



Research Article

Spread of Ideas: The Legacy of Diffusionism School

Prof. Faridullah Farahmand

Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, Faculty of Social sciences, Kabul University, Afghanistan

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Immigrant, diffusion, Stimulus, mechanisms

Article History:

Received: 14-02-2024

Accepted: 11-05-2024

Published: 22-05-2024

This comprehensive analysis explores the concept and development of diffusionism throughout the history of anthropology. Diffusionism, a theory that emerged in the early 20th century, posits that cultural elements are assimilated and disseminated throughout multiple nations, leading to transformative shifts in society. The German and British diffusionist schools were the primary institutions that concentrated on the transmission of cultural characteristics across temporal and spatial dimensions. The notion of "culture circles," first proposed by German diffusionism, led by figures like Wilhelm Schmidt and Robert Fritz Craebner, posited that the cultural traits of ancient civilizations spread to the surrounding regions. British diffusionism, spearheaded by Grafton Elliot Smith and V. J. Perry, emphasized Egypt as the birthplace of civilization and attributed cultural advancements to Egyptian origins. Franz Boas, the founder of the US diffusionist school, advocated for a historical-cultural perspective that opposed the idea of linear progress. Boas emphasized the importance of culture as a unified entity shaped by particular historical circumstances and dismissed notions of cultural advancement. Notable American diffusionists include J. Robert Lowie, Edward Sapir, Clark Wissler, and Alfred Louis Kroeber. Kroeber's examination of women's fashion trends and cultural zeniths demonstrates the multifaceted nature of diffusionist analysis. Lowie's study focused on challenging linear evolution ideas and emphasizing the crucial significance of spatial dispersion in understanding cultural events. Wissler concentrated on the biological components of disperse on, whereas Sapir examined how individual personalities shape cultural patterns. While diffusionism is not as common in modern anthropology, it is important for comprehending the intricacies of cultural transmission and societal progress. Diffusionism provides valuable insights into the dynamics of human culture and civilization by examining historical processes, geographic distribution, and cultural interaction.

Cite this article:

Farahmand, F. (2024). Spread of Ideas: The Legacy of Diffusionism School. *Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(5), 81–86. <https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v3i5.325>

1. Introduction

The diffusionism approach, which gained prominence in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, was developed by the British and German-Austrian schools of thought. The diffusionists maintained the belief that the majority of the characteristics of contemporary civilization spread outwards from cultural centers after its inception. The diffusionist approach in anthropology greatly influenced anthropologists' understanding of how societies developed due to the spread of independent technologies and cultural traits. However, as a theoretical framework, it was filled with ethnocentric ideas and only addressed a limited aspect of the extensive examination of global cultures. A holistic technique that differentiates between diffusionism and evolutionism has resulted in a more precise understanding of the problem as a whole. Predicting the future trajectory of anthropological philosophy is a difficult task. Although certain thoughts may undergo transformation, others have the tendency to pass by without being seen or acknowledged. The development of theories and academic disciplines is significantly shaped by the historical context in

which they emerge. Understanding the rationale behind conceptual changes is essential for our understanding of reality. However, specific theoretical perspectives and concepts are more advantageous for our understanding since they have the ability to accurately anticipate our environment. In the upcoming chapter, we will examine the corroborating facts and hypotheses, as well as explore how anthropological research can be utilized to evaluate theories. The diffusionism paradigm, which emerged in the early 20th century, offers a conceptual framework for understanding the evolution and transformation of cultures. Diffusionism is a theoretical paradigm that proposes that civilizations undergo change by assimilating and transmitting cultural elements. This is achieved through the use of the comparative method (Eriksen, 2007). The concept highlights the transmission of cultural information, encompassing technological progress, artistic expression, religious convictions, and economic tactics, between civilizations, and how this shapes the societal dynamics over time. This essay explores the core concepts and advocates of diffusionism, specifically focusing on the two primary classifications—the British and German variations. We analyze

*Corresponding Author:

Email: Faridullah.farahmand@gmail.com (F. Farahmand)

<https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v3i5.325>

© 2024 The Authors. Published by Sprin Publisher, India. This is an open access article published under the CC-BY license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

the techniques employed by diffusionists to examine patterns and spatial spread of cultural characteristics, with a specific emphasis on the transmission of cultural elements across different countries. We emphasize the significance of diffusionism in ongoing discussions, particularly in the realms of archaeology and biological anthropology. We also establish connections between diffusionism and other concepts in anthropology, such as evolutionism (Fakuhi, 2002). An in-depth examination of the principles and historical context of diffusionism reveals the theory's significant influence on anthropological investigation and its ongoing effect on our understanding of cultural dynamics and human evolution.

