

BOOK REVIEWS

MAURICE GODELIER and MARILYN STRATHERN (eds.), *Big Men and Great Men: Personifications of Power in Melanesia*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press / Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme 1991. xviii, 304 pp., Bibliography, Index, Figures, Maps, Tables. £32.50/\$49.50.

Maurice Godelier's *The Making of Great Men* appeared in 1986. It was a translation of the French original published in 1981. In that book, Godelier addressed the question of power among the Baruya, a society in the Eastern Highlands of Papua New Guinea. In doing so he addressed as well an earlier essay on power in Melanesian societies, viz. Marshall Sahlins's 'Poor Man, Rich Man, Big-Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia' (*Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. V).

Sahlins's paper was an exercise in political typology, contrasting two ideal models: the Melanesian big man and the Polynesian chief. Godelier proposed that within Melanesia there was evidence for another model to complement the big man, that of the great man. While Godelier's model focused on types of leadership, it described two different types of societies, each with its own distinct structure and logic. These were defined by their different positions on a number of variables including: forms of marriage exchange and of gender relations; the significance of esoteric and ritual knowledge; the existence of initiation rituals, of competitive exchange, of supra-local organizations, of the drive to increase production; and finally, whether exchange requires the transaction of equivalents (e.g., a bride for a bride, a life for a life). Thus, for Godelier leadership was a way of approaching the broader issue of forms of social organization and the logic that underlies them. The present collection is a sustained test of the utility and applicability of Godelier's model. It consists of papers given by different Melanesian ethnographers in a seminar at the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme organized by Godelier and Strathern.

The collection is anchored at either end by papers by Pierre Lemonnier and Godelier that address the same broad and complex set of questions. Different attributes define big-man and great-man systems. How are these attributes distributed and linked in Melanesia, both socially and developmentally? Do societies exhibit attributes of both systems? Can we detect a developmental sequence from great-man to big-man systems? As these systems are ideal types, it is no surprise to learn that attributes of both frequently appear in the same society. These dual appearances provide the raw material for the construction and illustration of how societies might move along the continuum defined by the two types.

A number of other writers pursue this comparative approach, usually by looking at a small number of societies within a circumscribed region. Thus, John Liep contrasts three societies in Milne Bay, Margaret Jolly describes three from Vanuatu, Eric Schwimmer contrasts a number of Orokaivan societies, and Roy Wagner describes the Dairibi and the Barok. Nicholas Modejeska's paper,

probably the most provocative, looks only at the Duna, but does so in terms of a clear developmental strategy and so is comparative across (hypothetical) time rather than space. The remaining papers look more narrowly at single societies. As they address Godelier's model (though some less successfully than others) they are necessarily cast in a comparative frame. Deborah Battaglia describes the Sabarl, Mark Mosoko the Mekeo, Donald Tuzin the Ilahita Arapesh, Bernard Juillerat the Yafar, Gillian Gillison the Gimi, Strathern the Melpa, Rena Lederman the Mendi, and Dan Jorgensen the Telefolmin Mountain Ok.

Most of the papers in the collection fall into one of three broad categories. One category most directly reflects the nature of Godelier's original effort and Sahlins's earlier one. These papers seek to identify forms of social organization, describe their structuring principles and speculate about how a society might change, particularly in the direction of the big-man type. Lemonnier's and Godelier's papers do this most clearly, and most of the comparative papers do so as well.

A second category is made up primarily of the papers that describe individual societies. The papers in this category show how a given society contains elements of both big-man and great-man systems. Individually, most of these papers are interesting. Collectively and in the context of this book, however, they become something of a burden. Partly, this is because there are so many of them—a single paper summarizing this sort of evidence would have made the same point more succinctly. Partly, also, the authors of these papers frequently seem to be talking about different big-man—great-man models. That is, different authors identify, with equal confidence, different elements of Godelier's model as central for his definition of big-man systems or great-man systems. Moreover, this recurring concern to identify key or definitive elements appears misdirected. Godelier's model is not a simple taxonomy of attributes of this or that sort of society. Instead, it is concerned with the ways that attributes fit together and operate in particular ways.

A third category is made up of papers that are concerned with indigenous perceptions, perceptions that usually serve as a basis for criticizing Godelier's model. These may interest readers concerned with particular societies or writers. However, their common concern with indigenous meanings, with culture, is only tangential to Godelier's model. That model is fundamentally social rather than cultural, in the sense that it is concerned with the operation of a social system. As a consequence, just how members of a given society see pigs or male initiation or even big-men, is, in and of itself, relatively unimportant. These indigenous understandings can be made important if they are related concretely and coherently to the model that these papers are supposed to address, but this is an author's responsibility (one that Jorgensen fulfils particularly well). It is not something that should be thrust upon the reader, who is less familiar with Godelier's model and with the specific societies being described than are the different authors. (This general 'treat 'em mean and keep 'em keen' attitude toward readers extends to Strathern, who is responsible for the brief introduction. She elected not to provide

the background that would make the collection accessible to many more readers than it is now.) I have touched on the content of the papers only briefly. They are diverse empirically and conceptually, and thus are difficult to summarize. Equally, despite occasional claims that Godelier's model is of general applicability, it seems unlikely that those without a fair knowledge of Melanesia (and the idiosyncrasies of Melanesian ethnographers) will be able to make sense of many of the papers. The potential appeal of the collection for many readers, Melanesian specialists or not, resides outside the specific ethnographic facts and arguments that it contains. Instead, it resides in the way the orientation of the collection relates to the most visible work in Melanesian ethnography of the past decade or so.

In the 1980s, Melanesian anthropology, at least at the 'grand' level, was increasingly characterized by a concern with indigenous constructions. Classic social anthropology seemed to disappear, taking with it a concern with how societies look from the point of view of the analyst seeking to summarize elements of social practice and the ways that they interact in a relatively coherent whole. This collection is a return to older concerns.

Godelier's basic model, around which the collection revolves, is classic structural-functionalism (Marxist variant). Godelier is explicitly concerned with identifying different social institutions and their interrelationships. He is explicitly concerned with the ways those institutions and those interrelationships form coherent and identifiable patterns or wholes, different social orders. He is explicitly concerned with the ways that those different social orders are related to the material conditions of social life. He is explicitly concerned with the ways that social practices and cultural beliefs reflect and regenerate those social orders.

This concern with older issues may be just a hiccup in the secular trend toward cultural studies. However, I prefer to be optimistic and see it as a sign of the return of an approach that seems to have been banished from Melanesian anthropology. This return would be a benefit if it freed the subdiscipline of the sort of intellectual mono-crop cultivation that has increasingly characterized the dominant literature. It would also be a benefit if it obliged anthropologists to consider once again a set of problems that were abandoned, but not resolved, with the abandonment of social anthropology (Marxist variant or otherwise).

