

idea of lumping them in the single category of witchcraft. The second chapter deals with a case of judicial arbitration, associating an interaction of the concepts of justice, wisdom, truth, and others with the notion of custom (*amaamuo*), namely, the theoretical order of discourse and knowledge, and thus highlighting the process through which the act of judging transforms commonplace presuppositions into institutionally explicit and expressible theoretical thought (79). The third chapter deals with the complex, ambiguous relationship between knowledge, truth, narration, and reality, in relation to the local conception of history as expressed dynamically by oral tradition. Independent from what we might call historical reality, “narration is always true insofar as it respects the rhetorical canon and fulfills its proper function, namely that of portraying the knowledge and the will of ancestors” (95). Knowledge and truth remain at the center of the fourth chapter, in which, starting from a discussion of the interpretive perspectives of the philosophers Kwame Gyekye and Kwasi Wiredu, Pavanello resumes discussing the notion of *amaamuo* (custom) as ancestral legacy, trying to demonstrate its nature as systemic knowledge, overarched by an internal order, and ends up hypothesizing that this system of thought is exquisitely theoretical, “not in the sense of theory as a plausible organization of hypotheses on the world or as a formulation of general principles, but as rhetorical organization and at the same time a logic of metaphorical utterances” (111). The relationship between economic structure and social representation is at the center of the fifth chapter, where Pavanello emphasizes an identification between profit maximization and continuity of lineages, and their control over land and other resources, made by Nzema theory, which thus shows its nature as a moral theory of utility and power. The sixth chapter deconstructs the conventional interpretation in studies of the Akan notion of family (*abusua*) as inclusive of two distinct levels, corresponding to hierarchically ordered anthropological notions of clan, which includes a lineage series, with the addition, in the specific case, of an emphasis on matrilineality typical of the Akan area, to the point of making it an almost exclusive trait of *abusua*. By contrast, in the Nzema case Pavanello makes a much more complex interpretation. At any given moment, membership in *abusua* is thus made up as much of lines of maternal as paternal descent. After all, the *abusua* category expresses a hierarchical reality defined by history and especially by the legacy of slavery, or by the absorption of former slaves that gives rise to internal lines of paternal descent considerably marked by their unfree origins. The two anthropological notions of clan and lineage are thus not considered as different aspects of social reality but merely as two ways of representing it. The seventh and last chapter, which reaffirms and reinforces this, resumes a previous contribution by Pavanello to the debate that has been going on for some time within Akan studies in a critical response to Ivor Wilks’ thesis of the origin of matrilineality as a functional institution in the

phase that Wilks defined as the “big bang” of Akan’s history in the 15th–16th century, describing it as a very rapid transition from a hunting and gathering economy pursued by nomadic bands to an agrarian system founded on matrilineality and matrilineality as a structure of social organization. Based on a detailed analysis of the Nzema kinship system in a comparative picture with other Akan groups and thence by formulating an interesting interpretation of the Nzema institution of “marriage inside the house” (*suanu agyale*), Pavanello argues in favor of the idea that matrilineality, in combination with elementary kinship systems structured in groups of descent, was present in this region well before the 15th–16th-century transformations.

Considered in its overall construction as a monograph, “La papaye empoisonnée” is primarily a serried dialogue between Pavanello and his discipline. This is undoubtedly a demanding reading for the non-anthropologist reader, let alone the non-specialist of Akan Studies. On the other hand, by virtue of its thematic vastness and underlying analytical and interpretive sagacity, this book is without doubt challenging for those who move in the extraordinarily developed context of research on this part of West Africa.

In this regard, it is worth emphasizing the importance of Mariano Pavanello’s choice of gathering in a volume written explicitly for Francophone scholars a series of meditations on a society split between an English-speaking and a French-speaking country which, however circumscribed, has been and remains a matter of study for a comparatively high number of researchers, which, however, depending on which side of the border they stand on, even today tend too often to underestimate publications in each other’s language. In addition, there is the peculiar complication of a substantial body of research carried out over an exceptionally long period by Italian scholars who, at least until very recently, have contributed to this intense work by publishing in their own language. In this sense, Mariano Pavanello’s volume is a more than timely attempt to cast a communicative “bridge” between scholarly communities.

