

was wir dagegen tun können“. Schade, das Buch von Bales habe ich gerade nicht zur Hand, und so erfahre ich nicht, “was wir [wer sind ‘wir’?] dagegen tun können“. Was steht stattdessen in dieser langen Abhandlung? Der Text fährt fort: “*Beispiel: Kindersklaverei in Brasilien im 19. Jahrhundert*“. Hier finde ich interessante Details zu diesem Thema, allerdings zu nichts anderem. Dieser Beitrag hätte berechtigterweise seinen Platz in einem Sammelband über Sklaverei, aber ein Lexikon sollte doch etwas umfassender und kompakter informieren.

Ich suche mir den Eintrag über “Methoden der Ethnopschoanalyse” heraus (331–353), denn das ist die Disziplin, die Stubbe vertritt. Doch auch hier werde ich enttäuscht. Über Georges Devereux lese ich, dass er “wahrscheinlich den Begriff ‘Ethnopschoanalyse’ schuf” (334). In einem Lexikon möchte ich gern gesicherte Erkenntnisse finden. Stammt der Begriff Ethnopschoanalyse nun von Devereux oder nicht? Müsste Stubbe das nicht genauer wissen? Die Methoden der Ethnopschoanalyse sind nicht unumstritten, aber über die Kritik daran, nämlich ob das Übertragen der im Europa des 19./20. Jhs. entwickelten Kriterien für die Deutung von “Eigentümlichkeiten ihrer psychischen Struktur” (hier die Bewohner peruanischer Elendsviertel) legitim ist oder nicht, verliert Stubbe kein Wort. Stubbe unterscheidet nicht zwischen Fakt und Deutung, wenn er schreibt: “An der Wurzel der Schwierigkeiten bei der organisatorischen Entwicklung der Gemeinde traf *Rabanal* häufig auf unbewussten Neid, der in Reibereien der Siedler untereinander, wie auch in Neidgefühlen gegenüber den Therapeuten zum Ausdruck kam” (337). Zuvor wurden die Slumbewohner bereits als irrational Projizierende und damit unfähig einer realistischen Einschätzung ihrer Situation dargestellt: “Interessant ist hierbei auch die Art und Weise, wie der Forscher, der in den Slum kommt, von den Bewohnern erlebt wird: ‘Abwechselnd als Erlöser oder Retter idealisiert und als Spione der früheren Eigentümer oder allgemein als Vertreter der feindlichen Welt der Großstadt denunziert, dienen wir als Projektionsschirme für mannigfaltige verdrängte Inhalte, mobilisierten Ängste in den Slumbewohnern’ . . .” (337).

Als ethnologisch Interessierte suche ich mir einen deklariert ethnologischen Begriff heraus: “ethnologischer Funktionalismus” (173–176). Ich zitiere hier den Anfang der vierseitigen Abhandlung: “Das folgende Zitat ist für das Verständnis des F. aufschlussreich: ‘Ich habe mich bisher im wesentlichen auf die wirtschaftlichen Beziehungen beschränkt, denn das Zivilrecht bezieht sich in erster Linie auf Eigentum und Vermögen, bei den Wilden so gut wie bei uns’“. In mir sträubt sich alles, das distanzlose Zitieren eines offenbar Altvordersten der Ethnologie in einem Nachschlagewerk aus dem Jahre 2005 weiter zu verfolgen und vor allem als Erläuterung des Funktionalismus zu akzeptieren. Am Ende des anderthalb Spalten umfangreichen Zitats steht: “Es sollte also nicht vergessen werden, dass für die Eingeborenen das Trauern auch nichts anderes ist als ein Glied in der lebenslänglichen Kette gegenseitiger Pflichten zwischen Gatte und Gattin und ihren beiderseitigen Fami-