2. Definition and History of Diffusionism

Diffusionism, an anthropological perspective, using the comparative approach to elucidate the reasons behind the varying levels of development observed in different cultures. The theory of diffusionism, originating in the early 1900s, posits that the transmission of cultural characteristics from one society to another is the driving force behind societal progress. Cultural information such as technology, economic views, religious convictions, and artistic representations can transfer or diffuse between civilizations. There were two prominent schools of diffusionism: the German school led by Father Wilhelm Schmidt and the British school led by G. Elliot Smith and William J. Perry (Scupin, 2012). Examining a culture as a result of spreading is distinct from contemplating the process of diffusion itself. The four distinct kinds that can be identified are direct contact, immigration diffusion, intermediate contact, and stimulus diffusion. "Direct contact" is the term used to describe the transmission of a cultural characteristic from one group to surrounding civilizations and then to more distant ones. The 'motte-and-bailey' castle, which is the typical design of medieval fortifications, first appeared in northern France about the tenth century and progressively became common across Western Europe. Paper, which originated in China many millennia ago, eventually reached the Arab world and later Europe between the eighth and sixteenth centuries. In situations like this, where the feature is considered a common item, the process typically consists of three recurring steps: (1) initial small-scale importation as a luxury item, (2) subsequent larger-scale importation as the item becomes widely used, and finally (3) internal production to either supplement or replace importation (Brix, 2001). Diffusionism highlights the transfer of objects or ideas from one culture, community, or location to another. Extreme diffusionism posits that inventions are generated once and thereafter disseminated over different regions, even those geographically remote, suggesting a lack of creativity among individuals. This phenomenon can arise either through the movement of culturally prosperous groups or through the direct transmission within established populations. Based on the notion of classical evolution, people possess an inherent inclination towards creativity, and all communities have a propensity to generate comparable outcomes, albeit at varying frequencies (Barnard, 2000).

Diffusionists conducted research on the spatial movement of cultural traits, suggesting that cultures consist of distinct components that have varied histories and origins. Consequently, they held the belief that not every element of a culture will inevitably integrate into a broader entity. Nevertheless, the majority of evolutionists argue that societies operate as cohesive systems and are interconnected. Evolutionists accurately recognized the presence of distinct cultural characteristics, such as Tyler's Residue Principle, that lack practical utility. Due to their unusual characteristics, these features garnered significant analytical attention as they were crucial for the reconstruction of historical social systems (Eriksen, 2007). Evolutionism places significant emphasis on the

