

der *Mönch* durch die Dörfer” (152). Die vom Rezensenten in kursiv geschriebenen Begriffe können westliche christliche Beobachter leicht irritieren und falsche Assoziationen hervorrufen. Ein Religionsethnologe, bzw. Religionswissenschaftler, sollte allerdings auch wissen, dass es keine “Tridentinischen Konzile (1545–1663)” (188) gab; es gab nur ein Konzil von Trient, das sog. Tridentinum.

Mehr stört sich der Rezensent allerdings an dem unglücklichen Gebrauch des Hochgott-Begriffes. Auch wenn “Hochgötter” in Anführungszeichen gesetzt sind und als jene “Gottheiten, denen im Laufe der Geschichte die Verehrung all derer zugekommen ist, die sich als Mitglieder der Gemeinschaft der Hindus begreifen” (180) verständlich definiert werden, sollte dieser Terminus wie auch die Bezeichnung “Hindu-Pantheon” (180 passim) besser vermieden werden. Beide Begriffe, Hochgötter und Pantheon, sind ambivalent, sowie teils aufgrund theologischer und religionswissenschaftlicher Studien oder der griechischen und römischen Tradition vorbelastet. Eine verunglückte oder mindestens rätselhafte Formulierung ist: “können die Götter des Hindu-Pantheons einerseits eine . . . Vielfalt von Erscheinungsformen annehmen, so tendieren sie andererseits dazu, in der Formlosigkeit und damit All-Einheit des Göttlichen Brahṃā zu verschmelzen, das gemeinhin als eine dritte Wesenheit des Hindu-Theismus verstanden wird” (180). Soll auf *nirguṇa brahman* verwiesen werden oder auf Gott Brahṃā? Verweist “dritte Wesenheit” auf eine *trimūrti*? Oder ist im Satz etwas schief gelaufen?

Allen kritischen Anmerkungen zum Trotz ist dies ein gutes Buch. Ich möchte es gerade Ethnologen und Religionswissenschaftlern empfehlen; es ist eine vorzügliche historische und ethnographische Studie zu Fragen und Problemen des Synkretismus in Goa, geeignet, die wissenschaftliche Reflexion über Synkretismus und Volksreligiosität darüber hinaus anzuregen.

Othmar Gächter

Hill, Jonathan D., and Fernando Santos-Granero (eds.): *Comparative Arawakan Histories. Rethinking Language Family and Culture Area in Amazonia*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002. 340 pp. ISBN 0-252-02758-2. Price: \$ 49.95

Small and well-prepared events sometimes produce more valuable results than big conferences, and the volume at issue is an excellent illustration for this observation. Based on papers written in 1999 and 2000 for the international conference with the same title held in May 2000 at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) in Panama City, the organizers, Jonathan Hill, from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and Fernando Santos-Granero, a staff researcher at the STRI, succeeded to join specialists from various countries for debating a specific but nevertheless important subject in South American ethnology: questions about the relationships between language family and the geographical distribution of certain cultural similarities as exemplified by Arawak-speaking peoples.

For many anthropologists this is an oblique question, because they prefer to separate linguistic from cultural classifications. Some even have allergic reactions to ethnolinguistic classifications by denying their heuristic usefulness, although no anthropologist would negate that culture and language have *something* do to with each other. Many anthropologists nowadays prefer treating this old question by discourse-analytical or even cognitive approaches, whereas the organizers of this volume opted for trying to revitalize a longstanding but not terminated debate in Americanist ethnology.

The Arawak language family stands out from others in the Americas for its enormous spatial distribution, historically reaching from the Caribbean islands to southwestern Brazil, before the population declines produced by European colonization. Nowadays, Arawak clusters still can be found in eastern Peru, southern Venezuela, and central, northern, and southwestern Brazil. Archeological, linguistic, and historical data indicate a quite dynamic expansion of Arawak-speaking groups in the Amazon and Orinoco basins at prehistoric and historical times, and the STRI conference was the first attempt to bring together anthropologists, archeologists, and historians specialized on these populations.

