

schen rein ornamentalen Motivarrangements ohne speziellen Bedeutungsgehalt und wirkmächtigen Mustern mit kulturell bedeutsamen Konnotationen, zwischen sinnfälliger, mnemotechnischer und auch unklarer Beziehung zwischen Motiv und Motivbenennung. D. M. Tillotson verweist auf eine 1890 erschienene Arbeit von Alois R. Hein als einen "jener Klassiker, die oft zitiert aber vermutlich selten gelesen werden" (478); m. E. ist es schade, dass in diesem Buch nicht die Gelegenheit ergriffen wurde, die Arbeit der eng zusammenarbeitenden Brüder A. R. und W. Hein – der eine Zeichenlehrer und Maler, der andere Volkskundler und Orientalist – zur Flechtornamentik Borneos in Übersetzung einer breiteren Leserschaft zugänglich zu machen, als einer Modalität und als Teil der Geschichte der Auseinandersetzung mit diesem Gegenstand. Ambivalent und unscharf bleiben die Darlegungen zu den Auswirkungen der Modernisierung im Sinne neuartiger Markt- und Produktionszusammenhänge und Konsumgewohnheiten (vgl. S. 50, 149, 468), dies wohl nicht zuletzt deswegen, weil die Verhältnisse regional sehr verschieden sind – zwischen der Lebendigkeit des Flechtens und dem Einsetzen von Veränderungen.

Zweifelsohne lässt ein Werk, das so reich an ethnografischem Material ist, Fragen offen. Doch sollte man das Buch eher als einen Ausgangspunkt und Grundlage der Forschung und nicht als deren Abschluss betrachten. Sein wichtiges Verdienst ist, und wird es über viele Jahre bleiben, dass es ein hochkomplexes und vielfältiges Feld in einer Gesamtdarstellung zusammenführt. Man kann dadurch viel lernen und verfügt über eine reichhaltige Grundlage, die weiterführende und vertiefende Fragen überhaupt erst ermöglicht. Das Buch ist auch gedacht, und das ist ohne jeden Abstrich gelungen, als eine Hommage an die Menschen Borneos und ihre ästhetisch und technisch raffinierte Kunstfertigkeit (xi). Oder, wie W. Hein mit Bezug auf Flechtornamente einem niederländischen Kritiker A. R. Heins entgegnete: "Jawohl! Wir haben alle Ursache, den Dajaks unsere Hochachtung zu zollen" (Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Ornamentes bei den Dajaks. *Annalen des K. K. naturhistorischen Hofmuseums* 10.1895: 113). In diesem Sinne ist zu hoffen, dass das Buch weit über Kreise der Südostasien- oder Indonesienkunde hinaus rezipiert wird.

Stefan Dietrich

Shimamura, Ippei: *The Proliferation of Shamans. Mongol Buryat Shamanism and Ethnicity* (Zōshoku suru shāman. Mongoru buriyāto no shāmanizumu to esunishiti). Yokohama: Shunpusha Publishing, 2011. 593 pp. ISBN 978-4-86110-299-8 [In Japanese] Price: ¥ 7,875

A book's title invariably raises certain expectations in a prospective buyer, especially, if the title practically formulates the very topic the possible buyer had been thinking about for some time. That is what happened to me, when I chanced upon Shimamura's book. For about ten years I could spend a short period of each summer looking for and meeting with shamans in the Hulunbuir region of northeastern Inner Mongolia, PR China. When I started this fieldwork, I had serious doubts whether I could find

shamans at all, but time passed, the number of shamans who came to my attention also increased to a level I had never dared to expect. As a consequence I began to ask myself, what the reason for such an increase might be. The encounter with Shimamura's book, therefore, raised the expectation that it would offer the key to answer that problem. It turned out that, not the least for reasons of differences in the personal and social circumstances of our research, my expectation was not answered in the way I had assumed it would. However, the book offered, instead, a great deal of valuable insights that challenged me to look at my own material under a new light.

