CULTURAL INTERFERENCE AND VALUE MAKING: INNOVATIVENESS AND CONSERVATISM IN CULTURE [1]

Rakefet SELA-SHEFFY[2]

Özet

Kültürel temaslarla ilgili araştırmalar genellikle *değişim* üzerinde durur ve bunu *kültürlerarası etki* ile ilişkilendirir. Bunların her ikisi her tür kültürel dinamik açısından vazgeçilmez olarak görülür. Ayrıca kimi tarihsel anlarda *değişim* ve *alışveriş* arasındaki bağlar yoğun biçimde politize olur ve 'reaksiyoner' ve 'ilerici' eğilimler arasındaki kültür savaşlarına hizmet eder. Değişim ve alışveriş üzerindeki vurgu, uzun süreli gelenekler ve inatçı kültürel sınırlarla nasıl bağdaştırılabilir? Ben her kültürde *değer üretiminin birbiriyle çatışma halindeki iki stratejisi* olan tutuculuk ve yenilik arasındaki gerilimi kaynakları belirleme ve bunlara hakim olma toplumsal mücadelesinin bir biçimi olarak değerlendiriyorum. Makalemde bu bakış açısını aşağıdaki konulara değinerek ayrıntılandırıyorum: (1) *Bireylerin geçmişten gelen rutinleri değiştirme ya da bunlara bağlı kalma motivasyonu* – rasyonel seçimden ziyade simgesel kar beklentisi. (2) Eğilim belirleyiciler ya da yerel kanonun muhafızları olarak *kültürel aracıların rolü.* (3) *Doğallaştırma süreçleri* – erek kültürde (başarılı ya da başarısız olan) karmaşık yayılma ve alımlama süreçleri. (4) Kültürlerarası etkinin doğasını ve hızını belirleyen, *erek kültürde eğilim belirleyici ve kanonlaştırıcı* eyleyiciler arasındaki hassas denge.

Abstract

Research on cultural contacts usually focuses on *change* and associates it with *cross-cultural interference*, both of which are seen as indispensable in every cultural dynamics. In certain historical moments, moreover, the nexus between *change* and *exchange* is highly politicized, at the service of culture wars between 'reactionary' and 'progressive' trends. How is this emphasis on change and exchange reconciled with longstanding traditions and persistent cultural boundaries? I look at the tension between conservatism and innovation – as two *conflicting strategies of value making* in every culture – as a form of social struggle over determining and monopolizing resources. In this paper, I elaborate on this view along the following points: (1) *Individuals' motivation to change or stick to enduring routines* – expected symbolic profits rather than rational choice. (2) *The role of cultural brokers* – as trendsetters or as guardians of the domestic canon. (3) *Naturalization processes* – the complex processes of (successful or failed) diffusion and reception in the target culture. (4) *The delicate balance between trendsetting and canonizing agencies in the target culture,* which determines the nature and pace of interference.

As one whose work was inspired from the beginning by dynamic relational thinking, I have continuously been engaged with questions of emerging cultural fields, canonization processes, and cultural encounters. As homage to Saliha Paker, I would like to dedicate the following pages to revisiting questions of culture change and interference, and the ways they relate to continuity in culture, questions where the contribution of Professor Paker has always been a source of inspiration.

The role of inter-cultural contacts in generating change has long been brought forward in such fields as cultural anthropology and history, where the idea of borrowings between cultures stands as an alternative perspective to deterministic, ethnocentric biases. Moreover, in certain historical moments, as in our own times, this nexus between *change* and *exchange* becomes politicized and translates into critical terminology, either that of conservatism vs. innovativeness, or that of culture hegemony vs. pluralism, at the service of culture wars between 'reactionary' and 'progressive' trends. While in the former cases change is highly evaluated as a token of innovativeness and progress, usually associated with cross-cultural openness and exchange, in the latter case it is lamented as a destructive process that threatens the so-called authentic cores of cultures. Stimulated by colonial and post-colonial criticism, questions of diffusion, reception and adaptation or maladaptation, sometimes referring to partly overlapping phenomena, have become central not only for discussing transformations imposed by Western civilizations on native pre-modern cultures, but also for changes created by global commerce and immigration worldwide today and in the past.

