. Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-system. In *Global Culture*. Mike Featherstone, ed. London: Sage.

Waterman, Christopher A. 1990. *Jùjú*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Watson, James B. 1970. Society as Organized Flow: the Tairora Case. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 26: 107-124.

Williams, Raymond. 1976. *Keywords*. London: Fontana.

_____. 1985. *Towards 2000.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Wolf, Eric. 1959. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Young, Robert J.C. 1995. *Colonial Desire*. London: Routledge.

blackwell readers in anthropology. the anthropology of the state. a reader. edited by aradhana sharma and akhil gupta. The Anthropology of the State. Blackwell Readers in Anthropology. Â 9 Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and the Imagined State Akhil Gupta. 211. Section II Planning and Development. Â While transnational corporations are key players in the circuit of outsourcing, national and regional states (both in those regions where outsourced jobs originate and those in which these jobs end up) are also important actors. Let us first turn to those states that serve primarily as destinations of out-sourced jobs, and to India in particular. Hannerz, Ulf (2000) Flows, boundaries and hybrids: Keywords in transnational anthropology. Working paper no. WPTC-2K-02. Oxford: University of Oxford. Transnational Communities Programme. Hart, Keith (2005): "Formal Bureaucracy and the Emergent Forms of the Informal Economy". Paper presented at the EGDIâ€"WIDER Conference on Unlocking Human Potential â€" Linking the Informal and Formal Sectors in Helsinki, 17-18 September 2004.

Planetary boundaries is a concept involving Earth system processes that contain environmental boundaries. It was proposed in 2009 by a group of Earth system and environmental scientists, led by Johan Rockström from the Stockholm Resilience Centre and Will Steffen from the Australian National University. The group wanted to define a "safe operating space for humanity" for the international community, including governments at all levels, international organizations, civil society, the scientific Anthropology, ʼthe science of humanity,ʼ which studies human beings in aspects ranging from the biology and evolutionary history of Homo sapiens to the features of society and culture that decisively distinguish humans from other animal species. Learn more about the history and branches of anthropology in this article. Flows, Boundaries and Hybrids: Keywords in Transnational Anthropology. Transnational Communities Programme Working Paper Series, WPTC-2K-02, online at: . Hannerz, U. 2011. Response to Rockefeller. There is now a rich body of theory in which the notion—and putative boundaries—of personhood have been thoroughly destabilised (Strathern 1996, 1999; Verdery and Humphrey 2004). A more ﬂuid concept of personhood ﬂowing into (and out of) things, landscapes, other species, and between individual and collective persons, has also enabled useful challenges to nature-culture dualism and anthropocentric visions of human-environmental relations. Transnational Social Spaces Network is a scientific work- and discussion forum. Bringing Transnational Relations Back in. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-33. Robinson, W. I., 2001: Social Theory and Globalization: The Rise of a transnational State. In: Theory and Society 30, 157- 200 http://journals.kluweronline.com/ Please use: "Search Articles" (top-left) with following string: Social Theory and Globalization: The Rise of a transnational State. Itzigsohn, J, 2000: Immigration and the boundaries of citizenship: The institutions of immigrants' political transnationalism. In: International Migration Review 34 (4), 1126-1154. Koopmans, R./Statham, P., 2001: How national citizenship shapes transnationalism. They tended to see transnational migration everywhere when, in fact, the range and scope of migrantsʼ transnational practices vary considerably. New research ndings were celebratory, predicting that by living transnationally, migrants could overcome the poverty and powerlessness to which capitalism relegated them. These weaknesses generated critiques. Some took issue with the terminology and ambiguity of denition, arguing that conceptual distinctions were not clear, for example, between global, international, and transnational. Alternative terms, such as translocalism (Barkan 2006), bi-localis

Â The keywords and titles of articles published in American Ethnologist from 2016 to 2019 show a striking intersection of anthropological scholarship and world‒event trends. Tables and word clouds generated from recurring words expose the centrality of critical events, which appears to support recent contentions about a "crisis‒chasing" mode in anthropology today. But it conceals the multivocality of authors' engagement with current events, while the idiosyncratic words that fill most of the keyword lists and titles in AE disrupt any generalization about anthropology's primary concerns. This article examines the relationship between solidarity and territorial boundaries, both of which are critical focal points in relation to the process of Euro. Â With that focus on boundaries and solidarity, the article will take a fresh look at cross-border movement of patients by conceptualising the field in a more abstract and theoretical manner which aims to be of value in relation to welfare systems in general. In particular, the article will examine the role of free movement and human rights as instruments for overcoming territorial boundaries. Â Urban & Transnational Anthropology eJournal. Subscribe to this fee journal for more curated articles on this topic. FOLLOWERS. The jungle is densely populated and is quite important for the creation of the planet's economic landscape. The aggregate output of transnational corporations (TNC) exceeds a quarter of the global GDP. Â The future of transnational corporations: trends and scenarios for global politics. August 30, 2012. Globalization by… "Flows, boundaries and hybrids: Keywords in transnational anthropology," Department of Anthropology Working Paper WPTC-2K-02. Stockholm University. Held, D. 1995. Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance. Cambridge: Polity Press. Janowitz, M. 1952. The community press in an urban setting. They tended to see transnational migration everywhere when, in fact, the range and scope of migrants' transnational practices vary considerably. New research ndings were celebratory, predicting that by living transnationally, migrants could overcome the poverty and powerlessness to which capitalism relegated them. These weaknesses generated critiques. Some took issue with the terminology and ambiguity of denition, arguing that conceptual distinctions were not clear, for example, between global, international, and transnational. Alternative terms, such as translocalism (Barkan 2006), bi-localis