Shimamura's relationship with Mongolia began about a decade ago. During that time he had been a foreign student in the Graduate School of the National University of Mongolia for about three years graduating with a Master's Degree. He then spent further years doing fieldwork mostly among the Aga Buryat of Dornod Province in north-east Mongolia and those of the Aga steppe at Lake Baikal in Russia, supplemented by occasional visits to the Aga Buryat of Hulunbuir in China. To make the discussion more accessible for the reader he uses the terms "Mongol Buryat" for the Aga Buryat (Agn Buriad) living as herders in northeastern Mongolia and "Russian Buryat" for the settled Buryat of Russia, because the two populations exhibit significant divergences in their respective culture. At the same time they share their conception of identity as Aga Buryat, a conception that clearly differs from that held by the Khalkha, the large majority of Mongolia's population, who consider themselves to be the true Mongols. To pay attention to these differences is very important for the author's argument. Basing his argument on the analysis of a complicated ethnic and cultural situation, Shimamura endeavors to show how the phenomenon of the proliferation of shamans among the Aga Buryat living in Mongolia is related to their effort to recreate their lost sense of ethnic identity. To achieve this purpose he proposes to develop a theory of identity and ethnicity to use it in order to answer the religious problem of how shamans and shamanism are bound up with the question of Aga Buryat identity in both Mongolia and Siberia (9).

The Aga Buryat in Mongolia are immigrants from southern Siberia. They had fled from their homeland to avoid an oppressive Soviet regime. In Mongolia, however, they were not welcome to the Khalkha majority. First, about half of their male population fell victim to the severe purges of the 1930s. Second, up to the end of the socialist era, they suffered further under the extremely harsh regime that was set to eradicate not only religion but also the traditional patrilineal clan- and family organization. With the demise of the socialist regime and of its social organizations a new kind of community began to emerge among the Aga Buryat. Under these new circumstances shamans began rapidly to appear in an astonishing number. Within a span of ten years, the author says, shamans came to account for about 1% of the Aga Buryat population in Mongolia's Dornod Province, so that there was one shaman for approximately 30 households (21). The usual studies of this kind of phenomenon tended to approach it under the aspect of the revival of a hitherto suppressed

shamanic tradition. The author, in contrary, feels that an answer to this phenomenon must rather be found by relating it to the Aga Buryat society's present-day circumstances and its sense of identity. He, therefore, proposes to pursue two lines in order to discover the reason for the proliferation of shamans, one social, the other religious or shamanic. To this purpose he shows how both of these reasons share a common problem: The search for lost roots.

For the Buryat, a patrilineally organized clan society, to know one's clan's or line's original ancestor, i.e., its root (*ug*), is of utmost importance. Among the Russian Buryat such knowledge had survived, either in the memory of the people or in clan books, the so-called "Records of *ug*." The Mongol Buryat, however, had lost this knowledge as a consequence of the equalizing policies of the socialist regime. After the establishment of a democratic government, the Mongol Buryat began to search for their clans' roots. For this they relied on the memory and the records of their fellow Buryat in Russia or even in China. Knowledge of one's root was now the acknowledged proof for being a pure Buryat. It led to the appearance of a "Buryat purism" that allowed discrimination against persons of mixed-blood descent. These persons were often born under circumstances forced upon their parents by the severe scarcity of male Buryat caused by political persecution. Women were left with no other choice than to look for a partner in other ethnic groups in order to have children. As a result, their partners and their children were considered by the Buryat purists as outsiders, as people without the appropriate roots to establish themselves as true Buryats.

One group of people affected by this situation were the shamans. The author's detailed description of the more than 20 shamans he has met reveals their common feature to be mixed blood. In order to function in the Buryat society stressing pure-blood descent, the shamans had to construct a plausible identity by finding their root *ug*. When such a mixed-blood person was stricken by a mysterious illness, the cause of the illness was taken to be the sign of being attacked by an *ug*, who tried to press the person into becoming a shaman. But in such a case, the *ug* was not a remembered ancestor in a single patriline, i.e., a root in the ordinary sense. It was first of all the spirit of a shaman of a previous generation, an *ongo*, which revealed itself and its demand by possessing the shaman candidate. This spirit was then interpreted by the shaman as being his/her *ug*, a lineal ancestor, but the ancestor could be one in the shaman's patrilineal as well as the matrilineal line. Often it was an ancestor invented by the shaman, whose name did not occur in any remembered or recorded list of ancestors. However, this ancestor was important in two ways. First, it was a personal spirit protecting the shaman. This ancestor did not only guarantee a shaman's authority as shaman, it also provided the shaman with an explanation for the cause of his/her illness. The illness appeared now to be due to an attack by the spirit who wanted a person to become a shaman. Consequently it became possible to explain the mysterious "shamanic illness" as the sign of a spirit searching for a person through which it could be active. When the shaman candidate respond-