Pierluigi Valsecchi

Peleggi, Maurizio: *Monastery, Monument, Museum. Sites and Artifacts of Thai Cultural Memory*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2017. 266 pp. ISBN 978-0-8248-6606-8. Price: \$ 62.00

Maurizio Peleggi’s “*Monastery, Monument, Museum. Sites and Artifacts of Thai Cultural Memory*” is a welcome contribution to studies of cultural memory, Thai Studies, Buddhist Studies, and the history of art. In addition, its final chapter should be of benefit to artists and curators who may still engage too little with work produced from and about spaces in some way related to Thailand. In “*Monastery, Monument, Museum*” Peleggi seeks to show, through a *longue durée* study running from the 13th century A. D. to the early 21st century, the processes through which the “mnemonic landscape”

(5) has been altered across time through diverse interventions made in the built environment by construction projects and the mobilization of powerful objects such as relics and images.

Through a rich array of case studies presented in terms legible to non-specialists while still engaging to specialists, Maurizio Peleggi draws our attention to the historically variable character of what has, does, and may count as “cultural heritage” or “national heritage” in Siam/Thailand (this nomenclature changed several times in the course of the 19th and 20th centuries). Of course, as Peleggi well understands, these very notions of “cultural heritage” and “national heritage” are of relatively recent vintage. Yet, since those 20th- and 21st-century scholars and citizens in Thailand or elsewhere who speak and write in the name of “cultural heritage” and “national heritage” often mobilize premodern artifacts and precedents within their arguments, Peleggi is right to emphasize that the coproduction of landscape and community through memory work in the built environment and “curation” (using the term broadly) of objects has a deep history in Thailand as elsewhere. As Peleggi writes, “[r]egarding cultural memory as a process rather than an outcome should prevent any static or ahistorical understanding of it and thus avoid the trap of traditionalism masked as tradition” (5).

While a detailed chapter summary is beyond the scope of this review, brief descriptive notes on the book’s content are in order to help orient potential readers. Chapter 1, “Buddhist Landscape and Cultural Memory,” addresses premodern Buddhist topography and ideas of sacred geography, as well as royal interest in relics and monumental reliquaries (*stupas*), and the restoration of Buddhist sites and objects. The nature of the memory produced or strengthened by restoration projects varies in relation to structuring discourses (my term not Peleggi’s) present at the time of restoration. Chapter 2, “Itinerant Icons of the Theravada Ecumene,” examines the mobility of Buddhist images, ways in which the biographies of images have been linked to places and patrons, and how mobile images have been captured/stabilized within particular mnemonic projects. For instance, Peleggi writes that “[a] historical understanding of the agency of devotional images ultimately requires an understanding of the actors who manipulated icons for their own ends” (42). Yet Peleggi is careful not to overstate the case for strategic use of such objects. As he notes with reference to changing image styles at Sukhothai (13th–14th century) and Chiang Mai (esp. 15th century), “[w]hether stylistic change ... was accidental ... or was, instead, consciously pursued to affirm the identity and authority of a specific dynasty or monastic lineage is open to question” (47). In the third chapter (in my view the weakest chapter in a book of considerable strength and power), “The Place of the Other in Temple Art,” Peleggi explores visual depictions of foreigners in several decorative projects, beginning to reflect on how the meaning of foreignness may have changed in the transition from premodern Bud-

dhist cosmology to modern conceptions of geography and ethnicity.

It is clear from the titles to parts 1 and 2 of the volume that Peleggi sees the emergence of Siam as a nation-state as interdependent with changes in the work of memory. Part 1 – “Sacred Geography” – includes reference to a number of royal actors and polities but with emphasis on the devotional/protective meanings attached to powerful objects and landscapes. In Part 2, which treats the 19th- and early-20th-century emergence of new forms of discourse and knowledge in Siam, the focus is “Antiquities, Museums, and National History.” Here we see “Kings and Antiquarians” (chap. 4) and in chap. 5 how the museum as a technology and art history as a discipline were harnessed in the service of an emerging historiography of the Thai nation. This, in Peleggi’s account, is an important turning point: “As a result of curatorial selection, classification, and exhibition, devotional images (*phrarup*) thus acquired a novel epistemic status as antiquities (*boranwatthu*) bespeaking the historical unfolding of the Thai nation” (87). Yet the nation-state does not sweep all before it. Chapter 6, “Whose Prehistory? Thailand before the Thais,” is the first of Peleggi’s modern-era indicators that the national memory – though constituted and affirmed by a powerful intersection of discursive and material production – does not go unchallenged in Thailand’s subsequent history. This chapter explores the irony of Ban Chiang (Isan) archaeology, undertaken as part of American Cold War presence in Southeast Asia (supported by the Thai state), which “destabilized the nationalist historical narrative pivoted on the preeminence of the Thai ‘race’” (110).

