

A fruitful alliance. On the relationship between history and anthropology

Gabriël van den Brink

The starting point for this contribution - which rather focuses on methodology than on content - is the historical research I have done during the past ten years. Formally, this research dealt with the process of modernization in the south-east of the Netherlands. Materially, it was an analysis of the changes the village of Woensel went through between 1670 and 1920. In this respect I made a systematic distinction between processes on a demographic-economic level, on a political-administrative level and on a mental-cultural level.¹ Because of the small-scale approach and the holistic perspective which is typical of local history my research has various points in common with anthropology. That is why the issue of the relationship between the two disciplines appeals to me. However, I believe that there is a difference between the actual research practice - which is characterized by a frequent interchange between history and anthropology - and the theoretical debate. In the Netherlands a pragmatic approach is generally favoured, which means that the fundamental differences between the two disciplines are only too easily ignored.² In this article I will therefore explore the differences between history and anthropology, in relation to their scientific objects, sources and theories. Only then do I consider a possible convergence of the both disciplines. My principal concern is a reflection on practical experiences. Therefore I will start with my own research and will then develop a more general argument.

Scientific object

Although my research dealt with large-scale processes such as industrialization, the growing rate of literacy, and state-formation, I have explored these processes by means of a local history. The question is whether such reduction in scale is helpful. In any case, the issue cannot be seen in purely quantitative terms, as if developments on a national or international level repeat themselves on a small scale, so that local history is only a smaller version of large-scale history, but not fundamentally different from it. In fact, the specific processes that take place at the level of a village or town community have their own dynamic and also their own methodology. In this respect it is fair to make the comparison to a microscope: a decrease in scale, or (which amounts to the same thing) an increase in magnification, reveals processes which are invisible, and perhaps do not even exist, at a regional or national level.³ The biological processes that take place in a cell are not the same as the processes in the body as a whole.⁴ Similarly, a reduction in scale leads to a qualitative change in the research object, which is only too often ignored.

A thematic shift, for example, is almost unavoidable. Obviously, attention becomes focused on ordinary people and the sometimes trivial but nonetheless meaningful aspects of their everyday lives.⁵ In Woensel I studied a 'small' community where all kinds of things have happened, none of them being of world-historic importance. Therefore, the study was more concerned with the everyday activities of peasants and weavers in the

cottage industry than with the actions of a local entrepreneur. We mainly paid attention to the recurrent routines of the village authorities and - as for national politics - focused on their local effects. We were not concerned with 'high' culture, but with the everyday culture of a rural community in Brabant.

In connection with this the political perspective is reversed. Researchers of the modernization process almost always have a top-down approach. They are forced to do so by their sources as well as the concepts they use. They prefer to use data from national sources and concepts which are only useful for a description of large-scale processes.⁶ The effect is, however, that the local population is seen as the more or less passive object for manipulation by the elite. By means of a local approach we turn this upside down and look rather at things from below.⁷ It is only too often true that the historical process - whether it concerns a slow decrease in wages or sudden calamities such as wars - is a heavy burden on the 'small man'. Peasants, wage labourers or artisans seldom had enough power to actually control the course of events. But at the same time they showed great inventiveness in surviving, used a myriad of tricks toward the authorities and dodged or evaded the measures imposed on them by the ruling classes.⁸ Therefore we emphasize that the inhabitants of Woensel were more than the passive bearers of a modernization process that took place in spite of them, as it were. We want to make visible how they actively involved themselves in this process and what changes resulted from this.⁹

It is obvious that this form of research bears a strong resemblance to anthropology, as this discipline is concerned with small-scale communities, lays stress on everyday life and focuses on the daily activities of the population. But the resemblance also extends to other aspects, such as the way in which things are described. Geertz's observation that anthropologists do not so much study villages as study *in* villages also goes for local history, in a certain sense.¹⁰ Anyone who encounters the same families and situations for years becomes familiar with them in the long run. The ups and downs of some or other family, the peculiarities of a certain person, the typical aspects of the local situation, memories of earlier events - as a result of this intensive contact with the local community one is bound to take part in its collective memory. And - consciously or unconsciously - one becomes involved in the tensions and conflicts that have occurred. Partly as a consequence of this the ideal of a 'thick description', cherished by certain anthropologists, comes within reach.¹¹

