

peatedly depicted in the codex and noticed that each deity was associated with a particular glyphic compound in the accompanying text. Paul Schellhas interpreted the glyphic compounds under discussion as names of corresponding deities. Last but not least Yuri Knorozov (1952) succeeded in a phonetic decipherment of Maya hieroglyphic writing which was based on “Diego de Landa’s Alphabet” and the extant codices, mostly, the Dresden Codex. Yuri Knorozov was able to show that the Maya writing was logographic and determined correct phonetic readings for several dozens of syllabic and logographic signs. Surprisingly, after Yuri Knorozov’s attempt to make a complete translation of the Maya codices (1975, see also the English edition: *Maya Hieroglyphic Codices*. Albany 1982), little was published on the manuscript (cf. H. Bricker and V. Bricker, *Astronomy in the Maya Codices*. Philadelphia 2011). Mayanists of the last 30 years were mostly concerned with hieroglyphic inscriptions of the Classic Period from the Maya Lowlands. The Dresden Codex as a source for new understanding of the ancient Maya was exhausted in those times; again religious matters of a lost civilization are not easy subject to deal with. Ironically, today our understanding of Classic Maya inscriptions manufactured several hundred years earlier is superior to our understanding of the Dresden Codex. The book under review seems to herald a new chapter in the study of this invaluable document.

An important contribution of the book under review is the first syllabary of the Dresden Codex ever published (58). It allows to a reader unfamiliar with Maya writing to start to read glyphs in Dresden Codex by himself. Unfortunately, the provided list of logographic signs (59) is extremely short. I also have some reservations concerning the syllabary. Why is the logographic sign TE? (tree) given as a syllabic value “te”? Did Nikolai Grube find a context where the sign undoubtedly has a syllabic value? Many syllabic signs found in the codex are missing, for example, “ʔa₁,” “b’a₃,” “b’o,” “ke,” “k’o,” “na₃,” “so,” “ʔu₃,” “ʔu₄” (here I use subscript numbers to distinguish different signs with the same phonetic value). I also believe the readings for “ne” and “je” in the Dresden Codex problematic; I can neither prove nor disprove their phonetic values in the contexts attested.

Reading, translation, and interpretation of a Maya manuscript is a risky business. Our understanding of Maya writing is still incomplete, many concepts and ideas of the Maya are still obscure for us, many signs and glyphic combinations attested are *hapax legomena*, some relatively frequent signs still elude their reading. It is obvious that any book dedicated to thorough analysis of a pre-Columbian manuscript would contain some misinterpretations, inaccurate readings, and debatable suggestions. After reading the book I have found myself anxious to get answers to many questions. For example, I find it hard to agree with the reading K’AL for the sign “TWENTY” (59). The phonetic complements in the spelling TWENTY-na-ki (Dr. 61) seem to offer an unquestionable proof that the sign in question is to be read WINAAK. Did Nikolai Grube find evidence for the K’AL reading I overlooked? Who was the first to suggest reading TZ’UL “for-

eigner” (126) and on which evidence? Why “his spouse” is *y-atan* if the glyphic compound spells “ya-ta-li,” cf. colonial Yukatek <*atal*> “purchased, reward”? How tamales (maize dough steamed in leaf wrappers) can be *mak*’-ed (eaten), if in Cholan and Yukatekan languages the word *mak*’- means “to eat soft and sweet things only (for example, overripe bananas and honey)”? The word for eating tamales is *weʔ*-. Is not the interpretation ʔu-k’am-waaj “he takes tamales” a better solution taking into account the fact that the “ma” sign frequently shows a deviant reading order due to the peculiar complete version of the sign in question? I have a number of similar questions and there is not enough room in this review to handle them. These are questions, which a specialist in the field gets after reading the book, because detailed reading, grammatical analysis, translation, discussion, and references are omitted. However, we should admit that, first, popular science literature is like this, second, it would be impossible to publish the Dresden Codex in such a format, and, third, many readers who are not specialists would not enjoy an extended academic edition. At the same time, consistent commentaries with particular attention to iconography, text structure, and general content allowed Nikolai Grube to show his readers an extraordinary perspective on the document and have a glimpse of its bewitching intrinsic logic.

