PARATEXT IN MALINOWSKI'S PREFACES

• MAJA ALEXANDRA NAZARUK •

ABSTRACT

The author argues that paratextual aspects of preface-building permit anthropologists to construct a deep-structure foundation to their work. The textual evidence reveals undisclosed information about the genesis of anthropological texts. Anchored in participant observation in native society (praxis derived from a social and cultural dimension), these texts open up the potential for the explosion of the *signans-signatum.* By this, the author refers to the ability of these texts to enable a dialogue concerning an anthropology of meaning—a cultural worldview with roots in writing and semiology –which these case studies illustrate. In this spirit, the essay focuses on Malinowski's prefaces to the works of his students and colleagues, understood as scriptural artefacts of the works and lives of anthropologists (cf. Geertz 1988). In these texts, the import of external judgment is evaluated for its influence on monograph genesis, showing premeditated personal involvement, foreshadowing from afar the objectivity-subjectivity debate. The essay reconstitutes disciplinary history.

Keywords: Malinowski, paratext, littérarité, semiotics, intersubjectivity, monograph-genesis, history of anthropology

Introducing paratextual literature

This essay establishes a framework which illustrates how paratexts provide leads into works of other people, thereby introducing novel social ideas, accounting, among other things, for their ability to build intricate social relationships and attribute privilege. By postulating the applicability and instrumentality of newly acquired data in the field, these paratextual aspects inscribe works thus signed into the multiple master-narratives within discourse, shaping forever the advancement of knowledge and world view. By addressing the culture content of the paratext, the emphasis is shifted in this essay towards culture studies, beyond the scope of the mechanics of language and literature, to which this device fundamentally belongs. The denotative function of language is privileged over the surface structures of semiotics. The prefaces discussed have concertedly expressed Malinowski's human understanding and highly articulated sense of subjectivity in a global way: each paratext represents a different regional coverage. If Malinowski is the champion of subjectivity, then the preface is indeed the first incision of this subjectivity in the written manuscript.

The discussion will be validated by proofs from six prefaces written by Malinowski, some of them on behalf of theses defended at the London School of Economics (LSE) and others for which Malinowski crafted prefaces, which have hitherto not been footnoted in

the critical literature, signifying an important lacuna in Malinowski studies. The intent behind this essay is to reveal the content value of these prefaces and discuss ramifications. Paratext, it is shown, is an armed tool in guiding social inquiry.

Reading Bronislaw Malinowski's texts, one meets two *sous-genres* of literary writing: the diary with its intimate self-explorative, self-reflexive aspect, and the monographs with their more dogmatic underpinnings supported by visuals (self-portraits taken in the Trobriand Islands enriched by descriptions of indigenous life and first contact). One element which has been left out studies about Malinowski's work concerns the paratextual aspects of his texts. In this essay, an understanding of the fundamental questions underscoring preface development is formulated through a survey of texts Malinowski drafted in support of up and coming authors who benefited from his endorsement, some of whom had been former students at the LSE.

I postulate that these transient moments of *action engagée* through penmanship are foundational elements of Malinowski's work and pedagogy. United in printed commentaries, prefaces are driven by the pressure of responding to academic, cultural, social, historical, and political priorities. In line with Malinowski's fieldwork method, by getting involved in heterogeneous themes and addressing works on a wide array of subjects, Malinowski becomes a 'participant observer' via his deployment of telling critique. In the following, I demonstrate the utility of the preface (functional, social, political), and discuss the literary aspects of this practice, bringing to light a range of unexplored source material. I begin by discussing Malinowski's writing as a literary practice at the level of anthropologists such as Clifford Geertz (1988: 73–102), Harry Payne (1981: 416–440), Robert Thornton (1985: 7–14), Renée Sylvain (1996: 21–45), Andrzej Paluch (Paluch and Flis [eds] 1985), Grazyna Kubica (Kubica et al. [eds] 1990), and Andrzej Flis (1988).

Definitions

Paratext is defined by Gérard Genette (1987) as the ensemble of structures surrounding the main text, composed of titles, prefaces, *dédicaces*, exergues, notes, insertions and prologues which make up the editorial and pragmatic aspect of a literary text, including the privileged place of its relation to the public and through it to the world (on paratext, see, e.g., Barnett [ed.] 2010; Collins and Skover 1992; Tötösy de Zepetnek 1993). The preface constitutes a part which Genette calls the *peritext* while the *epitext* contains interviews, correspondence, or diaries which might be annexed to the text, or that which comes after. However, Genette's typology is inflexible: he sums them all up as textual strategies used to advance the thesis of a text.

Cross-disciplinary applications

To study Malinowski's prefaces requires a curiosity in a plethora of issues and social puzzles such as paternity, incest, sex, economic relations, and faraway native contexts. The deployment of 'surface structures' becomes a function of a wild, flamboyant background

inspired by the search for humankind's heritage edified and projected through ethno-speech. An analysis of literary functions of Malinowski's texts reveals his person in-process as he was formulating ideas, thereby providing insight into his cognitive appeal. I analyze how these translations and transliterations of thinking-in-process modulate his inner core and become advanced, enhanced and developed through 're-writing' (*réécriture*), marking episodes of a search for a sense of self, their denouement achieved through personal biography, as well as the hidden underlying 'soul' of the person beneath the categories of analysis.