From the perspective of the receiving cultures, this scholarly endeavor obviously calls attention to the fact that no culture is intact. As the countless diverse forms of multiculturalism show, a distinction between what is intrinsically part of a given culture and what is not is often blurred. Rather than discrete units, cultures work as dynamic formations, constantly being shaped and reshaped by either aspired for or coerced processes of intercultural translation and adaptation. Stemming from this kind of search for cultural complexity, and embedded in a semiotic approach, Polysystem thinking (Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*) conceptualizes culture as an open-ended multiple system of systems, the boundaries of which are by definition fuzzy and ever-changing. As is evident from ample examples throughout history, what is claimed to be inherent to one culture often attains vital functions in yet another, sometime to the point of being naturalized in different target environments. Among the copious examples that can be cited are the 'Perso-Arabic and Turkish composition' which characterized Ottoman literature (Paker); the pivotal use of Arabic models in medieval Hebrew literature (Drory, *Models and Contacts*); or the highbrow status of French language and social etiquette in the cultural world of German aristocracy and bourgeois intelligentsia throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Elias, *The Germans*). Moreover, this polysystemic dynamics relates not only to highbrow spheres or grand-scale national cultures, but also to all kinds of 'subcultures', as it were, associated with ethnic, gendered, age or religious groups, status layers, professional or regional settings.

In short, from this perspective, change and exchange are understood as pertaining to the very notion of culture. To account for the concrete mechanisms of such travels and shifts of repertoires between culture spaces, the notions of transfer and interference (Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*), anchored in the dynamic-structuralist approach of the Prague School, have been proposed in the fields of Culture Research and Translation Studies. Like diffusion research in general, the study of interference proceeds from the dominant–dominated (or centers–periphery) tensions that are believed to shape all kinds of intercultural contacts and exchanges. However, rather than engulfing globalization forces as such, the focus of interest of interference studies lies in the complex dynamics

of transmission, reception and domestication that occur in the receiving local cultures, and the way they transform these domestic cultural settings.

Yet how is this fuzzy transitive notion of culture reconciled with the fact that in our experience and imagination traditions do persist, and that cultural boundaries are very powerful? Addressing this duality of continuity and change in culture, the socio-historical view proposed by Norbert Elias (1979) is that of open-ended configurations, gradually accumulating through long-term processes of consolidation of the endless modifications that incessantly occur in the manners and personal dispositions of the individuals who apply them. Such constant mutations and readjustments correspond in this view to the ever-changing nets of human agents who are interlocked in such enduring *human figurations*, be they states, families, education systems, or any other kind of persistent socio-cultural networks. Accordingly, it is only in retrospect that specific emergent figurations, such as European court society (Elias, *The Court Society*), modern German culture (Elias, *The Germans*), or football games (Elias and Dunning), can be recognized and sanctioned as distinct entities. The more a given figuration solidifies, the more dramatic the effect of 'crossing cultural boundaries' may seem. From a historical perspective, however, what in retrospect is seen as traces of past exchange between different separate cultures serves as an indication of how fuzzy and interwoven theses cultural figurations have always been.

However, such a bird-eye view of a sweeping evolutionary process overlooks the diverse forms and tempo of exchange between specific cultural settings (which may be peaceful or aggressive, long or short term, direct or indirect). Moreover, confining attention to the uninterrupted inertial energy of cultures, the role of the human agencies in propelling or preventing change is missed (Sela-Sheffy, "How to Be"). Why – and how practically – would people in certain social spaces be willing to change their habits and mindsets and embrace unfamiliar technologies, while others stick to enduring familiar routines and reject changes? To what extent does the 'foreignness' of the new options play a role in this process? And what are the chances that newly introduced options might be actually widely received and incorporated, to the point of eventually becoming naturalized in certain social spaces and not in other?

