

First, there is considerable slippage between terminology and marriage practice among these tribes, with an asymmetric preference but a basically symmetric kinship terminology. Secondly, there is even less of an Aranda four-line scheme in evidence here. If followed regularly, MBC marriage would allow the repetition of a spouse-exchange group's alliances in the immediately following generation, and indeed would formally require it at the model level. There would be no formal need for the dispersal of a group's alliances among several other groups (although this might happen), and while there would be a third terminological line, there would be no need for a fourth.

It will be interesting to review the new data on central Indian kin terms that Pfeffer promises us, courtesy of his students and colleagues. Until then I see no reason to revise my view that terminologies like the Juang represent a modified form of two-line symmetric prescriptive, and that there is still no evidence at all for Pfeffer's interpretation of them as four-line symmetric prescriptive.

## References Cited

### Korn, Francis

1973 *Elementary Structures Reconsidered*. Lévi-Strauss on Kinship. London: Tavistock Publications.

### McDougal, Charles

1963a *The Social Structure of the Hill Juang*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

1963b *The Social Structure of the Hill Juang*. A Précis. *Man in India* 43: 183–190.

### Needham, Rodney

1973 *Prescription*. *Oceania* 43: 166–181.

### Parkin, Robert

1990 *Ladders and Circles*. Affinal Alliance and the Problem of Hierarchy. *Man* 25: 472–488.

1992a *Dispersed Alliance and Terminological Change in South Asia*. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 23: 253–262.

1992b *The Munda of Central India*. An Account of Their Social Organization. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

1993a *Middle Indian Kinship Systems*. A Critique of Georg Pfeffer's Interpretation. *Anthropos* 88: 323–336.

1993b *On the Definition of Prescription*. The Problem of Germanic Kinship Terminologies. *Social Anthropology* 1: 309–325.

1997 *Kinship*. An Introduction to Basic Concepts. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

2001 *Perilous Transactions*. Papers in General and Indian Anthropology. Bhubaneswar: Sikshasandhan.

### Pfeffer, Georg

1982 *Status and Affinity in Middle India*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

1983 *Generation and Marriage in Middle India*. The Evolutionary Potential of "Restricted Exchange." *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 17: 87–121.

1985 *Verwandtschaftssysteme der südasiatischen Regionen im Vergleich*. In: H. Kulke und D. Rothermund (Hrsg.), *Regionale Tradition in Südasiens*; pp. 171–190. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

1993a *Dispersed Alliance, Terminological Change and Evidence*. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 24: 49–54.

1993b *Parkin's Evidence*. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 24: 153–157.

2004 *Order in Tribal Middle Indian "Kinship"*. *Anthropos* 99: 381–409.

### Spencer, Baldwin, and F. J. Gillen

1927 *The Arunta*. A Study of a Stone-Age People. 2 vols. London: Macmillan.

## History of Anthropology in The Netherlands

### A Review Article

Martin Ramstedt

The narratives contained in the two volumes of "Tales from Academia. History of Anthropology in The Netherlands"<sup>1</sup> are heterogeneous, yet complementary, "tales from Dutch academia" as regards the development of anthropology – and non-Western sociology, for that matter – in The Netherlands. The institutional histories of these two disciplines in The Netherlands have been closely intertwined, due to the specific sociopolitical context in which they have evolved, and because of a strong overlap in research focus. Unfortunately, only anthropology is mentioned in the title. For the insider, this neglect confirms the recent marginalization of non-Western sociology in The Netherlands to the benefit of anthropology. Yet, it is the institutional and intellectual entanglement of anthropology and non-Western sociology in The Netherlands that – to my mind – justifies the publication of the two volumes with the Verlag für Entwicklungspolitik in Saarbrücken, specializing in development studies.

The first volume, Part 1, presents "Trends and Traditions" within the institutional and intellectual

1 Vermeulen, Han, and Jean Kommers (eds.): *Tales from Academia. History of Anthropology in the Netherlands*; 2 parts. Saarbrücken: Verlag für Entwicklungspolitik, 2002. 1132 pp. ISBN 3-88156-763-1; 3-88156-764-X. (Nijmegen Studies in Development and Cultural Change, 39/40) Price: € 39,00; € 38,00.

field shared by both anthropology and non-Western sociology. It does so by introducing the intellectual traditions and research approaches connected to the relevant Dutch centers or institutes at the universities of Leiden, Amsterdam, Wageningen, Utrecht, Nijmegen, and Groningen through time. The timeline runs from the late colonial period through decolonization until the present, that is, until shortly before the final publication of the volume in 2002. The various contributors to the volume were or have been long-standing staff members of the institutions they represent in their respective articles.

The second volume, Part 2, is devoted to “Styles and Specializations” within Dutch anthropology, focusing on the societal and the interdisciplinary dimensions of the discipline. We hence find here chapters on the impact of ethnographic discoveries on early modern Dutch society, the function of ethnography in the Dutch colonies, the study of *adat*-law, ethnography as carried out by missionaries, feminist anthropology, the history of ethnographic museums and their relations to art collectors, ethnography in The Netherlands in relation to tourism and art, physical anthropology, visual ethnography, and ethnomusicology.