In Part 3, “Discordant Mnemoscapes,” Peleggi develops the most original and incisive section of the volume. (Part 2 profitably draws from his earlier published work in order to secure the *longue durée* analysis). Chapter 6 on Ban Chiang revealed the Janus-face of the new discipline of archaeology, able to challenge the national history it had helped to create (chap. 5). Within Part 3, Peleggi focuses centrally on contestation over cultural and national memory within Thailand, developing productive small-scale analyses of arguments made through monuments and memorial art practice. “Monumental Failures” (chap. 7) and “Rubbing the Past into the Present” (chap. 8) offer powerful accounts of how physical spaces within Bangkok – and moments in the historiography of Thai nationhood – have been reclaimed and deployed by artists addressing state violence and social exclusion.

One of the many strengths of Maurizio Peleggi’s book is his use of analytical perspectives drawn from several disciplines, and his comparative interlocution between Thailand and other locations including Italy and India. Peleggi notes his debts to scholars within the area of cultural memory studies, but also to anthropologists and historians interested in how “traditions” are made and mobilized towards particular ends, including claims made for the future via representations of the

past (esp. pp. 2–3). This book (and earlier work by Peleggi) also shows his productive engagement with scholarship from postcolonial and post-Orientalist studies which has drawn attention to the ways in which newer modern forms of knowledge and technologies have been mobilized in colonized and colonial-era societies as well as postcolonial nation-states (e. g., see p. 2). Such analyses are often written at a tragic register. Yet Peleggi ends on a high note: “For quite some time now, many in Thailand have been waiting for a high tide to wash away the sanctioned outline of historical and cultural memory and broaden its shore. Conflicting signals notwithstanding, that tide is finally rising” (163).

Anne M. Blackburn

Pfeffer, Georg: Verwandtschaft als Verfassung. Unbürokratische Muster öffentlicher Ordnung. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2016. 826 pp. ISBN 978-3-8487-2421-5. Preis: € 149,00

Klassische Verwandtschaftsethnologie, die nach Verwandtschaftsklassifikationsmustern, Heiratsregeln und deren Folgen für die Sozialstruktur einer Gesellschaft fragt, ist gegenwärtig sicherlich kein Modethema innerhalb des deutschsprachigen ethnologischen Diskurses. Kultureller Wandel und Hybridität, so möchte man sagen, stehen im Mittelpunkt des Interesses. Nicht die vermeintlich “alte Ordnung” wird rekonstruiert, sondern es wird untersucht, wie Geschlechterrollen neu verhandelt werden und wo und wie sich soziale Räume auf-tun, “neue” Möglichkeiten des Lebens in Beziehung auszutesten. Umgekehrt ziehen sich durch die allgemeinen Medien Diskussionen um arrangierte Ehen, sog. “Zwangsehen” oder sog. “Ehrenmorde”, wobei letztere als tragische Folgen des Versuchs gedeutet werden können, überlieferte Heiratsmuster durchzusetzen bzw. deren Übertretung zu sanktionieren. Georg Pfeffer, der sich als Ethnologe seit Beginn seiner wissenschaftlichen Karriere fortwährend mit Fragen der Verwandtschaftsethnologie befasst, legt nun ein wahrhaftes *opus magnum* vor, in dem er eben jenes Thema, Verwandtschaft und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Gesellschaft, in klassischer Weise in den Mittelpunkt seiner Überlegungen stellt. Das Buch stellt gesellschaftliche Ordnungssysteme ausgehend von den ihnen zugrundeliegenden Verwandtschaftssystemen dar. Pfeffer möchte mit seinem Buch aufzeigen, “wie natürliche Verhaltensweisen des *individuellen* Menschseins, also Sexualkontakte und Geburt oder Altern und Tod, die Wegweiser zur Gestaltung von *sozialen* Bindungen liefern” (24). Er möchte in diesem Buch Gesellschaftsordnungen und die ihnen zugrundeliegenden Ordnungskriterien vorstellen, die nicht wie die unsrige idealtypischerweise Personen als gleich betrachten. Es handelt sich dabei um durchaus “sehr verschieden gestaltete Verfassungen, die nur ‘mit Ansehen der Person’ wirklich werden” (24). Das Ziel des Buches liegt, formuliert unter Bezugnahme auf eine Überschrift im Buch, darin, eine “[v]erwandtschaftsorientierte Klassifikationen von Gemeinwesen” zu entwer-