This set of problems is broad, but for the present I will resolve them into three linked, basic questions. One of these is the question of typology. What is the status of the types of society that anthropologists construct? Another is the question of variation. How are we to explain the ways that societies vary between types? A third is the question of process. How are the elements of the social type manifest in social processes? These questions apply to Godelier's work. Are big-man societies, for example, real things or analytical constructs? If we find that a society does not exhibit all the attributes of a big-man system, how are we to account for it? Is that society a 'loosely-structured' big-man system? Is that society at an intermediate stage between the big-man system and some other type, or does it point to the existence of another, undiscerned (or unconstructed) type?

If the type has a 'logic', how is that logic manifest in actual social processes, in the ways that people in the society act in the real world that they inhabit?

The collective pursuit of these issues in Melanesian ethnography in the 1960s and 1970s showed the shortcomings of the existing structural-functional models and so was instrumental in undercutting the power of the whole structural-functional approach. (This is most apparent in the attacks on lineage models in the New Guinea Highlands.) But it seems unlikely that anthropologists were correct in seeing the problems as peculiar to the old approach. Instead, they are likely to emerge whenever a general model is applied rigorously to a variety of local settings, as many of the contributors apply Godelier's model to particular societies.

The eminence of the two editors of this book will help assure that it has a wide readership among Melanesianists. With luck, this will facilitate a revival of interest in the issues addressed by the older, more social anthropological approach that was used in the region, in which case the collection can serve a useful if unintended purpose. Renewed attention to the older approach might lead to renewed attention to the problems that approach generated and to the critical apparatus that was developed in dealing with these problems. This in turn may encourage researchers to interrogate more carefully the newer cultural approaches in Melanesian ethnography as well, to ask the same hard questions.

Were *Big Men and Great Men* to have this result, it would help make the discipline more sophisticated about the nature of Melanesian societies and the nature of Melanesian anthropology.

JAMES G. CARRIER

JAMES A. BOON, *Affinities and Extremes: Crisscrossing the Bittersweet Ethnology of East Indies History, Hindu-Balinese Culture, and Indo-European Allure*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1990. xviii, 211 pp., Bibliography, Index, Illustrations. £35.95/£11.95/\$51.75/\$17.25.

This latest book from James Boon, his fourth, was written mostly at Cornell (Boon is now a professor at Princeton). It is flagged on its back cover as pertaining to Anthropology/Asian Studies/History/Critical Theory, so the warning (p. ix) that the book is 'less concerned with any particular culture (even Bali), any isolable era (even now), or any religious or political persuasion per se, than with inevitably hybrid constructions in the history of difference' is perhaps superfluous.

Still, *Affinities and Extremes* is centred on Bali, on 'what has come to be called Balinese culture (which) is an authored invention, a historical formation, an enactment, a political construct, a shifting paradox, an ongoing translation, an emblem, a trademark, a nonconsensual negotiation of contrastive identity, and more' (p. ix). In this book, wherever possible, 'the theoretical accent is on reading

or rereading, whether applied to "their" activity and interpretation (that of, e.g., "the Balinese"), "our" activity and interpretation, or an epistemological locus that questions this dichotomy' (p. 203 n. 2, cf. p. 210 n. 2).

Among the 'figures' whose assistance Boon enlists to read or reread 'the text of Balinese culture', to which as to that of any culture, we are hopefully told (p. 54), there is more than the culture's 'manifest texts', are: H. Adams, E. Auerbach, J. J. Bachofen (*vis-à-vis* Nietzsche and Burkhardt), M. Bakhtin, R. Barthes, R. Benedict, G. Bateson, W. Benjamin, K. Burke (his corpus), M. de Certeau, E. Curtius, G. Davenport, just a dash of Derrida, M. Detienne, L. Dumont, U. Eco, L. Febvre, M. Foucault, N. Frye, C. Geertz (his combination), H. Kenner, C. Lévi-Strauss (his *oeuvre*), M. Mauss, M. Merleau-Ponty, F. Nietzsche (*vis-à-vis* and versus Wagner), W. O'Flaherty, W. Ong, P. Ricoeur, D. Schneider, M. Singer, V. Turner, M. Weber, F. Yates—a 'doubtless idiosyncratic list' which does not (it will be noted) include any Balinese.

This list is expanded in the book's bibliography, where among those mentioned are a few Balinese, Boon himself, of course, and Hocart. Hocart is said (p. 126) to have most characteristically generally claimed in *The Life-Giving Myth* that, for example, 'the interplay of myth, ritual, and the history of institutions is dialectic...'. This assertion would be more convincing, however, if the citation that Boon employs to support the claim that Hocart 'resisted notions of static replication between myth, ritual, and social organization' did not put what in Hocart's essay comes first last (and in added emphases). This slip (let it be called) and the numerous misprints in the text and the bibliography, as well as omissions in the latter, fail to instill complete confidence about the uses to which *Affinities and Extremes* puts the work of those figures; and they do not perhaps indicate that scrupulosity that is to be expected from a writer employing social facts.

The book, also, has at least two less than attractive features. The first is the author's slightly disparaging and condescending remarks about some of his colleagues' work. Of Robert Hefner, author of the admirable *Hindu Javanese* (Princeton, 1985), for instance, it is written: 'Pierre Bourdieu taught him that cultural traditions are not divided property and Dan Sperber that cultural knowledge is tacit...' (p. 152; also see, for example, pp. 205 n. 2, 207 n. 5). An earlier disclaimer and later praise do not draw the sting in such remarks.

Second, Boon adopts an extremely intrusive style of exposition. The 'Prelude' to the book, indeed, includes a lengthy (pp. xiii-xvi) 'Note on Style'; here Boon declares that 'like some ritual, my style at such points'—where 'the book's writing' evinces 'alliterative rubrics and mnemonic slogans—entexted ethnology, hybrid history, bittersweet Baliology'—'obviously calls attention to itself...'. How right Boon is; though he is perhaps less so when he sharply distinguishes this intrusive (some would say 'indulgent') style from himself calling attention to himself. As Leach has remarked (*Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. XIII (1984), p. 3), 'the particular, style of an individual scholar's anthropology is meshed in with other aspect of his/her personality...'.