The two volumes, consisting of altogether 37 contributions, a preface and the introductory essay of the two editors, actually build on the centennial conference of the Netherlands Anthropological Association (Nederlandsche Anthropologische Vereeniging, NAV), convened by Albert Trouwborst, Han Vermeulen, and Jan de Wolf in December 1998. The title of the conference, “Contingency and Continuity,” already pointed to a common reflection on the history of the NAV, and thereby also on the history of anthropology in The Netherlands.

According to my experience as a German working in The Netherlands since several years, the large amount as well as the heterogeneity of contributions – which often overlap in content and therefore display a certain redundancy of detail – can be attributed to something which I have come to classify and appreciate as “typically Dutch”: a strong disinclination to represent someone else’s position and tradition, especially when it deviates from one’s own. This and the fact that full attention is paid to the embeddedness of the history of anthropology – and non-Western sociology – in a wider Dutch sociocultural and -political context make “Tales from Academia” valuable not only for anthropologists contemplating the history of their discipline and related fields of study but for everyone interested in Dutch culture and society, too. Last but not least, the volumes are a treasure

for all devoted to the study of the development of modern academe.

As to the possible benefit of the two volumes for historians of anthropology, Frans Hüsken, Professor for cultural and social anthropology at the University of Nijmegen, raised – somewhat rhetorically – the question in his preface “whether so many articles on the anthropological ancestors, on departmental histories, and on the developments of disciplinary fields and sub-fields as well as analyses of the contributions of Dutch anthropologists to various regional studies, are not a bit too much to document the vicissitudes of a relatively small discipline in Dutch academia and a relatively small group of anthropological practitioners in the global scene of world anthropology” (vii). He concluded by providing a fitting answer himself: “By comparing the Dutch case with other national histories, it will be possible to go further than the stereotypical characterizations of Dutch anthropologists as primarily oriented towards practical matters (either towards issues of colonial administration or missionary endeavors or post-colonial development projects); as being primarily eclectic, shying away from analytical and theoretical rigor, or, put more simply, as lacking style” (x). Apart from that, I think, “Tales from Academia” will especially be appreciated by scholars working in the field of Indonesian studies, folk law studies, colonial anthropology, the relationship between Christian missions and anthropology, as well as Islamic studies.

In their introductory essay, Han Vermeulen and Jean Kommers sketched the specific trajectory of the institutionalization of anthropology in The Netherlands as follows: “for most of its history, the study [of anthropology] moved through two basic types, namely general anthropology, usually of a comparative kind, and regional anthropology, mostly of Indonesia, also of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, and of Africa and other regions” (3). This trajectory has – according to the authors – resulted in a dual identity, which in the early nineteenth century played out in the distinction between general anthropology (then called “ethnology”) and regional anthropology, or ethnography. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this distinction was reformulated as the distinction between ethnology and Indology, the latter referring to the civil service training programs. After World War II and the ensuing decolonization of Indonesia, the distinction was reformulated again as the distinction between cultural anthropology on one hand and non-Western sociology on the other. Recently, this distinction has increasingly come under discussion.

The beginnings of Dutch anthropology and non-Western sociology can be traced back to the activities of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences, founded in 1778. It was the first learned society in Asia altogether. Yet, the editors rightly pointed out that in terms of ethnography it was the British historians Marsden, Raffles, and Crawford who were the first to make a scientific breakthrough in the beginning of the 19th century, in spite of the promising start made by the Dutchmen Willem van Hogendorp and J. C. M. Radermacher at the end of the 18th century.

The slow development of ethnography as a systematic discipline in The Netherlands was due to the fact that the Dutch East India Company did not allow its employees to publish anything likely to damage its political and commercial interests. With the bankruptcy and consequent abolition of the Company in 1798, the conquest of The Netherlands by Napoleon and the subsequent flight of the Prince of Oranje to England, his return in 1813 and coronation as King of the newly established United Kingdom of The Netherlands in 1815, this was to change, and in the following 135 years, the archipelago was to be completely penetrated by ethnographers and colonial forces. When the Prince of Oranje placed the Dutch East Indies under the protection of the British, Sir Stamford Raffles became Governor General, and his archaeological and historical pursuits in Java set the standard for future Dutch researchers. The latter took over from the British when the East Indies were returned to the United Kingdom of The Netherlands in 1816.

While the Dutch were catching up with the British, the old university town of Leiden was one of the first centers for anthropology to blossom as a new academic discipline. And this does not only concern Dutch anthropology, but anthropology in general. One of the oldest ethnological museums in the world was founded there in 1837. And in 1877, one of the earliest structural anthropology chairs in the Western world was established in Leiden, too. Appositely, "Leiden" forms the first subsection of Part 1. It contains the contributions by Reimar Schefold, retiring professor of anthropology at Leiden University and until recently chairman of the Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology in Leiden, Han F. Vermeulen, research fellow at the Department of Cultural and Social Studies at Leiden University, and one of the editors of the two volumes, and Coen J. G. Holtzappel, who retired recently from his longtime position as lecturer at the Department for Cultural and Social Studies, Leiden University.