The Arawakan diaspora played a special role in twentieth-century ethnology of Lowland South America, for various authors created or at least made use of some stereotypes about Arawakan peoples, especially that of “peaceful culture-bringers” in contrast to “warlike Caribs.” It was not the authors’ intention to attack these essentializations by a fashion-like deconstructivist approach, but to look at the historical and ethnographical sources for its rising and at some possible grain of truth behind them by asking if there really can be identified some common denominators of most Arawak-speaking societies. Similar efforts were quite successfully done for Tupi, Carib, and Gê-speaking peoples of South America, and there even exists a branch of Brazilian indigenous ethnology called “tupiologia,” but no systematic and comprehensive comparison was undertaken so far for the Arawak family. The author’s principal goal is to reappraise the concepts of language family and culture area in the light of recent developments in anthropology and history with the aim to give Amazonianist ethnology and archeology more solid foundations for constructing models and hypotheses in long-term historical perspective than older descriptive and relativistic, often pseudo-historical approaches to comparison. However, the author’s theoretical aversions are less directed to these older approaches and much more to “the sterility and defeatism of hyperrelativism and postmodernist doubt, ills that have afflicted anthropology in recent decades” (5), as the organizers write in their introduction. Their main theoretical stance is that systematic ethnographic and historical comparisons are not only possible, but also valuable and useful for understanding long-term ethnic and interethnic dynamics, but that researchers have to be well aware of the perils to essentialize.

They recognize that the term “Arawak” in itself is problematic because it became a category of main-

stream anthropology without its inherent complexity being questioned. So it became necessary to excavate its conceptual history, which is well-done in the three chapters of part I. Another very successful approach was concentrating the case studies on two areas, which represent nowadays the largest concentrations of Arawak-speaking peoples: the Upper Rio Negro region of Brazil, Venezuela, and Colombia (northwestern Amazonia) and the sub-Andean lowlands at the headwaters of the Madeira and Ucayali rivers in southwestern Brazil and eastern Peru.

The volume's eleven chapters are organized in three parts. Some concentrate more on ethnographic, linguistic, or historical discussions and information, while others focus theoretical questions, but all are strong and well-written contributions which deserve more detailed presentations than can be done in this review. So the reviewer is entirely conscious of this limitation which prevents him from shedding more light on single contributions.

The first part ("Languages, Cultures, and Local Histories") starts with Santos-Granero's "The Arawakan Matrix: Ethos, Language, and History in Native South America," a critical assessment of presumed Arawakan characteristics by comparing cultures and social organization of three regional clusters at the time of contact and in colonial times: eastern Peru, northwestern Amazonia, and northeastern South America. The author affirms that there exists something like a common Arawakan matrix expressed by a particular Arawakan ethos, which in turn he defines by five elements ("implicit or explicit repudiation of endo-warfare"; "an inclination to establish increasing levels of sociopolitical alliance between linguistically related peoples"; "emphasis on descent, consanguinity, and commensality as the foundation of ideal social life"; "predilection for ancestry, genealogy, and inherited rank as the basis for political leadership"; and "a tendency to assign religion a central place in personal, social, and political life" [44 f.]). Nevertheless, Santos-Granero seems to be skeptical about his own conclusions, because his text contains some self-questioning passages, and the concepts of ethos and matrix by themselves deserve some caution.

Neil L. Whitehead's "Arawak Linguistic and Cultural Identity through Time: Contact, Colonialism, and Creolization" is an excellent evaluation of the term Arawak since the sixteenth century in the sense of a critical "Begriffsgeschichte." By concentrating on northeastern South America, and especially on the complicated case of the "Island Caribs," the author shows an intricate conceptual history characterized by a simplifying dualism (Arawak vs. Carib) and sometimes marked by profound ethnological blindness and linguistic deafness, but in perfect conformity with the colonial enterprise to classify native peoples in enemies ("belligerent Caribs") and potential allies ("peaceful Arawak"). After penetrating that web of stereotypes and ethnological distortions, one of the important conclusions is that defining "Arawak" is as difficult as doing the same with "Carib."

