

ough analysis of mapping. What Taylor adds to the existing discourse on mapping as a tool for disciplinarian and control is that she illustrates that local actors, such as the emerging elites found among the Khwe, engage in counter-mapping to undermine or counteract state (or NGO) supervision, refute other actors' claim and strengthen their own. In doing so, she demonstrates that the functions of a new technology (Global Information System, GIS) are to be located in the social and political domain rather than on the environmental level.

What struck me when reading this otherwise excellent case study were the parallels between the Kunene and the Zambezi Region when it comes to CBNRM efforts. This may not come as a surprise, one reason being that the most important national player here is the IRDNC, for whom the northern Kunene and western Zambezi (as "remote corners" in Namibia) are primary concerns. But it is no coincidence either that, respectively, the Himba and Khwe were "chosen" for community development, and personally I would have welcomed a more in-depth discussion of the historical and political reasons why these groups in particular are singled out by CBNRM efforts. Such a comparative discussion would also allow for a more thorough treatment of concepts such as power and authority, or processes of marginalization that remain undertheorized throughout the book.

A more profound criticism perhaps is that the author, while spending much effort on an actor-oriented approach of development efforts in West Zambesi, continues to regard the "state" as a monolithic, impersonal, unitary actor (and this, albeit to a lesser extent, also goes for "the" Khwe and Mbukushu). One, therefore, has the impression that the research was not finished, and could have benefited from an additional bout of fieldwork on top of the eight months the author spent in Zambezi. This may have to do with the mutual suspicion between on the one hand NGOs (and the IRDNC in particular) working in the region, and, on the other, the civil servants, military, policemen, officials, ... that personify the Namibian state. As the author documents in the methodology part of her introduction, this suspicion also fell to her share, and she candidly illustrates how this profound distrust affected her research. Still, expanding the actor-oriented approach to also include "the" state would have shed additional light on the "strategic essentialism" that characterizes contemporary Khwe politics. In addition, it would have placed into sharper relief the ambiguities and ongoing negotiations of power and authority between the various actors involved in community development.

Steven Van Wolputte

Trautmann, Thomas R., and Peter M. Whiteley (eds.): *Crow-Omaha. New Light on a Classic Problem of Kinship Analysis*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2012. 348 pp. ISBN 978-0-8165-0790-0. Price: \$ 65.00

"Who ordered that?" This was the response of one physicist to the discovery of the muon, a massive subatomic particle, in 1934. Scientists had figured out how

molecules are made of atoms, and atoms of protons, neutrons, and electrons; the new particle had no place in this tidy scheme. It was only decades later that the muon was situated within a more fundamental theory of elementary particles.

"Who ordered that?" might have worked as an alternative title for the present collection. Anthropologists have figured out a lot about how the distinction between parallel and cross kin structures social organization, especially marriage (summarized in an earlier edited volume: M. Godelier, T. R. Trautmann, and F. E. Tjon Sie Fat [eds.], *Transformations of Kinship*. Washington 1998). From this perspective, Crow and Omaha systems, with their mirror-image sexual asymmetries and their problematic relationship with marriage rules and other social institutions, present a puzzle. This book, the product of a 2010 conference, attacks this puzzle from several directions.

A quick primer: "Crow" and "Omaha" are, to begin with, labels for types of kin terminology. In a Crow terminology, Father's Sister's Child merges upward with ascending generation relatives, called by the same term as Father's Sister or Father. The reciprocals of the terms merge downward, resulting in skewness. The reciprocal of Father's Sister's Child (Mother's Brother's Child) merges with the reciprocals of Father's Sister or Father (the descending generation Man's Child or Woman's Brother's Child). Some versions of Crow merge additional terms, like grandkin terms. And Omaha is skewed the other way, a mirror-image of Crow with the sexes switched.

It has long been recognized that Crow and Omaha are related to matri- and patrilineality respectively. Crow terms for Father / Father's Sister can be glossed as something like "man/woman of Father's matrilineage," while Omaha terms for Mother / Mother's Brother are something like "woman/man of Mother's patrilineage." Yet Crow-Omaha terminologies characterize only a minority of unilineal societies, and not only unilineal societies, so something more is going on.

Lévi-Strauss suggested that Crow and Omaha classifications are about marriage, and represent a step beyond Dravidian and other elementary structures that designate some kin as preferred or prescribed affines. Crow and Omaha systems, on this argument, by classifying cross-cousins and more distant consanguines as close consanguines, make these relatives unmarriageable and force families to look for new alliances in each generation. A number of authors in this volume follow up on this suggestion. Peter M. Whiteley discusses the Hopi, who have a Crow terminology. He shows how, by following Crow marriage proscriptions and avoiding marriage with spatially and genealogically close kin, they make dispersed alliances. Wendy James considers a number of cases from northeast Africa. Sister exchange is a starting point for some groups, and balanced exchange a general ideal, but often with a prohibition on repeating alliances in the next generation. The result is the appearance of Crow and Omaha marriage patterns, not as fixed rules but as the outcome of opportunistic strategizing.