Theory is very intrusive too: to borrow a word Boon uses, it 'saturates' the book. A constant theme of this is to question notions of 'fixed patterns' (e.g., p. 209 n. 2), to try to show that Balinese ideology is not 'static' (but who said it was?), but 'inherently fluctuating' (p. 81). So it is argued, for instance, that Balinese spatial categories are 'textlike', stabilizing no synthesis; while an interesting but not conspicuously Balinese development of Swellengrebel's 'important overview' of Balinese cosmology involves 'a dance of categories'—an oddly reificatory image to adopt (as indeed is that of a colour that 'slips down'), especially by a writer who accuses another of being 'insufficiently relational' (pp. 81-2). Then, Hefner's book is taken to task (p. 151) for retaining 'disconcertingly' 'a "village study" style of generalization with its undertones of consensus' and for not noticing 'internal contradictions, softer inequalities, and possible tinges of hierarchy in Tengger categories of exchange'; as though Boon with his theory could possibly know better than Hefner and his participation in Tengger life. Moreover, although 'one might want to qualify (for its) assertion of "absolute classification"', Needham's crisp generalization (pp. 101-2) of the structural features of systems of asymmetric alliance, it none the less 'has the merit of underscoring that "variation in the side" ascribed ritual priority (sc. 'mystical influence')...'; but only because the latter point happens to accord with Boon's theoretical opinions.

In line with these commitments, Boon repeats his view (see also, for example, Chapter 8 of his *The Anthropological Romance of Bali 1597-1972* (New York, 1977)) that 'precolonial rank was unlikely as rigid as colonialist and nationalist representations have made it appear', though he now graciously allows that 'nevertheless, certain machineries—for example, the warna scheme and principles of hypergamy—code a fixity of social strata (which) provide advocates (both indigenous and outsider) of this view with materials for arguing their case' (p. 75). Still, Boon tells us (p. 74), with a nod in the direction of *Homo Hierarchicus*, that 'priestly purity encompasses the courtly political prowess upon which it is dependent for protection...'. This posited relationship could not, in the reviewer's view, obtain because it is hard, if not impossible, to ascribe any meaning to Dumont's 'theory'; but allowing that it can be, the relationship posited could hardly be fluctuating: purity either encompasses courtly political prowess or it does not. In any case, it is difficult to understand the employment of the image, which is not argued, without recourse to 'level', which appears to be inseparable from Dumontian 'hierarchy'.

And there's more—much more, on for example, Pigafetta, Marsden, Raffles, Crawford, Wallace, and Hose; on marriage alliance, social structure, and gender codes; *sociétés à maisons*, 'twinship', the 'ritual rhetorics of "love"'; on 'Hindu Bali as a third extreme between Sivaic and Puranic myths and tales...'; a concluding chapter that invites 'nations and critical theorists alike to multiply isms, including totemisms, Tantrisms and themselves' (compare Hocart, in *The Life-giving Myth*, p. 62: 'the termination *ism* has become associated with powers, capitalism, communism, militarism, and the rest, which push mankind this way and

that like the gods of old'); and a 'Postlude', which 'uncorks an ethnological nexus (plexus?, sexus?) where everything appears intertwined—New Guinea, Bali, Margaret Mead's marriages, Ruth Benedict's book, anthropology's future, respectability and deviance, us', intended 'to push to extremes our sense of how intensely mediated matters can become' (pp. xi-xiii, 173). Most of what Boon has to say on these and the other matters considered in *Affinities and Extremes* is neither to this reviewer's taste nor is it, in his view, generally very helpful or enlightening because those theoretical concerns, overpoweringly apparent as they are, are an unremitting barrier placed by Boon between his readers and matters, including aspects of Balinese ideology, that he writes about. It's a pity that in his reading, or rereading, of Hocart (e.g., pp. 125-8) Boon did not take *this* 'insight', from *Kings and Councillors* (p. 217), to heart: 'What we think has nothing to do with the matter, but only what the people we are studying think'.

One point made by Boon that does strike me as of much interest is that 'Balinese (not-Sasak) culture' might be investigated as 'a kind of allegory of antithesis to Islam' (pp. 92, 85). Not that the general point is new: it is made by Hefner all through *Hindu Javanese*, for instance, from which I have taken my cue for two forthcoming studies that try to explicate in what ways one of the central concerns of not just one or two but of most of the Balinese in Pagutan, western Lombok, namely their form of life and themselves as not just 'not-Sasak' but as in every regard finer than Moslems, affects Balinese ideology there. Of course, no significant recourse is had in those studies, nor will be had, to the idea that '...festivities (that is, 'sacrifices' (*yadnya*) or, for example, *aci*, 'rites') suggest an implicit parody of Islamic circumcision' (p. 92), which does not figure prominently in what Balinese people there in general say about such matters.

To conclude, it should be said that other writers—ready examples are Guermonprez, Schaareman, and Schulte Nordholt on Bali and Errington on southern Sulawesi—appear to have found earlier books and articles by Boon more widely useful, and doubtless *Affinities and Extremes* will be welcomed by such people. But can even a hardback of which much of two of its seven chapters (eight with its 'Concluding Destinations') and part of its 'Postlude' have already appeared, or will shortly do so, in easily accessible collections really be worth nearly £40.00?

ANDREW DUFF-COOPER

GEHAN WJIEYWARDENE (ed.), *Ethnic Groups across National Boundaries in Mainland Southeast Asia* [Social Issues in Southeast Asia], Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies 1990. viii, 184 pp., Index, \$24.00/\$18.00.

Large issues underlie this thought-provoking and widely applicable collection of essays: issues of the impact of state formation on the constriction of ethnic identity

and the instrumental role of development when it is utilized to serve essentially centrist policies. If more evidence is needed that ethnicity can not be construed as a fixed identity this volume provides it, not only in the data, but also in the variety of approaches the authors bring to interpreting the elusive dynamics of social change.

The collection deals with ethnic minorities living in border regions; locations that are political and historical pressure-points of extreme sensitivity to governments. Accordingly, as Tapp shows us by reference to his extensive fieldwork among the Hmong, excessive and unwarranted official attention is drawn to the inhabitants. They are perceived as being peripheral and therefore likely to be unpredictable, destabilizing features of the nation state. Both Tapp and Miles describe how this peripherality has been utilized by the centre, within a world economic system, through the legal/illegal practice of opium production, the trade of 'luxury items' and tourism. Miles further develops the argument by providing a detailed analysis of resultant change in Yao descent units.

Ethnicity is not only constructed out of the legitimation of an identity, whether externally or internally ascribed, but from a shared history. Millenarianism is a key unifying movement existing among the Lua people studied by Cholthira Satyawadhna. Her 'devolution' model, in which she includes the Wa of Yunnan and the Laveue of northern Thailand, tends to confuse rather than contribute to the overall analysis, but by emphasizing the importance of the constructed past, attention is paid to the impact of external forces in shaping over time the structure of a minority group. In this case, the focal interest is the development and replacement of matriliney as an organizing principle. Regrettably, this focus is not developed in relation to social change as perceived by women, although some interesting suggestions are noted by Satyawadhna on the relationship between the growth of the opium trade and the decline of women's authority within the community. No attempt is made in any of the essays to assess possible gender differences related to perceptions of ethnic identity.