Finally, the object of anthropology and that of history are comparable in a philosophical sense. In both cases a search for the Otherness of the present culture is involved.¹² The fact that in order to do so the anthropologist covers a geographical distance, whereas the historian mainly bridges time, does not seem to be essential.¹³ Both types of research require a (temporary) suspension of one's own world view and demand a serious effort to comprehend acts and events in an alien world of experience. It is obvious that at the same time this alien world provokes all kinds of projections. Both cultures from the past and non-European cultures have often been seen as primitive stages of European civilization. These worlds are said to contrast with our culture through irrationality, illiteracy, closedness or violence. These cultures might just as well be the object of idealization, where the world of the savages or our ancestors is represented as better, unspoiled or in

equilibrium with nature. In fact, both evaluations are based on the same view: the difference with contemporary culture is emphasized in a positive or negative sense.¹⁴ That is why the historian easily recognizes the classical themes of anthropology, for instance, the sacred, the village community, the role of magic or ritual and, more generally, all phenomena which are repressed in the present culture. For the anthropologist, on the other hand, European history is familiar ground. In the peasant community, witchcraft, or cases of religious mania, he recognizes phenomena which have already been studied in illiterate cultures.¹⁵

However, it is not unnecessary to say that the Otherness of our own culture manifests itself in a different way in anthropology and history.¹⁶ It is too easy to say that the former discipline just studies the Otherness in a different place and the latter discipline at a different time, as space and time are not symmetrical entities. In this respect at least three aspects play a role. Firstly, we can easily detach ourselves from a culture which is not our own, whereas we are tied more strongly to our own cultural tradition. The past - however different it is - still strongly influences the present, whereas a different culture - even when it prevails - is rather experienced as an external one.¹⁷ Secondly, there is no reciprocity between us and the past - the dead do not reply - whereas, in principle, an exchange between contemporary cultures is not impossible.¹⁸ Thirdly - as Lacan once observed - a movement in space is often related to a narcissistic or aggressive motive, whereas time is tied to fear.¹⁹ This is quite essential for the meaning of Otherness, since in one case it is linked with death (history) and in the other case with domination (anthropology). Such differences warn us not to simply equate the objects of the two disciplines. Therefore we should rather speak about them as being analogous.

Sources and technique

As for the sources and the analytical techniques, anthropology and history show less resemblance. In the Woensel study I mainly studied governmental records (municipal and provincial records, judicial archives). The use of these sources has pros and cons. A disadvantage is that in most cases they offer an indirect view of peoples' lives. Documents from an administrative practice are rather formal. Moreover, the fact that the texts are written, whereas the majority of the people were illiterate for a long period, also leads to bias. Life in the eighteenth and the greater part of the nineteenth century is inevitably seen through the eyes of civil servants.²⁰ A further disadvantage has to do with the political situation. In the eighteenth century Brabant was directly governed from The Hague, with many local administrative functions being performed by Protestants and other 'strangers'. At the same time the use of governmental records also offers advantages, one of them being great continuity. After the rural areas of Brabant were definitively annexed into the Dutch Republic, elementary forms of taxation and registration were soon set up. As a result, crucial data on, for instance, the population or landowners are available from the end of the seventeenth century onwards. Another advantage is that the documents are usually very reliable.

It is this combination of pros and cons which makes the material so valuable. In the eighteenth-century sources, in particular, two distinct worlds converge, as it were. On the one hand the civil servants of the Republic, who start to gather information

systematically, set up an administration, see to the observance of the resolutions of the States General. In the illiterate, Catholic rural areas of Brabant they represent a modern, relatively enlightened bureaucracy. On the other hand the local population, who support themselves by means of highly unproductive farming, have no political affinity whatsoever with the Republic, still live in the dark ages of papistry. They embody pre-modern life which - certainly by the advanced areas of Holland - is considered backward. In a way the situation resembles that in the colonies where civil servants faced an unknown culture. In both situations the documents they framed are significant from an ethnographic viewpoint. The so-called *hoofdgeldkohieren* (poll tax lists) are a striking example. Although introduced very early, at the end of the seventeenth century, they contain a wealth of information on family life, which far outstrips the well-known nineteenth-century population registers in detail and precision. For the same reason the judicial sources of this period are priceless: they reveal a way of life which is very different from that in the civilized world of the day.²¹

