

The precepts of anthroponomy, edited below, is one possible mediations of the output from the preceding set of flyers #01-#05. It displays the migratory dynamics of an X-factor that cannot be held, but migrates and shifts once the work of its operation is left. It cannot be recognised/yield recognition.

Rather, it can be conceived as the *trail* of the perpetual fieldworker, migrant or nomad. Which is why I have organised this repro-spective *walkabout* as a collection of *fieldwork notes*. It spans the interstitial space *between* ethnographic fiction *and* theoretical fact. And thereby formulates a critique.

It attempts to open the *seal* that *shares* and *divides* between *ethnography* and *anthropology*. And thereby proposes an explanatory framework for the phased transaction that went on between Prof. Fredrik Barth and myself. Scoped by embedding a model within the workings of a personal relation.

If the effect is an explosion, the hit-and-impact breaks the seal. It opens a different field. Which, from lack of a better term, I have called *anthroponomy*. My sense is that it mediates a connection to *natural history*, and incorporates as sense of 'disordered system' in the following 20 points.

20 precepts/ground-rules of anthroponomy:

1. We cannot explain/understand *something* by means of the *same*
2. Everything we do [A] *settles* in something *else* [B]
3. From each settlement-pair [A; B] emerges an understanding X
4. The *joinery* of A and B does *not* equate *their* understandings
5. A minimal pair of settlement X, A and B hold *each other* differently
6. The connection X between them is *specific*
7. X is distinct from both A and B, it is *simplex* and a *vectorial sum*
8. The relation between A and B is *mereological* and is *not* a thing
9. X is *substantial* in its *multiple* mediations between A and B
10. It is *self-organising*—the relation between A and B is *cohesive*
11. Numbers change from before to after they are *ac/counted* [for]
12. Ac/counting holds the work and impact of categorisation
13. Categories are *between one and many* [or, between 0 and 1]
14. Categories are *neither* elements *nor* sets [but operate *between* them]
15. Categories extend/restrict the elements in a group/set
16. Categories feature *anomalies*—heterostructural entities/agents
17. Anomalies are the empirical *references* of categories
18. They indicate and afford transformations [phase shifts]
19. They prompt/spur transpositions
20. *Mereology*—what we understand as the relation between parts and whole is a *transduction* [within and between wholes]

$$/A + Bi = X/$$

The following is a *précis* from Prof. Barth's correspondence with me. During the years of our relationship, I called him Fredrik (like everyone else). My point of using Prof. Barth here, is that by calling him Fredrik people would (and still are) missing the point: which was his professorial vocation.

Reading his profuse notes on my even more profuse drafts—which went on up to 1999—I clearly was a challenging human material for him to deal with: featuring my interest for detail, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, my unusual appetite for a broad range of readings and theoretical perspectives.

He urged me to stay on the empirical trail of the subject matter, and to avoid lengthy theoretical excursions: challenging both the memory, energy and patience of an imagined reader. Re-reading his correspondence, I remember feeling that he almost gave up on me. And he really acted as a friend.

Eventually, our correspondence came to reflect on his perspectives on games theory: he wrote that aspects of complex life-situations may advantageously presented in *games theoretic* terms, on account of complex life-situation, with *so many concerns*: life-ways can blow up cultural scripts.

Beer-drinking Fur peasants (Sudan) succeeding as cattle-traders to the point that they become milk-drinking Arabic nomads. The *opportunity costs* for entering transactions. These being asymmetric, he continued, the chances of develop an all encompassing *theory* from *games* is poor.

Since these hindsight reflections from 1999 on his 60s fieldwork in [Darfur](#) relate to *economic spheres* (at the crossroads between ecology and exchange) which, in my mind, either indicated that they applied in restricted *local* confines, or precisely at the interstices *between* economic spheres.

This was part of a discussion in which I was labouring to determine how a shared Jewish estate could exist without a common time and space. In a *games theoretic* framework, he insisted, the workings of systems is *specific*, and cannot be generalised across spaces (i.e., allegiances/parties change).

A communication from 2006 testifies that his views on my abilities as an *innovative fieldworker* and a *social analyst* with a sense of *theoretic problem*, had changed for the better. At it is in this context that we also mentions my work on *disordered systems* that eventually became a core of my thesis.

That is, the Passover/Seder ritual under the siege of Sarajevo (1992-95), as a *heterostructural entity X*—emerging from the internal (A)/external (B) cross-pressures of the *war theatre*—became a vehicle of *change* in cultural scripts *from Jewish ethnicity to Bosnian citizenship* in a capital under siege.

In retrospective, my fieldwork was partly motivated by the urge to penetrate Prof. Barth's work, which contained an enormous store-house of experience. Through my fieldwork I wanted to earn a right of say on the matters he had worked on all over the earth, and that he shared for a time with me.