The study of the preface is important because it paves the way into subject matter. It articulates the surface mechanics of the genesis of ideas and drives an insertion into a work by an insider who validates the anatomy of a work. It appears to be a simple structure with a lead statement developed around a *problématique* with an interior economy. The preface offers the first glimpse into a text and offers the first opportunity for communicative self-assertion. The preface constructs the intertextuality of the text by appending to it a framework of points of reference. New codes are established by this dialogue and the meaning of the original text is altered and mediated. Intersubjectivity is not lost in the case of the constitution of the preface and main text because the strong presence of the author of the preface is what invites the reader to pursue the quest of deciphering a manuscript. We are constantly reminded of the presence of the author of the text.

Intersubjectivity and intertextuality co-exist together in the relationship of preface and text. This is explained by Roland Barthes' thesis (1970) that the complex network of texts invoked in the reading process acquires new meaning and opens new possibilities for interpretation: one reads a text not in relation to the text only, but in relation to the framework in which it is presented. Barthes' ideas shaped the openness for interpretation of texts between writing and reading literature, including prefaces, which are constructed to produce several layered meanings of signification in so far as their public is varied, and also inherently because each element of their constitution carries a unique but polyphonic pitch that sometimes falls upon deaf ears.

In contrast to Barthes's open-ended ideas about transtextuality formation, the textual space called paratext is what Genette uses to address as 'transtextuality' and its associated terms of intertextuality, hypertextuality, metatextuality, and architextuality (Genette 1987: 198). The echoes, which resonate through Malinowski's work, are dialogical in a Bakhtinian sense and polyphonic. Malinowski's contribution to scholarship—in its durability (in its 'scientific revolution' in the sense of Thomas Kuhn's concept of 'paradigm shift' [1962])—becomes all-pervasive and stands the test and limits of time. His name alone is the signifier of this epoch of transcendence, becoming a thread in the tissue that is text—that is, Barthes's definition of text based on medieval interpretations of *textus*—and associated terms of fieldwork, participant observation, travelogue, personal journal, and functionalism. Malinowski has used the 'self' as a trampoline to infiltrate other discourses; his layers of meaning cut across boundaries of language, history, political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychoanalysis.

The ethnographic preface functions as a pedagogical and informative short text, which opens a cultural agenda into an array of unexamined social aspects. It creates emphasis and couches arguments for the consumption of readers. The horizon of expectations is shifted from surface-structures (literary aspects, language, communication) to deep

structures of meaning construction (seeds of ideas linked to humanities and social sciences scholarship, where anthropology is established on par with her bigger sister, sociology). These two levels of comprehending reality are interbred and produce a 'culture-context' of their own, as well as a discourse, out of which emerge hybrid concepts of humanity. The preface is a mark of a signature on an information parcel and is often authenticated with a real signing of the text.

Studying the preface as paratext is also important from a perspective of we/they cleavages; it is clear that in following a preface the scholar becomes co-opted as part of the 'we' subgroup in defence of a consortium of academic values, the preface being the material testament to his maturity and the beginning of his new, open-ended rite of passage. In this sense, the preface is a sort of validation of participation in the community, a license to perform one's work in a given cultural community. The paratextual aspects of preface-building are a testing ground for the analysis of an author's acumen, ability to adapt to sensitive subject matters, and expression of social relations (merit based association) with the incumbent. Preface writing has a sort of influence akin to social networking and represents the space—which envelops and extends the text—where the relationship between author and reader is established and negotiated: it is informative in value and function. It posits the existence of 'markers' which deploy typographical and iconographical signs used in the communication inherent in the hermeneutic process. It goes without saying that the paratext establishes a sort of autobiographical 'pact' with the implied reader (see Lejeune 1996)—it represents a set of instructions based on relating facts extracted from truth-events, unlike in fiction; all of its literature is based on self-narrating accounts in-process, of reality.

Relationship between writer and preface-author

I would like now to make a turn and argue that the relationship between the writer and the preface-author resembles what has emerged in post-colonial literature as the concept of the '*khamessat*'. Bourdieu points out in *The Algerians* (Bourdieu 1962 [1958]: 78–79) that agricultural workers at times call for the advantages of the *khamessat*, a payment in kind, an 'advance'. The literary pact is an embodiment of *khamessat*: an arrangement between author and reader, and between reader and reader, based on 'fidelity'. My argument presupposes that the relationship between the author of a text and preface-writer very much resembles the *khamessat*, insofar are as the elements of a master and slave dialectic are concerned, underpinned by a sort of debt. There is no abstract discipline or specific sanction; the pact is maintained and supported by pride and the fear of reprobation: 'the tenant remains faithful to the master. A consummate model of man's relation to man' (Verdes-Leroux 2001: 154). To understand the pact between the implied servant and master and its applicability to Malinowski or any other writer who puts his soul up for criticism, I take the definition of *khamessat* by Ines Mrad Dali who writes:

> The *khammes* (pl. *khamessa*) is most often a man who needs to get some immediate money to repay a debt or make a purchase urgently. He contacts a landowner and makes a mutual commitment which remains verbal and is regulated by the custom of the place, obtaining a lump sum of money.