Schefold's article "Indonesian Studies and Cultural Anthropology in Leiden: From Encyclopedism to Field of Anthropological Study" deals with the "early history" of the specifically Leiden strand of Dutch anthropology, which has right from the outset mostly focused on Indonesia. To date, Leiden University hosts the only (anthropology) department in The Netherlands with a chair solely devoted to the study of this region. Letting his account end in the 1950s, Schefold skillfully placed the scholars constituting "Leiden anthropology," such as P. J. Veth (1814–1895), G. A. Wilken (1847–1891), J. J. M. de Groot (1854–1921), A. W. Nieuwenhuis (1864–1953), W. H. Rassers (1877–1973), and J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong (1886–1964), in the European intellectual context of their time. While it is fairly well-known that J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong "invented" the structuralist paradigm before Claude Lévy-Strauss, for many a reader it will come as a surprise that Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss made extensive use of De Groot's ethnographic material in their analysis of Chinese symbolic classifications.

Vermeulen's contribution "Contingency and Continuity: Anthropology and Other Non-Western Studies in Leiden, 1922–2002" complements that of Schefold, elaborating especially on the structuralist phase of Leiden anthropology as well as on the transformation of colonial Indology into non-Western sociology in the 1950s. The reasons for establishing the latter program within the anthropology department in Leiden were twofold: (1) The Minister of Education and the curators at the universities of Leiden, Utrecht, and Amsterdam endorsed the view that Dutch expertise on the tropics should be maintained in order to contribute to European and American assistance to "underdeveloped countries" (111); (2) while anthropologists like J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong rejected intervention to the benefit of development on moral grounds, the new program was to host scholars like G. W. Locher, R. A. J. van Lier, and J. W. Schoorl who maintained "that if social intervention was to take place, this ought to be done professionally" (112). The non-Western sociology program furthermore embraced "new" regions, like Latin America, and Africa.

Holtzappel devoted his article exclusively to "Fifty Years of Non-Western Sociology in Leiden." He highlighted the fact that the program – which soon developed into a section of its own within the Department of Cultural Anthropology/Non-Western Sociology – was to integrate the cultural anthropology and sociology of a certain region under investigation with the goal to analyse "(1) its

processes of state and nation formation, and (2) its internal economic and social developments supported by comparative empirical sociological research in order to arrive at a theoretically coherent position" (184). Locher, who held the first chair in non-Western sociology until 1973, in fact dreamt of a new, that is, holistic, comparative social science, which integrates both anthropology and sociology, which is not averse to historical research, and which is directed at large-scale, worldwide developments. He furthermore envisioned the integration of theory with consultancy practice. His successor, Benno F. Galjart, continued in this vision. His retirement in 1998, however, has thrown non-Western sociology into jeopardy. Due to budget cuts, his chair has not been continued, to the benefit of the anthropology section which has abstained from any involvement in applied research.

The second center of Dutch anthropology in terms of age and importance is Amsterdam, where a chair of ethnology was established at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in 1907. It was held by S. R. Steinmetz and catered mostly to students of geography. Besides, a chair for colonial ethnology was established in 1917, endowed by the Colonial Institute and occupied by J. C. van Eerde from 1917 until 1935. The growing international reputation of the Cultural Anthropology/Non-Western Sociology Department at the UvA in the recent decades forces me to qualify my initial statement as to the "ranking" of Amsterdam behind Leiden, as it has pushed the former to the fore, to the detriment of the latter. Consequently perhaps, seven contributions – one of them coauthored by three anthropologists – occupy themselves with different aspects of the history of anthropology at the UvA. They were written by Willem F. Heinemeijer (1922–1999), professor of social geography and professor of urban studies at the UvA between 1968 and 1987; André J. F. Köbben, emeritus professor of anthropology at the UvA with a teaching assignment in non-Western sociology and founding director of the Centre for Research on Social Conflicts (COMT) in Leiden; Wim F. Wertheim (1907–1998), professor of law at the Law Academy of Batavia from 1936 to 1942 and professor of sociology and modern history of South and Southeast Asia at the UvA from 1946 to 1972; Jan C. Breman, emeritus professor of comparative sociology at the UvA and extraordinary professor of sociology at the Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague; Loes Schenk-Sandbergen, associate professor at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the UvA, associated with the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the

Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (ASSR) at the UvA; Rob van Ginkel, who works at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the UvA; Alex Strating, lecturer at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the UvA; Jorada Verrips, professor of social and cultural anthropology of contemporary Europe at the UvA; and Peter Pels, until recently lecturer at the Research Centre Religion and Society at the UvA and currently professor of anthropology at Leiden University.

In his article "A Short History of Anthropology in Amsterdam: Steinmetz and His Students," Heinemeijer occupied himself with a thick description of nascent anthropology in Amsterdam, that is, the era of Steinmetz (1862–1940), who had not only studied law and ethnology under Wilken in Leiden but also "Völkerpsychologie" (ethnopsychology) under Wilhelm Wundt in Leipzig. A portrait of his successor J. J. Fahrenfort (1885–1975) was provided by Köbben under the title "J. J. Fahrenfort (1885–1975): Schoolmaster and Scholar." Similar to Steinmetz, Fahrenfort concerned himself with influential strands of German ethnology, in his case with Pater Wilhelm Schmidt's "Kulturkreislehre" (theory of cultural regions), and more specifically with Schmidt's proposition of the existence of primeval monotheism, which Fahrenfort conclusively debunked as being grounded in "tendentious ethnography" (254). Likewise, Fahrenfort cogently criticized the related concept of primeval communism, demonstrating that "we find peasant communities with communal landownership in stratified societies", where it "is not an ancient institution but rather a relatively recent development" (254).