notion of change, with a particular focus on the principles and laws of natural science. However, diffusionism associates change with external forces that originate from the surrounding environment, such as closeness, transfer, and migration. The destination's cultural context assimilates the cultural phenomena of the original culture. Diffusionists highlight the capacity of civilizations to imitate and adjust to other cultures, rather than their ability to discover and innovate. Instead of studying the rules that explain how cultural phenomena are created and develop, these researchers aim to discover the laws that regulate the movement and spatial-temporal changes of these phenomena (Fakuhi, 2002). The concept of the applicability of ideas and technologies across various contexts was not a novel revelation. German philosophers in the 18th century demonstrated the shared origins of North Indian and European languages. Archaeologists have discovered that pottery and other handicrafts were disseminated from central cultural centers to the neighboring regions. Europeans were aware that the dominant religion on their continent originated from the Middle East. Anthropological diffusionism stood out for its emphasis on acquiring substantial empirical evidence and employing a meticulous and systematic approach to studying the spread of cultural characteristics. Several diffusionists, such as Rivers, conducted studies in specific regions to demonstrate that certain cultural traits originated from a common historical predecessor (Eriksen, 2007). Population increases or migration is a significant, yet often overlooked, method of spreading. An instance of immigration diffusion can be observed in American cities, where individuals have the option to select from a variety of "ethnic" eateries for their dining preferences. This accessibility is frequently attributed to the migration of individuals who have established eateries specializing on the cuisines of their home countries. The significant incorporation of English cultural elements, such as tools, traditions, beliefs, and language, that naturally accompanied the colonists to North America, serves as another instance of immigrant dispersal. The phenomenon of immigrant mobility is often overlooked, maybe because to the common association of the term "diffusion" with the idea of a cultural trait spreading largely between persons rather than among them. When evaluating whether a cultural element originated inside an expanding population or spread over an established one, it is crucial to use historical facts (Brix, 2001). We examine instances of Afghan eateries across the globe. The majority of the customers at these eateries are Afghan citizens. Hence, it may be inferred that the proliferation of migrations is a significant determinant. Diffusionist analysis prioritizes the geographical aspect over evolutionism, which focuses solely on history and natural laws. That refers to the migration of cultural phenomena from one geographic region to another. However, it is important to note that giving priority to spatial features in diffusionist study does not mean disregarding the historical element. Diffusion occurs simultaneously along two axes: the temporal axis, which determines movement by dating and estimating the lifespan of phenomena, and the geographical axis, where its impacts are observed within pre-established boundaries (Fakuhi, 2002). When examining the contemporary period, we observe a shift in the emphasis on history and geography, specifically in relation to the dissemination of culture across different periods and locations. The proliferation of information technology has facilitated the dissemination of culture, particularly in virtual contexts. We observe cultural evolution and interactions between geographically distant societies without being constrained by physical proximity limits. Many societies have not consistently advanced in accordance with the concept of evolution, in contrast to the theory of cultural evolution. Occasionally, societies may display regressive characteristics. Proponents of this idea argue that examining a culture's historical context and interactions with other societies

is crucial for comprehending the distinct attributes of that culture. Fakuhi (2002) argues that inventions and advancements have limitations, which is why they emphasize the significance of spreading indigenous cultures. Diffusionism is now the hypothesis with the lowest level of acceptance in the field of social anthropology. The subject in question remains alive, notwithstanding previous circumstances. The "Out of Africa" or "Replacement Model" and the "Regional-Continuity Model" are the two primary hypotheses on human expansion. These hypotheses are currently the focus of vigorous debate in the fields of biological anthropology and archaeology. This topic is closely tied to a longstanding dispute in diffusionism, which examines whether similarities primarily arise from the migration of people between different locations or from the transmission of genes or cultures within sedentary communities. Several diffusionists, like as Ratzel, really preferred the later option, and the intricacies of the arguments within the diffusionist school resemble those seen in contemporary studies of global prehistory. The concept of diffusionism continues to exist in the form of ideas such as the "cultural area," which are now widely recognized in all branches of anthropology. The enduring nature of diffusionism is additionally reinforced by the theory of world-systems or globalization (Barnard, 2000). The primary objectives of diffusionism are to identify cultural phenomena, identify coherent clusters of phenomena, identify the origins of diffusion, trace its routes, and analyze the factors that affect the intensity and prevalence of dissemination in each circumstance. The primary source of the diffusionist school, particularly in Austria, was the German-speaking countries of Europe. The Vienna School of Diffusionism and American Diffusionism were the primary constituents of the school. Nevertheless, there have been reports of some of its forms originating from France and Britain (Fakuhi, 2002).

3. Theories

It is typical to juxtapose the fundamental principles of evolutionary theory with diffusion theory. According to the evolutionary idea, humans possess an innate capacity for creativity, and inventions will spontaneously emerge throughout different cultures. Therefore, it may be inferred that innovations that are suitable for the specific evolutionary stage of each culture should be present in all cultures. In contrast, diffusion theory posits that individuals tend to be conservative and lacking in imagination, frequently adopting cultural features that originate locally. Diffusionism posits that all cultures universally progress through identical evolutionary stages. Contrarily, diffusionists argued that there exist singular and separate centers. Cultural artifacts were spread from these cultural hubs to other locations through the process of diffusion. Diffusionists held the belief that specific cultural characteristics disseminated from particular places, but they had differing opinions on other aspects. Below is a compilation of three renowned diffusionist schools