> In exchange, he agrees to work for the landowner. From this point, the *khammes* cannot leave this job without having paid the debt. The owner shall provide a field, seeds, draft animals and cash. These advances constitute the *sarmia* and lead to increasing the debt of the *khammes*. To fulfill the agreement, the *khammes* is required to perform all the work in the field, except for the harvest, for which the owner provides auxiliaries. The owner deducts the amount of the harvest *sarmia*, and debt payable from the *khammes*. Once the levy imposed on the *khammes* is paid, the latter receives a part of the harvest, as remuneration for his work (typically one fifth). With these two allotments, the fellah becomes the owner of the harvest's surplus. (Dali 2005: 180; unless indicated otherwise, all translations are the author's).

Dali projects that a person takes on a debt to perform a job and has to honour the pact by sharing honestly the gains in a forthright agreement. He can benefit from the debt by increasing his wealth, but he always owes the master for having shared the fieldwork with him (in the case of student and master in academia, this *sarmia* (debt) represents knowledge and academic know-how and strategies). This metaphor can be applied to the writer's pact with those to whom he feels sufficiently indebted to to be stimulated to compose his (sincere) lines.

These figures can work in the direction of Teacher-to-Student relationship (Fei, Richards and Kenyatta) or Individual-to-Individual book (similar is the case of the Cassubia book by Lorentz et al.). Debt is something negotiated between actors in the literary sense. It should not be misconstrued for profit to be made on the writing of the preface (even though it has been postulated that Malinowski received up to 250 guineas per preface on occasion), as has been suggested by some critics. Debt is a form of rapport in anthropological affairs, be it expressed as a form of kindness, favour etc.

In essence, we could say that writing a preface is the release of some sort of debt (incomplete work in exchange for the wealth of incommensurate *savoir*) which requires honouring a pact of transparency driven by pride. The master bestows upon the debtor the property (intellectual) which will free him from his position of being 'oppressed' (i.e., being a debtor), but it is through the pact of sharing in honesty and faith in the other that the writer will be able to repay him by first working on his field, then moving to collect a surplus of the harvest for himself. The preface writer is the master who frees the *khammes* from his work in the field and releases him into the world of independence upon repaying the *sarmia* upon which time he can now compose for his own tastes and requirements, as well as harvest his own crops, in his own lot. There is a promise of freedom once the work is terminated.

The meaning of this powerful exchange consists of the unmistaken ability of the affects involved: to get involved in this forthright pact requires a mental leap of faith in the other and commeasurable confidence in oneself. The promise of freedom guarantees one's place in society allowing the labourer to join the ranks of his master as opposed to experiencing negativity as an oppressed subject. There is in this formula agency and a promise of overcoming one's nihilistic condition. This interpretation assumes the debt between a writer and his preface-author and applies most of all to the Student-Teacher relationship; however to the detriment of my argument, it does not necessarily justify the case of the entire corpus of twenty prefaces, introductions and commentaries which Malinowski has written. It goes without saying, however, that someone owed him one for the act of

kindness which he showed in extending his hand in help, or, as the case may be, as a form of assertion of self-interest.

Beyond material property shared, the master shares a unique contribution of intellectual wealth. The 'preface' is the last step in sharing the master's acumen to realize the student's independence, his (public) release into the savage world, the stamp on the act. In this context, paratextual components such as the preface are written by a master for his student or intellectual ally as a form of introduction into the intellectual milieu. The preface is a form which honours and edifies the pact to which Dali refers. The preface is an open-ended articulation and lively celebration of this pact and a marker of a coming of age and coming-into-the world of a new persona. The preface represents a culminating point of the pact: the final embodiment of the two-way trust that qualifies the relationship despite the hierarchical difference between master and the writer. A preface is a text annexed before the main text, a sort of introduction highlighting the main ideas expressed in the text. The paratext 'makes present' and introduces the future text, assuring its place in the world, providing a sort of guarantee for its subsistence, if not brilliance. The preface is, however, more than a literary requirement, it has a political value: by developing it, the author extends support to the incumbent by applauding his/her excellent abilities and promoting this work among equivalent works.

It is hard to find a preface which denigrates a work unless it is done to extend a more elaborate argument in favour of the person who has written the book. In some cases, however—as in the case of Malinowski—we can expect salient criticism of the work (as an expression of the pre-established ex-centrism and radical opinion of the writer), which announces the apparition of a newcomer into the ring. The stronger the criticism, the stronger felt is the intimate co-option into the inner circle of political power in the sense that it is based on a process of psycho-dynamics, which develops out of the confrontation of new ideas and mediation of world views. Resolved confrontation, scission lead to intimacy. They are testament to the rigid opposition which the co-opted brother received in his adamant fight for his independent position. This fact creates the fabric of the give-in-and-out relationship and the vociferous antagonisms of apprehending alterity. While this reasoning is limited and does not explain all the cases, there is always some sense of debt which goes unaccounted for even those cases where the relationship is more individual-to-individual, rather than only student-to-teacher. Anthropology is 'business as usual', ruled by relationships of power, in which debt is a primordial element.

Let us take this up by a close reading of Malinowski's prefaces.