Wertheim on his part contributed an account of the "Globalisation of the Social Sciences – Non-Western Sociology as a Temporary Panacea" in The Netherlands at large, a process in which he himself was closely involved. His account therefore bears strong autobiographical traits. Given Wertheim's international repute, his article is very worthwhile to read also because of that. Whereas Wertheim's contribution focused on the embeddedness of the history of non-Western sociology in the wider Dutch sociopolitical context, Breman zoomed in on the specifics of non-Western sociology at the UvA, arguing for the globalization of sociology as a discipline independent from anthropology, yet open for collaboration. His bitterness due to the demise of non-Western sociology from the anthropological department at the UvA in 1996 was echoed by Schenk-Sandbergen in her essay "What are we Teaching for? A History of Non-Western Sociology at the University of

Amsterdam.” Here, she rightfully lamented the vanishing orientation to applied research for the following reasons: (1) “the decline in teaching of the erstwhile regional and thematic specialisation of South and Southeast Asia”; (2) “the decline in socio-political *engagement* and commitment”; and (3) “the scarce employment opportunities for graduate students who call themselves ‘anthropologist’” (315 f.). In the rest of her article she proposed how development anthropologists and sociologists can play a role in the twenty-first century.

Van Ginkel, Strating, and Verrips contributed an article on the history of the department of Euromed at the UvA, the acronym denoting a regional specialization unique in The Netherlands, that is, a specialization on Europe and the Mediterranean Area. The title of the article, “Trial and Tribulations of the Euromed Tribe: A History of Anthropology of Europe and the Mediterranean Area in Amsterdam,” refers first of all to the ill feelings that were evoked when a previous regional specialization on the Middle East was substituted by a new orientation towards Europe as a field of study. The study of European societies and cultures had already been considered a legitimate occupation for anthropologists at the time of Wilken in Leiden and Steinmetz in Amsterdam. However, studies on Europe had been incidental. It was decolonization, which finally boosted an anthropological interest in the systematic research of Europe. Hence, already in the 1950s André Köbben – himself an Africanist – emphasized the importance of doing anthropology “at home.” He in fact stimulated some of his students, such as Peter Kloos, Hetty Nooy-Palm, and Anton Blok to do fieldwork in small communities in The Netherlands and Sicily respectively. At the end of the 1960s, it was Verrips who launched the idea to start large-scale anthropological research at home. The international symposium “The Meaning of Small Communities in the Context of (Supra-)National Processes in Europe,” convened in 1973, eventually led to the foundation of the Euromed section at the UvA in 1977. By downsizing the hours of his assignment as professor of the Euromed section in 1988, Anton Blok initiated its decline, which was accelerated by the establishment of the Institute of Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES) in 1993. After Blok’s retirement in 2000, the task of reorganizing the anthropological study of Europe fell to Verrips. His endeavors resulted in a slow improvement of research at home.

Critical anthropology is part and parcel of the anthropological tradition at the UvA since the appointment of Johannes Fabian as Köbben’s successor in 1979. It followed in the wake of the

linguistic turn initiated by Fabian and was aptly described by Peter Pels in his essay on “How Anthropology Dissolves Its Object: ‘Critical Anthropology’ at the University of Amsterdam from 1975 to the Present.” Pels’s contribution eloquently testifies against the above mentioned stereotypical characterizations of Dutch anthropology as being primarily oriented towards practical matters and lacking theoretical rigor.

It is perhaps typically Dutch that the history of the Cultural Anthropology/Non-Western Sociology Department at the Free University (VU) in Amsterdam forms a subsection of its own in Part I of the publication under discussion here. It is, thus, not grouped together with the respective essays on anthropology and non-Western sociology at the University of Amsterdam. It is, furthermore, placed almost at the end of the book, which almost seems to hint at the well-known rivalry between the two universities in Amsterdam. For the benefit of non-Dutch readers, I will now briefly turn to Frits Selier’s article, bearing the somewhat mystifying title “In Search for Limitation: Aspects of Forty Years of CA/SNWS at the Free University, Amsterdam.”

Speaking of rivalry, it took me somewhat by surprise that Selier – who is a staff member of the Department of Cultural Anthropology and Sociology of non-Western Societies at the VU – did not at all mention the adjacent department of organizational anthropology, officially designated as the Culture, Organization, and Management Department (COM) of the VU, which would perhaps have deserved a contribution of its own. To be fair, the neglect on Selier’s part could be attributed to his assignment to only write about the history of his own department. Knowing about the common disdain of the applied research at COM on the part of many members of his department, I am nevertheless inclined to retain my suspicions.

Anthropology was introduced at the Free University in 1956 with the appointment of the linguist Louis Onvlee (1893–1986) as extraordinary professor of cultural anthropology. Onvlee had previously worked as a bible translator and researcher in Sumba. His Protestant background was an additional qualification, quite fittingly for the Free University which was then still a strongly confessional institution. In 1967, Onvlee was succeeded by Herman G. Schulte Nordholt (1911–1993), a former civil servant in Timor. The geographer Hans Tennekes took over from Schulte Nordholt in 1978. From 1962 onwards, three chairs were added to the chair of cultural anthropology, that is, a chair of non-Western sociology, later renamed into so-

cology of non-Western societies, a chair of non-Western history, a chair of non-Western religions, and a chair of non-Western economics. Moreover, since 1975, several research specializations were formed within both cultural anthropology and non-Western sociology, namely political and symbolical anthropology in the case of the former and urban studies as well as rural development in the case of the latter. At the same time, the VU more and more relinquished its confessional orientation.