In his contribution, Wijewardene also adopts an historical approach in order to largely discount the irredentism of Thai sovereignty in relation to Tai-speaking peoples within its borders. Wijewardene tackles the task through an examination of an assemblage of texts, serving to emphasize the interdependency of images of ethnicity that compose the idea a group holds of its own historical reality. In drawing attention to this composition, the essay does not quite manage to deal with either the socio-political field in which the Thai are placed or that context as constructed by Thai people, both arguably, necessary components of the discussion.

The way in which ethnicity is composed, in the course of an interchange with the dominant ideology, is a theme referred to in several of the papers, but perhaps particularly by Rajah. The contribution of Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983) is clearly evident here. Rajah's analysis notes how elements of the identity of the Karen separatist movement are idealizations based on early ethnological and missionary

writings; internalizations of external power structures that pre-date colonialism. These 'images' are used to anticipate a new world order in a millenarian sense, but, at the same time, the Karen make use of, for parades and uniforms, costumes and symbols that are held to be specifically Karen in origin; an incorporation of what Lilley calls 'semiology of sovereignty'.

An important contribution made by several of the writers, notably Tapp, Wijeyewardene and Satyawadhna, demonstrates the weakening of ethnic identity and community by the dominant state through the reification of traditional customs, objects, ritual and celebration. Pushed into a defensive position through external economic forces, minority peoples become complicit in the process, reproducing elements of their past that are distinct from their present reality. Hmong handicrafts are presented in a form that is a response to external markets to such an extent that they are now an important part of Thailand's foreign currency earnings (Tapp).

The reification of social forms, although offering a few individuals the opportunity for economic activity, is one indicator of the ultimately dependent position in which many ethnic minorities in Southeast Asia are placed. The marginalization of a group is demanded by the operation of a dominant economic system that requires less-developed subsidiaries. In observing some aspects of this engagement, the volume makes a useful contribution to understanding the reasons underlying both the processes of change and the maintenance of ethnic identification.

LINDA HITCHCOX

SALLIE WESTWOOD and PARMINDER BHACHU (eds.), *Enterprising Women: Ethnicity, Economy and Gender Relations*, London: Routledge 1988. 210 pp., Notes on Contributors, Name Index, Subject Index. £28.00/£9.95.

We have in this volume the 'women's answer' to Ward and Jenkins's edited volume, *Ethnic Communities in Business* (Cambridge, 1984), which was in turn one of the first attempts to deal with the economic status and strategies of ethnic minority groups in Britain. While sociologists (and some anthropologists) were quick to treat seriously the racism and ethnic chauvinism of the white population towards the local black population, most withheld—for whatever reasons—from studying one of the great ethnic stereotypes: the Asian (and other) business 'success'. While most British social scientists have presumably bought their fair share of goods from late-night corner shops, and consumed an average number of Chinese take-away meals, none until recently has thought these to be as academically interesting as the activities of Polynesian fishermen or East African cattle-herders. Times are at last changing, and anthropologists are realizing that

hard-nosed, even positivistic, economic anthropology can be as well studied at home as trendily subjective interpretations of being and belonging.

Enterprising Women comprises eight papers, together with an introduction by the editors, covering the economic activities of women who trace their origins to India, Pakistan, Cyprus, Hong Kong and the Caribbean. Westwood and Bhachu set the tone early in their introduction by pointing out that, although they are forced to use the term 'minority' as a compromise term in general discussion, the groups of women discussed in the papers that follow are all united in being black British women (they note, of course, that members of certain groups—Asians and Cypriots, for example—would object to being labelled 'black'). That is to say, they reject the implications of the term 'minority' that presuppose that white Britain constitutes an homogeneous society, fringed by externalized black groups. Not only do divisions of class and gender cross-cut ethnic divisions, but the women discussed in the volume are all involved in economic relations that are crucially and unavoidably embedded within the entire British economy. The idea of an 'economic niche', favoured by some of the few descriptions of the Chinese in Britain, is an anthropologist's conceit. There is a slight tone of triumphalism in Westwood and Bhachu's introduction, which spills over into some of the papers, but this can hardly be otherwise: the majority of the British public appears to believe that minority women—especially of Asian descent—have no economic status whatsoever, except as consumers or as unpaid workers in their husbands' corner shops.

The first paper in the volume, by Annie Phizaklea, continues the general tone of the introduction with a brief—perhaps too brief—argument concerning the importance gender relations within the family have for the organization of labour within the family firm. This theme is explored in a specific context (Greek Cypriot women in catering and in the clothing industry) in a paper by Sasha Josephides and touched upon with reference to Chinese women's labour in the fast-food industry in a paper by Sue Baxter and Geoff Raw. In each case, the authors make the point that such labour organization exploits the labour power of the female members of the family, who—at least those of the senior generation—regard it as normal or inevitable, and thus provides a springboard for minimally capitalized enterprises. Younger women, however, especially those born or educated in Britain, express some resentment at such practices—'most young women would rather not work for Cypriots at all' (Josephides, p. 52).

Three other papers (by Parminder Bhachu, Sallie Westwood and Pnina Werbner) deal with minority women in the wider labour market, working (often in a clerical or manual capacity) in large enterprises where they may have no kin or even ethnic links with their employers. In these papers, most of the authors are at pains to point out that the women they have studied have a perception of, and attempt to control their position within, the labour market: they are not the passive victims of economic circumstance. Indeed, as Westwood suggests in her paper on Gujarati women in a Midlands clothing factory, wage-labour employment may be seen (and used) as a single-minded strategy to accumulate capital or to provide

cash for quotidian needs while the real focus of interest and pride is the husband's firm or enterprise, which thus becomes a 'family' firm (p. 121).

Finally, two papers (by Shrikala Warriar and Ann Phoenix) involve a discussion of minority women's role as mothers. Taken together they provide an interesting contrast. While Warriar's Gujarati informants are torn between their perceived 'natural' role in the domestic sphere and the possible economic necessity of finding work in the open labour market, for the teenaged mothers of Afro-Caribbean origin studied by Phoenix 'childbearing...may well appear a welcome alternative to unemployment' (p. 166). This point (as well as many others made throughout the set of papers) highlights the fact that there are both ethnic and gender dimensions to the construction of apparently neutral categories such as 'employment', 'wage labour' and 'motherhood'.

Sensibly, this volume has been issued in paperback as well as hardback and has much to commend it as standard reading for students in sociology and applied economics as well as anthropology.

MARCUS BANKS

SALLY PRICE, *Primitive Art in Civilized Places*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press 1989. xi, 136 pp., Bibliography, Illustrations. \$19.95.