1. *Motivations to adopt or reject unfamiliar repertoires – the prestige factor*

One answer to these questions which always comes up is that, while perpetuating familiar routines is more economic and effortless, the adoption of new forms is contingent on their usefulness. The idea of social learning, especially as understood in cultural evolution research (Laland; Mesoudi) refers to a basic cultural mechanism that guarantees survival, not only of humans, but also of many other living species. The logic here is that the motivation to invent or imitate others' inventions is to provide basic needs, cope with risks and solve problems. Yet this kind of rational logic is contested by ample evidence on maladaptation (Richerson and Boyd; Laland and Brown). Not unlike other species, in the context of human societies, individuals and groups often select or adhere to routines which may be less fitting, if not destructive for their well-being (less healthy, less economic, less convenient), rejecting those which may be regarded as more fitting ones (Lau). Therefore, moving away from the logic of rational action, Bourdieu and followers have expanded on the *practical logic* (Bourdieu, *The Logic*). This logic emphasizes intuitive 'feel for the game', based on internalized dispositions to action, rather than calculated goals and profits. In this view, it is a sense of social belonging or distinction, and the claim for honor and self-worth, which explain why people are disposed to certain manners and styles. That is, it explains how the choice of,

351

adherence to or rejection of these manners and styles (including cases of maladaptation) are socially meaningful and effective. In short, in this view it is the *symbolic profits* that people may gain from adopting or avoiding ways of doing things that makes culture going.

The same symbolic logic also works to explain why certain social groups, or certain agents in a given social space, might or might not be receptive to *non-indigenous* cultural options. This view obviously calls greater attention to the well-acknowledged fact that not all contacts between social groups inevitably entail culture exchange in the first place. The very fact that a foreign repertoire may technically be available in a certain social space – whether through migration, colonialism, global commerce or tourism – does not necessarily mean that this foreign repertoire is equally accessible to and embraced by all groups in that space. Colonial settings throughout history provide ample evidence to passive or active rejection by local societies of the culture of an occupant power. For instance, studies of aboriginal communities' reaction to Western civilizations often show that even if these people often did not hesitate to adopt artifacts and tools provided by the Europeans, they hardly ever tried to imitate the fabrication of such tools (Hallowell 188). Among the many well-known examples from our own times that come to mind, a less discussed, though highly intriguing, one is the disregard of British culture by the mainstream new Jewish community under British rule in Palestine (1918-1948). Despite the improvement of life standards that had accelerated under the British rule, and the fascination with modernity that prevailed in the new Jewish society at the time, British ways of life hardly played a role in shaping the local modern Hebrew culture. Save for the upper civil servant sector, people in British-ruled Palestine normally did not try to adopt British models, and were indifferent, if not hostile, even to the English language. The point is that this was not just a matter of national-political resistance, but rather also a reflection of the local cultural preferences. For the majority of this population, everyday culture was continuously modelled after East- and Middle-European sources (Even-Zohar, *The Emergence*), while their highbrow culture was continuously German and French oriented.

From the perspective of moving rather than sedentary groups, immigration provides ample evidence to similar dynamics, where immigrant groups retain their home-culture, remaining alienated to the culture of the host societies. Often, this tendency for non-acculturation is interpreted as a deplorable syndrome of inferiority that leads to a failed integration. However, in many cases, no clear-cut link exists between week acculturation and unsuccessful integration in the host society's social operations, such as work or education. Often, in fact, it is precisely home-culture retention, or selective acculturation to the target culture, through which immigrants maintain dignity (Gans; Sela-Sheffy "Europeans in the Levant") and gain a seat at the common table (Boyer).

In contrast, culture interference often *does* occur even without direct contact between source and target societies, sometimes through the mediation of a third party. Again, examples of that sort are too abundant to be quoted, but as a brief illustration, one may quote the massive reception of Italian-style food outside Italy, which has taken place indirectly through the globalization of American fast food. In the Israeli case, it was only after American-style pasta and pizza had been popularized in the local setting that culinary borrowings directly from Italy have become not only fashionable, but also acquired higher status as recognized options of gourmet cuisine (Calo).

In all these and many other cases, the incentive to appropriate or reject foreign repertoires cannot be reasoned in terms of availability or convenience, nor can it be explained in terms of an instrumental need of new knowledge and technologies. Rather, it reflects status contests, where the possession of exclusive goods and expertise work – or fail to work – to demonstrate high aspirations.

In fact, instrumental use-values may often be attached only as a secondary function, at a later stage, to imported goods that had initially been received as prestige markers, as suggested by Renfrew with regard to the use of iron in pre-historical Europe, or as implied by Petroski regarding the diffusion of fork as an eating tool throughout Europe.