Jomo Kenyatta and state-building in Kenya

As an introduction to his work, it should be said that Kenyatta, originating from the Kikuyu tribe, later became Kenya's first president. The cultural monograph which constituted a political agenda for his government was a revisionist critique of colonialism and had been crafted in Bronislaw Malinowski's anthropology seminar at the London School of Economics. The monograph depicted social and cultural life in Kenya before seizure by the foreign governments, to which Kenyans had been subservient under colonial ties. The analysis attacks colonial governments for their attack on African communal property

and dispersion of social and cultural life, reducing the social fabric of Kenya to ruins and serfdom. The decay and the dissolution of social structures under oppressive regimes are shown against the backdrop of a story of intercultural exploitation and oppression.

The dynamic of give and take strife, mentioned above with regards the friction between student and master, is demonstrated within the harsh criticism that Malinowski employs to demonstrate that Jomo Kenyatta is indeed, despite challenges, a qualified candidate for the discipline. A strategy is used in the paratext to *Facing Mount Kenya: The Tribal Life of the Gikuyu* (Kenyatta 1938), which legitimizes a weakness and turns it around to promote it as a point of strength. For example, we witness Malinowski accusing Jomo Kenyatta of Eurocentrism by thrusting concepts of 'state', 'sovereignty', and 'Church' onto African tribesmen (Malinowski in Kenyatta 1938: xi). Malinowski develops the deconstruction of Kenyatta's allegedly faulty presuppositions in the following passage:

> There is a little too much in some passages of European bias. I might have been tempted to advise the writer to be more careful in using such antitheses as 'collective' v. 'individual' in opposing the native outlook as 'essentially social' to the European 'essentially personal'. At many points unnecessary comparisons are introduced and European expressions such as Church, State, 'legal system', 'economics' etc are used with somewhat superfluous implications. When we read of a 'woman specialist…who has studied a form of surgery from childhood', and who performs an operation 'with the dexterity of a Harley Street surgeon', the picture is amusing but not helpful. I am not aware that a Harley Street specialist had ever been placed side by side with the old Gikuu practitioner to be compared with her. Principles of aepsis are certainly not prominent in the ritual surgery of any African tribe. (Malinowski in Kenyatta 1938: xi)

This passage shows that by providing a deconstruction of Kenyatta, in the form of criticism, Malinowski actually enhances the endorsement of his student by strengthening his own perception of the latter's academic success. A preface which only sang praise would be cheap. This preface moreover gives an insight onto the depth of inquiry carried out in the field and the intricacy of the value-laden decision making which has to be undergone in order to produce theory. This criticism offers a carrot in that it provides an acute examination of participation and/or detachment in fieldwork. While it exposes the reality of a shortcoming, it reveals a deeper reality inherent in research making and advances the 'state of affairs' within the discipline.

Malinowski emphasizes the need for honesty in research and the dangers of one's own bias (Malinowski in Kenyatta 1938: ix). To this end, he notices that Kenyatta is a Native describing the situation of Natives, which pushes him to experience the tragedy of modern world in a doubly acute manner. Malinowski emphasizes that Kenyatta's work is far from reflecting the reputation of Africans as agitators (another stereotype). Overall, the Polish globetrotter provides a balanced perspective that is sensible but substantial. Malinowski is attracted to the human drama which constructs the biography of his students and one feels Kenyatta's difficulty in circumscribing his precarious position of tension.

It is necessary to say that Malinowksi himself is plagued with a tension regarding his own taboos and that he transfers his tribulations onto his students. Malinowski warns that sometimes psychoanalysts suffer from worse conditions than their patients (Malinowski in Kenyatta 1938: vii). For instance, my doctoral research currently in progress at the University of Montreal shows that despite his systematic work in the Trobriands, he

made confessions containing prejudice and one-sidedness in his personal diary about his subjects of study. His *carnet intime* represented his subjectivity and uttermost self insofar as it was written in his mother tongue; thus the language of his mother and civilisation. In the diary epithets like 'I am fed up with the Niggers and work' (Polish: '*Czuje sie fed up—znudzony—niggrami I praca*') emerge repeatedly in reference to the local indigenous people (Malinowski 2002: 514 [17 Dec. 1917]). This evidence demonstrates that in spite of his presumed quest for fairness and academic objectivity, in his intimate writings he expressed his bias.

This illustrates that Malinowski was conscious of himself being biased and therefore applied a critical eye towards others applying the same constructs and filters onto language research, because he had first-hand experience of the application of self-enforced stereotype to research. Just as he is aware of the potential of applying bias to research through his own experience, he was of course aware of the potential of partiality towards research on the grounds of in-group adherence as is the case with Kenyatta. The vulnerability to bias emerges out of this precarious context. It is not a logical derivate but something which results from an intricate web of social interactions, ethics and personal choices. Malinowski singled out Kenyatta in order to touch the tip of the iceberg of a greater problem which he felt was important in methodology.

Being a subject who studies subjects in a system where 'might is right' in the face of 'bluff and impudence' (Malinowski in Kenyatta 1938: ix) requires an ability to withdraw from one's in-group and choose an exit strategy to look beyond the boundaries of 'self' while being at the same time deeply involved with its intimate underpinnings. Kenyatta's overlapping identities force him to adopt the linguistic strategies of the 'conqueror' and Malinowski accuses him of adopting a Eurocentric bias in his analysis by pressing for the use of Eurocentric terminology and casts on language. According to Malinowski, this damages the research by imprisoning the data in new categories which do not relate to first-hand data from the field. The problem is that cultural equivalence and the study of African peoples cannot be achieved by applying British imperial and bourgeois values which risk the application of superfluous similes to colonial contexts.

