

in der Lage ist, den Schlüssel zu finden, kann die Botschaft ruhig lesen, da sie für ihn bestimmt ist. Wer dagegen den Schlüssel nicht findet, für den wird die Botschaft zur Störung ... Den Schlüssel aber zu finden, setzt voraus, ihn *hinter* der Botschaft zu vermuten ..." (188).

Genau um diesen Schlüssel geht es auch in dem Beitrag "Urbaner Bodensatz. Oder wie fotografiert man Schmutz und Dreck?" Kathrin Rottmann entfaltet ausgehend von Germaine Krulls Fotoreportagen aus den 1920er Jahren, die in Pariser Markthallen entstanden, Aspekte der geschichtlichen Entwicklung von Hygiene, gekoppelt an ästhetische Vorstellungen. Es gelingt ihr, zu zeigen, welchen großen Stellenwert dem Medium der Fotografie zukam: "Aufgrund seiner Entstehung und Beschaffenheit aus Licht, lichtempfindlichen Schichten und deren Trägern erschien es selbst frei von hygienisch fragwürdigen Materialien" (153). Das Ekelhafte stört nicht nur, es verstört und fasziniert und löst starke Empfindungen aus. Die hygienisch sterile Distanz des Mediums der Fotografie ermöglicht die Faszination an dem Verstörenden, am Ekel, gepaart mit Verwunderung. Der Ekel und das Sich-Wundern über Schmutz, das zeigt Rottmann anschaulich in ihrem Artikel, führte in der Geschichte zu bestimmten Erkenntnisprozessen über räumliche Hygiene und neuer Wohn- und Lebensraumgestaltung.

Störungen, das Verstörende, so auch die Quintessenz dieses Bandes, sind das, was gesellschaftliche Ordnungen und Strukturen nicht nur sichtbar macht, sondern sie haben das Potential diese zu verändern. Damit liefert dieses Buch eine Antwort auf eine der schwierigsten Fragen der Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften: Wieso, wann und wie ändern sich Gesellschaften? Den Störungen kommt hierbei eine große Bedeutung zu, gerade indem sie Ekel erregen, Menschen erschauern lassen, wie durch Gruselgeschichten in der Nacht, indem sie Furcht einflößen, wie bei Naturkatastrophen oder Kriegen oder indem sie Wut auslösen, wie bei staatlicher Überwachung. Störungen verweisen als kurzes oder endloses Rauschen auf das "Nicht-Geschehen". Der größte Sinn, einen Sinn in der Störung und im Leiden zu entdecken, liegt nicht nur im Trost, den eine solche Sinnfindung leistet. So viel Verzweiflung sie auch bringen mag, letztendlich ist es die Störung, welche durch ihre schonungslose Enthüllung Ordnungen offenlegt, eine Verständnis für sie weckt und Veränderung bewirken kann. Was als größtmögliche Bedrohung daherkommt, kann sich als Motor kulturellen Wandels entpuppen. Dieser Sammelband ist Sprengstoff, ist Balsam und Trostpflaster in einem. Er wirft einen Blick in die Abgründe, die sich auftun, wenn Störungen sich plötzlich und unaufhaltsam im Leben einzelner oder ganzer Gesellschaften ereignen. Mögen wir stets die Botschaft der Störung entziffern können und das Rauschen und Flirren aushalten, bis es soweit ist.

Urte Undine Frömming

Formoso, Bernard : L'identité reconsidérée. Des mécanismes de base de l'identité à ses formes d'expression les plus actuelles. Paris : L'Harmattan, 2011, 270 pp. ISBN 978-2-296-55342-2. Prix : € 26.00