In summary, I would recommend every Mayanist to get acquainted with the book under review. I hope that a revised and extended version of the book will appear in English. I am also eager to see an expanded academic edition of the Dresden Codex as well as a special volume dedicated to its study in the nearest future. And I suspect that many readers will get deeply interested in Maya culture after reading this book.

Albert Davletshin

Halmos, Istvan: *Music among Piara Indians. Melodies and Life of an Indigenous Community in Venezuela*. Budapest: L’Harmattan Könyvkiadó-Libri Kiadó, 2012. 502 pp., CD-ROM. ISBN 978-963-310-179-7.

After 55 years, the Hungarian ethnomusicologist Istvan Halmos has published parts of his recordings made during a field trip together with the anthropologist Lajos Boglár between September 1967 and June 1968 in Piara territory by the Orinoko River, on the border between Venezuela and Colombia. Their main field site was between the Samaripo and Cuao River, home to the two communities Caño Pauji and Caño Raya. Here Halmos had the opportunity to record a *Warime* ritual, which is unfortunately not published nor analysed but described in his diary notes attached in the appendix with the explanation, that the recording is archived with the others in the Musicological Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Science.

The main focus is on the analysis of 42 recordings which are attached in the supplied Audio CD. These recordings should be heard before reading the book in order to be able to follow the very detailed transcriptions and in-depth sound analyses. In his first chapter, named

“Vocal Music,” Halmos describes the circumstances of the recordings of Carmen’s song. Here he recounts that the song was recorded in three fragments because the session was interrupted several times and finally ended up with her very angry husband who dragged her out of the hammock while threatening her with a knife. Even if we notice Halmos’ attempt at very blunt self-criticism, an approach to an understanding of his role in that gender specified interaction through singing is missing. The idea of the ethnomusicologist in those days as only being interested in music is reflected in the second part of the first chapter where Halmos confesses that the recording of the “Farewell Song” was made without knowing the performers. He never fails to advise the reader about the recording circumstances and conditions, for example, lamenting problems about the budget and time pressure.

Without the possibility of evaluating first results in a laboratory at home before going into the field again, he pursues the study of the sound recording as an own entity by classical methods of comparative musicology. He created a diacritical sign system which is difficult to read and understand. Therefore, one could recommend the reader to use software to replay the field recordings in half time in order to be able to understand the transcriptions. Halmos searches for a classification of “musical” and “non-musical” tones using categories and signs of “(mainly) musical sounds,” “half-musical sounds, influenced by linguistic phenomena, but with a definitely musical core,” “a still musical sound with roughly localisable pitch,” “aspirate of uncertain pitch,” “whispered sound of undefined pitch,” and “not musical sounds” as they could be better defined as “stops or fricative,” etc. But the sound recording of Carmen’s song and the Farewell song points to what we should understand as Piaroa taxonomy and/or axionomy (Menezes Bastos) or at least “idea of structure,” which can be defined as a sound phenomena composed between singing, speaking, and chanting.

This becomes visible in Halmos’ summary, when it emerges that only “three basic moves” appear in 20 different melodic main types, with an ambitus of a fifth including seconds, thirds and a fourth. Next to inter alia topics like general impressions, sound formation and sound, pitches and intervals, there is a hand-written and, therefore, quite confusing rhythmic analysis, complemented by statistics of “word and tune” relations. This procedure is missing in the second song because lyrics were never transcribed. The comparison of the two songs reveals the impossibility to find an agreement concerning a Piaroa interval system or a typical “ethnic scale.” One has the increasing impression that Piaroa sound ontology is quite different to naturalist sound ontology and/or Western analysis.

