

survivalist inland “lineages” moved from isolated hamlets into bigger residential units during the second half of the nineteenth century (a shift toward the typical village model that suited Mission and Administration to help “manage” disparate and once discordant groups). This meant a weakening of *auhenua*, not only meaning the “land traditionally worked” but places of “primordial” or topogonic significance. Claims to, and associations with, *auhenua* became confused by the coexistence of lineages that previously had little to do with each other.

By the Second World War, when the *Maasina* movement was preaching a reinstatement to custom (*kastom*), in fact, such a return was no longer strictly possible for the Arosi. The ideal “unity of being” had been replaced by what Scott calls “heterotopia.” The only *auhenua* matrilineages best expressing this unity were very often replaced by a pattern of patri-virilocal residence, whereby men chose to stay on the coast and plant on land previously worked by their fathers. On Scott’s reading, in any case, once they were disturbed from their traditional moorings, the Arosi have always been concerned to “recover *auhenua*,” and in the face of a permanent impossibility the most satisfactory solution for them is through solidarity expressed by the Christian Church. If in old time “the mother denotes a permanent and inexhaustible connection to a place or thing by virtue of the unity of being within a matrilineage” (251), the church emerges in his story as a surrogate mother.

The third reason why I value this book is precisely because of Scott’s sensitive approach to Melanesian Christianity. In this he has skilfully combined the disciplines of anthropology, studies in religion, mission history, and missiology. Coming to terms with religious change has been a hard row to hoe for most anthropologists, but the massive shift of collective allegiance to Christianity (and very ecumenical expressions of it) is simply too big a fact of life in the Pacific to neglect. Such scholars as John Barker, Bronwyn Douglas, and Joel Robbins have led the way in asserting the patent necessity of placing Melanesian Christianity on the anthropological research agenda. Scott joins this list, in many respects being the most artful of them all. He explores how an indigenous people, with both a rich autochthonous inheritance, and with insightful missionaries of the likes of Coleridge Patteson and Charles Fox introducing the new message of peace, have manoeuvred their lives and relationship to grasp the unity behind the diversity of tensions. As the mythic Hatoibwari, the always unified yet dismembered serpent, was a metaphor of the related yet separated matrilineages, so the Church has become the symbol of a higher *auhenua*, a lasting means of deep *communitas* that makes strangely possible the apparently impossible recovery of lost, uprooted sacralities.

Garry W. Trompf

Sercombe, Peter G., and Bernard Sellato (eds.): *Beyond the Green Myth. Hunter-Gatherers of Borneo in the Twenty-First Century*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press, 2007. 384 pp. ISBN 978-87-7694-018-7. (Nordic Institute of

Asian Studies, Studies in Asian Topics Series, 37) Price: £ 19.99

Despite their pivotal interest to an earlier generation of evolutionist anthropologists, studies of hunter-gatherer groups using the intensive and informed methods of modern ethnography did not begin to appear much before the 1960s. It was always odd that the benchmark publication that signaled a change in our understanding for the better, the “Man the Hunter” volume coedited by Richard Lee and Irven DeVore in 1968, scarcely mentioned any of the 20,000 or so Bornean hunter-gatherers (usually described as Penan or Punan); but it is even stranger that index references are to be found in neither Marco Bicchieri’s “Hunter and Gatherers Today” (1972) nor Alan Barnard’s “Hunters-Gatherers in History, Archaeology, and Anthropology” (2004). Despite the pioneering fieldwork of Rodney Needham in the early 1950s, Needham himself – apart from a series of essays mainly devoted to naming systems – published little, and systematic fieldwork in Borneo did not really get under way until the 1970s. This book, therefore, seeks to fill a very real gap. It succeeds in doing this by providing an overview of existing literature, and a set of focussed and complementary papers on different groups. At a stroke, it has become an essential work of reference, alongside other recent substantial monographs, such as Carl Hoffman’s controversial “The Punan” (1986), Bernard Sellato’s “Nomads of the Borneo Rainforest” (1994), and Rajindra Puri’s “Deadly Dances in the Bornean Rainforest” (2005), this latter unfortunately appearing too recently to get a mention in the present volume.

The most useful service performed by this book is to supply a substantial and considered 50 page introduction, which, in addition to guiding the reader through existing work, corrects persisting popular myths about the Penan and Punan, and brings to our interpretation of their lives, a twenty-first-century perspective. This is ably accomplished by Bernard Sellato, a senior anthropologist specializing in this field of study, and the linguist Peter Sercombe. The rest of the book includes two previously published pieces (Needham’s encyclopedic summary, which first appeared in the Human Relations Area Files compendium, “Ethnic Groups of Insular Southeast Asia”) and the final chapter on the Eastern Penan of Sarawak by Brosius from *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. Sellato contributes a general piece on the Kalimantan Punan, and Stefan Seitz a comparative analysis of Punan relations with the animal world. Other chapters focus on particular groups: Bhuket ethnogenesis (Shanthi Thambiah), the Tubu’ river Punan of east Kalimantan (K. A. Klimut and Rajindra Puri), the Malinau Punan (Lars Kaskija), the West Kalimantan Punan (Mering Ngo), the Punan Vuhang (Henry Chan), and the Sukang Penan of Brunei (Peter Sercombe and Robert Voeks). Each of the chapters cover a substantively different subject and reflect various theoretical styles, from the ethnographic empiricism of Sellato and Sercombe, through the quantitative ethnobotany of Voeks, to the postmodern idiom of Brosius. The whole is given further authority by a foreword written by Kirk Endicott who,

while well-known for his work amongst the Batek of the Malaysian peninsula, here sets Borneo within the wider context of hunter-gatherer studies in Southeast Asia.