lien.” Dann endlich finde ich als Quellenangabe “Malinowski”. Aber was an dessen Aussage funktionalistisch ist, wird mir nicht erklärt. Etwas später erfahre ich lediglich: “Mit dem Funktionalismus, der als Antithese zum Evolutionismus und zur Kulturhistorischen Ethnologie bzw. dem Diffusionismus verstanden werden kann, rückte nun im Rahmen der stationären Feldforschung die lebendige, konkrete ‘naturvölkische/primitive’ Gesellschaft in den Mittelpunkt des Interesses” (174). Im weiteren Verlauf werden noch einige Funktionalisten aufgeführt: Über Franz Boas und seine Schule erfahre ich zum Beispiel, dass sie “zu Recht die Wichtigkeit ethnographischer Feldforschung” (175) betonten, über Emil Mühlmann, dass er “eine einflussreiche ‘Geschichte der Anthropologie’ verfasst” hat (175), über Thurnwald, dass eine für ihn zentrale Frage lautet: “Wie und warum gesellen sich bestimmte Individuen und andere nicht?” (176), über Marcel Mauss schließlich, dass “das Konzept von der ‘totalen sozialen Tatsache’” von ihm stammt, “das für die moderne Kulturanthropologie und Ethnopsychologie bedeutsam geworden ist” (176). Bei keinem dieser Wissenschaftler wird allerdings erklärt, was sie zu Funktionalisten macht und was den Funktionalismus nun eigentlich ausmacht.

Nach diesem Streifzug durch das Lexikon frage ich mich: Was will ich von einem alphabetisch geordneten Nachschlagewerk? Ich suche prägnant ausgeführte Begriffsdefinitionen. In dem vorliegenden Werk finde ich das nicht. Nicht jeder Eintrag bietet eine Definition an. Der Informationsgehalt der verschiedenen Stichwörter ist sehr unterschiedlich. Er variiert von wenigen Zeilen bis zu 15 Seiten. Aber welche Begriffe einen breiten und welche nur wenig Raum erhalten, entbehrt für mich einer nachvollziehbaren Systematik. Ich habe den Eindruck, dass dieses Buch nicht einer einzigen Feder entsprungen ist, denn die Einträge sind nicht nur unterschiedlich aufgebaut, sondern divergieren auch sehr in ihrer Kompetenz und Länge. Ich habe ein Nachschlagewerk vor mir, das in vieler Hinsicht ungenau oder gar falsch informiert, so dass ich nicht weiß, wie weit ich mich auf Auskünfte zu den Begriffen verlassen kann, über die ich noch nichts oder nur wenig weiß.

Godula Kosack

**Tule, Philipus:** Longing for the House of God, Dwelling in the House of the Ancestors. Local Belief, Christianity, and Islam among the Kéo of Central Flores. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg Switzerland, 2004. 366 pp. ISBN 3-7278-1478-0. Price: € 50,00

Tule presents a historically situated and detailed descriptive ethnography of a religiously mixed indigenous, eastern Kéo culture on the southern coast of Central Flores Island in Eastern Indonesia. By concentrating on the traditional cultural system, the author attempts to demonstrate the way in which this cultural system serves as a bridge between the majority Catholic and minority Muslim population of Udi Worowatu.

The manuscript consists of nine chapters. Chapters one and two provide the background for the study in

terms of analytical and methodological frameworks as well as locating the eastern Kéo in their ethnographic setting. Chapters three through six address the complex dynamics of traditional eastern Kéo social organization which is grounded in the local concepts of origins – in relation to founding ancestors, land, village, and especially the house.

Tule argues that the eastern Kéo social order is based on the house, and thus this society is best understood in terms of a “house society.” The house, as referring to a social unit, is a significant locus of social order that unites eastern Kéo concepts of village life, symbols of cultural identity, religion and cosmology, kinship and marriage and thus the multiple identities of the indigenous society, including the Christian and Muslim diversity in the community. The author emphasizes the significance of the concepts of “topogeny” (places of origin), “oikogeny” (houses of origin), and genealogy (ancestral derivations) for this eastern Kéo society, thereby depicting an integrated and “harmonious” socio-cosmological system. The author’s arguments follow the lines of Lévi-Strauss (*The Way of the Masks*. Seattle 1982) and more recent comparative Southeast Asian and Austronesian works on the theme of the “house society” (cf. J. Fox [ed.], *Inside Austronesian Houses*. Canberra 1993). These three chapters furthermore provide rich detail about physical and symbolic aspects of the house, village spatial orientation, leadership, and kinship system, including various cultural institutions of marriage. Tule also addresses the significance of the ‘*embu mame* (wife-giver) – *ana weta* (wife-taker) relationship between houses which also serves to bridge Catholics and Muslims relations of eastern Kéo.