La question de l'identité se prête à des approches multiples, philosophiques, psychologiques, psychanalytiques, sociologiques, ethnologiques, historiques, politiques, etc. Le grand mérite de l'ouvrage de B. Formoso (professeur à l'Université de Nanterre qui a, entre autres, travaillé sur les Chinois en milieu thaï et les Tsiganes) est d'avoir tenté une approche résolument transdisciplinaire, usant d'un large comparatisme, et pris à bras le corps une problématique aussi complexe à un moment où, semble-t-il, notre époque est confrontée à une crise sans précédent des identités tant individuelles que collectives. Il a plongé dans l'actualité la plus brûlante en n'esquivant pas le "grand débat" lancé en France par l'éphémère Ministère de l'Identité Nationale autour de la question : "Qu'est-ce qu'être français aujourd'hui ?" Il propose une grille d'analyse originale combinant cinq opérateurs logiques : l'identification, la différenciation, la projection, la sériation et la novation. "Ces cinq mécanismes régissent en effet les rapports affectifs, cognitifs et normatifs qui relient l'individu à son entourage. Ils permettent à cet individu de conceptualiser le monde et son rapport au monde selon ces oppositions principes que sont le semblable et le différent, le beau et le laid, le bien et le mal, ou encore le juste et l'injuste" (147). L'ouvrage resitue enfin les grands référents identitaires que sont le genre, la parenté, l'ethnie, la nation, la "race" (munie de guillemets pour l'occasion) et la religion (dont il n'est traité qu'incidemment) autant dans l'histoire des sociétés que dans celle des idées, avec les multiples débats auxquels ils ont donné lieu. Dans les deux derniers chapitres consacrés respectivement à l'individu et à la "révolution individualiste", l'auteur cherche à définir en quoi des données aussi différentes que l'essor des nouvelles technologies de communication, la frénésie de consommation, le développement des réseaux sociaux sur Internet, le culte narcissique du corps ou le progrès de la génétique modifient nos rapports à nous-mêmes et aux autres.

Nous sommes là en présence d'un ouvrage remarquablement pensé et documenté, érudit tout en étant fortement structuré, débordant de données significatives et d'apports originaux quant au fond et à la méthode. Il fera partie de ceux qu'on garde à proximité pour les avoir sous la main et pouvoir les consulter. Un tout petit détail : p. 36, je ne pense pas qu'on puisse classer les Yénish parmi les Tsigane.

Pierre Erny

Freed, Stanley A.: Anthropology Unmasked. Museums, Science, and Politics in New York City. Vol. 1: The Putnam-Boas Era. Vol. 2: The Wissler Years. Wilmington: Orange Frazer Press, 2012. 1025 pp. ISBN 978-1-933197-83-8. Price: \$ 80.00

Please do "judge a book by its cover," when it comes to Stanley Freed's opus magnum on museums, science, and politics in New York City, and especially on one of the leading departments of anthropology in the United States, embedded in the American Museum of Natural History. Different from gaudy covers of pocketbooks and distinguished but dull covers alike the front cover of these two volumes exhibits in elegant hues of ochre, brown, and

light green the upper part of a Haida mask. The mask, carved and painted by Charles Edenshaw in the year 1900 represents Gagiit, a wildman. The mask is not torn from a face; one can just look at what is behind the mask: a double stripe featuring portraits of anthropologists who are dealt with in the respective volume. These stripes continue on the back cover which, of volume I, shows also an Abelam figure collected in New Guinea by Margaret Mead in 1933 and an old drawing of the Crystal Palace on 42nd Street which housed an art fair in 1853 to 1854 and which burnt to the ground in 1857. The back cover of volume II exhibits a drawing of the “Bird-Ford Earth Shaker,” a motor-driven sifter used in archaeological work, and a photograph of a native of Ohio, Stanley Freed, the author; time to indulge in his book.

Among the three major cities of the United States by the year 1800 – Boston, New York, and Philadelphia – that were big enough and sufficiently rich to support organized intellectual activities, New York with 61,000 inhabitants was the biggest, but it lagged behind the other two in economic and political importance. Philadelphia was top-ranking in science with Benjamin Franklin founding the University of Pennsylvania in 1740, and its medical school, established in 1765. The city was home of the American Philosophical Society and the Academy of Natural Sciences which in turn opened a Museum in 1826 “which marks the beginning of museum-based natural history in this country.” Boston had Harvard College, which, by 1850, overshadowed all other American colleges, and it had the Linnaean Society of New England, later the Boston Society of Natural History, which turned later into the Museum of Science.

Nothing of that sort in New York. There was Barnum’s American Museum which housed some good material, but which was mainly a place of popular education and amusement. For several reasons the Paleozoic Museum never saw the light. The Lyceum of Natural History, a democratic organization founded in 1817, could have grown, in spite of all difficulties, into the leading scientific body in the city. But in 1866 a fire in the Academy of Music reduced the Lyceum’s collections which were housed in the basement of that building to a pile of ashes.

