the context to explain how two major actors in the Senegalese arena, the secular state and religious institutions, create the possibility for an open religious dialogue by allowing for the personal and communal expression of faith, beliefs, and agency. The author lays out the particular relationship between the state and the Sufi orders as mutual cooperation, where the state allows for various religious expressions and the religious institutions, in turn, participate in helping to resolve political issues, which fosters an atmosphere of tolerance. More specifically, she argues that Sufi mysticism, applied in diverse Islamic orders, contributes to a deliberate practice of tolerance among adepts through their spiritual engagement in everyday realities.

To demonstrate the experience of everyday realities for Sufi disciples, Cochrane consults a cross section of devotees from different brotherhoods in Senegal, including the Layeen, Tijani, and Murid orders, to explain their particular relationship to faith and the way they apply it in their daily lives. These conversations elucidate the creativity and commitment of individual and communal practices of different believers, which lead to spiritual affirmations of their identities. This relationship and application of faith engages three main elements: the pervasiveness of prayer, the role of guidance and commitment to faith, and the practice of everyday mysticism, brought out in the remaining chapters. Through her discussions with individual practitioners, Cochrane highlights the pervasive nature of prayer for many disciples, which includes canonical and supplementary prayers, and, more importantly, the integration of internal prayer with external work. In the philosophy of the Baay Fall branch of the Murid brotherhood, for example, work, along with all aspects of their daily routine, is explicitly considered a form of prayer.

Cochrane develops further that for guidance in their practices of faith, disciples turn to their spiritual guides or *marabouts* who help to shepherd believers toward the ultimate Sufi goal, unity with God. The relationship between disciples and *marabouts* is not submissive, however, but based on conscious choice and the ability to apprehend the situation from a critical perspective. Most importantly, the lessons taken from the spiritual guides are personally interpreted by the disciples, which, ultimately help to define their individual selves. The practice of pervasive prayer and deference to spiritual guides demonstrates an everyday kind of mysticism that discourages the removal of the self from the world, but, rather, encourages an active engagement in the world in which the presence of God in all things is recognized. This awareness cultivates a sense of balance between the spiritual and the material, in which the internal spiritual aspect is nurtured by prayer and study, while the external, material aspect is developed through an active social life.

Through individual practices of prayer, deference to *marabouts*, and balance between the spiritual and material realities, Cochrane argues that disciples of Sufi orders navigate their own creative practices that both inform and express their faith and therefore self-identity, independently of state and religious authorities that represent them, which leads to a voluntary form of tolerance. The author points out, however, that this expression of agency through faith is limited by social disparities, such as gender and economic inequalities, as well as particular hierarchies in Sufi orders, which the author for the most part, treats as resolvable.

Aside from the limitations that Cochrane addresses, there is a bigger limitation to the creative expression of faith and of the self that stems from the very notion of tolerance. Contrary to Cochrane's implications, there are certain religious and personal expressions that are rarely tolerated by the Sufi orders in Senegal, despite the brotherhoods' propensity for tolerance. This can be seen when certain actors engage in criticism of the Sufi brotherhoods. It is also visible through the dismissal indigenous practices as legitimate expressions of faith, as well as through the absolute rejection of certain personal choices within the community. For example, although Cochrane points out instances of restraint and peaceful protests in reaction to "Jeune Afrique's" portrayal of the Murid founder Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba, in a recent incident, a known critic of the state, Assane Diouf, who directed his criticism at the spokesperson of the current khalife, was ambushed in his house by Murid adepts. Similarly, although indigenous cultural traditions are tolerated, such as the husband carrying a knife for four months after the marriage, there is no clear acceptance of the legitimacy of indigenous religions in and of themselves. Finally, while one of the narrators, Maam, does not press charges against a thief, showing her application of religious teachings of compassion, those same teachings are not generally applied to homosexuals, who are at times exhumed and desecrated after their burials by Sufi disciples.

Laura Cochrane's study on everyday faith in Sufi Senegal is a well-researched and informative work that addresses an understudied component of stability in Senegal. Based on her research, the exceptionalism does not stem from the balance and open dialogue between religious and political authorities, but, rather, from the agency of Sufi adepts, who express their faith in creative ways, leading to religious tolerance. While the concept of tolerance from the ground up should be nuanced, as it is not perfect, it is worthy of exploration. This work would be especially relevant to readers interested in religion in Senegal, Sufi brotherhoods, Senegalese exceptionalism, as well as those interested in learning more about Islam.