In chapters seven through eight the author discusses the aspects of the traditional belief system and ritual practices and the ways in which these dynamically interact with the Catholic and Muslim religions in the society. Tule carefully addresses the issues of conversion to a monotheistic religion (both Catholicism and Islam) and the ways in which these World Religions have been “inculturated,” that is the ways aspects of traditional beliefs and ritual practices are accommodated by the monotheistic religions and vice versa. The last chapter is a summary of the main points made by the book.

Although one of the important themes of the book highlights the fact that this is a mixed community in its Christian and Muslim components, the chapters dealing with social organization, kinship and marriage institutions, including bridewealth and counter-gift exchanges, and particularly, the institution of *ana mera*, do not always clearly demonstrate the dynamic ways in which Christian and Muslim practices interface with the cultural customary practices of the Worowatu community. Indeed, often data of this nature is buried in the footnotes. The discussion on the “inculturation” aspects of Islam/Christianity and traditional worldview and practices still appears to privilege Christianity in the sense that there appears greater detail in the discussion of these “inculturation” aspects with regards to Catholicism as opposed to Islam. While this simply could be a conse-

quence of greater Catholic inculturation in Worowatu, given that the majority subscribes to this monotheistic religion, the issue does not appear to be thoroughly discussed. Furthermore, the considerations and analysis of local Christian-Muslim relations could have been advanced further by a more thorough contextualization with respect to the interethnic and religious conflicts that recently plagued the Indonesian Republic.

Unfortunately, the majority of the analytical and comparative discussions are buried in the footnotes of various chapters. These analytical passages would have had a greater scholarly impact had they been included in the main body of the chapters. This is one of the reasons why some of the main points of the book being summarized in the Conclusion Chapter – such as the section on “Precedence, alliance, and structure contested” – sound less like a summary but rather like newly introduced analytical points and thereby reducing the impact of the Conclusion Chapter. Furthermore, some of the descriptions of cultural practices that only use local terminology without any glosses or reiteration of glosses, as in chapter five, can be distracting and at times confusing, particularly for those readers not familiar with local languages, concepts, and practices from central Flores. The manuscript also could have been more carefully copyedited.

While it is of little excuse, it might be pointed out that for the author (just like for this reviewer) English is a second language. It is rather baffling, however, that the publisher’s copy editor did not discover the numerous copyediting problems that plague the work. There are a number of places in the main body of the manuscript, and frequently in the Index section, where the font suddenly changes in the middle of the sentence. There are also numerous typographic errors. The page numbers provided in the Index section often do not match up with the Index entry. The index, while including a number of frequently cited authors, by no means lists all of the frequently cited authors in the manuscript. The bibliography is not as detailed as it could be since when chapters or articles from an edited volume were referred to in the book, these usually are not individually cited, but only the edited volume itself is cited. On a rather “nit-picky” note, there also appear to be some very minor inaccuracies with regards to comparative central Flores language discussion and some dates. For example, the desecration of the host and the subsequent riots of Muslim-Christian conflict in Bajawa (capital of Ngada district) did not occur in December 1991 but during the end of the first week of January 1992. Furthermore, grouping together what Tule refers to as the Ngadha language with the languages of Nage and western Kéo contributes to some inaccuracies; for example, the term for horse in most dialects of what Tule calls Ngadha (cf. p. 40) is not ‘*ja* but *jara*.

However, Tule’s book is not only a valuable contribution to ethnographies of Flores cultures (providing a detailed description of yet another “link” of the cultural “chain” of this island) but also to eastern Indonesian and Austronesian comparative studies. The extremely

rich ethnographic detail of this work allows for the kind of comparative work by specialists in the field that most modern (American influenced) types of ethnographies no longer avail themselves to. The work is also a valuable contribution to social organization and kinship studies as well as to the anthropology of religion. This work, furthermore, provides valuable insights into some methodological issues and challenges faced by indigenous anthropologists, including the difficulties and dynamics of negotiating multiple self-identities (in the case of the author, indigene, kin, anthropologist, and Catholic priest). The book also contributes to ongoing scholarly discussions on Christian-Muslim relations, which generally tend to focus on the issues of global terrorism, and the violent, separatist, or ethno-nationalistic aspects of these relations, particularly in a Southeast Asian context. The author addresses such interreligious relations and provides an explanation as to why these Christian-Muslim relations among the eastern Kéo at least, do not automatically possess the character of “conflict” and “violence.” A thorough understanding of the culture and history of specific localities and people is significant in this regard. While tensions may arise locally in the context of ongoing interreligious conflict in Indonesia and the rest of the world, for the eastern Kéo, the indigenous cultural system for now appears to mitigate and resolve such tensions – the “House of the Ancestors” mediating with the “House of God.”