The main part is dedicated to the *marana* flute players after a short section of presenting the interaction between whistling and playing a friction instrument (*rere-tana*) for entertaining as well as the *vuyvuy*-flutes. The flutes are used in evening sessions when flautists just play in their hammocks to entertain themselves. Halmos focused on descriptions of the production of the flutes. On the one hand, his worship to Izikowitz becomes clear when

presenting his results of the measurements of *vuyvuy*-flutes: 1. Total length; 2. sound-forming edge and distal end; 3. sound-forming edge and opening at the distal end; 4. sound-forming edge and nearest stop at the distal end; 5. stop closest to the proximal end and sound-forming edge; 6. between stops; 7. distal lip and stop closest to it; 8. stop closest to the distal end and distal end; 9. measurement of the reed’s inner bore. On the other hand, he wonders why Piaroa flute makers do not use any techniques for measuring speculating that in Piaroa language there only exists the numbers “one and two.” Without discussing that point, it should be noted that the Piaroa counting system is actually based on five and is quite complicated (Monsonyi).

But it seems that numbers and measurements are not important in Piaroa sound production, since all European forms of analysis have shown that all measured flutes (*vuyvuy* as well as *marana* flutes) do not correspond to each other as flute makers decide to measure by their eyes. These inconsistency with regard to hole positions, tube length, and so on are the reason why measurements of pitches and intervals have the same results. And even the technique of playing a 4-hole flute like the *marana* shows a variance of up to 20 different tones. Halmos identifies scales including minor/major seconds, minor/major thirds, a fourth, a tritone, a fifth, a minor/major sixth, and even a seventh. Most of the tones can be heard in its octaves as well and the reader can notice that Halmos is deeply rooted in Western ideas of pitch systems.

His analysis of the *marana*-flute players again reflects his method to see the recordings as agents linking the reader (and hearer) to a sound which was practiced 55 years ago. He defines a tune as “playfield” framing the performance from the moment “the owner of the musical instrument takes it in his hand and comes to an end when he reset it”. He uses the term “units” as structures which range from “stanzas” via “section like motif” to “motif,” and “time out periods” until “moments of errors,” “bad sound informations and testings.” Ideas are counterparts to melodies as Halmos hears *marana* music as “allotropy and gyration of ideas”.

His category of appearance describes the general character of his sound interpretations. He introduces us to ten levels of stratifications, from “trim to unstructured appearance,” with its conclusion that all players and *marana* owners have their own style of sound production and qualities. The intensive sound analysis of the *marana* flutes leads in the end to a summary identical to the introduction as well as the short lists of musical genres in Piaroa society and musical instruments. The pages 233 to 502 offer a miscellany of information, including diary notes and letters, about recordings not analysed in the present volume, music, musical life, musical instruments in specialist literature, Piaroa territory, settlements, economy, social roles, and beliefs. Before the photos, the immense corpus of musical transcriptions, and the detailed sound analyses of the entertainment flute music can be studied, other notes and fragmented information are presented. Halmos refers to some short quotes by Claudia Augustat’s field research and her observations of cultur-

al transformations in the year 2000 in a final statement: “Nowadays my recordings are the main conservator of the Piaroa musical tradition – I mean.”

Besides the fact that another proofreading is necessary we have to agree with his statement as the presented collection of material is very important for further investigations, restudies, and reinterpretations.

Matthias Lewy

High, Casey, Ann H. Kelly, and Jonathan Mair (eds.): *The Anthropology of Ignorance. An Ethnographic Approach*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 220 pp. ISBN 978-0-230-34082-4. Price: \$ 55.00

Many years ago Mark Hobart pointed to the “growth of ignorance.” It would seem that in the intervening years since 1993, ignorance has burgeoned. A concern with ignorance and not knowing has been the subject of numerous seemingly unconnected enquiries by researchers from diverse fields including not only anthropology but also sociology, political science, history of science, and information technology studies, among others. By pushing at the boundaries of our knowledge of knowledge, researchers have increasingly become aware of the flipside to ways of knowing: to the place of ignorance, not knowing and nesience in our own academic disciplines and in daily social life. Specifically, anthropologists, in their intense desire to discover knowledge about the native Other, have often overlooked informants’ own accounts of ignorance, those points where the people themselves recognise the limits of local knowledge.