Monika Brodnicka

Dalsgaard, Steffen, and **Morten Nielsen** (eds.): Time and the Field. New York: Berghahn Books, 2016. 160 pp. ISBN 978-1-78533-087-2. Price: $ 27.95

Time seems to be a universal dimension of life, measurable by clocks and calendars, continuously moving from the past through the present to the future. However, anthropological studies have identified culturally diverse ways of dealing with time, thinking about past and future, or structuring the flow of time by social rhythms. Although an "anthropology of time" is still not in the center of anthropological research and theorizing, the impact

of culture on peoples' particular time orientations is not questioned.

The anthology "Time and the Field" edited by Steffen Dalsgaard and Morten Nielsen leads anthropological attention once again to the topic of time, adding to the already existing body of literature an important further dimension. The chapters – as diverse as they are – all focus on the relation of time and the field of ethnographic research. Not only does the field (and its people) have their distinct time orientation or temporality but the field itself is understood as having fundamental temporal properties, being a "confluence of different times and temporalities" (6). Like this, the field is no longer understood primarily as a spatial concept – a site or location where the fieldworker goes to – but equally important as a temporal site. The chapters in the book are exciting examples, showing that an analytical exploration of the interrelations of the concepts time and field lead to innovative approaches and insights.

Antonia Walford looks at the production of new knowledge in science practice. Working with two groups – micrometeorologists and climate modelers – she investigates how these groups relate their data with analysis, thereby revealing different conceptualizations of time. The micrometeorologists regard time as a given, linear, "natural" flow, with a certain past (past data) which serves as scale for present understanding/analysis and expectations for future data. New knowledge is made by reaffirming old knowledge. Climate modelers, creating predictions with their mathematical models, take time also as a constant invariant variable; the future, however, remains uncertain and necessarily constructed in the models. New knowledge (in the form of predictions) is made here by proposing "certain uncertainty" (31).

Steffen Dalsgaard's account gives a deep description of how the state in Papua New Guinea is perceived by rural people in a temporal manner. The people of Manus experience the state not as a social institution with laws and practices governing over a bounded territory. To them the state becomes manifest through personification: local politicians, their presence, attention, and resource allocation to the local village community. Instead of being a permanent organization of society, the state is rather seen as having a limited duration, depending on the time of the local politician's presence and attentiveness. "The state" as research field appears and is handled as a field *in* time and *of* time.

Working with marginalized youths in Brazil and Georgia, Anne Line Dalsgaard and Martin Demant Frederiksen compare the cases of two young men. Both men live in unpromising conditions, but maintain and repeat daily routines, relying on the future's openness and, thus, the chance for betterment – a practice that the authors call "active waiting" and "practice of hope." Based on their insights and revisits to the field, Dalsgaard and Frederiksen reflect on their own practice of ethnographic writing, which usually leads to a conclusion. They realize that a conclusive end of an ethnographic text freezes "the others" even more in time than the "ethnographic present" (Fabian) and denies openness and change in the informants' (the field's) lived lives, which proceed when the ethnographer already left the field.

Also Ton Otto elaborates on anthropological practice with its inherent paradox of sharing time with the others (in fieldwork) and creating the others (in the text), thereby placing them in a different time than the anthropologist – what Fabian called "denial of coevalness." Sharing the same historical time, the others still have different time orientations and these can be grasped in ethnographic fieldwork because of the discrepancies between the anthropologist's and the others' temporalities. Fieldwork turns out to be a strong and effective method to make time (own's and others') visible.

Studying senior home care in Sweden, Peter A. Lutz contrasts care management policies with the staff's perspective. Instead of conceptualizing them as a struggle of objective vs. subjective time, he introduces the concept of "surfacing." He analyzes spatial-timings in care and how time surfaces in care through relational movements (inspired by Bruno Latour). But it remains difficult to comprehend the presented theoretical model. Following the links between the very abstract concepts and the presented empirical data is demanding, what is probably owed to the complexity of the topic and the shortness of the article.

