

Dabei erwies sich in dieser nicht nur ethnisch, sondern auch von der Kirchen- und Sektenangehörigkeit stark differenzierten Gemeinde, dass die Ämterübernahmen keinem stark vorgeschriebenem Muster folgten. Im Vergleich zu den klassischen Vorarbeiten von Manning Nash, stellt der Autor somit einen "dramatischen Bedeutungsverfall" der traditionellen Institutionen fest.

Für Muquiyauyo, eine weitgehend spanischsprachige Gemeinde im zentralperuanischen Andenhochland kann der Autor auf den ethnologischen Klassiker "A Community in the Andes" von R. Adams (1959), eine *re-study* aus dem Jahre 1978 (M. Grondín) sowie auf eine Regionalstudie des Bruderschaftssystems (Celestino und Meyers 1981) als Grundlage für seine Feldforschung zurückgreifen. Dabei ergab sich im Unterschied zu den beiden mesoamerikanischen Beispielen ein anderes Bild. Weder ließ sich eine enge Verbindung zwischen zivilem und religiösem Ämtersystem ziehen, noch konnte Brockmann bei den von ihm dokumentierten Karriereverläufen eine hierarchisch aufsteigende Linie bis hin zum höchsten Amt feststellen. Klare Angaben zu Struktur und Übernahmeformulation von Ämtern waren nicht möglich, was auch durch die Komplexität der Verwaltungsstruktur bedingt ist. Neben der Distrikt- und Kommunalebene ist das Dorf verwaltungsmäßig in vier *cuarteles* (Viertel) aufgeteilt, die sich mit den *barrios* überschneiden, die hier als Festgemeinschaften begriffen werden und für die Durchführung der religiösen Veranstaltungen nach dem katholischen Ritualkalender zuständig sind. Die Situation wird noch komplexer durch die Existenz kalendarisch nicht festgelegter Feste wie dem beliebten *cortamonte* (rituelles Baumabschlagen) oder dem *jalapato* (Entenziehen), welche zu Hochzeiten und anderen familiären Anlässen veranstaltet werden. Schließlich ist noch die Rolle der zahlreichen Migranten nach Lima zu berücksichtigen, die letztlich die kostspieligsten Festämter übernehmen und so das dörfliche Prestigesystem weiter aufmischen. Dieser Situation ist durch ein Kurzkapitel unter dem Titel "Verflechtungen" natürlich nicht Genüge getan, was allerdings unter Berücksichtigung der Fülle von Daten und der Kürze der Feldforschung verständlich ist.

In den Schlussbetrachtungen wird auf die weiterbestehende Gültigkeit des Ansatzes der *peasant communities* für Lateinamerika hingewiesen und nochmals die Überlebensfähigkeit der Ämtersysteme aufgrund ihrer extremen Anpassungsfähigkeit betont. Gerade unter diesem Aspekt wäre eine Diskussion der Frage der Veränderungen im Kontext der nationalen und schließlich globalen Entwicklung mit entsprechendem Gesellschafts- und Identitätswandel (A. Wimmer) interessant gewesen, anstatt diese kategorisch und ohne Begründung abzulehnen (293, Fn. 1). Alles in allem bleibt zu betonen, dass diese Arbeit einen ersten Gesamtüberblick über die Ämtersysteme liefert, mit einer datenreichen Vergleichsanalyse der Karriereverläufe und Austauschprozesse. Außerdem stellt sie einen der wenigen ethnografischen Vergleiche zwischen Mesoamerika und dem Andenraum überhaupt dar, auf diese Weise einem lange geäußerten Desideratum entsprechend.

Albert Meyers

**Browman, David L., and Stephen Williams:** *Anthropology at Harvard. A Biographical History, 1790–1940.* Cambridge: Peabody Museum Press, Harvard University, 2013. 589 pp. ISBN 978-0-87365-913-0. (Peabody Museum Monographs, 11) Price: £ 48.95

In their introduction to "Anthropology at Harvard," David L. Browman and Stephen Williams note the tendency of much writing in the history of anthropology to depend on capsule biographies, which, when strung together one after another, can come to dominate and deaden a narrative, draining the life out of history. Mindful of the problem, yet desirous of documenting the work of scores of scholars, teachers, and students who have been "overlooked," they have aimed for a "biographical history," that is, one that is built out of thumbnail biographies, yet one that tries to be more than merely "a chronological dictionary" (5). Whether readers think Browman and Williams have succeeded will depend on their expectations of what "a history" should deliver.

As a source of historical information, their book is enormously useful. It is exhaustively researched, with a fabulous bibliography and dozens of marvelous photographs. For anyone working on the history of Harvard University, or more specifically the history of natural history and science at Harvard in the 19th century, or on the relationship between 19th-century scientific scholarship and New England scientific societies, or on the emergence of academic anthropology in the context of 19th-century museum anthropology – and several other topics – the book is a goldmine, and it is fascinating.

And yet, "Anthropology at Harvard" reads more like a chronicle than a history. This is not surprising, given the authors' intention to correct for the "presentism" they think has marred the history of American anthropology ever since "Boas emerged as the victor in the competition for organizational power in early-twentieth-century anthropology" (7). Boas and his students "rewrote the history of anthropology," leaving out scholarly competitors, notably Frederic Ward Putnam, the central figure in "Anthropology at Harvard." Browman and Williams seek to right that wrong – to "resurrect an important historical thread in the heritage of Americanist anthropology and bring it back into the narrative of the development of our discipline" (7). And bring it back they do, but all too often with little historiographical purpose other than to assert the importance of the institutional tradition they are documenting.