It is against this background that Freed tells us the story of the many efforts and setbacks and the people behind them which eventually led to the foundation of the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH). He manages to lead the reader on unexpected roads to the central events of this story. Thus, when it comes to the role played by Albert Bickmore in creating the AMNH, he first tells us about Jean Louis Agassiz, the Swiss naturalist, who had come to the USA in 1846, became a professor at Harvard, and managed to create the Museum of Comparative Zoology which was opened in 1860. Since the federal government was not interested in such a museum, Agassiz used the double strategy of combining public and private money, a device used later in the establishment of the AMNH. Bickmore, who as a boy growing up in Maine, developed a strong interest in wildlife, entered Dartmouth College, and went later to study with Agassiz in Cambridge. From him he learned strategies to run

a museum, and even before he left Agassiz’s museum in 1863 he had drawn plans for a Museum of Natural History in New York. The Civil War delayed these plans for years. Bickmore went on a three-year collecting trip to the Dutch East Indies and came back with a collection weighing more than 4 tons.

The American Museum of Natural History was opened in 1869 in the former Arsenal and moved to the present locations in 1877. For several reasons the museum lost momentum in the 1880s and it took an extraordinary personality like Morris Ketchum Jesup to come up with plans how to improve the museum, especially in the fields of business and exhibitions. He himself and his wife gave the museum a bequest of more than \$ 5 million. Jesup wanted to attract visitors by offering interesting exhibitions labeled in an attractive way: “I am a plain, unscientific business man, I want the exhibits to be labeled so that I can understand them – and then I can feel sure that others can understand.” He became president of the AMNH in 1881 and guided it over 28 years as “The Heart, Brain, and Soul of the American Museum of Natural History.” Many more buildings were added to the one wing of 1877. Many collections were acquired. The museum was opened to the public on Sundays. The “golden years” of the AMNH had begun.

After they had worked together in Chicago to present anthropology at the World’s Columbian Exposition, intended to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus, Frederic W. Putnam joined the staff of the AMNH in 1894 as Curator of the Department of Anthropology, followed by Franz Boas in 1896 as Assistant Curator. The core of the “unbeatable anthropological team” was created.

Before Putnam became curator at the AMNH, the museum staff concentrated on acquiring and documenting collections and build up exhibitions. With Putnam working in the museum things changed. Starting with some cautious formulations that existing collections should be supplemented, the idea of doing museum-backed fieldwork was strengthened and got also support from the president’s side. Out of this movement grew the plan for an expedition covering the North American “Northwest Coast,” the entire Bering Strait area, and major parts of easternmost Russia. Boas became the director of this enterprise, called “American Anthropology’s Greatest Expedition” (ch. 4). It is the author’s merit to give here a detailed, well-documented, and well-commented upon report (164–383) on how this bundle of expeditions started and continued, what its goals were and what was achieved by the very different members of the expedition. Whoever wants to get an overview of or insight into what happened during these expeditions and who the people were who took part in them, will read the chapters 4–7 of this volume before reading the reports published by the participants or reports by other people on these expeditions. Whereas doing fieldwork on the Canadian Northwest Coast was logistically simple, fieldwork in Siberia was difficult and sometimes very close to torture. Summing up the situation is a sentence “Here Nothing is Cheap Except Death Which You Can Have in This Country at Spe-

cial Bargain Rates.” Laufer wrote to Boas from Sakhalin: “... robberies and murders are daily occurrences.” One is reminded of A. Tschechov’s report “Sakhalin.” Stanley Freed is anthropologist and a wise man. He comments on a discussion about Laufer being a Jew or not. Boas just wanted to wipe off this discussion, since he found unjust the classification of an individual as a member of a particular group. But exactly this contradicts his doctrine of cultural relativism, where each way of a given community to live together would (at least initially) be considered of equal value. And Freed’s comment on this, after a long quotation from a text by L. Glick, is that “it seems that some cultures are more relative than others” (298). There are more comments on Boas and his rigid rules of doing fieldwork correctly. After Laufer published scanty field notes, Freed comments that this “was due chiefly to his close adherence to Boasian anthropology and not to a lack of qualifications ... The Boasian style constrained a fieldworker to a narrow research program with the endless recording of texts as the principal requirement. The brilliant people drawn to anthropology by Boas’s dynamic personality blossomed only when they abandoned the Boasian paradigm” (301).