Before the advent of critical theory, discourse was justified and evaluated by reference to whichever theory of knowledge underlay it or was current at the time. Such a theory contained, either explicitly or implicitly, certain truth propositions that permitted the textual authority of a work to be evaluated. Post-modernism has rightly questioned the often arbitrary distinctions that a more secure world imposed between different types of knowledge as well as seemingly suspending the possibility of scientific or near scientific accountability. As a result, the criteria on which textual authority rests have been given a permanently problematic status. In the absence of substantial criteria for supporting truth propositions, there has emerged a tendency among some modern writers to use uncritically a pastiche of different written genres and sources, all explored shallowly and attributed equal authority, to circumscribe arbitrarily a personal field of discourse. Unfortunately, and despite its admirable intentions, *Primitive Art in Civilized Places* falls into this fashionable category. The issues and themes it discusses are without exception relevant and important but in the main inadequately addressed because of the variable quality of the data and the limitations of the arguments. The first chapter, 'The Mystique of Connoisseurship', a rich area requiring a great deal of serious and critical study is perhaps the most disappointing part of the book, while Chapter

8, where Price uses her own fieldwork, reasserts the scholarly flair evidenced in her previous publications.

The work moves effortlessly from questioning the basis on which connoisseurship is exercised to its discursive effects in ascribing psychological universals to the perception and reception of art, thereby ignoring the cultural heterogeneity of the societies from which it comes and emphasizing the overarching importance of a tutored sense of aesthetic appreciation. While art, no matter what its origin, is accoladed as a uniquely human achievement that attests to the universality of mind, non-Western art has nevertheless been represented as its most elementary, instinctive and primordial expression, capable of providing an entrance into the most intimate recesses of the psyche. The latter proposition establishes an asymmetrical relationship that opposes Western to non-Western art by attributing grace and refinement to the first while relegating the second to the values associated with the infancy of civilization. Chapter 4, while acknowledging the exceptions of Firth and the Boasian school (arguably the most influential writers of this time), describes how non-Western art has been depersonalized and studied not as the product of a creative individual, but as the expression of a collective representation or sensibility. Price argues that the anonymity of such art is the pre-condition that enables the West to deny its timelessness and legitimize the ahistorical primordial psychology that it is taken to express.

These first four chapters each explore aspects of the West's ideological flirtation with non-Western art and describe how it is accommodated within dominant classifications and accorded a particular significance and importance *vis-à-vis* Western art. Next, the activities of collectors and curators are examined. Long quotes are provided from the works of Leiris and Shortridge to demonstrate the well-known and accepted views that early public collections were not always ethically acquired and that museums themselves are partly responsible for perpetuating the misrepresentation of foreign arts and cultures by their modes of display and representation. Returning to an earlier theme, Price argues that the anonymity prescribed to non-Western art works permits collectors and dealers to value a piece by the pedigree of its previous owners and the prestige of the collections of which it was once part, thereby denying indigenous cultural values. Price is at her best and most interesting in her treatment of authorship and pedigree and this must be considered the real strength of the book.

All the themes and issues discussed by Price provide valid and worthy areas for scholarly and critical attention, and by demonstrating the interrelationships between them she is able to describe an important nexus of cultural misrepresentation underlying theory and practice and to discuss its attendant political implications. But none of these themes and issues is as new and as previously unexplored as she would apparently have her readers believe. When compared with the critical literature, which is largely ignored, her arguments appear poorly, and sometimes only selectively, documented. Given the relevance of the issues involved, it is unfortunate that the book does not amass the necessary broad and detailed documentation to assert and further develop the themes that are by now

replete in the literature. Nowhere is this shortfall clearer than in the discussion of connoisseurship. Taste is approached by arraying the views of an art historian (Kenneth Clark), two dealers and three collectors, with the incisive critical insights of Bourdieu, Haskell and Sieber Alsop. While it is an entirely valid exercise to use historical changes in aesthetic appreciation to criticize aesthetic transcendentalism, this cannot be convincingly achieved using such limited examples. The intention behind Price's discussion of connoisseurship reminds one of Kris and Kurz's *Legend, Myth, and Magic in the Image of the Artist*, which relativized the office of the artist by examining the changes in the idea and value of his calling in Western civilization. Their success at undermining a unitary category of 'artist', again often distinguished by his purportedly transcendental labour, was achieved only through a thorough review of disparate and detailed sources. Neither can Price's discussion be compared with the detailed and exhaustive material assembled by Bourdieu in mapping the different tastes of the French. Indeed, since the book suffers from the same ahistoricity for which she criticizes the 'art establishment', it is often difficult to know which historical period the attitudes and views she discusses actually represent. This difficulty is further compounded by the anonymity of the informants who supply the opinions crucial to her arguments.

The work also reiterates the naïve view of exhibitions. Exhibitions of ethnographic objects are not reducible to just two types—those organized by aesthetic principles and contextualized displays, and the suggestion that exhibitions should be reflexive is no longer radical. Even before it was raised by James Clifford, it had been incorporated by George MacDonald into the exhibition philosophy at the Canadian Museum of Civilization and it remains much discussed by museum curators. Again, an important statement has not been developed beyond its initial formulation.

Although ignoring history and the voices in her own text, the work suggests a peculiar view of such notions when their absence is criticized in the works of others. *Primitive Art in Civilized Places* treats history and the concept of individuality as 'hard' categories, apparently independent and not themselves cultural constructs. The work does not easily concede that the act of an artist signing his creation or insisting acknowledgement supposes his/her compliance and adoption of Western concepts of the self, just as history need not necessarily be restricted to a unilinear and cumulative structure of events as conceived by Judaeo-Christian historiographers. If by the self we necessarily mean individuals, and if by history we uncritically accept the Western sense of time as objective, we may be as equally guilty of cultural misrepresentation and aesthetic imperialism as those authors who imposed the ahistorical and anonymous views on creative intelligence.

Three further issues discussed here are also worthy of note. Particularly interesting is the idea that while the West may have accepted that non-Western societies can produce art of great aesthetic appeal, it may not have conceded that such people have the ability to recognize similarly valued pieces from societies other than their own. Likewise, Price's observation that museum labels have an inverse relationship to the value of the work, and more generally, her reflections

on the tendency for anthropologists and the public to exaggerate the erotic and fertility aspects of non-Western art, as well as the inflation of symbolic interpretation to subsume non-symbolic native statements, are worthy of much deeper consideration and study. Like so much else in this work, these are interesting and intriguing observations, but overall one is left disappointed that they are never sufficiently developed.