The last three chapters deal with the diverse temporalities of the fieldworker and the field and their interrelations. Inger Sjørslev (relating to Marilyn Strathern) asserts that boredom during long-lasting fieldwork is a valuable phase of "unfocused presence" which serves as "ground" against which focused events (here rituals) stand out as "figures" and that the oscillation between the two enables deep ethnographic insights. Recurring field visits over many years led Michael Whyte to reflect upon the value of being brought up-to-date each time as a process of re-establishing coevalness and sharing sociability between fieldworker and the field and their respective (continuously shifting) temporalities. Finally, Morten Alex Pedersen and Morten Nielsen analytically bring together phenomena, which are in the field temporally separated, with the concept of "trans-temporal hinges." These hinges seem to be sociocultural configurations with implicit symbolical meaning, which are temporally imbued by the authors for the sake of interpretation. Connecting such disparate temporalities allows for a broader and far-reaching understanding.

George Marcus' afterword completes the collection by picking up the topic of modern-day challenges to anthropological work. While Steffen Dalsgaard and Morten Nielsen pointed in the introduction to the effects of globalization, connecting researcher and the field over time even after fieldwork periods (e.g., through communication media), Marcus discusses the requirements and demands of an "anthropology of the contemporary": e.g., shorter phases of fieldwork, rapidly changing fields, and belated publications or overlapping zones of representation. In total awareness of these challenges, he calls for patience in ethnographic research, as "'being there' is perhaps no longer as important as 'taking one's time'" (154). And this time taken opens the chance for serendipity: moments of surprise discoveries, when detached elements

come together at one moment and suddenly make sense – as Steffen Dalsgaard and Morten Nielsen mention in the introductory part.

"Time and the Field" is an original and colorful collection of articles, approaching the overall topic from various perspectives, all illustrated with vivid accounts from the field. They cover a broad range of issues and comprehensions, from reflections on methodology, descriptions of specific temporalities over theoretical experimentations (surfacing, trans-temporal hinges) to analysis about temporal constituencies of the ethnographic field. Hopefully the book achieves to bring the topic "time" more into the center and awareness of anthropological fieldwork and analysis in general. Because, looking at sociocultural phenomena (events, relations, interpretations, etc.) under a temporal perspective facilitated new, often surprising and always fascinating insights and explicitly requires a critical reflection of one's practices, underlying assumptions and interrelations to the field and with the field.

The book is surely a valuable inspiration for young anthropologists preparing their first fieldwork as well as for experienced fieldworkers motivating them to look at their data and practic e from a different, time-inspired angle.

Evelyn Wladarsch

Deimel, Claus: Des Museums neue Kleider. Die Riten im Museum der Menschen. Berlin: VWB – Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, 2017. 193 pp. ISBN 978-3-86135-283-9. Preis: € 28,00

"Des Museums neue Kleider" ist ein Beitrag zur schon seit längerem konstatierten Krise in der Ethnologie. Claus Deimel, gelernter Ethnologe und leidenschaftlicher Ethnograf, bis zu seiner Pensionierung 2013 Direktor des GRASSI Museums für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig und Vorstand der Staatlichen Ethnographischen Sammlungen Sachsen, hat hier eine kritische Aufarbeitung heutiger ethnologischer Museumstätigkeit vorgelegt und damit einen Beitrag zum Thema "Krise" im Selbstverständnis ethnologischer Museen. Auf knapp 200 Seiten gibt er nach Art der Geertz'schen dichten Beschreibung Einblicke in die Arbeit der Völkerkundemuseen in Deutschland. Wer Museen nur als Besucherin oder Besucher kennt, mag überrascht sein, wie sehr die Arbeit in Museen von kulturpolitischen und bürokratischen Vorschriften bestimmt wird, von Besucherzahlen, von vorhandenen oder nicht gewährten Geldern und letztendlich auch von Ausstellungsmoden und von der Konkurrenz zu anderen Museen. Dabei gelingt es Deimel aber auch, unsere komplexe, verwaltete, westliche Welt *vor* den Museumsmauern sichtbar zu machen, die die Existenz ethnologischer Museen ja mit bestimmt. Sein emischer Blick, der Blick von innen, zeigt eine Institution, einen ganz eigenen Kosmos, dessen Regeln und Existenzbedingungen die museale Arbeit in starkem Maße prägen. Wobei – wie er schreibt – es der ethnologischen Expertise, der Kreativität und oft auch der Sturheit der MitarbeiterInnen zu verdanken ist, dass immer wieder gesellschaftlich virulente Themen durch museale Darstellung der Öffentlichkeit vermittelt werden können, trotz der Zwänge der Museumsinstitutionen.