One testing ground for the cultural equivalence is faith. Malinowski scrutinizes the assault on magic—defined as the possibility of penetrating the mental mechanisms of others in occultism and telepathy or spiritism—by revealing the fact that Europeans cannot criticize these practices, being themselves captured by deceit of faith in Hitler as god, the omniscience of Stalin, or cabinet ministers who believe in Christian science, which is a commentary on cultural relativism and pokes holes in the legitimacy of some episodes of human collective behaviour in European master narratives. Furthermore he tests cultural equivalence reached through reflexivity which is understood as the ability to reflect upon oneself, to be self-critical in a vertical way, as if one were looking in one's own looking-glass reflection. In the case of Kenyatta and Xiaotong Fei, Malinowski writes that they are Natives studying their own anthropological condition, meaning that they belonged to the in-group which they were trying to study as out-group members, giving them a double position of power and vulnerability:

> We have to recognize the fact that an African who looks at things from the tribal point of view and at the same time from that of Western civilization, experiences the tragedy of the modern world in an especially acute manner. (Malinowski in Kenyatta 1938: ix)

Malinowski's use of the adjective 'acute' breaks down the concept into something affective which influenced soul and mind. Being a participant observer in one's own tribe was also selling out its secrets to the outside, building fame based on trading inside knowledge of perceived difference, by appealing to the Eurocentric masters. Malinowski develops this point with some of his other students, namely Xiaotong Fei, which I consider in the following analysis.

Xiaotong Fei in an autobiographical move from China

Xiaotong Fei creates a monograph which epitomizes the transformation of Chinese traditional culture under influence from the West, by bolstering his arguments with data collected in the field across a number of villages during the 1930s. Fei's analysis of village economy had convinced him that rural industry was needed to supplement agricultural earnings. He exerted his influence by stimulating the government to promote rural industry which spread through China in the 1980s. Fei had great public acclaim, with regular coverage in the news and media, extensive global travel—from Canada to Japan to Australia—and numerous distinctions such as the Malinowski Award of the Society for Applied Anthropology, the Huxley Memorial Medal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, an honorary doctorate from the University of Hong Kong, and other honours in Japan, the Philippines, and Canada. Among other things, Fei spearheaded a rigorous emphasis on education in sociology and anthropology in China, offering training and developing teaching resources after numerous bans by the Communist establishment.

Malinowski further advances the argument of the challenges of double-adherence to the camp of Master and Conquered Man when he elaborates in the preface to Xiaotong Fei's *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley:*

> This book is not written by an outsider looking out for exotic impressions in a strange land; it contains observations carried on by a citizen upon his own people. It is a result of a work done by a native among natives. If it be true that self-knowledge is the most difficult to gain, then undoubtedly an anthropology of one's own people is the most arduous, but also the most valuable achievement of a fieldworker. (Malinowski in Xiaotong 1938: xiii)

Malinowski's comments on prejudice and racism are an echo of the period in which they were drafted. For example, about Fei, he wrote—surprised—that Fei shows no animosity towards the Japanese, but rather an eager interest in producing balanced perspectives in examining the self-in-process and self-turning-back onto oneself, as a sort of ontological process:

> There is no hatred even of the Japanese people. On the first page of this book the Author refers to the invading country only in terms of dispassionate appreciation of its role in consolidating the Chinese nation and forcing it to build up a united front, and to readjust some of its fundamental problems, economic or social. (Malinowski in Xiaotong 1938: xx)

This comment seems ludicrous in today's social milieu in anthropology and elsewhere but shows Malinowski's flexibility in dealing with the Other, in spite of the limitations placed

upon an open-ended discussion of otherness and fair treatment. In addition, it appears that Malinowski expresses his understanding of the prejudice, which he voices in this way, by triumphantly undoing the stacked pyramid of cards, to endorse subaltern candidates. The preface is the ultimate way in which he can extend his alliance with the Other, and de-Other his reductionist-glance.

The self-other dichotomy concerns not only these personalized experiences of victimhood, but also the violent coercion of self against other, as has been the case of China in its transformation under Western impact. Progress, technology, and advancement procure stability, but leave behind a path of shadows and corpses. The Chinese self has to be renegotiated, to make way for a new identity, one that reconstructs the fragile 'I' (and 'eye') of the community. The upshot is the formation of new identities which transcend this situation through a violent historical process and rewriting of narrative. We can only echo the writer's prophetic desire that in the ruin of that village and many others, 'the internal conflicts and follies should find their resting-place' and that 'from the ruin a new China shall emerge' (Malinowski in Xiaotong 1938: xx).