The question of analytical techniques is closely related to the sources. Historical analysis is traditionally based on reading, not only in the trivial sense of the word (since most of the documents have a textual form) but also in a more specific sense. Critical analysis of the sources requires careful reflection, not only on the actual text, but also on the person who wrote it, the circumstances under which it was written and for what purpose, and on the relationship of a source to other sources (whether textual or not). In addition, I did quite a lot of calculations for my study. This was possible because many government documents contained figures or data that could be quantified. My calculations generally had two objectives. Firstly - whenever possible - to find a relationship between diverse indicators at a certain moment. For instance, the relationship between the size and composition of the household and factors such as social status, acreage of land, and age. Secondly we drew up chronological series for a variety of phenomena. This was feasible not just for agricultural or demographic processes but also for certain political developments and even for some cultural tendencies. Consequently we were able to determine fairly accurately at what moment the transition from the *Ancien Régime* to the modern period took place.

Comparing this to anthropology several major differences are immediately apparent. Whereas history is primarily based on analysis of records, anthropological information is mostly gathered during fieldwork. At least, this was the case until the nineteen sixties. Until then anthropologists usually stayed in a small community outside Europe for a year or more and gathered data by means of participant observation. On their return they wrote an ethnographic survey, in which the various data (relating to religion, politics, classifications, family relations) were linked together.²² The emphasis on fieldwork - which had a strong impact on the development of anthropology - was, of course, a result of the character of the societies that were studied. For illiterate cultures in particular "one has always been highly dependent on direct observation on the spot and the necessary prolonged stay among the people one studies..."²³ The lack of written sources makes an historical approach almost impossible.²⁴ It goes without saying that in such communities, too, the past is still at work, but mainly in the form of the customs or oral traditions existing at the moment of research. There is no independent source on the basis of which an analytic distinction between the present and the (remote) past can be made.

Consequently, all historical depth dissolves. The phenomenon of 'invented traditions' shows that this poses a serious problem.

Compared to the sources available to the anthropologist those of the historian appear rather poor. He is denied direct observation of the object. Even the researcher who studies a small-scale community for a long time will never know from his own experience what the voice of a central figure sounded like, how warm or cold it was at a certain moment, what smells and colours were characteristic of the landscape. He has to make the most of the paper remains of an archive, of fragments of a frozen language. The historian does not have the welcome aid of the fieldworker, who can turn to his informants for further explanation. This is one of the reasons why it is often difficult to say something about the meaning of an event or action in the past, not to mention the way in which it was experienced by the people involved. In order to reconstruct this meaning intimate knowledge of the context is required. But here, too, the sources are problematic. As a rule, the material is very fragmentary or incomplete and, what is more, often undeniably biased, so that it is difficult to find out what the culture as a whole looked like.²⁵

Against this 'poverty' the only advantage the historian has is chronological dating, by which he can render historical depth to the phenomena and facts he describes.

Yet I do not believe that there is a fundamental discrepancy between fieldwork and the study of records. The difference results from a practical situation - the question of whether there are written sources - and not from theoretical problems. Therefore both techniques can effectively be combined if the practical situation permits it. In the past twenty years this has been done increasingly. Anthropologists have discovered the value of records and make grateful use of critical instruments developed by historians. Historians, on their part, have broadened their observations.²⁶ In the wake of anthropologists they consult informants who are still alive (oral history) and make various use of non-written material. Briefly, under favourable circumstances the 'breadth' of anthropological observation can be complemented by temporal 'depth'. Historical research, on the other hand, is 'broadened' to a certain extent. Therefore the relationship between anthropology and history, at the level of techniques and resources, should be seen as complementary. By saying this we do not ignore the difference between the two disciplines, but emphasize the practical aspects of it. The importance of this difference is mainly dependent on the subject, the period, or the region in question.