The question thus arises how and under what circumstances this pursuit of foreignness gains momentum in a given cultural figuration. Eventually, it is always restricted to certain social sectors, usually balanced by an opposed tendency of other sectors to conform to domestic repertoires and fight 'culture invasions,' as it were. Thus, even prevalent global trends, such as the current spread of American technologies and cultural images worldwide, attain different values in the different local settings into which they are introduced, regardless of their use-value. A case in point is the polarity of reception attitudes towards the American-oriented psychotherapeutic culture in various countries. In Israel, for example, while educated aspiring sectors embrace the psychotherapeutic discourse and praxis as a token of a progressive cosmopolitan lifestyle, popular sectors approach it with hostility and call it fake and harmful (Friedman-Peleg; Sela-Sheffy "Two Way Cultural"). Another example is the differentiated reception strategies of American food chains around the world. While McDonald's has long been established as a standard fast-food facility in diverse cultural settings worldwide, Starbucks coffee shops have not gained the same position. In the Israeli case, according to people in the industry, the reason why Starbucks has failed to gain ground is its incompatibility, as an American icon, with the local aspiring images of sophisticated European-oriented coffee and cafés (Coussin).

Openness for foreign-originated innovations, on the one hand, and conservatism, on the other, thus constitute two opposing strategies of value making that are fundamental to every culture. The tension between them reflect social struggles that are at play in each and every field of action, where the authority to define the legitimate resources is constantly negotiated between the different social sectors vying for control. This tension emerges very clearly from the ambiguous moral value attached to the pejorative notion of 'provincialism' in its popular uses, where in some cases (i.e., from an innovation seeking perspective) it refers to cultural isolation and backwardness, whereas in others (from the perspective of traditionalism) it means an inflated pursuit of cosmopolitanism at the cost of domestic legacies. A paradigmatic illustration of this tension is provided by translation studies (where translation may be understood either as a specific form of cultural importation, or as a general metaphor thereof). As studies on translation *norms* show (Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*), the work of translators oscillates between domestication and foreignization, that is, between converting the imported items to fit domestic conventions, or retaining their effect of foreignness. Studies show, for instance, that literary translators are often predisposed to conformity with domestic norms (although this tendency differs considerably from one cultural space to another). Whereas in non-highbrow fields, such as advertisement, technical manuals, TV series, etc., foreignization is far more tolerated (including the use of foreign expressions in their original form). That is, from the viewpoint of the target society, while in some cases translators tend to act as guardians of the domestic canon, in others they are less committed to this role (Sela-Sheffy, "How to Be"). In the latter cases, depending on the position of the translator, the retention of foreign flavors may either be discredited as a sign of incompetence, or celebrated as a novelty anteceding a change.

2. *The role of cultural brokers*

Translators, like all other transmitters of culture, thus play the role of brokers in 2the market of symbolic goods' (Bourdieu, "The Market") in two different ways: either by securing the value of longstanding domestic cultural assets, or in promoting a change of existing value scales. That is, they act either as canonizers or as trendsetters. Whether they act in one way or the other, or both, depends on their position in their social environment. According to Bourdieu ("Quelques Proprieties"), the greater the capital of cultural stakeholders, the greater the efforts they would invest in sanctioning established forms in their field of action, while the newly arrived tend to capitalize on innovativeness (see also Even-Zohar, "The Position"). In a similar vein, anthropologist Grant McCracken proposed the 'patina principle', in the sense of the visible marks of oldness that cumulate on the surface of precious material objects, to indicate their enduring value. The thicker the patina on an object, the longer its age, which fact testifies, according to McCracken, to its worth. In this view, longevity is an utmost resource for guaranteeing high status. Conceived as a visible status marker, the patina stands here as a metaphor for gate-keeping functions, in providing an 'objective' measure, as it were, for securing the privileged position of those in possession of longstanding valuable property, while excluding those who are not.