The Catholic counterpart of the Free University is Nijmegen University, formerly called Catholic University of Nijmegen (KUN), completed a similar trajectory from a strictly confessional to a more or less secular institution. This is mirrored in the history of anthropology at this university, vividly described by Peter C. G. Meurkens in his article "Between Nostalgia for the Past and Ethical Enthusiasm: Half a Century of Anthropology in Nijmegen, 1948–1998." Meurkens, a staff member of the Research Methods of the Social Sciences Department at KUN, discerned altogether four phases of the development of anthropology in Nijmegen: in the first phase (1948–1968), anthropological research was carried out in order to support the Roman Catholic mission, very much in the vein of the Vienna School of ethnology founded by Pater Wilhelm Schmidt; the second phase (1969–1975) was characterized by a strong orientation towards ethics and society, expressing itself in the introduction of political economics and feminism; the third phase (1976–1987) marked a penchant for theoretical discourse; while in the fourth phase, discourse and research have displayed less a penchant for grand theories than a pragmatic eclecticism. In the same period, the Centre for Pacific and Asian Studies under the tutelage of Professor Ad Borsboom gained an international reputation.

The "Development Sociology and Anthropology at Wageningen University, 1898–2002," as described by Jan H. B. den Ouden, has been geared to applied research, which goes back to the colonial period, due to the fact that the university at Wageningen has been a technology-oriented, agricultural university. In reaction to decolonization, a new chair of Empirical Sociology and Sociography of Non-Western Regions was established in 1955. It was occupied by Rudie A. J. van Lier, who was very much interested in the integration of theory and problem-oriented research. Norman Long, who took over the chair from Van Lier in 1981, holding it until 2001, turned away from grand theories and interventionism, promoting an actor-oriented approach and a change of perspec-

tive "from the transfer of knowledge to the transformation of meaning." In 1959, the chair of Legal Systems and Public Institutions of Non-Western Regions had been added to the one held by Van Lier, to which A. H. Ballendux had been appointed. He in turn was succeeded by Franz von Benda-Beckmann.

Utrecht University (UU) belongs among the Dutch institutions, which were the first to host anthropology programs in The Netherlands. In his account of "Anthropology at Utrecht University," Jan de Wolf – senior lecturer in cultural anthropology at UU – pointed out that ethnology was felt important enough to make a separate provision for it in the curriculum, when the new chair of social geography was established in 1908. It became a discipline in its own right in form of the Indology Faculty for the training of colonial civil servants, established in 1925. It was placed under the tutelage of Heidelberg-trained J. H. F. Kohlbrugge (1865–1942), whose experiences in the colony as a medical doctor inspired him to frank criticism, which earned him reprimands, among others, from the famous Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje. Kohlbrugge's successor, H. Th. Fischer (1901–1976), seemed to have less problems with Dutch supremacy in the colonies, which he justified with the superiority of European moral values. Fischer was succeeded by H. U. E. Thoden van Velzen in 1971, who worked on sociopolitical issues in Surinam. Besides, Jan van Baal (1909–1992) had become part-time professor in 1960. He also held a supernumerary chair for religious anthropology at the UvA. In Utrecht, however, he concentrated on problems of education in developing countries. After Thoden van Velzen's departure to the UvA in 1991, two new chairs, held by A. C. G. M. Robben and D. N. A. M. Kruijt, continued Utrecht's regional specialization in Latin America.

According to Dick A. Papousek, reader in social and cultural anthropology at the Department of Romance Studies, University of Groningen (UG), as well as director of the Centre for Mexican Studies at the same faculty and professor of social anthropology and social development at the Free University in Brussels, and his coauthor Yme B. Kuiper, associate professor in cultural anthropology and history at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at the UG, the Northern town of Groningen hosted "A Small Institute in a Wicked World: Cultural Anthropology at the University of Groningen, 1951–1989." The current positions of the two authors are already an indication of the fact that the former anthropological institute fell victim to the severe budget cuts that took place in

The Netherlands since the end of the 1980s. Before anthropology took hold in Groningen, only a few local scholars had been interested in anthropological themes. The best known of them was first of all the historian Johan Huizinga (1872–1945), famous for his “Homo Ludens” (1938), and Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890–1950), professor of the history of religions and later Minister of Education. When a full chair of anthropology was finally established in 1951, it was held by A. H. J. Prins (1921–2000), teaching ethnography and comparative ethnology to geography and some sociology and economics students. Prins was an Africanist, partly trained at the London School of Economics. In the 1960s, anthropology expanded, finding a new home with the newly created Faculty of Social Sciences and placing a strong emphasis on research rather than teaching. After the demise of the Institute of Cultural Anthropology in 1989, a strong interest in the discipline has been retained by the Faculty of Theology and Science of Religion and the Faculty of Law.