Sidney da Silva Facundes's "Historical Linguistics and Its Contributions to Improving Knowledge of Arawak" is not only an excellent introduction to the history of knowledge and classifications of the Arawak language family but also to general principles of linguistic reconstruction and historical linguistics (especially for laypersons). By selecting three languages from a same subgroup and reconstructing parts of their protolanguage, Facundes, a linguist from the Federal University of Pará, Brazil, shows that the last word was not yet spoken on internal classifications of the Arawak family.

In the volume's second part ("Hierarchy, Diaspora, and New Identities"), Michael Heckenberger's "Rethinking the Arawakan Diaspora: Hierarchy, Regionality, and the Amazonian Formative" can be considered as one of the volume's key pieces, linking archeological, ethnographic, and historical evidences from the Caribbean and northwestern and southwestern Amazonia to show that there is more than common linguistic origin which characterizes Arawakan groups. Parallel to other groups worldwide (for example, Bantu) Heckenberger emphasizes structural continuities as manifested in a cultural schema, also glossed as an "ethos" (as did Santos-Granero), but stressing only three features: settled village life, regionality, and social hierarchy, though he warns that these should not be interpreted as equally shared by all Arawakan groups or exclusively by them. However, there are strong indications that the Proto-Arawak were among the earliest populations in Lowland South America to develop institutional social hierarchy and regional organization characteristic of "chiefdoms" in Amazonia.

France-Marie Renard-Casewitz's chapter about "Social Forms and Regressive History: From the Campa Cluster to the Mojos and from the Mojos to the Landscaping Terrace-Builders of the Bolivian Savanna" is a convincing masterpiece in regional comparison by selecting the "Campa" groups (Asháninka, Ashéninka, Matsiguenga, and Nomatsiguenga) of eastern Peru and the Mojos of eastern Bolivia and looking at their political organization. The author demonstrates that in these cases hierarchical structures are less important than horizontal intraethnic and interethnic long-distance trade relations so that regionality seems to be a more distinctive feature than the other two presented by Heckenberger.

Peter Gow's very well-written and provocative "Piro, Apurinã, and Campa: Social Dissimilation and Assimilation as Historical Processes in Southwestern Amazonia" is what he calls an "unashamedly conjectural" history of the Urubamba Piro. One of his principal points is to criticize concepts like "pre-Andine Arawak" by stressing their mere heuristic value for scientists but their insignificance for indigenous peoples living in that region. He demonstrates his hypotheses by analyzing the interethnic relations between Piro, Apurinã, and Campa-Matsiguenga characterized by dissimilation and assimilation.

The last chapter of this part, Alan Passes's "Both Omphalos and Margin: On How the Pa'ikwené (Palikur)

See Themselves to Be at the Center and on the Edge at the Same Time,” is about an interesting case of ethnogenetic formation in northeastern South America (in the region of today’s French Guyana and Brazil’s Amapá state), a region of refuge for various indigenous peoples since colonial times. By using historical and ethnographic information for analyzing spatial metaphors and symbolism, the author concludes that centrality of place seems to constitute a major ideological theme for Arawak-speaking peoples.

In the last part (“Power, Cultism, and Sacred Landscapes”), which concentrates on northwestern Amazonia, the Venezuelan anthropologist Alberta Zucchi, in her chapter entitled “A New Model of the Northern Arawakan Expansion,” presents recent archeological, ethnographic, historical, linguistic, and ecological data for a new model of ancestral homelands, exploratory travels, permanent migrations, and occupation of new territories of the Maipuran branch of Arawak peoples in the Upper Orinoco and Upper Rio Negro regions. This Arawakan regional diaspora was characterized, among other features, according to Zucchi, by peaceful mechanisms, inclusive types of sociolinguistic organization, and ritual processes of topographic writing, converting specific elements of the landscape into topographs and topograms, thus transforming new land symbolically into a group’s own territory.

Jonathan Hill’s “Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Woman: Fertility Cultism and Historical Dynamics in the Upper Rio Negro Region” has two goals: (1) retheorizing the culture area concept and (2) showing the mystic and ritual dimensions of landscape construction among the Wakuénai (or Curripaco), underlining their gender aspects. The second goal was achieved in a more convincing manner.

