

sive Vokabular lernen, dass “Psychosen” auch in anderen Sinnzusammenhängen positiv beeinflusst werden können, aber vor allem, dass es sich immer lohnt, über den eigenen Tellerrand zu schauen. Für Ethnologen, die an Psychologie und deren ethnologischer Analyse interessiert sind, ist es gleichfalls empfehlenswert, weil der Autor seine Gedankengänge transparent darlegt und damit zu einer Metaanalyse geradezu einlädt.

Katarina Greifeld

Woodward, Mark: Java, Indonesia, and Islam. Dordrecht: Springer Science+Business Media, 2011. 275 pp. ISBN 978-94-007-0055-0. (Muslims in Global Societies Series, 3) Price: € 106,95

Der Autor des vorliegenden Buches erforscht bereits seit den späten 1970ern die lokalen Ausprägungen des Islams in Yogyakarta, zeitweilig die Hauptstadt der unabhängigen indonesischen Republik und bis heute das einzige noch bestehende politische Sultanat in Indonesien. Das Buch enthält Aufsätze, die zwischen 1985 und 2010 verfasst worden sind, und welche die Thematik fortführen, mit der Mark Woodward durch seine Monographie “Islam in Java. Normative Piety and Mysticism in the Sultanate of Yogyakarta” (Tucson 1989; ursprünglich seine Dissertation an der University of Illinois, 1985), in der Fachwelt bekannt und umstritten geworden ist. Seine damalige Dissertation könnte man als eine akademische Pflichtschrift betrachten, in der versucht wurde, die Sichtweise auf die “Religion von Java”, so wie sie von Clifford Geertz geradezu paradigmatisch definiert worden war, radikal umzuändern. Woodward meint, dass amerikanische Doktoranden, wie er selbst, in den 1970ern überhaupt keine Ahnung hatten, dass “Javanese really are Muslims. That would not happen today” (65). Ganze Generationen sind mit der Pflichtlektüre des Buches “Religion of Java” von Clifford Geertz aus dem Jahre 1960 groß geworden und obwohl ich Woodward vollkommen zustimme, dass Geertz das islamische Element in der “Religion von Java” zu wenig berücksichtigt hat, nimmt Woodward doch eine unhaltbare Extremposition ein, wobei er mit “blindem” Eifer überall den Islam in Java entdecken möchte.

Seine Informanten, vor allem hochrangige Hofdiener am Sultanshof, haben ihn gerne mit Informationen gefüttert, die beweisen sollten, dass die mystische javanische Weltanschauung (*kejawèn*) immer mit dem klassischen Sufismus identisch gewesen sei. Dabei bleibt unbeachtet, dass diese Gewährsleute ein großes Interesse daran hatten, das Sultanat von Yogyakarta nicht nur, wie üblich, als Zentrum der traditionellen javanischen Kultur, sondern zugleich als Hochburg des Islams hochzustilisieren. In Indonesien werden nur fünf (seit kurzem sechs) Weltreligionen anerkannt und alle Bürger müssen einer Religion angehören. Die Daten der Feldforschung entstammen einer Periode, in der sich im indonesischen Diskurs die Idee durchgesetzt hatte, dass die mystische javanische Weltanschauung nicht als “Religion”, sondern bloß als “Glaube” gelten dürfte. Woodward beteiligt sich als Hobbytheologe nach Kräften an der “Verreligionisierung” der javanischen Kultur: So soll z. B. das Essritual *slametan*, das

von Geertz als Herzstück der javanischen Kultur betrachtet wurde, seine Begründung im Koran und in Prophetenüberlieferungen gehabt haben (118–121). Hier verdingt sich ein Regionalwissenschaftler als Islamwissenschaftler ohne Arabischkenntnisse (66) und mit mangelhaften Javanischkenntnissen. Es ist vielbezeichnend, dass javanische und indonesische Termini fast immer falsch geschrieben sind. Leser mit Indonesischkenntnissen werden sich über phantastische Neubildungen wie *obat ngamuk* (80, lese: *obat nyamuk*) oder *muafiqh* (242, lese: *munafik*) freuen.