My disappointment with the book may be the result of having unduly high expectations of perhaps what was only meant to be a modest introduction to the problems of this fledgling sub-discipline. If this was the author's and publisher's intentions then the work must be treated more generously and credit awarded for some of the provocations it raises. *Primitive Art in Civilized Places* could almost be an overture for a much more exhaustive and authoritative work that still awaits to be written.

ANTHONY SHELTON

SUSAN M. PEARCE (ed.), *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, London and New York: Leicester University Press 1989. xiii, 177 pp., Index, Figures. £17.50.

In his preface to this collection of papers (which came out of the 1987 conference 'Museum Studies and Material Culture' held to mark the 21st anniversary of the Department of Museum Studies at Leicester University), Geoffrey Lewis suggests that the book addresses 'issues of critical concern to museology and therefore to all those involved in museums today'. Somehow its title belies such a broad sweeping significance; some of its content, thankfully, does not.

Material culture studies, and the development thereof, are certainly an issue of importance to museum curators, but such studies must be seen as part of the broader context of all museum work. Refreshingly, some of the authors (Jenkinson, Hooper-Greenhill, Kavanagh) take such a view as they address material culture as a vehicle for investigating the relationship of the object to the institution, the curator as a purveyor of the dominant ideology, and the mythology and fiction of the 'past' or 'other'. However, the overall thrust of the book is that a more intellectual and rigorous study of material culture (the 'fetish of the object' as Gathercole might suggest) by museum curators will pave the way to improving the content, credibility and impact of museums. Such a perspective is somewhat more predictable on the European side of the Atlantic. Museums here have been generally protected from the very direct attacks on their right to interpret museum collections (leaving aside issues of how they do it) that many North American and Australian museums have faced. But it is still somewhat naïve. Recognizing that these papers were written just as some of these attacks were being made, its

authors can be forgiven, but their naivety stands to be noticed by all of those who work in museums. I am not suggesting that museum curators become visionaries of the future; I am suggesting, however, that they pay greater attention to the larger world in which they function, and that they attune their thoughts and actions to the issues and realities of the intellectual, political and social climate in which they work. As such they will be tracing the same path as some of their academic colleagues (Marcus and Fisher, Clifford etc.) who began several years ago to reflect on their assumed authority to the work that they do.

Conceptualizing curatorial work as 'material culture studies' narrows the audience who will acknowledge it and fails to engage the desired discussion and commentary from a wider community. My comments are not meant to remind us yet again of the age-old reticent attitude of non-museum anthropologists to the study of material cultures, an attitude which took root in the early decades of this century, the time that the introduction to this book begins, but to raise the point that some of the papers in this book are much more than 'material culture' studies (they are in fact good anthropology) and should be recognized as such. Museum curators and audiences need to see that their work is part of a much wider intellectual debate that is challenging the basic premises of what is identified as knowledge and truth. They need to see their work beyond the context of 'museum studies'.

Pearce in her two contributions outlines (and subsequently demonstrates) how specific theoretical frames can be applied to material culture research. Her introduction is a good review of what progress has been made in this area, even if I cannot agree that the 'interpretation of material culture has become a major academic preoccupation' (p. 1); it is growing, yes, but the majority of museum collections still remain unresearched and devoid of new interpretations. Museums are also not overwhelmed by the rush of graduate students at their doors. The main frustration in her opening remarks is that she seems to gloss over major developments all too quickly. Just where is Gidden's concept of 'structuration' going to take material culture studies? It is an interesting thought.

It is not clear from Pearce's papers (and some of the others as well) exactly what practical implications the strides that material culture studies have made in recent years will have on the work of the curator. Gathercole gives a very clear example of how his ideas can be applied, which is enlightening and heart-warming for the curator who will always remain, no matter how theoretically rigorous and involved his/her thinking about objects may become, bound to the very practical reality of interpreting and communicating ideas through the much-flawed (but very popular) medium of exhibition. This is a fundamental challenge to the curator—beyond developing new frameworks to think about objects and museums.

The book is a good place to begin for students new to the field, or for those who have long rejected the idea that the material production of a people is worthy of serious study and that museums, as institutions (as part of that production), are ripe for investigating the multiple and negotiated realities of that production. The volume is worthy of further note as it includes contributions from continental

Europe, the United States and Australia, as well as from both those who work in museums and those employed in the academic world of anthropology. Such cross-fertilization is good but could have been improved and expanded to include contributions from those who are represented (often by their descendants) in museum collections—those whose material culture is being studied. They have a right to be part of this very important discussion.

JULIA D. HARRISON

MIRANDA GREEN, *Symbol and Image in Celtic Religious Art*, London and New York: Routledge 1989. xvi, 260 pp., Bibliography, Index, Plates, Maps. £25.00.

The study of Celtic religion is hampered by the fact that the Celts themselves left no written record of their practices. Any inquiry is, therefore, very dependent on the surviving art and our interpretation of it. Green states that her book is concerned primarily with the physical, visual expression of the divine and with what the function of a created image is. She also discusses the influence of Mediterranean artistic traditions on Celtic art.

In her preface, Green comments that the surviving evidence is more informative of ritual than the nature of the belief system. There is little mention of the gods themselves. And as the evidence is unsupported by written sources, the iconography is both ambiguous and potentially misleading. As with many agricultural societies, the Celts would have been preoccupied with observable natural phenomena, these forces being for them apparently supernatural. This focus on the natural environment is reflected in Celtic religious symbolism, which includes a prominent tradition of animal imagery. In common with other rural tribal societies, there was limited communication between the various regions, leading to local conservatism and the favouring of tribal deities. Even with those sky-, sun- and mother goddesses that transcended regional boundaries, there were still local preferences.

Chapter 2 looks at the female image and concludes that the maternal character embraces a wide range of activities. Green feels that the dominance of the mother cult suggests a society in which the female principle was important and the possibility of a matrilineal society. But the fact that there were a large number of statues and figurines of women cannot be taken simply to indicate women's place in society. In concluding the chapter Green admits that while the 'images cannot, by themselves, lead to a true understanding of a cult...the overwhelming feature...is a fundamental concern with life, fertility and regeneration' (p. 43).

Divine marriage is the focus of the next chapter. The pairing of gods was very much a function of the Roman-Celtic blend, and through an analysis of the art Green tries to establish the nature of the relationship between the two partners.

She investigates how partner swapping, polygyny and polyandry were represented in Celtic art and how in turn they may have functioned in Celtic religion and, possibly, Celtic society. Green feels that through their imagery as down-to-earth, familiar gods and goddesses, who were 'easily identifiable with the average peasant family' (p. 73), these couples would have brought comfort to their viewers.

The male image is considered in Chapter 4. Celtic art reflects the traditional male roles of war and hunting in Celtic society, but it also depicts a group of gentler gods who were full of beneficence, good-will and prosperity. Green also compares how these primarily warlike gods correspond with, and were adapted to, the Roman ones.