In reaction, so McCracken suggests, those who are "unable to use patina, [are forced to] use its terrible rival, fashion" (42). Accordingly, accelerating fashions, which, as Malcolm Gladwell argues, "became [recently] trickle-up" and are characterized by "the elusive prey of street cool" (78), provide an alternative prestige strategy for coping with the tyranny of seniority and conservatism. However, such a strong association between seniority and orthodoxy as value-determining factors is not always valid. Often, the opposite is true, namely, that conservatism becomes precisely the strategy of the newly arrived, who must first accumulate enough capital to get admitted to the club in the first place. Whereas rapidly changing fashions may be the privilege of senior agents, who must constantly re-affirm their authority as those who set the rules.

Moreover, the balance between these two value-making strategies – namely, securing the value of existing traits or attributing greater value to non-indigenous ones – eventually depends on the moral contents with which these traits are embedded in each and every case. While in 'settled life' (Swidler), familiar routines are usually understood as naturally entwined with commonsensical ideologies (such as civil decency, friendship or family commitments, career aspirations, etc.), at some historical points, rising ideological agendas invoke deliberate fabrication of whole new ways of life. Such cases of dramatic transformation often attain the form of a total 'culture planning' (Even-Zohar "The Making of Culture", "Culture Planning"; Toury "Translation as a Means"). Typical such examples are the construction of secular national cultures by way of revolutionizing traditional religious ones. Stimulated by the emergent European nationalism, this process took place during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in peripheral European-oriented cultural settings, including modern Turkey (Ahmad; Lewis; Tahir Gürçağlar, Paker and Milton; Zürcher) and modern Hebrew (Jewish) cultures (Even-Zohar "The Emergence", "The Position"; Shavit and Shavit; Toury "The Beginning of Modern"). In both cases, as in many similar ones, entire foreign, Europe-originated cultural packages, from official organizational models to models of everyday life, were massively borrowed and widely propagated in the name of modernity. Accordingly, imported goods have served as both the concrete supply for implementing the desired new models, as well as the means of training for the skills required for their continuous reproduction. These processes were led by restricted circles of trendsetters (the *Young Turks* or the Jewish *Zionists*), who were well acquainted with the European educated society and trained with the repertoire of secular national

354

cultures. While these agents were not in the position to take leading roles in the source cultural environment, they were able to use the expertise they acquired from it as their distinctive capital in their home societies, and eventually managed to mobilize large sectors to their national projects.

3. Naturalization processes

In typical cases of radical culture borrowings, such as mentioned above, a predilection for non-indigenous models of life is promoted, generating a massive appropriation of new goods and practices in multiple areas of life. Nevertheless, as has often been pointed out, even in times of such drastic changes, a great deal of the rejected old traditions persists as part of the new cultural configurations, either as indelible canonical relics or as trivial routines that escape the attention of the rule-setters. The persistence factor is therefore crucial for understanding interference, which, beyond the introduction of non-indigenous repertoires, entails complex processes of reception and incorporation of such repertoires, until they become unmarked components of the domestic culture. According to Even-Zohar, the consequence of interference lies not in the flow of goods from one culture to the other as such, but in their naturalization through domestic reproduction, a process which generates an 'authentic need' of these goods in the target culture, to the point they leave no traces of their foreign origins. As an illustration, Even-Zohar ("The Making of Culture") takes the appropriation of black pepper imported to Europe from the East in medieval times. Having eventually gained the status of a basic ingredient of Western cookery, black pepper has induced in this culinary world a taste for seasoning in general, without which cooking is inconceivable today.

Such a long-term naturalization of a foreign repertoire in the receiving culture is a complex process, the pace and intensity of which depend on multiple factors. It can often be partial or take unpredictable forms and directions, or it can fail entirely. As sociologists Kaufman and Paterson have shown, a lot can be learned precisely from failed or limited interferences. Their work on the reception of cricket in British Commonwealth colonies throughout the nineteenth century reveals how, although this game was equally introduced by the British to all the colonies at the same time, its appropriation by the different domestic cultures varied considerably, depending on local social structures and specific agencies in each and every case. Interestingly, precisely in local settings where British culture was most alienated, notably in India, this sports activity was massively adopted and popularized, to the point it has gained the status of a native national game. In contrast, in local settings that were originally closer to British culture, notably in North America, this game has ostensibly failed to gain ground. But in fact this 'failure' was just a different type of reception: There, cricket has been embraced as a symbol of elitism and has endured very effectively to date, as confined to exclusive clubs.