Concepts and theory

Although I used various theories in my research, I consciously avoided aiming at an overall theory of modernization. Such attempts have mostly ended in an unhistorical juxtaposition of 'modern' and 'traditional' societies.²⁷ I also passed over reductionist theories which give primacy to one type of modernization - such as Marxism which sees economic changes as decisive. Instead I used a 'differential' approach, in which the economic, the political and the cultural history of Woensel are reconstructed separately in order to determine their interaction afterwards. All the same, in the analysis of separate fields theoretical concepts were positively useful. For instance, the demographic and economic situation could be analysed by means of Chayanov's theory on peasant

economy, while the theory on state-formation by Tilly could provide insight into a number of political phenomena in Brabant. For an analysis of the rural culture I took recourse to cultural anthropology (as will be shown below). In other words: theories or concepts from other disciplines than history may well be used, provided that one is aware of the fact that their use is restricted to specific problems and bound to limits of time and space.²⁸

The latter aspect also applies to the theoretical insights we have borrowed from anthropology. They mainly refer to ritual behaviour. Up until the nineteenth century the rural areas of Brabant had many rites of passage, as described by Van Gennep.²⁹ Both ethnographic literature and archives show that birth, wedding and death were widely celebrated. At these occasions collective meals and night-time disturbances played an important role. There were also forms of charivari, which can partly be interpreted as a reversal of the wedding ritual. A remarkable form was the so-called *taoffelen*, in which young people from the neighbourhood met after sunset for the symbolic punishment of a person who had violated the prevailing codes of married life. This was done by causing nightly disturbances and vandalizing the wrongdoer's house. This kind of symbolic behaviour also occurred at the time of political tensions. Moreover, there were numerous forms of violence in Brabant in which ritual fights played an important role. Following Turner I analysed all this by drawing distinctions between the sociological, ideological and syntactic aspects of ritual behavior.³⁰ Finally the whole complex of behaviour lent itself to a structural analysis in the sense of Lévi-Strauss. It appeared that, in a formal sense, the gestures in rites of passage, forms of charivari and ritual fights were all related. They also refer to certain gestures in fanning and to the division of labour between men and women. The symbolism of the human body and the bodily openings, as described by Douglas, played a central role in all of this.³¹

The question is whether such a structuralist interpretation of the rural culture is justified. In my case I had three positive arguments. Firstly, my objective was a reconstruction of the mental world in rural Brabant. This requires the portrayal of a coherent image, as I had also presented for the economic and political situation. However, the creation of such an image would have been impossible if I had neglected the often latent symbolism of fertility or honour and shame. Secondly, I do not believe that a structuralist interpretation can be applied always and everywhere. I use this method for a rural area (not for an urban culture) and for the *Ancien Régime*. I do not say that there is no cultural change in this period, but it certainly grew much more intensive afterwards.³² In a study dealing with the contrast between the *Ancien Régime* and the modern period, the old culture naturally assumes the relatively stagnant character of a 'cold' society. Thirdly, the historian naturally lags behind, and may even have an inborn reservation towards, recent developments in a different discipline. He will hesitate to adopt the latest trends in anthropology, wait and see whether new theories are generally accepted and, in anticipation of this, prefer to use more or less classical models that have proven valuable. Moreover, he has no objections to using 'dated' authors such as Durkheim, Mauss or Lévi-Strauss, because he knows that not all scientific developments are necessarily a form of progress.

With this last aspect we face a more general problem in the relationship between history and anthropology. In my view the two disciplines are conceptually or theoretically opposite to each other, for whereas the anthropologist subjects diachrony to the synchronic dimension, the historian does the opposite. This could be seen as a natural consequence of the difference between fieldwork and study of records, but basically it is a more fundamental issue. Anthropology as a scientific discipline developed as a reaction against nineteenth-century evolutionism. And so structural functionalism from the second quarter of our century had an unhistorical approach. "Society was regarded as a more or less timeless, integrated, organic whole, in which each custom, each institution, each section performed certain functions for the preservation of the larger entity which they were part of".³³ Structuralism, too, which flourished in the third quarter of our century, considered the temporal dimension of minor importance.³⁴ Nowadays - following the development of a certain 'historicization' of anthropology - the timeless models and concepts developed by ethnology are often criticized. But this does not mean that the objective of a systematic analysis is given up.³⁵ This is evident from typical anthropological tools such as the holistic and the comparative approach - two forms of theory that focus on the position of a phenomenon within the culture as a whole or on the mutual comparison of cultures, respectively, in which diachrony is disregarded.