The new reality comes at a cost; it signifies a reconciliation with grief over loss—a source of inspirational nostalgia which occurs in the village of Kaihsienkung, with its serene beauty a unit of analysis for scholarship. Malinowski's description of this drama of social and cultural change contradicting old foundations encourages him to discuss its poetic qualities: its pastoral and romantic layout with its 'streams, bridges, temples, rice fields and mulberry trees' (Malinowski in Xioatong 1938: xiii). Thus, Malinowski also addresses the weakness and lack of unity and gradual whittling down of honour in comparison to degrading European sentiments and emphasizes the need for anthropology. By becoming acquainted with the life of a small village or of a people, according to Malinowski, the anthropologist studies mankind under a microscope, as it were. Malinowski's closing statement is that 'anthropology to me at least was a romantic escape from our over-standardized culture' (Malinowski in Xiaotong 1938: xv). These literary outputs express the way in which anthropologists extend themselves into external spaces of culture, which are antecedents of our present and nostalgic of past times. As can be seen then, the paratext gives shape to a large undefined 'space' (intellectual, social, cultural *espace*) where identity is being examined, played out, lived and negotiated.

Audrey Richards and the anthropology of food

Audrey Richards was also Malinowski's student at the LSE, where she obtained her doctorate in 1931. Richards' fieldworks included Zambia, the Transvaal region of South Africa, and Uganda. In *Hunger and Work in a Savage Tribe* (1932), Richards proposes a thesis on food and eating with regard to its production, economy, and consumption along with related cultural practices and customs. Malinowski's introduction to this work is pedantically humorous when he mentions that Richards fills the gap in an area which represents the most important field of study in humanity's chronology after sex. Malinowski's puns concern the importance of food over libido and he scolds himself for over-analyzing the latter, thus proving that these two impulses are the two driving forces of humanity; furthermore this can be proved by psychoanalysis on the grounds

that our habits are acquired during childhood: 'Nutrition as a biological process is more fundamental than sex' (Malinowski in Richards 1932: x). Clearly, food is important, but I am driven to ask why Malinowski does not attach any importance to hunger as an expression of poverty. The way I read it, there is no grassroots awakening in Malinowski's statements. His colonial perspective keeps the slaves hungry in their position and does not address basic human needs theory, at least not in this preface (although Raymond Firth writes on this topic in his work on Malinowski, *Man and Culture* [see Firth 1957]).

A more succinct statement follows. Namely, Malinowski claims that food is the province of the economist: the history of the formation of human values, development and cooperation of labour, early forms of capitalism, and exchange are its bi-products and he emphasizes that it is necessary to study nutrition in order to gain access into these much under-studied areas (Richards: vii–xvi). This paratext makes the ordinary appear to be extraordinary.

Lorentz et al. and the politics of nationalism

Malinowski's preface to a book titled *Cassubian Civilization* (Lorentz et al. 1935) offers an instance where the preface author likens himself to the native autoethnographer. Kashubia or Cassubia (in Polish *Kaszuby*, in German *Kaschubei, Kaschubien*) is a culture and language in the historic region of eastern Pomerania of north-western Poland. Located west of Gdańsk and the mouth of the Vistula River around the Danzig corridor, it is inhabited by members of the Kashubian people. The reason for Malinowski's interest in Kashubia lies in its relative cultural and linguistic independence in the face of centuries of German oppression. The cultural overlap of national cultures (Germans to the West and Russians to the East) prevented the establishment of political structures which would feed the desire of its people for autonomy. Malinowski thought that pre-World War I Austria-Hungary offered the best policies of a federal constitution that addressed the minority problem. In fact, he made the suggestion that Cassubia's government was a model of a miniature League of Nations prior to the latter's creation. The reasons for the horrors of European nationalism lay in the fact that it was subject to two incompatible sorts of grouping: culture and language, which defied forming the nation as political organization, as a state. The failure of the state consisted of its use of untenable force to control loyalty, irrespective of national sentiments (Malinowski in Lorentz et al. 1935: v–xii).

In *Cassubian Civilization*, Malinowski's prefaces contribute to the construction of a liminal subject and intellectual hermit. It is possible to extract conclusions from the preface concerning the identity of anthropologists, who like Persian carpet merchants, classify and archive mosaic tapestries of hybrid experience in the palace of the text-imbedded intertextual intimate self. The paratextual veil of the preface represents one layer of such archi-text, a screen into a larger web of worlds within worlds. Malinowski's prefaces cover vast geographical areas and call for an exceptional sense of imagination and ability to 'feel' otherness, as well as construct cultural worlds around skeletons of concrete (field generated, utilitarian) data to make them alive and allow for the possibility of classification. By extending his criticism of these texts, Malinowski relates to the subject areas at hand through previous contact experience.

Malinowski's zealous engagement in and passion for the topic—nationalism and plight of self-determination of a minority group—are also an expression of reflexivity. This is related to the fact that the Cassubs are linked to Polish ethnicity. Malinowski is thus like Kenyatta and Fei, a metaphoric subaltern voicing his opinions as the dominant Other, from above and from below, which allows him to understand his students with more insight. The paratext is sometimes used to establish (political) positions within the playing field. Moreover, Malinowski lived in a Poland under Austrian rule, which helps shed light on the political attachments expressed in the comments above.

Kinship in Tikopia

We, the Tikopia (1936) is an excellent delineation of projects based on field immersion in primitive societies, offering qualitatively explained typologies of social institutions on a Pacific Ocean island, including its intricate kinship system. Raymond Firth is the first academic authority on Tikopian ethnography as the only study of Tikopia previous to his was made in 1910 by a missionary anthropologist.