The pre-Roman Celts were very dependent on natural images to represent their deities, and these natural symbols are discussed in Chapter 5. Green argues that 'the religious beliefs of the Celtic world had their roots firmly within the concepts of animism and the sanctity of the natural world in all its manifestations' (p. 131). The iconography of natural phenomena falls into two categories: animate and inanimate. The main feature of Celtic belief, in common with those of many ancient and modern pre-industrial societies, was the intense awareness of, and reverence for the powers of the natural phenomena that surround them. Green feels that the 'sensitivity of the Celts to their natural environment is striking and manifests itself in the amount of religious imagery which is associated with the natural world' (p. 167).

In Chapter 6 Green states that 'Celtic imagery is distinctive in that it was frequently used to make a positive statement concerning the extreme potency of a divine concept...[and]...was not hidebound by the rigid framework of realism' (p. 169). Therefore, deities' powers were often shown as physical, visual expressions. This included the use of multiple, and especially triple, images. Three-faced images, in any culture, are a strong symbolic acknowledgement of power and sanctity and, as the images are not naturalistic, they are perceived as supernatural.

Chapter 7, discussing style and belief, focuses on the relationship between art and religion. Green claims that 'the style in which images of deities were presented may be as significant as the gods they portrayed' (p. 206). She examines how artists and patrons envisaged the gods and discusses how this may reflect the attitudes of the people towards the supernatural. Green also considers how great Roman influence was on Celtic traditions and the different ways that style and belief were represented in art. She argues that the Celtic gods were not of this world and that therefore the images were not bound by human perception: the 'idea may have been that a schematic, understated image could be interpreted flexibly by different people, a kind of choice of perception' (p. 215).

This book uses symbol and image to tell us who the Celtic gods were and what their functions were. It looks not only at the deities themselves but also how their portrayal in art changed when the indigenous society came into contact with a more advanced one. Despite its archaeological basis, *Symbol and Image* will be useful for anthropologists as an example of how the uncertain nature of religion

can be studied through its relationship to art, especially when a lack of written evidence leaves only other, more ambiguous, sources.

LORI-ANN FOLEY

L. B. DAVIS and B. O. K. REEVES (eds.), *Hunters of the Recent Past* [One World Archaeology 15; ser. ed. Peter J. Ucko], London etc.: Unwin Hyman 1990. xx, 406 pp., Index, Figures, Tables. £15.00.

This book is one of a series of some twenty post-conference publications emanating from the controversial World Archaeological Congress held in Southampton in 1986. Although the principal orientation of the conference was archaeological, multidisciplinary approaches were much in evidence, and none more so than in this book, which represents the combined efforts of anthropologists and archaeologists in a detailed and diverse consideration of communal hunting. Ten of the nineteen papers were delivered at the conference, nine were commissioned subsequently to fill gaps and generally broaden the scope of the topic. The main thrust of the book centres on the recent ethnographic and archaeological records, although aspects of the Palaeolithic and Postglacial periods are also covered. The majority of the papers deal with the Americas, but the areal coverage also extends to the Circumpolar Zone, New Zealand and northern Europe.

The book encompasses a diverse group of topics from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. Most of the papers are prey-specific, such as those on bison hunting on the North American Great Plains, reindeer/caribou hunting in northern latitudes, guanaco hunting in South America, or mountain-sheep hunting in the Rocky Mountains. The range of prey considered in total is extensive: bison, horse, bighorn sheep, pronghorn antelope, guanaco, mammoth, horse, reindeer, the New Zealand moa, deer, and marine fauna such as sea lions and seals.

As might be expected, much of the evidence for communal hunting centres on the examination of faunal data from archaeological contexts, analysis of which enables inferences to be made about hunting techniques themselves, as well as about subsequent processing of the kills. Other papers consider theoretical issues, such as those that question whether Palaeoindians were specialized big-game hunters or were more likely to have been generalized opportunists. Prehistoric cave art is scanned in the search for clues to Palaeolithic hunting techniques, and several papers adopt an evolutionary-ecological perspective and assess the change over time of hunting strategies and approaches in particular areas. Several papers consider the overall ecological aspects of communal hunting, and how it was integrated into the social economy generally, for example by timing the hunt to coincide with prime conditions for meat or hides, or by locating settlements at the ecotonal intersection of the home ranges of different prey species.

There is much of interest here for the socio-cultural anthropologist. The continuous nature of the record for an essentially unbroken hunting tradition on the North American Plains has proved a powerful opportunity for co-operation between archaeologists and ethnologists. Such ties are complementary; archaeology has a unique perspective on the time dimension often lacking in socio-cultural anthropology. Especially in the case of traditional societies, so much of so many social institutions is developed on antecedent foundations. It follows, then, that an outlook on the past is indispensable if we are fully to understand what is evident in the present, particularly in the case of those extinct societal institutions, such as hunting, that provided the basis or heritage that underlay or influenced subsequent adaptations we recognize today.

Although societies that subsist exclusively by hunting and foraging are all but extinct and restricted to occupation of marginal environments, it must be remembered that such an economy was universal for over 99% of human existence. Clearly, we ignore at our peril the legacies of hunting. The last major treatment of the topic was the 1968 *Man the Hunter* symposium (edited by R. B. Lee and I. Devore), which showed that far from being a fragile and perilous hand-to-mouth existence, a hunting and gathering way of life was the basis of the original affluent society. Now that hunting has received a seal of sociological approval, the way was open to pursue more of the detailed aspects of a hunting economy and its implications for social organization. This book is just that, and thus represents a valuable contribution to the literature of both archaeology and socio-cultural anthropology. Its treatment of its subject-matter is timely, diverse yet well-balanced, and very readable.

In these days of increasing specialization and a burgeoning literature, academic books that are designed to reveal their content quickly and efficiently are becoming indispensable. This book is a good example of what is needed. The contents page has itemized sections for all the papers, and the editor's introductory chapter consists largely of liberal synopses that have been supplied by the authors themselves to minimize errors of misrepresentation. All this serves to provide the reader with an accurate assessment of what lies in store, enabling the book to be sampled, or enjoyed in full.

JOHN CASTLEFORD

CLIVE GAMBLE and OLGA SOFFER (eds.), *The World at 18000 BP*, Volume One: *High Latitudes*; Volume Two: *Low Latitudes*, London etc.: Unwin Hyman 1990. xx + xix, 334 + 343 pp., Indexes, Maps, Tables, Figures. £45.00/\$65.00 each.