The last chapter of volume I is entitled “Exhibition, Science, and Boas’s Resignation.” Concentrating for a moment on the first two concepts, the reader will find here arguments for and against collecting, and especially many differing views on what an exhibition should exhibit, and why and how it should be done. Holden Caulfield, from Salinger’s “The Catcher in the Rye” loved the Museum because it gave him the feeling of stability and security. He believed that exhibitions never changed.” Freed adds: “But they do.” Thinking of the decades when exhibitions in the AMNH did not change, this sounds a little over-active. But they do change. Chapter 8 (384–465) presents a good overview of ideas concerning museum work, which had already been discussed in the “Introduction” where the twofold character of museum anthropology is discussed, where a balance has to be achieved (rarely present within one person) of being a good scientist and a good promoter of what is thought of as valuable to be shown in an exhibition. “Valuable” is not meant in the pluralistic way but as a curtsy to human faculty and capacity.

Clark Wissler is at the center of interest in the second volume of this publication. It seems that this clear-minded, outspoken, yet modest person is much closer to the author than Boas ever may have been. Occasionally it reads like a restoration of Wissler. For people working at the museum, Wissler must have been much more influential than Boas. There was a concept of an area inhabited by people following closely the same ideas, values, attitudes. There was maybe a core area, and there was a culture concept applicable to exhibition work. Wissler had clear words, and to some people he appeared as “a very striking case of extreme impersonality” (Mead). Freed adds “People who do not wear their emotions on their sleeve are not necessarily unfeeling.” A very polite comment, indeed, which informs us better about Margaret Mead than about Wissler.

Wissler continued supporting fieldwork, be it in ar-

chaeology, be it in anthropology. He obviously favored solid archaeological work, as demonstrated in chapters 10 and 11, 13 and 14. Freed knew some of the people he is dealing with and precluded any work on the period when he entered the Museum and especially while he served as curator of the department. He did fieldwork in India, but he doesn’t mention it especially. And when it comes to Margaret Mead and Colin Turnbull and then to Shapiro as successor to Wissler one can note a wise calmness towards these people.

Stanley Freed wrote a book that I would have swallowed up as a young student, had it been available, and that I swallowed up now that I am a retired professor in anthropology. It’s a great intellectual excitement.

Wolfgang Marschall

Geertz, Armin W., and Jeppe Sinding Jensen (eds.): *Religious Narrative, Cognition, and Culture. Image and Word in the Mind of Narrative*. Sheffield: Equinox, 2011. 336 pp. ISBN 978-1-84553-295-6. Price: £ 24.99

This volume of essays is based on papers given at conferences held at the Department of the Study of Religion, Aarhus University. The initial research program entitled “Religious Narrative, Cognition, and Culture” gave place to another, broader project (entitled “Religion, Cognition, and Culture”) and in the past decade a number of important conferences took place at the department that largely contributed to the formation of the field of the Cognitive Science of Religion (CSR). The reader familiar with the history of this field will find traces of the developments of the past decade throughout the book: whereas the introductory chapters contain reflections on the state of the art of the field, some essays that apply insights from CSR are informed by its early stages. However, this should not be counted as a drawback: the book offers a survey of various CSR approaches and their applications to different materials, which especially readers less familiar with CSR might find helpful.

The first and second parts of the book contain a series of theoretical essays. The introductory chapters written by the editors present some strong theses. The first chapter declares the editors’ commitment to a particular model of human cognition: “cognition is neither solely nor perhaps even primarily located in individual brains, rather being distributed and situated in pragmatic social contexts” (1). As a consequence, the editors promise to focus on “what the social world brings to the mind, that is, the formative effects that various kinds of cultural knowledge ... may have on the ways in which minds are made and how they work” (1). It can be noted that the formulation of the latter sentence somewhat mitigates the unyieldingly programmatic start. While the idea that thinking is distributed across many minds and pragmatic contexts is fairly radical and much debated, few cognitive scientists would doubt that cultural knowledge (in the form of information originating in the social and material environment) shapes the mind. Armin W. Geertz’s chapter on “Religious Narrative, Cognition and Culture. Approaches and Definitions” emphasizes the pre-linguistic origins of narratives and its