fen (30). Diese beansprucht jedoch keine Vollständigkeit, da er anmerkt, dass er beispielsweise die von Sharon Bastug herausgearbeitete “turko-mongolische Klassifikationstechnik” in dem Buch nicht darstellt (30), auch bleibt – so Pfeffer – letztlich offen, wie viele in der menschlichen Geschichte realisierte Verwandtschaftsklassifikationssysteme im Verlauf der Geschichte, insbesondere im Zuge der europäischen Expansionsgeschichte, verschwanden, ohne dass sie dokumentiert wurden (30). Die Frage nach historischen Wandlungsprozessen solcher Klassifikationssysteme wird letztendlich durch einen Vergleich solcher Systeme, wie er in dem Buch geboten wird, aufgeworfen, ist aber kein Gegenstand des Buches (37).

Um Personen, die sich bisher noch nicht mit Verwandtschaftsklassifikationen befasst haben, den Einstieg in das Buch zu erleichtern, bietet Pfeffer zunächst eine knapp gehaltene, aber präzise Einführung in das Problemfeld (24), wobei er als Ausgangspunkt für seine Erklärungen das deutsche Verwandtschaftssystem wählt, das den Leserinnen und Lesern vertraut sein sollte. Das Buch gliedert sich dann in sieben Abschnitte, die jeweils Unterabschnitte miteinschließen. Die ersten sechs Abschnitte stellen jeweils ein System sozialer und verwandtschaftlicher Klassifikation dar, wobei diese jeweils anhand mehrerer Beispiele illustriert werden. Diese decken chronologisch und räumlich ein breites Spektrum ab, wobei sich durchaus bemerkbar macht, dass der Autor als Ethnologe in Südasiens beheimatet ist. Pfeffer weist bereits in den Überschriften der einzelnen Ethnien oder Gesellschaften gewidmeten Unterkapiteln auf die Ethnologinnen und Ethnologen hin, denen er in der Beschreibung des betreffenden Verwandtschaftssystems und der damit verbundenen Gesellschaftsstruktur folgt. So tragen diese Abschnitte Titel wie “Heirat und Kopffagd der Ilongot nach Renato und Michelle Rosaldo” (67), “Schräge Heiraten der Trio nach Peter Rivière” (162) oder “Der Kreis der Omaha nach Alice Fletcher und Francis La Flesche” (359). Für kundige Leserinnen und Leser bieten diese klaren Kapitelbezeichnungen bereits nützliche Hinweise darauf, was folgen wird. Auch erleichtern sie die Nutzung des Buches als Nachschlagewerk. Pfeffer arbeitet sechs verschiedene Systeme heraus, wobei das erste darin besteht, dass es keine feste Ordnung aufweist (60). Diese Situation sieht er bei den meisten Wildbeutern gegeben, was dazu führt, dass deren familiäre Situation sich letztlich mit derjenigen in westlichen Industriegesellschaften und deren Patchworkfamilien vergleichen lässt, obwohl der ökonomische Kontext natürlich vollständig gegensätzlich ist (52). Die fünf weiteren Großabschnitte fassen die darin beschriebenen Verwandtschafts- und Gesellschaftssysteme unter den Titeln “Bloße Untergliederung”, “Affinität als allgemeine Bindung”, “Abstammung als allgemeine Bindung”, “Deszendenz als kombinierte Bindung” und “Affinität als hierarchische Abgrenzung”. Dieser letztgenannte Abschnitt befasst sich mit der indischen Kastenordnung. Das abschließende siebte Kapitel nutzt Pfeffer, um Schlussfolgerungen aus den von ihm her-