All contributors are necessarily concerned with issues of identity and ethnicity, and with the role of nomadic forest groups in the context of contemporary forest economy and management. But the book goes well beyond these themes, to explore the extent to which those people habitually described by those around them as Penan and Punan are independent (either in terms of their subsistence or in terms of their social relations), accommodate a common value system of “immediacy, autonomy, and sharing,” and exemplify a typical set of cultural practices, even when they are sedentary. What emerges is certainly much variation in those strategies deployed in particular places and at particular times, but also a “common logic of procurement”; all being part of a historical ecology that speaks more of complex resource management and social flux than of simple hunting and gathering. Contrary to the comfortable stereotypes – both Western and local – we learn that Bornean foragers do not always engage in sustainable extraction, despite being widely regarded as sensitive to those long-term ecological cycles that regenerate growth; have fewer words for plants than their farming neighbours despite being acknowledged as forest experts; and do not always live up to their pacifist reputation, by actively resisting the incursions of incoming loggers.

While the editors accept that Penan and Punan may give us some analogies helpful in understanding South-east Asian pre-agricultural prehistory (in, for example, their sago economy), they avoid the reductionism now familiar from evolutionary ecology, and remain agnostic as to whether contemporary groups might be remnants of pre-Austronesian foragers or “secondary” Austronesian specialist forest extractors. Neither do they commit themselves to a particular model based on linguistic or ethnographic data, and competently demonstrate how what evidence we do have, for the recent past at least, indicates nuanced and distinctive histories for individual groups, some entering into relations of trade and bondage with local agricultural peoples, to varying degrees of intensity and permanence. All these data challenge yet again the validity of the conventional category of “hunter-gatherer,” but most importantly Penan and Punan are through this collection beginning to speak for themselves, most clearly through Klimut’s coauthorship with Puri. Theirs is a dynamic world – one contributor sees it as inherently unstable – full of paradoxes, conforming only weakly to the usual comforting liberal environmentalist ideology; unquestionably politically and economically marginalized, and under modern conditions increasingly culturally depleted. But it is a world nevertheless in which local people actively make decisions about how to pursue their livelihoods, and what kind of accommodation to reach with their nonforaging neighbours and the civil states within which they find themselves. Their means of achieving this include strategically using the stereotypical identities imposed upon them by outsiders.

It is a common enough observation that many collected editions on a single subject lack thematic coherence and evenness of quality. In the case of this book, such a lack is well enough compensated for by its adding to the tools of scholarship, science, and governance a convenient work of reference on a much neglected people. Strangely though, for a work that adopts a largely critical and agnostic position on cultural history and debates of common heritage, the editors attempt bravely to persuade us that we should adopt “Pnan” as a compromise and all-encompassing term for the often competing, confusing, and controversial ethnonyms “Penan” and “Punan.” This may be its shortest-lasting legacy.

Roy Ellen

Soothill, Jane E.: *Gender, Social Change, and Spiritual Power. Charismatic Christianity in Ghana.* Leiden: Brill, 2007. 261 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-15789-7. Price: € 79,00

Ruth Marshall-Fratani’s 1991 essay “Power in the Name of Jesus” opened a debate on the question of gender, social change, and power in African Pentecostalism which has continued down to the present. This book, based on case studies in Ghana is the most important research on the question to date. Clear, concise, and elegantly written, it is a subtle and nuanced analysis of the gender dynamics in this form of African Christianity.

Jane Soothill is very aware of the difficulties posed by her position as a female, British scholar, versed in the gender debates of the Western academy. As she notes, the “book looks at the lives and experiences of ‘African women,’ which requires the researcher to be doubly aware perhaps of the relationship between the ‘Self’ and ‘Other,’ especially given the history of European women’s engagement with their African counterparts.” This is something she does very well.

Soothill looks at Pentecostalism and gender in an historical perspective before moving on to contemporary patterns. Looking back to the evangelical move in the USA, she notes that “on the whole the evangelical movement was not a feminist one” but that “many women, when they did move from evangelicalism to feminism, took with them the knowledge and skills they had learnt” (55f.) in their churches. These claims are often made for Pentecostalism in other parts of the world. Soothill examines the work of Salvatore Cucchiari and Elizabeth Brusco, writing from southern European perspectives and Latin American perspectives, while going on to look in some detail at the claims of Ruth Marshall-Fratani with regard to Pentecostalism, gender, and power in Africa. It was upon much of this material that David Martin based his somewhat ecstatic conclusion that Pentecostalism is in fact a “women’s movement”; a “sisterhood of shared experience.” Martin points to the “buried intelligentsia who through their involvement in the churches more and more actively relate to each other and sustain each other.” Jane Soothill is more circumspect and more complex in her analysis, concluding that “the gender discourses of Charismatic Christianity are used in multiple ways to