Apart from accounts on the history of the different anthropology institutes in The Netherlands, Part 1 of “Tales from Academia” also contains three complementary contributions pertaining to “Decolonising Dutch Ethnology: Steps Toward the Indonesianisation of Anthropology in the 1950s,” penned by Michael Prager, lecturer in ethnology at the University of Münster (Germany), “The ‘Ethnologenkring’ (1945–1971) and the Professionalisation of Anthropology in The Netherlands” by Peter Kloos (1936–2000), former professor of sociology of non-Western societies at the VU, and last but not least “Protected by Paper; Or How Dutch Anthropology Was Quite Effectively Protected for Nearly Thirty Years by a Series of Consecutive Memoranda,” jointly written by H. J. M. Claessen, emeritus professor of cultural anthropology at Leiden University, and J. W. Schoorl, emeritus professor of development sociology/anthropology at the VU.

Kloos’ article brings into view the history and activities of the “Ethnologenkring” or Circle of Ethnologists, an informal organization of professionals which contended with the Netherlands Anthropological Association, a formal organization of professionals and amateurs alike, originally founded in 1898. The contribution by Claessen and Schoorl presents an account of the policies of the Dutch Ministers of Education and Science pertinent to the development of anthropology in The Netherlands.

Prager’s article constitutes a category of its own, as it is concerned with the decolonization

of anthropology in independent Indonesia in the 1950s, building on a brief sketch of the history of anthropology in the Dutch East Indies and during the Japanese occupation. Decolonization of anthropology in Indonesia in terms of personnel was finally achieved when the last Dutch professors withdrew from Indonesian universities at the time of the conflict over Irian.

Part 2 – which is in a sense much more incoherent than Part 1 in terms of structure – first of all contains direct supplements to the histories of the Dutch anthropology/non-Western sociology institutes discussed in Part 1. I am referring here in the first instance to the subsection on ethnographic museums, comprising the articles by Ger van Wengen, former head of the Education Department of the National Museum of Ethnology, Victorine Arnoldus-Schröder, curator at the Ethnological Museum “Gerardus van der Leeuw” at Groningen, and Raymond Corbey, philosopher cum anthropologist attached to the Department of Philosophy at Tilburg University as well as the Department of Archaeology at Leiden University.

While investigating “The Interaction between Studies in Material Culture and Academic Anthropology” in The Netherlands, Van Wengen zoomed in on the philosophical or theoretical orientations of the scientific collectors and curators, by whose endeavors the Dutch ethnological museums have evolved from the 19th century to the present day. His article provides a perfect backdrop for Arnoldus-Schröder’s concerned and well-argued “Browsing at the Neighbours: History of the Ethnological Museum ‘Gerardus van der Leeuw’ in Groningen.” Corbey’s contribution, on the other hand, directs our gaze to the “Objects-in-Motion: Collectors, Dealers, Missionaries, and Artists,” elucidating some lines of the “unofficial” *circuit des objets*, which constitutes a hitherto unwritten chapter of Dutch colonial as well as cultural history.

A fitting supplement to Corbey’s essay was provided by Herman Roodenburg, senior research fellow and head of the Ethnological Department of the Meertens Institute in Amsterdam as well as professor of cultural history at the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium). In his discussion of “Marken as Relic: The Merging of Painting, Tourism, Craniometry, and Folklore Studies around 1900,” he showed – not without humor – how a small picturesque Dutch island to the north of Amsterdam attracted artists, tourists, physical anthropologists, and folklorists, who contributed to a romantic imagination of ancient, Teutonic Holland rediscovered in “primitive” Marken. This imaginary strand was strangely at odds with more

common nationalist feelings of pride in the Dutch civilization of the “Golden Age.”

Machteld J. Roede, formerly senior staff member of the Health Sciences at the University of Maastricht, and John de Vos, curator of the Fossil Macro-Mammals and the Dubois Collection of Naturalis in Leiden, home in on two related topics already obliquely introduced in the previous articles on the Dutch ethnographic collections and the island of Marken. In Roede’s “A History of Physical Anthropology in The Netherlands,” we learn that the close connection of physical and cultural anthropology in the 18th and 19th centuries finally came to an end in 1970, when the physical anthropologists left the Netherlands Anthropological Association for the newly established Netherlands Foundation for Anthropobiology. Roede’s optimistic outlook for physical anthropology – in view of the tremendous growth of interest in the evolution of humans – is borne out by the news on recent findings in De Vos enlightening report on “A Century of Dutch Paleo-Anthropological Research in Indonesia.” While the finds of the *Pithecanthropus erectus* in Java (1891–1893) and the *Sinanthropus pekinensis* in China (1926) had drawn attention to Asia as the possible origin of man, attention shifted to Africa with the later finds of the *Australopithecus* fossils (1959–1960). Recent finds of fossil hominids in China and artifacts in Pakistan as well as new dating of sites in Java, which are now claimed to be about two million years old, have again brought Asia to the fore, though. Moreover, recent research has challenged the claim that only *Homo sapiens* were able to cross water barriers. It is now postulated that the older *Homo erectus* were already capable of doing so.