There have been attempts to interpret the past in a similar way. Actually, one can always try to describe a certain period of cultural history in its own coherence. The work of Burkhardt or Huizinga (and, more recently, Schama) reminds us of the value of this approach.³⁵ Nevertheless, it is clear that the most typical aspects of history relate to chronology. In this respect, most researchers have a sceptical attitude towards historical 'causality'. They emphasize the unpredictable course of history in which individual, incidental or otherwise contingent factors always play a role. With all changeable factors, they focus on the temporal dimension of the process.³⁷

The fact that anthropology and history are contradictory at a conceptual level does not mean that their combination is impossible or unfruitful. On the contrary, in the past three decades we have seen a 'historicization' of anthropology and an 'anthropologization' of history which have proven to be extremely productive. However, this does not mean that the theoretical distinction between anthropology and history no longer exists. Quite the contrary. Whereas the former discipline concentrates on the typical nature of a (synchronic) system of meanings, the latter studies a (diachronic) process in which this system is used and/or changed.³⁸ Therefore a combination of anthropology and history has unequal effects for each of the two disciplines.³⁹ Consequently, the combination of both methods can be seen in two ways, dependent on the question which has been taken as the starting-point. One could start from the insights and more or less static models developed in anthropology, in order to use them in historical research. This approach has been successful in the past few decades, resulting in a range of new themes in history. However, one could also start from the historical approach in order to critically examine the concepts and models of anthropology. Following De Certeau I consider it the task of the historian to determine the boundaries beyond which an anthropological analysis becomes meaningless.⁴⁰ The fact that these models are 'timeless' does not mean that they can be used always and everywhere. For instance, the analysis of ritual violence presented above only applies within certain boundaries of time, space and social

environment. All this shows that anthropology and history do not only contrast with respect to their analytical methods, but also as to the effects of their mutual application.⁴¹

Conclusion

In summary, we think that the interaction of history and anthropology is characterized by three relationships. As for the nature of their objects, there is a certain *analogy* between the two disciplines. Both anthropology and history are concerned with the Otherness of the present culture, albeit that the former finds this otherness ‘elsewhere’ and the latter in the ‘past’. The disciplines are *complementary* at the level of the sources and the analytical techniques related to them. Whenever the practical situation permits, fieldwork and research of records complement each other perfectly well. As for concepts and models the disciplines show a *contrast*. Even under ideal circumstances the anthropologist primarily starts from a systematic approach, whereas the historian basically focuses on temporal development. In the diagram below these characteristics are summed up in a single key word, the last line referring to the mutual relationship between anthropology and history.

	object	sources	concepts
anthropology:	elsewhere	fieldwork	synchronic
history:	past	records	diachronic
relationship:	analogy	complement	contrast

Thus we can summarize the situation as it existed until about 1960. In this period - barring a few exceptions - both anthropological and historical research were carried out in the classical way. This changed drastically in the following period which was characterized by a mutual rapprochement between history and anthropology. It should be observed, however, that this approach started from anthropology and that history’s ‘reply’ only dates from the past decade.⁴²

On the part of anthropology, this change in course was primarily the result of a political process. Decolonization led to a shift in the object, namely a growing amount of research into peasant societies. This also resulted in a new theoretical approach, since peasant societies are indisputably part of a wider social development and - certainly in Europe - are not static or unhistorical. In its turn this shift resulted in an increasing interest in written sources and study of records. As a result of all this anthropology adopted an historical approach in the nineteen seventies and the structural-functionalist paradigm was heavily criticized.⁴³ Not that there is any unanimity on this point or that ‘historical anthropology’ is generally accepted as an independent specialism. But the majority of anthropologists do realize that questions relating to change and continuity are indispensable in almost all ethnographic studies.⁴⁴ As has been said before, the interest in an anthropological approach developed much later among historians and not until 1980 did there seem to be a real breakthrough. Again, various approaches were subsumed

under the banner of 'historical anthropology', though the distinction with prevailing social history was clear. In his well-known practical way Burke characterized the new approach in a few points.⁴⁵ Although the specific nature of this discipline remains a point of discussion up to this day, the interest of historians for anthropological questions and methods seems to be aroused and is unlikely to disappear quickly.