Here it is apt to point out a strange lapse in the authors' account of presentism, which they attribute to the fact that the Boasians "maintained control" of American anthropology until the end of the Second World War (7). But much happened between the high point of the Boasian ascendancy and the present: starting in the 1930s, in the wake of new theoretical trends – neo-evolutionism, British functionalism, and French structuralism – the Boasian approach was eclipsed, either forgotten or rejected. It was not until the 1960s, when such scholars as Irving Hallowell, Dell Hymes, and George Stocking set about creating a more professional, less presentist history of anthropology, that Boas was rediscovered. And the rediscovery

of Boasian approaches dovetailed with the emergence of “symbolic” or “interpretive” anthropology, creating a new synergy that did indeed overshadow, at least for a time, other theoretical approaches in North American anthropology.

All of which is to say that the authors skip two generations of scholarly competition in their account of Boasian dominance, a dominance that was always contested, that has risen and fallen in a complicated historical choreography that cannot be understood merely by resurrecting forgotten figures. While “Anthropology at Harvard” tells us what was going on at Harvard, it does little to contextualize those developments in relation either to other anthropological trends or to wider social forces.

To give but one example: the authors announce that the “American renaissance” of the late 19th century – with its attention to the classical European past – had a significant impact on American archaeology, separating classical and Americanist archaeologies and marginalizing the latter (9, 151–156). They return occasionally to a discussion of the American renaissance (81 f.), but they never relate the concept, or similar concepts, in a sustained way to their chronicle of facts. They never really explain the historiographical significance of the material they have so carefully amassed, other than its use buttressing their claim that Harvard anthropology has been important.

Above all, then, “Anthropology at Harvard” is an in-house history. Its authors are Harvard men in many senses, and it is published by the press of the institution which is the object of its narrative. It is a labor of love. And yet, this would seem to be a jealous love. It is difficult not to intuit the resentment that seeps out of the prose at various points, concerning the authors’ belief that Harvard has not enjoyed the prominence in histories of North American anthropology they think it deserves. Such resentment is not admirable. It is in fact annoying. But it does not obviate the fact that we are in the authors’ debt for having made so much material available to us, with admirable suggestions as to the different kinds of historiographical problems such material could be made to speak to.

Richard Handler

**Bulgakova, Tatiana:** Nanai Shamanic Culture in Indigenous Discourse. Fürstenberg: Verlag der Kulturstiftung Sibirien, 2013. 261 pp. ISBN 978-3-942883-14-6. Price: € 28,00

With this book, Tatiana Bulgakova explores a form of shamanic practice that has all but vanished, over the thirty-odd years of her interaction with the Nanai people, one of Siberia’s indigenous communities. Her informants are the last generation of village-based, Nanai-speaking shamanic practitioners in Khabarovsk region, in Siberia’s Far East. Many of these informants have now passed away; the last initiated shaman died in 2013. As this volume shows, these people constantly had to negotiate a complex array of spirits and deities, within interrelations that shaped every aspect of daily life. For example, marriages had to be organised around the clan spirits that were

passed to individuals down the paternal line, in order to ameliorate the collective illnesses these spirits could inflict: entire clans would suffer fits of hysteria and persistent bad luck, as the spirits pressured their clans to produce another shaman (35–40). The arbitrators of human conflicts, the *diangians*, were chosen and initiated by the spirits, just as the shamans were. Like the initiated shamans, *diangians* were forced into an unusually close relationship with the spirits, so that they could convey the will of the spirits in settling an argument or feud (167–180). Shamans would find themselves drawn into deadly spiritual battles with each other, when their helper spirits saw fit to attack another colleague; Bulgakova has recorded several instances when these attacks proved to be fatal.

The contrasts between these experiences and relationships, and those of the present generation of Nanai shamans, is briefly illustrated by the “Epilogue.” Like shamans and psychic healers in other parts of Russia, these specialists now rely on terminologies and techniques imported from around the world; many of them have relocated to the local towns, and are more comfortable speaking Russian than Nanai language. Thus, rather than concealing their clients’ souls in a protective *dēkaso*, guarded by their helper spirits, contemporary Nanai shamans clean their clients’ auras, removing bad energies. This volume, therefore, presents a valuable record of shamanic experiences and practices that have irrevocably changed in tandem with their social setting. Bulgakova’s long-term commitment to her informants has enabled her to gather a wealth of rich, intricate stories and interpretations, which form the main substance of the book. She often quotes her informants verbatim, treating her readers to colourful and fascinating vignettes as she does so. For instance, one shaman likened hungry helper spirits who attack their shaman to collective farmworkers, who also will abuse their boss if he or she refuses to pay them (160). The abundance of ethnographic detail makes this volume an especially helpful resource for those who are trying to understand the phenomenon of shamanism in general, along with its history: the range of encounters between human practitioner and spirit will certainly provide useful comparisons and contrasts with other forms of shamanism.

Bulgakova presents her ethnographic material within a series of themes, such as the role of cultural production in negotiating and expressing a shaman’s struggle with her spirits; or the influence spirits exerted over pre-Soviet forms of justice, authority, and crime. Each of these sections addresses debates within the ethnographic and historical literature on indigenous Siberian or peasant Russian communities, rather than the discussion of broader topics such as personhood, ritual, or “the traditional” as a political category. Thus, Bulgakova uses her material to question assumptions about the democratic nature of precolonial indigenous Siberian societies, for instance, or the Soviet-era repression of shamanism. As part of this, she includes some captivating accounts of Soviet anti-shamanism campaigns, which describe ordinary Nanai people being arrested rather than the shamans themselves: the unforeseen consequences of earlier campaigns led the militant atheists to develop a healthy respect for shamanic