Die horrende Vielzahl an Tippfehlern ist eine echte Zumutung. Was bedeutet z. B. “One I worked with insisted that I become proficient in archery before his would discuss more than the outline of his understanding of the path leading to knowledge of and union with God” (77)? Oder: “This framework also allows for the explanation of the Javanese view if relations between bio-medical and traditional models of health and illness” (104)? Sätze bleiben unvollendet wie: “Often these are carried in These structural similarities provide few clues about the history of either ritual” (179). Das Kopieren, Ausschneiden und Einfügen per Tastatur kann auch schlimme Folgen haben wie z. B.: “This is one of the reason the reasons why few young people indulge in it on a regular basis” (183). “What follows is a schema ... in the course of history” (40) wird wörtlich wiederholt auf S. 42; “Reformist Muslims, who regard the visitation of graves as sinful innovation, never do this” (212 Zeile 17–18 wird in Zeilen 31–32 wiederholt).

Leider ist das Buch nicht zu empfehlen, aber da es als Band 3 in der Reihe “Muslims in Global Societies” erschienen ist, wird es ohnehin automatisch für teures Geld von den Universitäts- und Institutsbibliotheken gekauft werden.

E. P. Wieringa

Zigon, Jarett (ed.): Multiple Moralities and Religions in Post-Soviet Russia. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011. 238 pp. ISBN 978-0-85745-209-2. Price: \$ 70.00

Advocates of new ethnographies of morality tend to bemoan the anthropology’s longstanding inattention to morality as an autonomous sphere of human life, rather than simply a synonym of cultural cohesion. However, ethnographies of postsocialist societies have yielded no shortage of work on morality. Starting with the volume “Markets and Morality. Ethnographies of Postsocialism” (R. Mandel and C. Humphrey [eds.], Oxford 2002) and moving to a number of recent works on religion and community, ethnographers have taken the social, economic, and political upheavals that accompanied the collapse of state socialism as a starting point for interrogations of how people cope with the breakdown of familiar moral orders and social ideals. Jarett Zigon’s edited volume continues this tradition.

A feature that distinguishes the volume from some of its predecessors is the effort to present a coherent conceptual and terminological framework. In the introduction, Zigon reiterates a distinction between morality and ethics he proposed in previous works. In his usage, “morality” refers to understandings of good and evil that exist

at the level of institutional and popular discourses or embodied practices. The term can thus refer both to explicit, systematic codifications of behavioral rules and the implicit values and embodied responses that underlie everyday behavior. “Ethics,” by contrast, refers to the “work on oneself” that people undertake in moments of moral crisis and breakdown, when they find themselves unable to follow existing templates of moral behavior. Zigon proposes that anthropologists focus on such moments of ethical work, because they offer windows both on the range of ethical techniques and on the historical mechanisms by which moral systems are constructed, interact with one another, and change.

Based on this framework, Zigon considers the decades that followed the disintegration of the Soviet Union as a “historically unprecedented period of social and political upheaval” (3), which presents post-Soviet citizens a rich array of moral dilemmas and opportunities to ethically work on transforming themselves. Among the voices offering new moral points of orientation, religious organizations present one of the clearest points of departures from the Soviet past, when atheism was officially promoted. All essays in this collection deal with religious efforts to promote new moral attitudes and ethical techniques in the social, economic, and cultural spheres.

One of the volume’s notable contributions is that it brings together ethnographies on religious groups that have so far been underrepresented in English-language ethnographies. These include “new religious movements” indigenous to Russia (such as the followers of the self-proclaimed Christ Vissarion studied by Alexander Panchenko) and Muslims in the North Caucasus (represented in Ieva Raubisko’s pioneering ethnography of Chechens piecing together their lives in the midst of ongoing violence and destruction). Counterintuitive though it may seem, another hitherto underrepresented group is Russia’s most numerous denomination, the Russian Orthodox Church. The essays by Agata Ładykowska, Detelina Tocheva, Kathy Rousselet, Jeanne Kormina and Sergey Shtyrkov, and Tobias Köllner bring together an ethnographic picture of contemporary Russian Orthodox life that has few parallels in published literature. Essays by Alexander Agadjanian, Melissa Caldwell, and Catherine Wanner cover trends in a variety of (predominantly Christian) confessions.