"Flows, boundaries and hybrids: Keywords in transnational anthropology," Department of Anthropology Working Paper WPTC-2K-02. Stockholm University. Held, D. 1995. Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance. Cambridge: Polity Press. Janowitz, M. 1952. The community press in an urban setting. They tended to see transnational migration everywhere when, in fact, the range and scope of migrants' transnational practices vary considerably. New research ndings were celebratory, predicting that by living transnationally, migrants could overcome the poverty and powerlessness to which capitalism relegated them. These weaknesses generated critiques. Some took issue with the terminology and ambiguity of denition, arguing that conceptual distinctions were not clear, for example, between global, international, and transnational. Alternative terms, such as translocalism (Barkan 2006), bi-localis Leading anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen shows how anthropology is a revolutionary way of thinking about the human world. Perfect for students, but also for those who have never encountered anthropology before, this book explores the key issues in an exciting and innovative way. Eriksen explains how to see the world from below and from within – emphasising the importance of adopting an insider's perspective. He reveals how seemingly enormous cultural differences actually conceal the deep unity of humanity.Lucid and accessible, What is Anthropology? draws examples from current affairs The keywords of transnational anthropology on which I will concentrate my comments are "flows", "boundaries", and "hybrids". Like much of the recent vocabulary we are engaging with here, these are metaphorical, somewhat tentative notions, perhaps in a slightly longer run imprecise or ambiguous, and thus open to contestation. Flows, boundaries and hybrids, then; a few comments on their past and present places in our shifting habitats of meaning, sometimes in the history of anthropology, at other times in an interdisciplinary conceptual landscape. But then these three turn out to have in their immediate vicinity a number of other concepts of a similar nature, which may also require a passing remark. This article examines the relationship between solidarity and territorial boundaries, both of which are critical focal points in relation to the process of Euro. With that focus on boundaries and solidarity, the article will take a fresh look at cross-border movement of patients by conceptualising the field in a more abstract and theoretical manner which aims to be of value in relation to welfare systems in general. In particular, the article will examine the role of free movement and human rights as instruments for overcoming territorial boundaries. Urban & Transnational Anthropology eJournal. Subscribe to this fee journal for more curated articles on this topic. FOLLOWERS.

Hannerz, Ulf. 2002. Flows, Boundaries and Hybrids: Keywords in Transnational Anthropology. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press.Google Scholar. Jackson, Peter. â€œTransnational American Studies: Conceptualizing Multicultural Identities and Communities.â€ In Fremde Texte verstehen. Festschrift fÃ¼r Lothar Bredella zum 60. They tended to see transnational migration everywhere when, in fact, the range and scope of migrantsâ€™ transnational practices vary considerably. New research ndings were celebratory, predicting that by living transnationally, migrants could overcome the poverty and powerlessness to which capitalism relegated them. These weaknesses generated critiques. Some took issue with the terminology and ambiguity of denition, arguing that conceptual distinctions were not clear, for example, between global, international, and transnational. Alternative terms, such as translocalism (Barkan 2006), bi-localis Hannerz, Ulf (2000) "Flows, boundaries and hybrids: Keywords in transnational anthropology". Working paper no. WPTC-2K-02. Oxford: University of Oxford. Transnational Communities Programme. transcomm.ox.ac.uk. Hastrup, Kirsten (2013) "Scales of attention in fieldwork: Global connections and local concerns in the Arctic", Ethnography, 14 (2) : 145â€"164. sagepub.com. Lien, Marianne E. and Aidan Davidson (2011) "Roots, rupture and remembrance: The Tasmanian lives of Monterey pine", Journal of Material Culture, 15(2): 1â€"21. sagepub.com. Marcus, George (1995) "Ethn â€œFlows, boundaries and hybrids: Keywords in transnational anthropology,â€ Department of Anthropology Working Paper WPTC-2K-02. Stockholm University. Held, D. 1995. Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance. Cambridge: Polity Press. Janowitz, M. 1952. The community press in an urban setting. (2000) Flows, Boundaries and Hybrids: Keywords in Transnational Anthropology. (1992) Culture, Cities and the World (1986, with Ulla Wagner) Anthropology of Immigration in Sweden. (2004) Foreign News: Exploring the World of Foreign Correspondents. (2010) Anthropology's World: Life in a Twenty-First Century Discipline. ISBN 978-0-7453-3047-1. Further reading. Main article: List of important publications in anthropology. References.