ed to this spirit interpellation and accepted it, i.e., when the candidate "got hold of" the spirit during the initiation ritual, this resulted in the healing of the shaman's mysterious illness. Second, in a further and different move, the shaman then claimed that this spirit represented the shaman's ancestral line and, therefore, his/her social root *ug*. However, because the shaman is of mixed blood, this root is not confined to a single clan or patriline as it would be for the ordinary Buryat. It is a multilineal root, because it was made to represent ancestors in the father's as well as in the mother's line. The invention of this kind of multiple root allowed the shaman not only to remedy the serious social handicap of being of mixed blood and, therefore, without an acknowledged root, but also to demonstrate an ability for making use of multiple sources of authority and identity.

The shaman's spirit was, however, not the only spirit to be conceived as the cause of illness or other misfortune. The author mentions that he found representations for only one spirit among the Buryat he investigated. These representations were made in a human shape hidden in a pouch and installed on the altar on the north side in a *ger*, the Mongol tent. This most sacred place in the house/*ger* is called *khoimor*, and the spirit enshrined there is called *khögshin* (wife, or spouse), a name that perhaps could be translated in English as "woman of the *khoimor*." This spirit image can be found in all Buryat households who adhere to shamanism (395). The spirit is believed to be a deity protecting children, but it is in particular venerated as the "Mother of all Buryat," because all Aga Buryat trace their common descent to this mythical ancestor. According to their oral tradition it is the spirit of a princess who once, at the price of her own life, had led the Aga Buryat in a breakaway from the other Mongols, who traced their lines to Genghis Khan. But, because the Mongol Buryat had forgotten about this spirit, they had neglected to pay it due attention. By today, they came to think of the many misfortunes they had to suffer from as being a sign that the spirit is pestering them, trying to get their attention again and with it the veneration it deserves. This shamanist belief is common to the Aga Buryat and offers them a plausible explanation for the cause of their misfortune. But at the same time it provides them with a shared identity as the children of this one "mother."

As mentioned before, Shimamura intends to show, by analyzing both religious and social reasons, why the number of shamans among the Aga Buryat has so dramatically increased in the recent past. The answer to that "why" is the Buryat eminent concern for their root, *ug*. This concern means so much that a person who cannot present clear evidence for its root is an "outsider." The question of root is, therefore, also the question of a person's identity. But there are many whose root and with it their identity is dubious because they are of mixed blood. To them shamanism offers a solution. It allows such a person to "catch" the spirit of a previous shaman as its spirit *ug* and then invent descent relationships to it and so to create a root and an identity which make the shaman, notwithstanding the handicap of being of mixed blood, acceptable to society.

In this position the shaman is a guardian of Buryat culture. For the shaman's rituals, especially an initiation ritual, become an occasion for the participants to learn or relearn their Buryat culture. Although the Aga Buryat at Lake Baikal look down on the Mongol Buryat as being old-fashioned, their shamans insist on being initiated in Mongolia, because they believe that the Mongol Buryat are still close to original Buryat culture. On the other side, Mongol Buryat shamans look to the Buryat area in Russia as the sacred place, where their spirit ancestors once lived. Because of these relations it is exactly the shamans who act as a bridge between the two groups of Buryat. Therefore, the author proposes to understand the relations between these Buryat groups not as fashioning them into an "imagined community" but rather an "imagined network" of ethnicities without clearly defined boundaries between the individual groups (518). Within this network the shamans create their own identity and at the same time they support the Aga Buryat in refinding theirs.