The areas of life where post-Soviet believers engage in ethical work range from family and intergenerational relations challenged by violent conflicts and rapid social change (Raubisko, Rousselet, Kormina and Shtyrkov); the economics of charity work and church construction (Caldwell, Tocheva, Köllner); and efforts to form religious sensibilities in people and institutions shaped by Soviet secular culture (Ładykowska, Panchenko, Wanner). Like its predecessors in the anthropology of postsocialism, this collection demonstrates that times of accelerated socio-political change present a privileged opportunity to study people’s efforts to reconstitute themselves and their moral systems.

A question that remains is how unique any of this is to the postsocialist era. Although not all authors agree

with the editor’s proposed distinction between morality and ethics, most seem to accept the basic premise that the post-Soviet period makes unprecedented demands on people’s ability to change. To a reader familiar with the literature on the state-sponsored creation of the “New Soviet Man” in the 1920s and 30s, this claim is a bit surprising. Agadjanian makes a helpful distinction when he argues that Soviet citizens, having lived through the global moral upheaval of the 1920s, participated to a lesser degree in the renewed turmoil of the 1960s (17). So people’s perceptions of an exorbitant rate of change since the 1990s are fueled in part by the confrontation between relatively conservative Soviet values and the results of moral changes that the capitalist West had gone through during the decades before the fall of socialism.

In general, many of the chapters could have been enriched by a closer reading of recent literature on Russian and Soviet history, as well as the literature on Russia’s religious traditions coming out of history, religious studies, and political science. It is, for instance, highly simplified to claim that the Russian Orthodox Church has, or seeks, the “formal status of ‘official’ national religion” (Caldwell, p. 51). Nor is it convincing when Tocheva claims that there is no historical precedent for the practices of informal redistribution of used goods through Russian Orthodox parishes (86), given the long-standing practice in urban and rural Russia of in-kind gifts to the church as a form of almsgiving and commemoration.

Of all the essays, Panchenko and Kormina and Shtyrkov offer the most sustained interrogation of the relationship between Soviet history and post-Soviet religious moralities. Both chapters point out the continuities between Soviet and post-Soviet moral sensibilities, especially for believers who came of age before the Soviet Union collapsed. Followers of the Siberian Last Testament Church engage in practices of self-interrogation and self-criticism that resemble the ways Brezhnev-era youth were encouraged to ethically work on themselves. And Russian Orthodox laypeople bring a suspicion of communal church life and official church structures from their atheist upbringing, while flocking to visit the grave of a saint who addresses the problems of urban family life.

One of the most haunting observations of this volume is Raubisko’s demonstration of how such basic moral conservatism can turn against people. In her account of postwar Chechnya, citizens who are trying to pick up their lives in the aftermath of conflict not only suffer from the violence of their own government, but also from its deliberate “reversal” of widespread moral norms (106). By torturing elders, raping women, and making it impossible for families to protect their children, government forces are upsetting moral norms in order to disorient and discourage members of their own communities. At this point, it becomes clear that “ethical work on oneself” is not the only response to moral breakdown. Where there is a perceived assault on communal morality, the response can be a defense of an established moral system, or the attempt to withdraw from moral bonds and moral reasoning altogether. Raubisko shows examples of both reactions in her essay.

Reading her ethnography and some of the other contributions, one is left with the impression that ethical work on the self is only one of a range of possible responses to perceived moral breakdown, a response whose prevalence

in post-Soviet Russia perhaps needs to be historicized itself. In this way, the collection as a whole points beyond its declared theoretical framework, which is certainly an achievement.

Sonja Luehrmann