The preface to *We, the Tikopia* starts differently from Malinowski's other prefaces. Malinowski admits that his student does not need a preface to put him on the map, as earlier stated aspects of the preface would dictate. Malinowski explains this fact by saying:

> There is no need here to introduce a newcomer, to pat a novice on the back, or put the *Imprimatur* on the book of an amateur in anthropology. (Malinowski in Firth 1936: vii)

This paratextual endorsement is validated by Firth's earlier publications which include his first book, *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori* (1929). Malinowski's endorsement is further strengthened by the usage of positive critique stating that it is 'among the most important recent contributions to the science of man' (Malinowski in Firth 1936: vii). The proofs include the 'thoroughgoing empirical spirit, the wealth of concrete documentation' which 'bring before us living men and women. Their affairs become real to us although presented with a sane and sober theoretical framework' (Malinowski in Firth 1936: vii).

Malinowski's endorsement builds on his academic relationship with the incumbent, which goes back to twelve years of experience in the classroom analyzing genealogies and kinship nomenclatures (Malinowski in Firth 1936: viii). The point that Malinowski is making in his preface is that Firth's book contains 'echoes of these discussions', while applying additional academic criteria to his output. The single element which makes Firth stand out is the biographical and residential approach to the study of kinship in all aspects of social organization and material setting. Malinowski links kinship studies to the global study of anthropology by explaining that cultural anthropology ought not to be '[a] jumble of slogans or labels, a factory of impressionistic short-cuts, or guess-work reconstructions' (Malinowski in Firth 1936: xi). The preface is his outlet for expressing the fundamentals of the discipline which he coined:

> Cultural anthropology is a social science—I almost feel tempted to say, the science among social studies. (…) The longest span of evolutionary survey places at his disposal the collective experience of mankind, and thus ought to give him the fullest historical sense and the deepest insight into human nature. (Malinowski in Firth 1936: xi)

Some of the most incisive remarks about anthropology are made post-factum, when the anthropologist attempts to circumscribe his student's position within the global net of the discipline. The opinion aspect of the paratext helps to endow the ideas of personal conviction with increased saliency. The paratext is not anonymous and is not objective; it is carried by the vehicle of subjectivity powered by a touch of impetus. The anthropologist as author strikes again, abandoning objective science to mark his sense of triumphant personal self. Malinowski goes all out for it.

Dobu witchcraft

Reo Fortune's book on sorcery in Dobu offers discussion of further detailed fieldwork from Melanesia, with detailed analysis of primitive psychology, and a daily record of life and customs, social and cultural developments and tribal structures. Intricate social detail is woven here into a passionate narrative of cultural discovery.

The preface building strategies in the *Sorcerers of Dobu* (1932) focus on predicting the discovery of natural universal laws of behaviour in society. Malinowski's treatment of the Dobuans as the 'enlightened, light-hearted, easy-going civilized tribes of North-West Melanesia' (Malinowski in Fortune 1932: xix) is very different from the epithets of 'Niggers' (Polish: '*Nigrzy*'), 'Boys' (Polish with an Anglicism: '*Boje*') and 'Savages' (Polish: '*Dzikusy*') which he had afforded them in his diaries (see Malinowski 1967, 2002). The goal, however, is to overcome shortcomings in order to focus on methodology. First, Malinowski passionately endorses his method of studying the natives in their own language, not pidgin. The emphasis on method calls for a 'case method', 'illustrations', endorsements of 'abstract description' based on theoretical underpinnings, use of 'induction' and 'inferences': 'The functionalist anthropologist has constantly to make inductive generalizations from what he sees, he has to constantly theorize in the field, theorize on what he sees, hears, and experiences' (Malinowski in Fortune 1932: xxix). Malinowski was a pioneer in applying elements of the scientific method at the very heart of social sciences: 'in drawing his inferences from detail to the general rule, the anthropologist has to carry out all his operations in the open—within sight and control of his readers' (Malinowski in Fortune 1932: xxx). Malinowski's double personality as writer with a Kantian subjectivity and scientist of 'social fact' led to a theoretical synthesis which imposed his paradigm on generations to come.

As a side note, it should be said that Malinowski also wrote a preface to the *Primitive Mind and Modern Civilization* by Charles R. Aldrich (1931), but the preface is a general endorsement which does not give further clues to Malinowski's ideas about anthropological detective work, besides the obvious work of Aldrich, to which it is a *passerelle*.

Conclusion

The intent of this essay is to create a rapprochement between anthropology and literary studies to validate the claim that anthropological preface building is a genre of *lettres*. It is clear at this time that unless things change, the anthropologist is the author and this dictates his scientific endeavour, challenging the objective status of anthropology as a science. The essay started with a definition of paratexts derived from Genette, carefully crafted around the notions of intersubjectivity and intertextuality also reiterated by Roland Barthes. It became clear that cultural ideas are shaped in their bare bone essence by surface structures (textual strategies) which guide and influence a vertical dialogue. It has been demonstrated that the paratext is also a form of material space which shapes the relationship between reader and author, buttressed by typographical and iconographical signs of the hermeneutic process. Lejeune's autobiographical pact between writer and reader was deconstructed to demonstrate that, in anthropology, it is also underwritten by a commitment to truth and true renderings of reality. I have tried to show another side of the pact by arguing that the preface writer resembles Bourdieu's master who releases a student (*khamessat*) from debt (*sarmia*).