Treating Crow-Omaha systems in the framework of alliance theory also suggests a particular place in social

evolution for them. Whiteley shows that, in North America, Crow-Omaha systems are found especially in areas of greater population density and social complexity, and along major linguistic and geographic divides. Patrick McConvell presents evidence from Australia that Omaha systems have developed especially where expanding populations have moved into already occupied territory. Complementing this, Laurent Dousset considers kinship systems from Australia's Western Desert, in which parallel-cross distinctions are optionally suppressed. He labels this "horizontal skewing," but it differs from Crow-Omaha skewing, and seems to be associated with movement into previously unoccupied marginal environments where dispersed alliance is more an ecological than a sociopolitical adaptation. Christopher Ehret reviews reconstructed kin lexicons for the Nilo-Saharan language family. He reconstructs Crow terminologies near the root of this ancient family, with shifts to Omaha in recent branches of the tree. The story seems to be one of basal matrilineality giving way to patrilineality, a pattern observed in other demic expansions.

At a more general level, several authors, including Thomas R. Trautmann and Nicholas J. Allen, outline different unidirectional social evolutionary pathways leading away from an initial state of direct affinal exchange and Dravidian terminology. One of these pathways leads to Crow-Omaha marriage prohibitions, possibly with an Iroquois system as an intermediate step. (I was not clear on whether the Dravidian initial state was supposed to go back "only" to the origins of major demic expansions over the past 5–10 thousand years, or all the way to the expansion of modern humans.)

Taken together, these chapters situate Crow-Omaha marriage systems and their relations with Dravidian and Iroquois within deep history. It is interesting to consider this in conjunction with recent work on political evolution in state societies: there is qualitative and quantitative evidence that the two major motors driving the formation and expansion of states are intensification, and contact and conflict along major cultural faultlines. (See P. Turchin, T. E. Currie, E. A. L. Turner, and S. Gavrillets, War, Space, and the Evolution of Old World Complex Societies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110/41.2013: 16285–16286. <www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1308825110> for a recent statement.) Based on the work presented here, it looks like the same forces may be involved in the earlier evolution of kinship systems, including the rise of Crow and Omaha marriage rules.

But other chapters show that the relationship between Crow-Omaha and marriage rules is not straightforward. R. H. Barnes observes that the Omaha Indians themselves have an Omaha kin terminology (naturally), but do not abide by "Omaha" marriage proscriptions. David B. Kronenfeld notes that the Fanti of Ghana, who have an optional Crow terminology, do not follow Crow marriage rules. The Fanti themselves think that the generational skewing in their Crow terminology is odd – it coexists with another, unskewed, terminology – but explain it as reflecting a rule of inheritance running from a man to his

sister's son. Marcela Coelho de Souza explores variation among Northern Gê groups in Brazil, where kin terminology is tied to a system of name inheritance. Ceremonially important names are received from (typically) Mother's Brother or Father's Sister, and men and women succeed to the relationships of their namesakes. Among one Gê group, the Kayapó, according to Terence Turner, men go through a separation from their natal families one generation ahead of their sisters. Coelho de Souza and Turner show how Crow and Omaha classifications fit these social facts.

As several authors observe, Crow-Omaha classifications look like a multi-purpose "social technology" not defined by any one function – which leaves the nature of Crow-Omaha itself unsettled. A final chapter summarizes discussions among seminar participants, concluding that Crow-Omaha systems are historically derivative, and that Crow-Omaha skewing is an optional overlay on a more fundamental "deep structure" of crossness. I wish they had seriously considered the opposite possibility: that sexually asymmetrical Crow-style matrilineal crossness and Omaha-style patrilineal crossness are not an overlay, but part of the conceptual deep structure of kinship. As such, either might be at work even in symmetrical Dravidian and Iroquois classifications, with their skewness hidden away – a kind of recessive trait – by overriding generational distinctions.

My concluding verdict would be that the Crow-Omaha puzzle persists, and anthropologists have not quite reached an agreement on the underlying generative components of kinship – anthropology's equivalent of the physicists' elementary particles. Nonetheless, this book advances the discussion greatly, and is essential reading for anyone seriously interested in the anthropology of kinship.

Doug Jones

Van Ess, Josef: Im Halbschatten. Der Orientalist Hellmut Ritter (1892–1971). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013. 257 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-10029-8. Preis: € 49.00

Der Islamwissenschaftler Josef van Ess, der diese Hommage an seinen verehrten Lehrmeister Hellmut Ritter verfasst hat, war der Letzte, der bei ihm promovierte. Er hebt ein Loblied auf einen Philologen alten Schlages an, der sich vortrefflich mit den traditionellen handschriftlichen Quellen in den drei klassischen Islamsprachen (Arabisch, Persisch und Türkisch) auskannte. Unterdessen hat sich vieles in der Islamwissenschaft geändert, "weg von Poesie und Religion, hin zu Wirtschaft und Politik" (viii, 236f.). Van Ess stimmt einen Abgesang einer vergangenen Epoche in der Islamwissenschaft an: Voller Bewunderung für den Altmeister, der schon mit 27 Jahren die erste Professur innehatte, bleiben für die Nachgeborenen nur noch abschätzige Bemerkungen übrig.

So soll Ritter jene Sprachen, mit denen er wissenschaftlich umging, nicht nur passiv, sondern auch aktiv beherrscht haben, was zu seiner Zeit für Orientalisten bestimmt äußerst ungewöhnlich war (86); van Ess jedoch meint, dass sowohl Professoren als auch Studenten auch heute noch "meist nur in einer einzigen Islamsprache so-