(The reviewer’s multiple identity relations with the author should be pointed out – Philip Tule Muwa is a friend, an adoptive brother [*nala*] through my own research and “fictive” kin network from Ngada district of Flores, a former classmate from the Australian National University with common doctoral supervisor, a fellow anthropologist, and a Catholic “spiritual advisor.”)

Andrea K. Molnar

**Zimoń, Henryk** (ed.): *Dialog międzyreligijny*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2004. 380 pp. ISBN 83-7306-184-3.

Modern man, more than ever before, is aware of religious and cultural pluralism. Recent times have witnessed the emergence of awareness that our world consists of plurality of cultures and religious traditions and that peoples and nations have the right to their distinctive characteristics. This new attitude can be observed in the Church, which recognizes the positive values in this plurality and in the interreligious dialogue. A major impulse for this dialogue comes from Paul VI’s encyclical “*Ecclesiam suam*,” published during the Second Vatican Council (1964). The Pope presented the Church as being destined to continue God’s salvific dialogue conducted by God with humanity for ages. For Europeans, who grew within the Christian traditions, the contact with followers of other religious traditions invokes certain postures. What attitude toward “others,” whoever they may be – Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, etc. – is called for by the Christian faith and experienced in such an environment?

The collective work “*The Interreligious Dialogue*,” edited by H. Zimoń, is an attempt to address these issues. Zimoń is the director of the Department of History and Ethnology of Religion at the Institute of Fundamental Theology at the Catholic University of Lublin and an expert in the areas of non-Christian religions – especially the African religions, religions of nonliterate peoples, Buddhism, and interreligious dialogue. The book was published by the Scientific Society of the Catholic University of Lublin, as the sixth volume in the *Religiological Studies* series. It represents the fruit of the symposium of Polish fundamental theologians, which took place at the Divine Word Seminary in Pieniężno on April 27–28, 2000.

The book consists of thirteen articles, of which five deal with issues of theology and eight pertain to the dialogue with African traditional religions, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism. The articles were authored by professors from Polish university centers – experts in fundamental theology and comparative religion. The book begins with the table of contents in both Polish and English (5–12), a list of abbreviations (13–15), and the introduction by the editor in Polish and English (17–28).

The theological part of the book (29–157) contains five articles. The first article, “*Christological Basis for Interreligious Dialogue*,” written by M. Rusecki, presents the concept of the dialogue and provides an analysis of christological foundations of the interreligious dialogue, addressing such issues as Logos in protology, Jesus as the subject of messianic hope, annunciation and incarnation, divine and messianic consciousness of Jesus, revelational and motivational character of Jesus’ miracles, revelation on the cross and redemption, Christ’s resurrection and its meaning. The author declares that christology – when it is properly understood and when it constitutes recapitulation of theology – provides firm and lasting foundations for various forms of interreligious dialogue. Bishop Z. Pawłowicz in the first part of his article, “*Interreligious Dialogue in Poland*” (65–84), discusses the fundamental principles of interreligious dialogue; in the second part, he presents its practical dimensions in Poland, where in addition to Christianity four religions – Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism – are present and where there are also various religious movements and spiritual and ideological associations. F. Solarz, in “*The Attitude of the Church to Non-Christian Religions in Light of the Council schemes in the Declaration ‘Nostra aetate’*,” analyzes the attitude of the Church to non-Christian religions in light of four council schemata in “*The Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions – Nostra aetate*.” In her article “*The Personalistic Bases for the Dialogue between the Church and Non-Christian Religions According to John Paul II*” (123–141), K. Parzych presents individual characteristics of persons, meetings of persons, exchange of individual values, intentions of good and truth in personal relations as well as resulting knowledge and reconciliation as the foundation of the dialogue. The Church’s