4. The delicate balance between trendsetting and canonizing agencies

Trendsetting agencies, such as shops, magazines, TV shows, etc., are responsible for stimulating a short term chase-and-flight dynamics (Gladwell) between rapidly rising and outdated fashions, with the new trends either quickly vanishing or being routinized (Sela-Sheffy "Canon Formation"). Consequently, as much as new fashions and the adoption of foreign resources are believed to control culture, they often have lesser impact for the long run, depending on the extent to which they persist and become naturalized. In their classical, widely cited model, Ryan and Gross describe the gradual process in which innovations are diffused and received among target

communities. In their longitudinal study of the reception of new seeds by a farmer community in Iowa, they showed that this process starts with the adoption of new items by restricted circles of 'innovators' and 'early adopters', who are opinion leaders in their social spaces. The larger the distribution of these items by ever-growing circles of 'early majority' and 'late majority', the slower this process becomes, until these items are finally adopted by the 'laggards', the most conservative of all, at which point they culminate into taken-for-granted popular goods. Only the 'innovators' react directly to new goods and styles introduced by external agencies. For all the others, the spread of innovations depends on interpersonal imitations within a given community.

The longer this process continues the more secure and irreversible the status of the newly received items become as part of a domestic tradition, and the stronger their effect of canonization. Obviously, along this gradual community-based reception and solidification on the consumption level, culture consolidation entails the work of established canonizing agencies, such as educational systems, grammarians, museums etc., to which authority is ascribed to sanction certain repertoires and delegitimize others. These agencies are responsible for the construction of (physical or abstract) longstanding pantheons that cannot be deleted from the public consciousness (Sela-Sheffy "Canon Formation"). In cultural fields of rigid social equilibrium and extreme centralization, it is likely that the power of canonizers outweighs that of trendsetters. Yet, as a rule, it is hard to imagine a functioning cultural figuration where all channels of interference and innovation are hermetically blocked.

In other words, it is the constant tension between the work of canonizers and the actual ups and downs of the symbolic market, to use Bourdieu's terms, which incites and controls the import and circulation of new goods. Even cultural spheres which seem to be extremely codified and stagnant disguise changes that occur 'under the radar' of the canonizers' policy. The most obvious examples are these of extreme orthodox communities, of which the Jewish ones in Israel or the United States are typical cases. Whereas borrowing from secular popular culture is utterly denied and often officially banned by spokesmen of these communities, in many areas of life such creative borrowings and adjustments constantly occur (including the use of modern Hebrew, work and leisure practices, TV and social media, etc.; Caplan and Sivan). In these secluded highly conservative spaces, these are usually women who act as innovators (ibid.). Given their officially marginal status in their communities, they, rather than men, are eventually the ones who can use their competencies to act in cultural spheres that lie beyond the boundaries of their own culture.

At the same time, canonization efforts often increase precisely in times of change, when newly adopted foreign repertoires displace, or are perceived as threatening to undermine traditional ones. Paradigmatic examples are cases of language and style standardization. As Rina Drory (*Models and contacts*) has shown with reference to the Hebrew culture in medieval Spain, the growing reception of textual practices adopted from the Christian world gave rise to increased efforts to sanction the diminishing canonical Jewish-Arabic poetical language that had previously prevailed. The manifesto of Hebrew poetics, *Book of Studies and Discussions,* written in the twelve century by the Hebrew poet Moses Ibn Ezra, was intended as a guide for the exemplary work of Hebrew poetry that employed Arabic models. However, the cultural sphere in which this book was written was no longer that of the Jewish community in Arabic Spain, where Arabic culture had actively been used as a dominant source, but rather that of the Jews in Christian Spain, where Arabic literature became past legacy.

As a rule, in all social spaces of whatever type and dynamics, there is a delicate balance between these two forces – domestic canonization vs. exchange with other cultures – which shape the nature

and pace of change. On the one hand, when the pursuit of 'updateness' through adoption of foreign styles becomes overriding, to regain exclusivity, trendsetters may compete with one another precisely by 'revolutionary conservatism' (Bourdieu, "Quelques Propriétés"), that is, by recycling existing outdated forms. The various manifestations of 'retro' styles are obvious examples. And the same holds for large-scale cultural revolutions, such as that of European nationalism throughout the nineteenth century, where reviving ancient local traditions was invoked as a tool for transforming contemporary social and political life. On the other hand, as the canon debate in literary studies in recent decades attests, canonizing institutions readjust their standards from time to time, and confer canonicity on repertoires previously unacknowledged, so as to close the gap with the continuing rising ideologies and flow of new styles promoted by innovation trendsetters (Sela-Sheffy, "Canon Formation"). This process is evidently belated, as recognition can only be conferred in retrospect on forms that have persisted long enough to become fairly established.