Venezuelan anthropologist Silvia Vidal, in her chapter on “Secret Religious Cults and Political Leadership: Multiethnic Confederacies from Northwestern Amazonia,” examines the emergence and transformations of regional multiethnic political organizations along the Rio Negro and Upper Orinoco in the eighteenth century by stressing the importance of sacred landscapes, mythic knowledge, and male-dominated ritual hierarchies.

The final chapter is Robin Wright’s “Prophetic Traditions among the Baniwa and Other Arawakan Peoples of the Northwest Amazon,” where the author also examines the construction of indigenous leaderships based on ritual power and mythic knowledge, but focusing on their role in millenarian movements and as shamanic leaders.

This volume is a true treasure-house for all those interested in South American indigenous ethnology for being highly informative, rich in details, and really interdisciplinary. Another very positive aspect is that the single contributions are interrelated and refer one to the other, producing a high level of coherence rarely achieved by volumes of this kind. The most important conclusion is that it is possible to define “Arawakness” by a set of features described as a distinctive pattern of sociogeographic flow, connectedness, openness, and

expansiveness: (1) a pattern of continuous expansion; (2) frequency of regional and macroregional sociopolitical formations around sacred places; (3) orientation around regional centers; (4) creation of ethnoscapes; (5) open and inclusive character of sociopolitical formations; (6) widespread networks of ceremonial exchange; (7) relative frequency and intensity of multilingualism, cross-linguistic ties, and transethnic identities; and (8) avoidance or suppression of endo-warfare (16–19).

On the other hand, one of the promises contained in the volume’s subtitle, that is, to rethink the concept of culture area, is badly fulfilled, because only two authors (Hill and Wright) really tried it. They stress its usefulness and even propose a series of new features to be considered for constructing them, especially indigenous historical and political visions, but they fail in exemplifying their points (for instance, demonstrating their applicability by proposing some new or reframed culture areas). But this is the only weak point of this excellent volume.

Peter Schröder

Izard, Michel (éd.): Claude Lévi-Strauss. Paris: Editions de l’Herne, 2004. 482 pp. ISBN 2-85197-096-8. Price: € 49,00

Cet énorme cahier in-quarto de plus de 50 collaborateurs, collectif donc composite, avec des textes rares de Lévi-Strauss, une chronologie de l’homme et de l’oeuvre, des articles parfois éblouissants de quelques ténors de l’anthropologie actuelle, équivaut à plus de 1000 pages in-octavo. Pansu comme une bible, pensé comme le summum des hommages, il n’a ni le ton constamment dithyrambique d’un “Liber amicorum”, ni la rigueur fade d’un “Dictionnaire des oeuvres”, ni le mordant critique d’aigris aux mots déjà fanés avant que le soleil ne décline. Si les grands moments d’écriture (Tristes Tropiques, Structures élémentaires de la parenté, Anthropologie structurale, Totémisme, Pensée sauvage, Mythologiques, Masques) sont particulièrement célébrés, ils sont aussi passés au crible d’une analyse qui en dit les antécédents, les jeux d’influences, les sous-entendus, les forces et faiblesses. On doit à Michel Izard, figure importante du Laboratoire d’anthropologie sociale du Collège de France, ce labeur peu aisé de rassembler les disciples, d’exciter les mémoires, de préciser à chacun sa tâche pour éviter les doublons et en définitive de remettre sur la scène actuelle un structuralisme, exploité en diverses disciplines, qui a permis à l’anthropologie de conquérir bien des lettres de noblesse durant la seconde moitié du vingtième siècle en France et ailleurs. Ceux qui chantaient après 1968, le requiem du structuralisme puis la fin des mythes, ceux qui dénonçaient l’anti-humanisme, le scientisme ou l’idéisme du maître ont ravalé leur verbe acide quand I. Chiva, J. Pouillon, C. Tardits, F. Héritier ont montré que persistaient les manières de penser lévi-straussiennes par delà quelques accointances entre structuralisme et marxisme (énoncées par L. Sebag), structuralisme et écologie (bien que l’idée de nature ne soit jamais au net). L’Ecole a désormais une place historique dans l’étude des relations de parenté,