Can we now draw the conclusion that the distinction between the two disciplines makes no longer sense and is bound to disappear in the long run? An author like Damton has said exactly that and believes that history and anthropology will eventually merge.⁴⁶ I consider this both undesirable and naive. For although there is a certain convergence or mutual interest, one should be more aware of the unequal effects of this process on the two disciplines. Let us return to the diagram given above once more and point out that a 'historicization' of anthropology and an 'anthropologization' of history are by no means identical. The first amounts to a 'quantitative' extension of anthropology, which means that its sources and techniques are complemented by a new type (study of records), without the nature of its conceptual instruments being affected. As a consequence, the object of anthropology is also extended (historical depth), but without losing its specificity. The second process is completely different and leads to a 'qualitative' change in historical research. By this I mean that historians make use of new theoretical instruments ('timeless' concepts or models), without a fundamental change at the level of their sources or techniques. Consequently, their object is not only broadened but actually changed. The material is approached with completely new questions, which also sheds new light on old issues.⁴⁷

For various political, technical and theoretical reasons there will probably be an increasing convergence of anthropology and history.⁴⁸ So far this process has been productive, because the rapprochement has mainly taken place at the level of the sources and the research object - not at the theoretical level. I even believe that it is in the interest of both disciplines to maintain their fundamental differences at the level of concepts and models. If the distinction between the synchronic and the diachronic analysis becomes too vague, the combination of history and anthropology would no longer have an added value. And so this article ends with the somewhat paradoxical appeal of an historian to the discipline of anthropology to please continue with the development of timeless models and unhistorical concepts.

(translation: Jeske Nelissen)

Notes

1. This resulted in a dissertation which was defended at the University of Amsterdam in 1995: *De grote overgang. Een lokaal onderzoek naar de modernisering van het bestaan. Woensel 1670-1920*. A commercial edition of this book is forthcoming in 1996. See the review in this issue of *Focaal*.
2. A real discussion has not taken place as yet. According to Frijhoff (1992: 21) one of the reasons for this is "the way in which historians sometimes plunder cultural anthropology, by picking and choosing single elements that they like without

properly reflecting on the theoretical and methodological implications of anthropological methods”.

3. Levi (1991: 95-7); Revel (1989: xi).
4. Of course this does not mean that there is a separation of local and global processes. Referring to the example mentioned: the failure of a whole organ also affects the function of the cells, just like, conversely, a virus infection at cell level can destroy the whole organism. As regards methodology one could however say that historical and anthropological research at micro-level presupposes a thorough knowledge of global processes, whereas the opposite is less true.
5. Cf. Revel (1989: xxi).
6. Cf. Tilly (1984: 20, 25, 80).
7. Revel (1989: xii).
8. Cf. Certeau (1989a: 11-32, 77-97).
9. Ludtke (1989: 12-3).
10. Geertz (1973: 22).
11. Although concrete events and details are not meaningless, I believe they should primarily feature in the presentation or explanation of the research results. The research itself should not be dominated by such details (Cf. Vos 1994: 91).
12. Cf. Fabian (1990: 116-7) and Frijhoff (1992: 12).
13. Vos (1994: 78, 97), Kuiper (1989: 59).
14. Fabian (1990: 117-8).
15. Kuiper (1989: 50-1, 56-8).
16. Cf. Certeau (1989b: 209-10).
17. The radical adherents of relativism respectively post-modernism too easily ignore this.
18. Perhaps we had better say that the exchange with the past is always imaginary whereas that with other cultures can be both real and imaginary.
19. Lacan (1985: 184-7).
20. Ginzburg (1982: 13) draws attention to a similar problem.
21. This illustrates that the sources can only be used in the right way if they are seen in

the light of power relations.

22. Zwaan (1984: 73).

23. Blok (1980: 101).

24. Ibidem: 102.

25. Frijhoff (1992: 24-5, 37).

26. Kuiper (1989: 52).

27. A critical review is given by Wehler (1975).

28. This view opposes the 'shameless eclecticism' of the historians which has been criticized by Frijhoff (1992: 18).

29. Gennepe (1977).

30. Turner (1977: 186, 190) as well as Turner (1962: 125, 172-3).

31. Douglas (1976 and 1973).

32. This dynamic has been described in detail in Rooijackers (1994). However, it is no accident that this study does not deal with the period after 1853. In spite of all changes popular culture in Brabant may be considered fairly stable until this point, but afterwards it is transformed significantly.

33. Blok (1980: 102). See further Kuiper (1989: 53).

34. It goes without saying that this only applies to the paradigm of 'classical' anthropology, which was dominant until 1960. Nevertheless there have always been undercurrents, such as the work by Wolf shows, see Schneider and Rapp (1995).