Nicht nur die universitäre Ethnologie auch die ethnologischen Museen sind von der Krise des ethnologischen Selbstverständnisses betroffen. Das wurde vor Jahren schon daran deutlich, dass sich sowohl die Museen als auch die Universitätsinstitute umbenannten, letztere meist in Institut für Kultur- oder Sozialanthropologie. Der Begriff "Völkerkunde" schien obsolet, dazu "politisch unkorrekt" und auch "Ethnologie", was als Synonym für Völkerkunde (*ethnos* heißt Nation auf Griechisch, Volk ist *laos*) galt, schien nicht mehr zu passen. Die früheren Völkerkundemuseen heißen jetzt z. B. "Museum der Weltkulturen", "Weltkulturen Museum", "Museum fünf Kontinente". Zwar kam darin die kritische Aufarbeitung der Rolle, die die Ethnologie/Völkerkunde in der Kolonialzeit gespielt hatte, zum Ausdruck, ein wirklich neues Konzept zum Umgang mit dem völkerkundlichen Erbe in den Museen, ist – wie Deimel zeigt – bis heute aber nicht erkennbar.

Ein neuer, unbeschwerter Umgang mit Ethnografika war und ist auch deshalb nicht möglich, weil die Frage nach der Provenienz der Objekte nach wie vor wie ein Damoklesschwert über ihnen hängt. Wie kamen sie in die europäischen Sammlungen? Wurden sie geraubt, gekauft (und wenn für welchen Preis?) oder geschenkt, von Einheimischen, die sich über den "Wert" des Objekts in der westlichen Welt nicht im Klaren waren? Also auf jeden Fall eine Provenienz unguter Bedingungen. Können Ethnografika überhaupt noch guten Gewissens in Europa ausgestellt werden? fragt Deimel. Und wenn ja, wie?

Die Krise der Ethnologie bezieht sich auch auf die Ausstellungen selbst. Bis in die 2. Hälfte des letzten Jh.s war ihre Funktion, die Vermittlung "fremder Kulturen" einem interessierten Bürgertum zu Hause, noch zu erfüllen. In der heutigen globalisierten und digitalisierten Welt sind auch "ferne Länder" nah und im positiven oder auch negativen Sinn (als Verlierer der Globalisierung) Teil der postmodernen Lebenswelt. Die in den ethnografischen Museen gesammelten Objekte entsprechen zum größten Teil aber nicht mehr den heutigen Lebenszusammenhängen in den Ursprungsländern. Sie sind historisch, Zeugen vergangener Zeiten. Da liegt es durchaus nahe, sie weitgehend unter ästhetischen Gesichtspunkten auszustellen, wie im Pariser Musée du quai Branly z. B. Damit aber machen sich die Ethnologie und ihre Museen tendenziell überflüssig, ordnen sich einem von der westlichen Welt ausgehenden Kunstverständnis unter. Das Musée du quai Branly, nach allen Regeln der postmodernen Museumsarchitektur errichtet und gefüllt mit in Europa befindlichen ethnologischen Spitzenstücken, gewährt Ethnografika aus aller Welt nun einen europäischen Kunststatus. Die Frage ist, ob die Angehörigen außereuropäischer westlicher Länder stolz sein können, dass nun auch ihre materielle Kultur in Europa als Kunst anerkannt wird (allein schon durch die aufwendige und kostspielige Museumsanlage) oder ob sie das als einen erneuten "kolonialen" Übergriff erleben? Die gleiche Frage gilt auch für das noch im Aufbau befindliche Humboldt Forum in Berlin.

In Europa und den reichen Ländern der Welt sind Museen jeglicher Art äußerst beliebt und es entstehen ständig neue. Zum Teil kleine private Museen, sehr gerne aber auch moderne Paläste, "Kathedralen der Hochkultur",