Finally, in any particular case of interference, the receiving (ever-mutating and fuzzy) cultural figuration maintains, as mentioned earlier, a kind of center-periphery relations with the source culture from which new models are borrowed. In the context of long-lasting highly canonized cultures, innovations are likely to be borrowed from foreign sources of lesser status, which often serve as the marginal layers of the receiving culture. The lesser-ranked models of these sources are then being relabeled by trendsetting agencies and gain value in the target culture as 'exotic' or 'authentic', without necessarily interfering with the enduring hardcore domestic canonical forms that are protected by strong canonizing agencies. On the other hand, borrowing foreign repertoires from external prestigious sources is typical to fields with weaker consecrating agencies, or fields where powerful canonical pantheons are not (yet) extant at all, such as of everyday life practices and popular cultural production. In these realms of cultural production, the innovators are often people who are also able to act as competent actors in the source cultural spheres. Employing in the target cultural fields models they acquire from higher-ranked sources is for them a means of upgrading the status of the local cultural production in the target fields, and hence a way of promoting themselves to the position of senior consecrating agencies in their domestic arenas.

Works Cited

Ahmad, Feroz. *The Making of Modern Turkey*. Taylor & Francis, 1993.

Bourdieu, Pierre "Quelques Propriétés des Champs." *Questions de Sociologie*, 1980, pp. 113-120.

Bourdieu, Pierre "The market of Symbolic goods". *Poetics* vol. 14, no. 1–2, 1985 (1971), pp. 13-44

Bourdieu, Pierre.*The logic of practice*. 1980. Polity Press, 1990.

Boyer, Pascal. "Cultural Assimilation." *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001, pp. 3032-3035.

Calò, Emanuela. "Change of Taste in Israeli Food: The Case of 'Italian Cuisine', 1980 - 2000." M.A. thesis, Tel Aviv University, Unit of Culture Research, 2005. [Hebrew].

Caplan, Kimmy, and Emmanuel Sivan. Israeli *Haredim [Orthodox Jews]: Integration Without Assimilation*, The Van Leer Institute and Hakkibutz Hameuchad Publishing House, 2003. [Hebrew].

Coussin, Orna. "Not Our Cup of Coffee." *Haaretz*, 2003. [Hebrew].

Drory, Rina. "The Hidden Context: About Literary Production of Triple-Culture Encounters in Medieval Times." *Pe'amim*, vol. 46-47, 1991, pp. 9-28. [Hebrew].

Drory, Rina. *Models and Contacts: Arabic Literature and Its Impact on Medieval Jewish Culture*. Brill, 2000.

Elias, Norbert. *The Court Society*. 1969. Translated by Edmund Jephcott, Pantheon, 1983.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process*. 1939. Translated by Edmund Jephcott, Blackwell, 1994.

Elias, Norbert. *The Germans*. 1989. Translated by Stephen Mennell, Polity Press, 1996.

Elias, Norbert and Eric Dunning. *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilizing Process*. Blackwell, 1986.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "Polysystem Studies". *Poetics Today*, vol.11, no. 1, 1990, pp.1-6.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Emergence of a Native Hebrew Culture in Palestine, 1882-1948." *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1990, pp. 175- 191.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1990, pp. 45-51.

Even-Zohar, Itamar."The Making of Culture Repertoire and the Role of Transfer." *Target*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1997, pp. 355-363.

Even-Zohar, Itamar "Culture Planning, Cohesion, and The Making and Maintenance of Entities." *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni, John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 277njamin

Friedman-Peleg, Keren. *"Ha'am al hasapa": The politics of trauma in Israel*. The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2014. [Hebrew].

Gans, Herbert J. "Toward a Reconciliation of 'Assimilation' and 'Pluralism': The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention." *International Migration Review*, vol. 31, no. 4, 1997, pp. 875–892.