While physical and paleo-anthropology are small disciplines, they are by no means marginalized. This is, however, presently the case with three other specializations within Dutch anthropology. In their coauthored article “Feminist Anthropology in The Netherlands: Autonomy and Integration,” Els Postel-Coster, emeritus professor of cultural anthropology at Leiden University, and José van Santen, formerly deputy director of the Research School for Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies (CNWS) at Leiden University and currently researcher at the Institute of Islam in the Modern World in Leiden, told the bleak history of feminist anthropology – or gender studies as it is now called – in a country with the lowest percentage of married working women in Europe to date. For different reasons, Dirk J. Nijland’s “A History of Ethnographic Film, Video, and Multimedia in The Netherlands” is equally disheart-

ening. Regardless of the outstanding international repute of the visual ethnographers at Leiden University, the Centre for Ethnography in Leiden has come under severe threats since 2002. Avoiding a justifiable pessimistic attitude in his reflection “Between Musicology and Anthropology: Methodological Issues in Twentieth-Century Ethnomusicology in The Netherlands,” Wim van Zanten, staff member of the Department of Cultural and Social Studies at Leiden University, teaching statistics, data theory, and anthropology of music, focused on three general issues that are pertinent to music studies in his country: (1) comparison and generalization; (2) balance between theory and musical practice; and (3) aesthetic and the influence of technical developments, especially in the realm of multimedia, for representing the performing arts.

The seven articles grouped under the heading “Regional Anthropology” focus on the study of Islam and *adat*-law in Indonesia, colonial ethnography in the Dutch East Indies, missionary ethnographers in Flores, anthropology in West New Guinea, and anthropological transactions between Japan and The Netherlands. In his contemplation of “Anthropology, the Study of Islam, and Adat Law in The Netherlands and the Netherlands East Indies, 1920–1950,” Albert A. Trouwborst, emeritus professor of social anthropology at Nijmegen University, set out to explain the absence of a relationship between anthropology, the study of customary law (*adat* law), and the study of Islam in the field of Indonesian studies during the interbellum. His deliberations make it clear that the importance of anthropology for the Dutch colonial administration has been overrated, as civil servants – who had themselves received some anthropological grounding during their training – usually only felt it necessary to turn to specialists regarding issues of Islam or *adat* law. Professional anthropologists, like J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong in Leiden, for their part tended to have some reservations against an involvement in colonial administration.

In their joint description of “Anthropology of Law and the Study of Folk Law in The Netherlands after 1950,” Franz and Keebet von Benda-Beckmann, who are currently sharing the responsibilities as head of the Project Group “Legal Pluralism” at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle (Germany), elucidated the shift from earlier attempts to describe wholesale customary legal systems of tribal and ethnic groups in the Malay archipelago to a broader range of specific domains of social and economic organization, in which the coexistence of different sets of law are studied systematically.

The absence of a relationship between anthropology, the study of *adat*, as well as Islamic law in the colonial period, as described by Trouwborst, and the fact that Dutch anthropologists in the 1970s and 1980s distanced themselves from colonial anthropology, favoring a new beginning of their discipline, account for “The Delayed Reception of Colonial Studies on Adat Law and Islamic Law in Dutch Anthropology.” This well-argued article was cowritten by Léon Buskens, lecturer in Islamic law and the anthropology of the Middle East at Leiden University and professor of Islamic law and culture at Utrecht University, and Jean Kommers, lecturer in anthropology at Nijmegen University.

The latter subsequently turned to “Ethnography in the Netherlands East Indies, 1850–1900: Social Change and Representations of Indonesian Cultures,” focusing on a period, in which socio-cultural changes “back home” inaugurated the so-called “ethical policy” in the colony. Kommers distinguished between two sets of representations – knowledge – of Indonesian cultures, prevalent at the time: (1) scientific ethnography of local cultures, and (2) social knowledge about the Other, then called “knowledge of the native.” Both sets of representations, so Kommers, made up “colonial ethnography” (757 f.). Moreover, he endorsed the view that scientific ethnography played a relatively unimportant role in the former Netherlands East Indies.

Marie-Antoinette Th. Willemsen, researcher at Nijmegen University, highlighted the contribution of missionaries to the developing discipline of anthropology in her article “A Twofold Commission: Arndt and Verheijen, Missionaries and Ethnographers on Flores, Indonesia.” She concentrated on the Society of the Divine Word (SVD), which was established by the German priest Arnold Janssen in 1875 at the village of Steyl in the Southeast of The Netherlands. Wilhelm Schmidt, the founder of the Vienna School of anthropology, entered the SVD-convent in Steyl in 1883. In spite of the fact that the different SVD missionaries working in the Dutch East Indies mostly stayed for many years in one locality, their ethnographic accounts were generally not well received by professional anthropologists. It was not until 1970 that anthropologists working on Flores, for instance, started to take an interest in the work of men like Arndt and Verheijen.

It requires some insider knowledge of Dutch colonial history in order to appreciate the sensitive issues connected with “Changing Practices of Anthropology: Moving from West New Guinea

to Papua,” which nevertheless remain strangely oblique in the rather descriptive article composed by Sjoerd R. Jaarsma, researcher at the centre for Pacific and Asian Studies at Nijmegen University. We, in any case, learn little about the conflict-ridden decolonization of Irian in relation to the practice of Dutch anthropology at that time.