An analysis of paratextual aspects of preface-building in Malinowski demonstrated that praise does not come for free. By scrutinizing those students and allies for whom he wrote prefaces, Malinowski attempted to show the obstacles which they overcame in their journeys, and to facilitate understanding of cultural issues in research. Malinowski's approach in preface building was comparative: his prefaces are rooted in fieldwork across the world: China, Eastern Europe, Africa and Polynesia. This diversity shows his adaptability to a multicultural discourse and his flexibility in dealing with various forms of clashes of civilizations. Malinowski was the first to note cultural relativism, thereby undermining the legitimacy of master narratives. It is also in his prefaces that we understand the condition of we/they cleavages, the perception of which gained him the reputation for deep understanding of in and out-group membership. The opinion aspect of paratext subjectivity was discussed to show how these texts were connected to Cracow's son's boisterous sense of self.

In a more abstract way of approaching Malinowski, the paratextual evidence offers a writing-centred approach to ethnographies and the fieldwork on which they are based, in the spirit of the scholarship by Clifford Geertz in *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Literary composition in this sense, and paratext as its illustration, are used as artefacts of analysis in a textual anthropology which solves problems for human needs by addressing the scriptural remnants of civilizations and the brave men who studied them. The relationship between a scientist and his *magnum opus* becomes mediated through a language of signs and symbols, which codes rituals and social constructs of human behaviour. This language is the language of an *anthropology of meaning* inspired by these written artefacts. I would like to argue that a deconstruction of paratext is a building block towards laying the bricks of such a theory, which underscores the study of man making sense in the world.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, Charles R. 1931. *The Primitive Mind and Modern Civilization.* New York: AMS Press.
Barnett, R.-L. Etienne (ed.) 2010. *Poetics of the Paratext*. Special Issue, *Neohelicon* 37 (1): 3–316.
Barthes, Roland 1970. *S/Z.* Paris: Editions du Seuil.
Bourdieu, Pierre 1962 [1958]. *The Algerians*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Collins, Ronald and David Skover 1992. Paratexts. *Stanford Law Review* 44: 509–552.
Dali, Inès Mrad 2005. Inès Mrad Dali, "De l'esclavage à la servitude. Le Cas des Noirs de Tunisie". *Cahiers d'études africaines* 179–180: 935–955.
Firth, Raymond 1936. *We, the Tikopia: A Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia.* Boston: Beacon Press.
Firth, Raymond 1957. *Man and Culture: An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Flis, Andrzej 1988. Cracow Philosophy of the Beginning of the Twentieth Century and the Rise of Malinowski's Scientific Ideas. In Roy F. Ellen, Ernest Gellner, Grazyna Kubica and Janusz Mucha (eds), *Malinowski Between Two Worlds: The Polish Roots of Anthropological Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fortune, Reo 1932. *Sorcerers of Dobu: The Social Anthropology of the Dobu Islanders of the Western Pacific.* New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.
Geertz, Clifford 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author.* Standford: Stanford University Press.
Genette, Gerard 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
Kenyatta, Jomo 1938. *Facing Mount Kenya: The Tribal Life of the Gikuyu*. London: Secker and Warburg.
Kubica, Grazyna, Roy Ellen, Ernest Gellner and Janusz Mucha (eds) 1988. *Malinowski Between Two Worlds: The Polish Roots of an Anthropological Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kuhn, Thomas S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Lejeune, Philippe 1996. *Le pacte autobiographique.* Paris: Seuil.
Lorentz Fr., Adam Fischer and Tadeusz Lehr-Splawinski 1935. *The Cassubian Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Malinowski, Bronislaw 1967. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Malinowski, Bronislaw 2002. *Dziennik W scisym Znaczeniu Tego Wyrazu.* Cracow (Polish version of the diary, edited by Grazyna Kubica).
Paluch, Andrzej and Marioli Flis (eds) 1985. Antropologia spo³eczna Bronis³awa Malinowskiego. Warsaw: Pañstwowe Wydawn. Naukowe.
Payne, Harry 1981. Malinowski's Style. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 125 (6): 416–440.
Richards, Audrey Isabel 1932. *Hunger and Work in a Savage tribe*. London: Routledge.
Sylvain, Renée 1996. Malinowski, the Modern Other: An Indirect Evaluation of Postmodernism. *Anthropologica* 38 (1): 21–45.
Thornton, Robert 1985. Imagine Yourself Set Down… Mach, Frazer, Conrad, Malinowski and the Role of Imagination in Ethnography. *Anthropology Today* 1 (5): 7–14.
Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven 1993. Hypothesis: The Preface as a Genre. In Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek, *The Social Dimensions of Fiction: On the Rhetoric and Function of Prefacing Novels in the Nineteenth-Century Canadas*. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher.
Verdes-Leroux, Jeanine 2001. *Deconstructing Pierre Bourdieu against Social Terrorism from the Left*. New York: Algora.

Xiaotong, Fei 1938. *Peasant Life in China: A Field Study of Country Life in the Yangtze Valley*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co.

MAJA ALEXANDRA NAZARUK
DOCTORANTE
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE & ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL
maja.nazaruk@umontreal.ca