Gladwell, Malcolm. "The Coolhunt". *The New Yorker*, 1997, pp. 78-88.

Hallowell, Irving A. "Sociopsychological Aspects of Acculturation." *The Science of Man in The World Crisis*, edited by Ralph Linton,Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 171-200.

Kaufman, Jason and Orlando Patterson. "Cross-National Cultural Diffusion: The Global Spread of Cricket." *American Sociological Review*, vol. 70, no.1, 2005, pp. 82-110.

Laland, Kevin N. "Social learning strategies." *Learning & Behavior*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2004, pp. 4-14.

Laland, Kevin N. and Gillian R. Brown. "Niche Construction, Human Behavior, And the Adaptive-Lag Hypothesis." *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2006, pp. 95-104.

Lau, Raymond W.K. "Habitus and the practical logic of practice: An interpretation."

Sociology, vol. 8, no. 2, 2004, pp. 369–387.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 1968.

McCracken, Grant. "Ever Dearer in Our Thoughts: Patina and the Representation of Status before and after the Eighteenth Century." *Culture and Consumption: New Approaches to the Symbolic Character of Consumer Goods and Activities*, edited by Grant McCracken, 1988. Indiana University Press, 1990, pp. 31-43.

Mesoudi, Alex. "An experimental comparison of human social learning strategies: payoff-biased social learning is adaptive but underused." *Evolution and Human Behavior*, vol. 32, no. 5, 2011, pp. 334-342.

Paker, Saliha. "Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics: A Systemic Approach." *Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Homage to Itamar Even-Zohar*, edited by Rakefet Sela-Sheffy, and Gideon Toury, Tel Aviv University, Unit of Culture Research, 2011, pp. 459-474.

Petroski, Henry. *The evolution of useful things*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1992.

Renfrew, Colin. "Verna and the Emergence of Wealth in Prehistoric Europe." *The Social Life of Things*, edited by Arjun Appadurai. Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 141-168.

Richerson, Peter. J. and Robert Boyd. "Cultural evolution: Accomplishments and future prospects." *Explaining culture scientifically*, edited by Melissa J. Brown, University of Washington Press, 2008, pp. 75-99.

Ryan, Bruce and Neal C. Gross. "The Diffusion of Hybrid Seed Corn in Two Iowa Communities." *Rural Sociology*, vol. 8, 1943, pp.15-24.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. "Canon Formation Revisited: Canon and Cultural Production." *Neohelicon*, vol. Xxix, no. 2, 2002, pp. 141–159.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. "How to Be a (Recognized) Translator: Rethinking Habitus, Norms, and the Field of Translation." *Target*, vol.17, no.1, 2005, pp. 1-26.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. "Europeans in the Levant' Revisited: German Jewish Immigrants in 1930s Palestine and the Question of Culture Retention." *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte / Tel Aviv Yearbook for German History*, vol. 41, 2013, pp. 40-59.

Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet. "Two-Way cultural transfer: The case of the Israeli TV Series BeTipul and Its American Adaptation in Treatment." *Media Culture and Society*, (forthcoming).

Shavit, Zohar and Yaacov Shavit. "Translated vs. Original Literature in the Creation of the Literary Center in Erez-Israel." *Ha-Sifrut*, vol. 25, 1977, pp. 45-68. [Hebrew].

Swidler, Ann. "Culture in Action". *American Sociological Review*, vol. 51, 1986, pp. 273-286.

Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz, Saliha Paker and John Milton. *Tradition, tension and translation in Turkey*. John Benjamins, 2015.

Toury, Gideon. "The Beginning of Modern Translation into Hebrew: Yet Another Look." *Dapim* (Haifa University), vol. 11, 1998, pp. 105-127. [Hebrew]

Toury, Gideon. "Translation as a Means of Planning and the Planning of Translation: A Theoretical Framework and an Exemplary Case." *Translations: (Re)Shaping of Literature and Culture*, edited by Saliha Paker, Boğaziçi University Press, 2002, pp. 148-165.

Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. 1995. John Benjamins, 2012.

Zürcher, Erik Jan. *The young Turk legacy and nation building : from the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey*. I. B. Tauris, 2010.