3.1 German Diffusionism;

The British and German diffusionist schools exhibited several distinctions. Schmidt and his proponents contended that there existed multiple ancient hubs of civilization. Their proposal suggests that cultural features spread outwards in concentric circles, reaching different locations and populations from their initial cores. The term used to describe this perspective in German is "Kulturkreise," which pertains to the intellectual tradition that emphasizes cultural circles. Similar to the British diffusionists, the German school believed that ancient cultures had declined to such an extent that they were no longer recognized to be part of civilization. Diffusionist theories are ethnocentric perspectives on human civilizations that deviate from the dominant ideas of Western civilization,

similar to unilineal evolutionary views (Scupin, 2012). The co-founders of the German intellectual movement, commonly referred to as the "Vienna School," were Wilhelm Smith and Robert Fritz Craebner. Their proposition posits that the genesis of early human civilization can be traced back to a specific region in Asia, and that the diffusion of this culture to other regions was facilitated by commerce and extensive migrations. In Germany, diffusion theory is referred to as historical theory or synthetic theory. Advocates of this hypothesis argue that the cultural attributes of this society are a product of amalgamating multiple cultures. They highly prioritize the utilization of archaeological findings to acquire diverse cultural components.

Several German scholars focused primarily on the subject of diffusionism. Friedrich Ratzel is credited for the division of the world into several cultural areas. Tyler was influenced by his work (Merrill, 2007). Ratzel was a German polymath, who excelled in the fields of natural history, exploration, journalism, and geography. In 1899, he achieved the distinction of being the first to incorporate the human aspect into the discipline of geography with the release of his book "Human Geography". Ratzel incorporated a political element into his thesis by shifting his focus from natural determinism to geopolitics due to external factors. The author of "Vital Space" proposed that the state might be regarded as a means to augment the vitality of specific geographical regions. Ratzel's theory of geography exhibited a pronounced anthropological orientation, while also displaying prominent Darwinist inclinations. As previously stated, the Vienna Diffusionism School was established by followers of Ratzel. Ratzel's perspectives, which aimed to elucidate cultural similarities through the spatial distribution of these occurrences, had an impact on the development of the 'culture circle' concept (Fakuhi, 2002).

3.2 British Diffusionism

The study of ancient Egypt provided the basis for the formulation of the diffusionism concept that is taught in British educational institutions. Smith and Perry were experts in Egyptian culture, having extensively studied Egyptology for several years. Based on this experience, they reached the conclusion that all aspects of civilization, ranging from technology to religion, started in Egypt and spread to other cultural regions. The absence of specific Egyptian cultural elements in diverse nations was attributed to an ethnocentric viewpoint, suggesting that these cultures had deteriorated or declined. The less developed cultures, as opposed to the more advanced societies, had only lost their knowledge of the fundamental principles they had acquired from Egypt (Scupin, 2012).

Grafton Elliot Smith is a prominent advocate of the English diffusion school. The author penned two literary works, namely "Migration of Primary Culture" and "Children of the Sun," which drew extensively from their own imaginative faculties and literary preferences. However, these works were deficient in a robust scientific underpinning. The proponents of this concept held the belief that advancements and cultural enhancements originated in a certain location and subsequently disseminated to other areas. According to Fakuhi (2002), Egypt was seen as the major source and birthplace of culture and civilization for all nations, whereas Greece was seen as the secondary source. Elliott Smith, as previously said, was a prominent figure in the English diffusionist school, which is also known as the Egyptianist or solarist school. He collaborated closely with V. J. Perry in leading this school. This ideology posits that various cultural elements observed in multiple civilizations worldwide, such as the utilization of Polynesian pearls, the construction of Mayan pyramids, the Incas' veneration of the sun deity, mummification customs in Africa, and the existence of pyramids themselves, collectively indicate

an Egyptian source dating back to the fourth millennium BC (River, 2000). The phenomenon of excessive expansionism generally conforms to the pattern described in the book "Children of the Sun" (1923) by Sir Grafton Elliot Smith and William Perry. They hypothesized that the forebears of human civilization were the ancient Egyptians who worshipped the sun. Smith and Perry believed that Egypt served as the birthplace of innovation, supplanting the intellectual prowess of the Hebrews and Christians. They contributed to the dissemination of information in order to challenge the idea of evolution (Merrill, 2007).