Jan G. van Bremen, staff member of the Centre for Japanese and Korean Studies at Leiden University and secretary-general of the Japan Anthropology Workshop, dealt with another sensitive issue of modern Dutch history, that is, the relationship between his country and Japan. His article, “‘The Work of Our Hands.’ Anthropological Transactions between Japan and The Netherlands,” brings to the fore collegial interaction between Japanese and Dutch anthropologists, which actually goes back to the first Japanese anthropologist to open the debate with academic counterparts in The Netherlands: Kumagusu Minakata (1867–1941). According to van Bremen, this interchange was small but steady in the first half of the 20th century. It is interesting to learn that during the Japanese occupation of the former Dutch East Indies, it was the Japanese ethnologist Tōichi Mabuchi (1909–1988) who read Dutch studies on the archipelago in preparation for his assignment in Indonesia. Instead of highlighting the difficult parts of Japanese Dutch history, van Bremen then described the parallel development of anthropology in both Japan and The Netherlands. Coming back to Mabuchi, van Bremen pointed out that Mabuchi continued his interest in Dutch scholarship even after the war. Moreover, he furthered it wherever he could. In the 1960s, Mabuchi himself was invited by the “Ethnologenkring” as well as the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam.

There are three contributions left to review here, which deal with the origins of Dutch anthropology. In his article “The Death of James Cook as a Cultural Encounter Gone Astray: Morality and Ethnology in Dutch Enlightenment Writings,” Remco Ensel, research fellow at the VU and lecturer at Nijmegen University, provided a late, yet valuable supplement to Marshall Sahlins’s famous interpretation of the natives’ view of Cook’s first arrival and subsequent return to Hawaii by focusing on the European side of things, and here especially on the reflections of Cook’s fate in Dutch Enlightenment writings.

Susan Legêne, head of the curatorial department of the KIT Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam, on her part discussed the origin and historical context of the two foremost ethnographic museums in The Netherlands, that is, the National Museum of Eth-

nology in Leiden and the Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam, in an essay on “Ethnography and Colonialism after 1815: Non-Western Culture and Dutch Cultural Heritage.”

The account on “The Indonesia and Africa Specialist P. J. Veth (1814–1895): Founder of the First Chair of Anthropology in The Netherlands (1877),” written by Paul van der Velde, senior policy advisor at the UvA, zooms in on the life of “the greatest specialist in colonial affairs in The Netherlands during the nineteenth century” (647), who was held in high esteem by one of

Holland’s foremost national writers, that is, Multatuli alias Eduard Douwes Dekker (1820–1887). The writer regarded Veth as the leading authority of the Indies, a statement which was perhaps not only inspired by Veth’s scholarship but also by his excellence as a writer.

It is particularly the contributions of van der Velde, Legêne, and Ensel that make “Tales from Academia” an entertaining reading not only for scholars interested in the respective disciplines but also for those interested in cultural history in general.

**Religia. Encyklopedia PWN** (Tadeusz Gadacz and Bogusław Milerski [eds.]) – In 2003, Polish readers welcomed the publication of the last volume of “Religion, Encyclopedia PWN.” The publication of the successive volumes of the encyclopedia was met with great interest in Polish scientific circles. The entire encyclopedia consists of nine printed volumes (each volume of c. 500 pages). It is also available on CD which contains the entries of the nine volumes as well as over 1,200 entries not included in the printed version, for a total of 12,494 entries, 24 maps, and 1,470 illustrations. The entries cover not only all areas of the study of religion (theology, philosophy, ethnology, psychology, sociology, pedagogy, comparative religion, and geography of religion), but also interdisciplinary studies of religion that show the connection between religion and politics, art, music, literature, etc. In consecutive volumes, an interested reader will find information on various world religions, churches, denominations, ecumenism, new religious movements, heresies, holy books, gods, historical events, as well as biographical notes on founders of religions, reformers, mystics, and contemporary scholars of religion. Along with these more traditional concepts, the reader will find entries on religious symbolism of colors, numbers, animals, birds, insects and themes which appeared in the context of religious studies relatively recently, such as “neurotheology.” This is the first encyclopedia on the Polish book market to present religion in a manner that is expert, comprehensive, and easily accessible to a reader. – (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 2001–2003. ISBN 1-1083-01-13-414-3)

Stanisław A. Wargacki

**Leksykon Sociologii Religii** (Maria Libiszowska-Żółtkowska, Janusz Mariański [eds.]). – This “Lexicon of Sociology of Religion” is the first dictionary-style examination of the terms and issues of sociology of religion to be published anywhere in the world. The 325 entries of the lexicon are the collective work of 60 scholars – mainly sociologists, but also psychologists, educators, theologians, and experts in comparative religion – who represent various research methods and theoretical backgrounds. The subject matter entries focus almost entirely on issues in the area of sociology of religion, while touching upon comparative religion as a secondary matter. The lexicon also explores some of the new sociological topics, which found their expression in such entries as: Globalization and Religion, Internet and Religion, Political Science and Religion, or Sociology of Missions. Each entry provides a bibliography, which documents the state of the international and Polish scholarship in the area of sociology of religion. The biogram entries present the leading international and Polish scholars and their achievements, with particular emphasis on the classics of the sociology of religion and their followers. The lexicon is addressed not only to sociologists and experts in related areas, but also to readers who have a general interest in the subject matter of religion, history of religion, and the interrelation between religion and the life of the individual and the community. – (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Księży Werbistów VERBINUM, 2004. 497 pp. ISBN 83-7192-241-8)

Stanisław A. Wargacki