35. Blok (1980: 105-7).

36. Burke (1988: 15-7).

37. Frijhoff (1992: 15).

38. Frijhoff (1992: 33 and further 25-6, 31-2) and Vos (1994: 94-5).

39. Locher (1983:49), too, draws attention to this.

40. Cf. Certeau (1988b: 79-82).

41. I therefore agree with the view (of the editors) that 'anthropological history' and 'historical anthropology' are two distinct paradigms.

42. Vos (1994: 81).
43. According to Zwaan (1984: 69-70, 73-4). See further Blok (1980: 101-2).
44. Kuiper (1989: 53-5).
45. Burke (1988: 15-6).
46. Kuiper (1989: 59).
47. Vos (1994: 90).
48. Zwaan (1984: 78-9).

References

- Blok, A. 1980. Inleiding. *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis*, 6: pp. 101-11.
- Burke, P. 1988. *Stadscultuur in Italië tussen renaissance en barok*. Amsterdam: Contact.
- Certeau, M. de 1988a. *Kunst des Handelns*. Berlin: Merve.
- Certeau, M. de 1988b. *The writing of history*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Douglas, M. 1973. *Natural symbols. Explorations in cosmology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books
- Douglas, M. 1976. *Reinheid en gevaar*. Utrecht/Antwerpen: Het Spectrum
- Fabian, J. 1990. Cultuur, tijd en het object van de antropologie. In: R. Corbey et al. (eds.), *Natuur en cultuur. Beschouwingen op het raakvlak van antropologie en filosofie*. Baam: Ambo: pp. 110- 26.
- Frijhoff, W. 1992. Inleiding: historische antropologie. In: P. te Boekhorst et al. (eds.), *Cultuur en maatschappij in Nederland 1500-1850. Een historisch-antropologisch perspectief*. Meppel/ Amsterdam: Boom: pp. 11-48.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures. Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gennep, A. van 1977. *The rites of passage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ginzburg, C. 1982. *De kaas en de wormen. Het wereldbeeld van een zeventiende-eeuwse molenaar*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Kuiper, Y. 1989. Antropologie en geschiedenis. In: P. de Vries et al. (eds.), *Geschiedenis buiten de perken. De waarde van de geschiedwetenschap voor andere wetenschappen, politiek en beleid en cultuur*. Leiden: Stichting Leidschrift: pp. 49-61.

- Lacan, J. 1985. De agressiviteit in de psychoanalyse. *Te Elfder Ure* 36. *Psychoanalyse* 2. *Agressiviteit en narcisme*, 28(1): pp. 167-87.
- Levi, G. 1991. On microhistory. In: P. Burke (ed.), 48 *New perspectives on historical writing*. Oxford: Polity Press: pp. 93-113.
- Locher, G. 1983. Over antropologie en geschiedenis. *Theoretische Geschiedenis*, 10: pp. 49-63.
- Lüdtké, A. 1989. (ed.), *Alltagsgeschichte. Zur Rekonstruktion historischer Erfahrungen und Lebensweisen*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Revel, J. 1989. L'histoire au ras du sol. In: G. Levi, *Le pouvoir au village. Histoire d'un exorciste dans le Piémont du XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Gallimard: pp. i-xxxiii.
- Rooijackers, G. 1994. *Rituele repertoires. Volkscultuur in oostelijk Noord-Brabant 1559-1853*. Nijmegen: SUN.
- Schneider J. & R. Rapp (eds.) 1995. *Articulating hidden histories. Exploring the influence of Eric R. Wolf*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tilly, C. 1984. *Big structures, large processes, huge comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Turner, V. 1962. Three symbols of 'passage' in Ndembu circumcision ritual: an interpretation. In: D. Forde et al. (eds.), *Essays on the ritual of social relations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press: pp. 124-73.
- Turner, V. 1977. Symbols in African ritual. In: J. Dolgin et al. (eds.), *Symbolic anthropology. A reader in the study of symbols and meanings*. New York: Columbia University Press: pp. 183- 94.
- Vos, J. 1994. Historische antropologie: een plaatsbepaling. *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis*, 20(1): pp. 77-98.
- Wehler, H. 1975. *Modernisierungstheorie und Geschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zwaan, T. 1984. Sociologie, antropologie en geschiedenis. Recente ontwikkelingen in Nederland. *Skript*, VI: pp. 69-82.