3.3 United States of America diffusion

Anthropology took several years to regain prominence in this country following the departure of Lewis Henry Morgan, who was basically the sole authority in the field. The field of anthropology experienced substantial growth with the arrival of Franz Boas. Boas assumed the role of the leader of the American diffusionist school. This idea, often known as "historical culture" or "cultural change," posits that many elements of culture, borrowed from different cultures, are interconnected and combine to create a novel cultural composition with specific objectives. The progression of human civilization throughout history does not necessarily imply advancement, contrary to the assertions made by proponents of evolution. The classification of cultures, the construction of society, and the biological evolution are not aligned with cultural revolution. According to his research, Robert Lavey, Clark Whistler, Alfred Kroeber, and Franz Boas are identified as the most prominent American figures of the diffusionist school, but the future of it remains ambiguous (Fakuhi, 2002).

3.3.1 Franz Boas (Frantz Boas) (1858 - 1942)

Boas was the well-known leader of the American diffusionist school. He initially went after degrees in geography and physics. As a professional anthropologist, Boas began his career by traveling to the Eskimos' homeland. He soon realized that the "culture" of any group of people is more important to understand their attitudes and behaviors than the biological conditions under which they were born. Boas came to the conclusion that culture ought to be studied as a coherent system with independent logic and internal logic (Dortier, 2003).

Boas maintained that rather than being generalized based on overarching evolutionary patterns, cultural qualities should be examined within specific cultural contexts. Boas noted that there is notably less representation of the Northwest American tribes in the National Museum's holdings, one is because relics from other tribes are scattered throughout the museum's sections along with items connected to one particular tribe. To highlight the unique artistic qualities of each tribe, it would be more useful to arrange ethnographic collections according to tribes rather than classifying and showcasing them based on technological advancement. A country's distinct aesthetic and art can only be understood by looking at the work that its citizens have produced as a whole (Moore, 2011). Contrary to evolutionists' claims, Boas contends that the presence of similar technologies in disparate parts of the globe does not always imply that those locations are at the same stage of civilization. Boas, who advocated for the complex nature of real phenomena, contended that understanding the complexities of human life requires taking into account natural laws, cultural autonomy, historical legacies, transmission routes, linkages, and the uniqueness of each cultural characteristic (Dortier, 2003).

Boas contends that cultures are more than just observable products of common evolutionary stages; rather, they are cohesive entities that emerge from specific historical processes (Moore, 2011). He proposed that similar cultural customs and behaviors could have different roots. He asserts

that the primary goal of anthropology is to provide a thorough analysis of a particular culture, taking into account its organization, the dynamic relationships that exist between members of that culture, and the reciprocal relationships that exist between the individual and the culture. Boas highlighted that we know there are laws governing the advancement of human civilization, and our goal is to identify them. Our research aims to identify the processes via which particular stages of culture have developed. The ultimate goals of study are not represented by customs and beliefs alone. Our goal is to understand the fundamental causes of these rites and beliefs, namely by exploring the historical context in which they first appeared. A thorough examination of customs and their relationship to the general culture of a specific group, as well as an assessment of their geographic distribution among neighboring tribes, sometimes provide a means of determining relatively important historical variables. This method gives us information on how particular customs came to be and the psychological processes that influenced the formation of those customs. Three different ways that this kind of research can produce results are by pinpointing the environmental factors that shaped or influenced the elements, elucidating the psychological elements that play a role in the formation of cultures, or demonstrating the impact of historical communication on the evolution of cultures. Franz Boas continued until his death in 1942 to carry out thorough and diversified research in the field of anthropology. His theories were influential for many decades to come, and many of his students went on to study the relationship between the person and society—a topic that Boas considered to be extremely important.