The majority of the papers in this two-volume publication stem from the symposium 'Hunter-Gatherers at the Last Glacial Maximum: The Global Record', held during the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology

in Toronto in May 1987. The aim of the volumes is to present archaeological data on a global scale, in order to examine the nature of long-term human adaptation to the environment. At 18,000 years BP (before present), the world was experiencing the last glacial maximum (LGM), when minimal temperatures coincided with the maximal extension of the ice sheets. Though the exact timing of the LGM and the associated climatic minima vary in different parts of the world, by focusing on this time-window centred at 18,000 BP, Gamble and Soffer aim to provide an opportunity for documenting highly variable strategies of regional survival in response to a universal climatic phenomenon. The editors stress that this approach should not be seen as an attempt to advocate the primacy of the natural environment in determining the nature of human adaptations, but rather as providing a context within which to present a global synthesis and to question how far demographic and cultural changes were dependent on the environment.

The collection of thirty-four papers by forty-four authors from five continents is truly international in scope, though the quality of the contributions is extremely variable; some accept *per se* environmentally deterministic explanations for culture change, despite the fact that such views are currently unfashionable among anthropologists and archaeologists alike, whereas others question such adaptationist arguments and find evidence to suggest the contrary. The most common themes that are discussed in the papers are changes in population distribution, subsistence strategies, lithic technology, and social organization.

The project has highlighted many problems that need to be solved before interregional comparisons can be made. However, by providing a global synthesis of late glacial hunter-gatherer behaviour that finally breaks with the traditional Eurocentric bias in the subject, *The World at 18000 BP* makes a valuable contribution to Upper Palaeolithic studies and palaeoanthropology.

SARAH MILLIKEN

S. J. SHENNAN (ed.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity* [One World Archaeology, 10; ser ed. Peter J. Ucko], London etc.: Unwin Hyman 1989. xxv, 312 pp., Index, Figures, Maps. £35.00.

Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity presents a collection of papers that originated at a session on 'Multiculturalism and Ethnicity in Archaeological Interpretation' at the World Archaeological Conference in Southampton in 1986. The twenty-three papers by scholars from all five continents return to one of the most fundamentally important questions of archaeological interpretation: what can legitimately be inferred about the social groups that produced the material culture that forms the primary data base of the archaeological record, and can one assume that such groups considered themselves to be distinct from other contemporaneous social groups?

Shennan's introductory chapter provides a useful historical perspective on the concept of ethnicity in archaeology. The papers are then grouped into three sections that confront different aspects of the problems of recognizing and interpreting ethnicity in the archaeological record: the first section deals with general theoretical and philosophical questions revolving around the theme of objectivity in archaeological interpretation; the second section considers the question of the relationship between cultural identity and variation in material culture; and the third section focuses on the question of ethnic change. While some papers are purely archaeological, others combine ancient documentary sources with modern ethnography, such as Wang's fascinating paper exploring the definition of ethnic groups in the Yunnan province of China.

Unfortunately, the book ends abruptly and without a summary chapter, thus leaving the reader somewhat bemused after the conflicting theoretical opinions expressed in the various papers. However, the immense diversity of the case studies provides stimulating food for thought, and this volume should be essential reading for both archaeologists and anthropologists alike.

SARAH MILLIKEN

YE DABING and WU BING'AN (eds.), *Zhongguo Fengsu Cidian* (Dictionary of Chinese Customs), Shanghai: Shanghai Cishu Chubanshe (Chinese Dictionary Publishing House) 1990. iii, 811 pp., Appendixes, Indexes, Illustrations. 36 Yuan Renminbi.

It has become a popular activity in the People's Republic of China in the last few years to publish dictionaries on folklore and folk literature, to edit or re-edit historical collections of articles dealing with general or specific folklore subjects, and to compile reference materials on folklore subjects out of local histories and the like. The *Zhongguo Fengsu Cidian* is the first comprehensive dictionary of its kind. Work started on it in 1982, and 102 contributors have written 12,157 articles, partly illustrated, and grouped into the twenty categories of 'general', annual rituals and festivals, birth, marriage, life cycle and birthdays, folk medicine, death, social behaviour and etiquette, dress and personal ornamentation, food, dwellings, tools and implements, communications, production and professions, folk arts, ancestor cults and society, music, belief and ritual, sorcery, divination and taboo. The volume also has three appendixes: a chronological list of festivals, with their local terms, the nationalities that celebrate them, the dates on which they are held, the areas in which they are found, and the activities typical of them; a list of Han-Chinese kin terms; and a list of important reference materials. A 75-page index grouped according to Chinese characters is also provided.

MAREILE FLITSCH

MIHÁLY HOPPÁL and OTTO VON SADOVSZKY (eds.), *Shamanism: Past and Present* (in 2 parts) [ISTOR Books 1 and 2], Budapest: Ethnographic Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences / Fullerton, CA: International Society for Trans-Oceanic Research 1989. 398 pp., Name and Subject Index, Figures. No price given.

The 12th Congress of the ICAES, held in July 1988, included a symposium entitled 'Shamanism: Past and Present', thirty-eight papers from which comprise the contents of these two volumes. A thorough introduction by the editors summarizes each of the papers, which are organized thematically.

The first section contains theoretical analyses of the scope and definition of shamanism, its location, and its place in history. Among the contributors are M. Hoppál on the 'Changing Image of the Eurasian Shaman', A. Hultkrantz on 'The Place of Shamanism in the History of Religion', J. Pentikäinen on 'The Shamanic Poems of the Kalevala and their Northern Eurasian Background', and O. von Sadvoszky on the 'Linguistic Evidence for the Siberian Origin of central Californian Indian Shamanism'. Subsequent papers are organized regionally, describing practices in Lapland, western Siberia, the northern and trans-Baykal, the Altay, Nepal, southwestern China (Yunnan, Guizhou, and Sichuan), Korea, Manchuria, the Amur, southern Alaska, and the Canadian Arctic. A number of these papers are by scholars who themselves belong to the groups of people represented, for example, T. Kim on 'The Realities of Korean Shamanism', E. Gear on 'The Way of the Soul to the Other World and the Nanai Shaman', and N. Dauenhauer and R. Dauenhauer on 'The Treatment of Shaman Spirits in Contemporary Tlingit Oratory'. Some regions are presented for the first time, for instance, in Shi Kun's paper 'Shamanic Practices among the Minorities of Southwest China'. The final papers derive from 'neo-shamanism' (as I would term it) in the Western world, which may be differentiated from traditional shamanism.

This collection has been published by ISTOR, an acronym for the International Society for Trans-Oceanic Research, whose aim is to promote research into the cultural unity of mankind, and thus to enhance international co-operation. The names of the board of directors can be found opposite the title pages, the address and the complete statement of intent on the back covers.

S. A. MOUSALIMAS