This collection of essays edited by High, Kelly and Mair brings together articles written by a number of recently established scholars on this very theme from an anthropological perspective. In this they have been successful: this collection contains high-quality, engaging, individually informative chapters that cover regions as diverse as Senegal, Japan, the UK, Amazon, Greenland, Brazil, and the US. The Introduction by Mair, Kelly, and High on “Making Ignorance an Ethnographic Object” argues the case that: “... ignorance has a substance of its own, as the product of specific practices, with effects that are distinct from the effects of the lack of knowledge to which the ignorance in question corresponds” (3). They locate the issue of ignorance within the history of the discipline and offer a wide-ranging review of aspects of not knowing in anthropological perspective from Durkheim and Malinowski through to Marxism and post-structuralism. Part of their argument is that ignorance is produced through social relations, and that ignorance is productive of new social relations. Indeed, it should not pass without comment that the strategic gaps in the editors’ own representations of knowing about not knowing is itself productive in this specific disciplinary field.

Ignorance is construed in many ways by the authors of individual chapters, which deal with, for example, “temporal ignorance” – a state of unknowing arising from actors’ concerns about the future, which by definition is unknowable and uncertain – to the plotting of complex dialectics in the production of ignorance set within a ma-

trix of social and political relations. Pfeil’s chapter on almsgiving in Dakar, Senegal, is perhaps one of the most complete accounts that adopts the second perspective. Taking ignorance to be “the presence of an absence of knowledge,” she skilfully traces local interpretations and diagnoses of the circulation of anonymous objects given to beggars at traffic lights or other observable places in the city. She argues that ordinary people’s ignorance of the origins and intentions behind individual acts of sacrificial gifting and almsgiving “makes possible certain forms of local knowledge about the city, as a unified moral agent” (35). In a similar vein, Nozawa’s chapter on amateur Japanese life-writing (*jibunshi*) is at once a reaction to the “increasingly hegemonic process of standardisation” dating from the 1960s in Japan, as well as a democratic process of popular literacy in which ignorance of the potential readership and the erasure of authorial presence are key factors. Ignorance here is a source of agency that gets the writing done in a field characterised by the anonymity and the ordinary.

High’s chapter on Amazonian Waorani shamanism highlights the way in which shamanic knowledge is constitutive of a kind of person capable of predation on other beings – human and animal. Shamans are different kinds of being in the world, and this marks them out as potentially dangerous. The decline in the number of people willing to admit knowledge of shamanism has less to do with the impact of missionaries or other such factors, and more to do with strategic denials of inappropriate relations on the part of individuals wishing to live in a relatively harmonious way with others. High thus illuminates the connections between ignorance, knowledge, and being. Flora’s chapter on the denial of knowledge of the reasons for suicides in Greenland also examines aspects of the person in her explanation of why people claim that they “don’t know.” Not only is it inappropriate, we learn, to venture views about another person’s intentions, but to speak of suicide leads to dangerous thoughts that might cause future suicides through the agency of words themselves.

Indeterminacy, uncertainty, and the unknowability of the future play a part in the other three chapters of the book. Leitner focuses on the unknown possibilities and future promise of spaces within the social and professional networks of researchers in Cambridge University, who are actively involved in creating social links, financial opportunities, and so on for themselves. His ethnography of a networking workshop, the mapping of social relations entailed in the workshop’s activities, and the kinds of reciprocal roles the participants play out over time, all reveal the constant interplay between knowing and not knowing. Procupez focuses in her chapter on a number of families that formed a housing cooperative with the aim of becoming lawful residents in a poor urban squatter quarter in Buenos Aires. Caught between the ever-present threat of eviction and the indefinite wait for bureaucratic authorities to act, members of the group resort to patience as strategy of coping with the unknown. This quality is not just an inner disposition of those resigned to their fates, but is a political stance and a means to work