3.3.2 Alfred Louis Kroeber

Alfred Kroeber (1876-1960) is often regarded as the final anthropologist of the Renaissance era. Throughout his 85-year lifespan, he made notable progress in the field of anthropology. This discipline has transformed from merely documenting unusual and peculiar occurrences to encompassing a wide range of human experiences, providing a comprehensive understanding of humans in both cultural and biological contexts. Kroeber was engaged in all of these fields and was the final anthropologist to focus on many disciplines. The majority of his studies focused on Native American life and their languages during the later stages of American Indian autonomy (Moore, 2011). Moore argues that culture is transmitted through human interactions rather than genetic inheritance mechanisms. Irrespective of its source, culture rapidly becomes a transpersonal concern, manifesting in distinct patterns and forms. In addition, culture encompasses ideals that might be manifested in a formal manner or perceived via the individuals of the society to which the culture pertains. One of the responsibilities of the anthropologist is to determine the specific attributes of this particular category. Kroeber's core definition of culture states that it is acquired through learning, shared among individuals, displays distinct patterns, and conveys significance. Kroeber's most captivating examination is a subject that may appear unconventional: alterations in women's attire. He addressed this subject on two occasions, initially in 1919 and subsequently in 1940. Kroeber's fascination with women's fashion was based on the conviction that it epitomizes unadulterated elegance, and the evolution of fashion can be traced by examining archival fashion publications from Paris. For his second investigation, Kroeber had compiled data spanning from 1787 to 1936. The researcher's discoveries demonstrated that significant changes in fashion had varying recurring patterns. Specifically, the prevalence of long dresses peaked throughout the 18th century as well as the middle and end of the 19th century, while shorter gowns were most

fashionable during the years 1815 and 1931. In addition, Kroeber noted intriguing patterns in the diversity of designs. Although there were only slight alterations to the original style in most years, there were certain times of substantial transformation before the original style once again became popular. Kroeber's analysis of historical causes yielded no explanation for these oscillations, attributing them solely to the organic fluctuation of fashion. The main factor driving changes in fashion seemed to be the desire to conform to or diverge from an inherent and subconscious template in women's formal clothing (Moore, 2011).

Kroeber first developed the notion of a 'cultural peak' in his early research on the distribution of cultural elements. A cultural peak is the point in time when the development of specific cultures reaches its highest level simultaneously. Given Kroeber's longstanding argument against attributing cultural breakthroughs primarily to exceptional individuals, it can be inferred that the study of remarkable discoveries reveals that societies frequently advance their culture to its furthest potential. This phenomenon is particularly noticeable in the intellectual and aesthetic parts of these cultures, but it is also observable in the more tangible and pragmatic aspects (Moore, 2011).

3.3.3 J. Robert Lowie

Robert Lowie (1883-1957), an American anthropologist and disciple of Boas, actively sought to criticize and interrogate the linear evolutionary theories in his works. Lowie's academic focus was on North American Indians, namely the Crow Indians. His significant contribution to the field of anthropology came from his research on the kinship, economic, and political systems of these indigenous communities. Geographical distribution phenomena have a significant effect in the historical reconstruction of a culture. If a quality is universally present, it should be regarded as a consequence of the implementation of a broad societal principle (Preston, 1966). On the other hand, if this phenomenon is only seen in a few specific locations, it can be attributed to diffusion in particular circumstances. These circumstances can be studied by analyzing the cultures in where the event occurred. Moreover, the case of the blacksmith dam in Madagascar serves as evidence that cultural practices can be influenced by kinship rather than a universal norm. Furthermore, individuals that share common attributes may originate from other lineages but have assimilated comparable cultural customs through interaction or mutual influence. Hence, the geographical distribution indicators should be elucidated by considering causal variables, tribal affiliations, or international interactions, and any conclusions drawn from non-anthropological data should be contextualized within a historical framework (Fakuhi, 2002). For example, when constructing a history of blacksmithing, the blacksmithing tradition in Mali would be considered connected to an earlier period because a specialized and advanced form can be detected in an area of Asia that was far away from the ancient iron smelting sites. On the other hand, the practice of blacksmithing in Madagascar is considered a relatively recent imported tradition. This is because Madagascar is the farthest point that the Malian civilization has reached, as stated by Fakuhi (2002).