Shimamura's is a painstaking and fascinating argument. It is based on careful and emphatic fieldwork, which he presents with such a degree of detail that the reader is well prepared to appreciate the author's interpretations and conclusions. In order to back up his interpretations, Shimamura pursues various strands. First of all he analyzes the circumstances and functions of the shamans, but then he puts them into the wider context of their social conditions and of the oral traditions of the shamans as well as of the Aga Buryat. Furthermore, in order to give his fieldwork data also historical depth he uses earlier Mongol as well as Russian sources that otherwise would be difficult to be used by readers not familiar with these languages.

There are, however, some facts that will limit the use of this book. The most deplorable from the point of view of the average researcher is certainly the fact that it is written in Japanese. Shimamura's work would deserve close attention by scholars of shamanism and of Mongol culture. Unfortunately, I believe, it is probably not likely to find a translator. Other shortcomings, such as, for example, that references for important sources extensively used in the argument are missing in the bibliography, are annoying. Yet, on the whole, they are minor shortcomings and are not likely to jeopardize this work's value as a significant contribution to the study of shamanism alive.

Peter Knecht

Shibley, Jesse Weaver: *Living the Hiplife. Celebrity and Entrepreneurship in Ghanaian Popular Music.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2013. 329 pp. ISBN 978-0-8223-5366-9. Price: £ 17.99

After publishing several articles and producing two documentary films on the contemporary popular Ghanaian music known as hiplife, anthropologist Jesse Shibley offers a multisited ethnography that deeply explores the richness and complexity of this genre's local and global circulation. Merging Marxist, linguistic, and semiotic theoretical paradigms, his work provides an examination of the expressive aesthetics of neoliberal capital-

ism in Ghana and its diaspora. This book vividly demonstrates hiplife musicians as entrepreneurs who harness new media and contemporary technologies to transform aesthetic value into economic success via celebrity. While employing these new forms of communication, Shibley argues that hiplife artists simultaneously rely on established African/Ghanaian communicative practices to lend legitimacy to their work and the genre itself; "traditional" cultural signifiers connect hiplife music to highlife along with well-known local proverbs, folklore, and idiomatic speech. While hiplife artists employ various strategies to indigenize the global phenomenon of hip-hop, the author notes throughout the text that hiplifers also use markers of Afro/cosmopolitanism to increase their celebrity status.

His narrative captures the realities and anxieties of creating music in the 21st century. Shibley highlights the global flows of capital, communication, and fame linking Accra, London, and New York – sites that have been most critical to this genre's development. It is evident that the author has traveled these pathways extensively himself, befriending hiplife artists to uncover meaningful and intimate stories of travel and the creative process on multiple continents. Weaving together emails, blog posts, social media commentary, and interviews, the author highlights the fragmentation and rapid global movements of ideas and sounds that both mark our contemporary world as well as propel this genre and its artists to international stardom.

The book is roughly divided into two sections; chapters one through four offer a social history of hiplife's development while the latter half focuses more acutely on the genre's circulation, interpretation, and its integration into the fabric of everyday life in Accra and the Ghanaian diaspora. After an engaging story about the commercialization of hiplife and the struggle of young musicians to become stars, the reader is introduced to the "godfather of hiplife" – Reggie Rockstone – who becomes a recurring character from which to hang theoretical discussions. Afro-modernity and Afro-cosmopolitanism, which become notable analytical categories, receive only brief mention here, while a fair amount of space is dedicated to laying out certain elements of Marxist theory on which the author relies heavily. Shibley also briefly ties his work to the well-known anthropological discourse regarding the ways in which social relations are formed through exchange.

Chapter one shows that the cultural processes of appropriation and reinvention that created hiplife have a long history dating at least to the development of highlife and later Afro-beat, Afro-soul, and similar reimagining of African-American music and culture. James Brown becomes a central figure in the discussion of how reimaginings of the African diaspora follow a "logic of appropriation," which seeks to imbue foreign cultural practices with local style and meaning. Building on this discussion, chapter two looks at how hip-hop came to Ghana, noting that hiplife emerged in relation to a privatizing Ghanaian state that celebrated the individual entrepreneur. The growth of neoliberal capitalist ideologies also encouraged the rise of new independent Ghanaian media in the mid-1990s. Refracted through the lens of class and race rela-