3.3.4 Clark Wissler

Clark Wissler (1870-1947) primarily specialized in biological anthropology and anthropometry. However, he then shifted his concentration to the study of American Indians within the field of anthropology. Wissler prioritized ecology above all else in the theory of diffusion. He held the belief that cultural phenomena diffuse from a central point, spreading outwards in concentric circles in all directions. Hence, the distance of peripheral phenomena from the core can serve as an

indicator of their longevity. As one moves closer to the center, cultural phenomena become increasingly obvious and genuine. Furthermore, Wissler conducted a multitude of studies on myths, positing that these investigations could reveal the underlying motivations and rationales behind various social behaviors (Fakuhi, 2002).

3.3.5 Edward Sapir

In the discipline of anthropology, Sapir's anthropological ideas from his time are noteworthy. According to Sapir, it is more productive to investigate how the mix of unique personalities within societies shapes and influences cultural patterns than it is to look for explanations for how culture affects human nature. Because of this viewpoint, Sapir advocated for individualistic psychology and, among his contemporaries, framed his ideas about culture more from a psychological than an anthropological perspective (Preston, 1966). Sapir's thoughts about anthropology and literature are intimately related. Through a fresh and original style of poetry, his literary philosophy reveals a scientific and creative sensibility that cultivates and generates cultural elements. His theories also mirror his conviction that individual and societal traits interact dialectically, impacting one another in a dynamic way (Handler, 1984).

4. Conclusion

To summarize, it can be said that various anthropological schools have tackled significant matters within the field, each offering their unique perspectives and views. Evolutionism, as one of the earliest schools of thought, introduced the concept of change and development in various aspects of human life, particularly emphasizing cultural evolution. While diffusion provided an explanation for the spread of cultural elements, it failed to address the origins of those traits. It diminished the significance of human ingenuity by highlighting the transmission of cultural characteristics from one area to another and their assimilation by the receiving region. Undoubtedly, the issue of distribution vs innovation has been an important topic in the previous literature on anthropology. Diffusion was purportedly inadequate in explaining the occurrence of independent invention or cultural transformations. The diffusion idea as a whole is undermined when two or more civilizations have prolonged contact and manage to preserve their distinct ways of life, or when this interaction leads to selective borrowing. The phenomena of cultures exhibiting similarities and parallelism with one another, even in the absence of contact or interaction, remain unexplained. Diffusionism was another significant and contentious school of thought that emerged. Its supporters stressed the role of diffusion in the movement of cultural elements between different communities and geographic regions. Functionalism, a widely recognized institution, conducted research on the factors that contribute to the stability of human societies and the various functions performed by social phenomena and systems. Structuralism, known by several names depending on the location, is a field of study that examines the underlying patterns and structures of social dynamics. Its aim is to find important systems within human societies. Anthropologists have continuously defended and challenged these schools of thought over time, aiming to enhance and broaden their theories to advance our understanding of human society and culture.

References

- Barnard, A. (2000). *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brix, H. J. (2001). *21st Century Anthropology: A Reference Handbook*. Canisius College and State University of New York at Genesco. Sage E-publication.

- Dortier, J.-F. (2003). *Humanities: The Range of Knowledge*. (N. Fakuhi, Trans.). Tehran: Nai Publishing.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2007). *History of Anthropology (From the Beginning to the Present Day)*. (A. Blokbashi, Trans.). Tehran: Gol Azin.
- Fakuhi, N. (2002). *History of Thought and Theories of Anthropology*. Tehran: Nai Publishing.
- Handler, R. (1984). *Sapir's Poetic Experience*. *American Anthropologist*, 86(2), 416-417.
- Merrill, W. D. (2007). *Anthropology: The First Step*. (H. Sabbaghi, Trans.). Tehran: Shirazeh Publishing and Research.
- Moore, J. D. (2011). *The Life and Thought of Great Anthropologists*. (H. A. Puri & J. Ahmadi, Trans.). Tehran: Sociologists Publishing.
- Preston, R. J. (1966). *Edward Sapir's Anthropology: Style, Structure, and Method*. *American Anthropologist*, 68(5), 1105-1128.
- River, C. (2000). *An Introduction to Anthropology*. (N. Fakuhi, Trans.). (7th ed.). Tehran: Nai Publishing.
- Scupin, R. &. (2012). *Anthropology: A Global Perspective*. (7th ed.). Pearson.