

shows how it reacts to the cosmological process and causes a progressive change in the victim. He states that the ritual as an aesthetic process works in the embodied basis of human cognition. Through this process the victims are delivered from their particular sufferings and feelings of injustice and recover the existential position of subject. In ritual the pragmatic force of aesthetic processes is actualized.

Angela Hobart in “Transformation and Aesthetics in Balinese Masked Performances – Rangda and Barong” (161–182) presents the Balinese feast Galungan with its famous Barong and Rangda masks, and the less known Calon Arang Dance-Drama, showing the power of aesthetics during their performance and their influence on the participants. The diverse aesthetic modes cause the transformation of meanings and experience and enable the participants to remake their worlds and reinforce their life. The festive mood encompasses also the next contribution, that of Roberto DaMatta, “A Concise Reflection on the Brazilian Carnival” (183–195). The author shows that the ritual inversion and obscenity during the Carnival help to recreate the Brazilian society. It is impossible to imagine Brazil without Carnival which is a constitutive part of Brazilian identity.

Don Handelman’s “Bureaucratic Logic, Bureaucratic Aesthetics” (196–215) presents the opening event of Holocaust, Martyrs and Heroes Remembrance Day in Israel. The author states that the aesthetics of official celebration of this day are close to the mundane life, following the bureaucratic mentality. The everyday aesthetics of practice are feelings of rightness-in-doing, of the feeling that it is right what is done. The celebration of this political feast constitutes the societal icons, fully open to the inspection of the public gaze, which demonstratively shows social taxonomies.

The last essay, Yoram S. Carmeli’s “Compassion for Animals, Indifference to Humans” (216–230), discusses the problem of the protection of animals, especially those which perform in circus. The author shows the compassion of the audience for animals, against which he sets its indifference for the hard and dangerous enactments of performers. In their moralist posturing against the state of animals, not only the circus fans but also the Animal Rights protesters themselves lose what for them is Nature’s real nature. Paradoxically, rejecting the attitude making animals like humans, they accept the reducing of man to the state of machine.

Circus ring, official hall, open air, temple, court, almost every space is appropriate to be a stage of the performance. However, the nature of performance requires the presence of aesthetic forms. The book analyses the multiplicity and variety of these forms showing that the notion of aesthetics can not be reduced to art and that the aesthetics in performance served not only to express some truths and have affective effects, but also to recreate the individual and the society, producing renewal or change. Nowadays, when the aesthetics seems to be in the centre of anthropological debate, this book dealing with symbolic constructions and experience is welcome.

Jacek Jan Pawlik

Hoffmann, Henryk: *Dzieje polskich badań religioznawczych 1873–1939*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2004. 301 pp. ISBN 83-233-1770-4. Cena: Zł 29.00

Hoffmann’s book “The History of Polish Scientific Studies of Religions 1873–1939” is most welcome in scholarly circles dealing with the annals of religion. Even though religious studies or studies in comparative religion in Poland date back 130 years, the course of their development is not well documented. This lacuna is now well covered by Hoffmann’s in-depth research. The author not only brings together much of the literature (60 pages of references) on the subject from a variety of academic disciplines, but he also sifts through it with intelligence and care. The book consists of an introduction, followed by eight chapters, a conclusion, and an index of names. At the end of the book there are numerous photographs of scientists who contributed to the development of comparative religion, including two non-Polish founding fathers of the discipline, namely Friedrich Max Müller and Cornelis Petrus Tiele. There are also several photographs of title pages from the first issues of leading scientific journals dealing with religious studies, for example, *Revue de L’histoire des Religions* from 1880, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* from 1898, and the renowned *Anthropos* from 1906.

The first chapter of this book, “Religious Studies as a Scientific Field and the Significance of Understanding Its Developmental History,” deals with the beginnings of religious studies and the discipline’s emergence as an independent branch of science. This evolution into an independent scientific field is marked by the dissociation of religious studies from theology. In this opening chapter, the author also discusses the relationship of scientific studies of religions to other disciplines, such as theology, philosophy, history, sociology, ethnology, and geography of religion. The last is the youngest discipline in the study of religion among those listed. At the conclusion of this chapter Hoffmann presents a brief but interesting outline of Marxist studies in comparative religion, which was a dominating paradigm in the study of religion in the context of the post-Second World War period of communist Poland and lasted until the collapse of the Iron Curtain in 1989. Although the basis for Marxist studies of religion was laid out by K. Marx and F. Engels, the leading representatives of the initial stage of the evolving Marxist study of religion were Soviet scholars like K. Kautsky, A. Labriola, J. Plechanov, and H. Cunov and most of all the leader of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, who was V. I. Lenin. After the Russian Revolution, Marxist studies of religion found particularly beneficial conditions for development in the USSR. Following the Second World War in the Soviet Union, many academic centers conducted thorough ethnographic and psychological research on religion and atheism. From this part of the book we learn that religious studies based on Marxist ideology, together with communists’ ideas, first spread throughout Soviet Block countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Religious studies based on Marxist ideology were also

undertaken in the West. The most renowned researchers were Italians E. de Martino and A. Donini, Englishmen A. Robertson and G. Thompson, and Frenchmen Ch. Hainchelin and M. Verret.

Chapter two, entitled “Beginnings of Polish Religious Studies,” introduces the forerunners of Polish scientific studies of religions in the age of Enlightenment and Romanticism. Here the author particularly concentrates on two pioneers, J. A. Karłowicz, a historian, philosopher, and ethnographer, and I. Radliński, the latter referred to as the father of Polish scientific studies of religions. Many of these pioneers carried out extensive research in Slavic religions. We also learn from this chapter that Polish scientific studies of religions began at this time to differentiate into two streams: one was “secular,” encompassing freethinkers and later also Marxists, and the other “confessional,” associated with scholars representing views of various churches, but mostly the Roman Catholic Church.

The third chapter, entitled “Development of Catholic Religious Studies,” concerns the contribution to religious studies of scholars from Catholic circles. A majority of these studies were apologetic and challenged the evolutionistic theories of religion which were rife at that time. The Catholic precursors of religious studies were, among others, Father S. Pawlicki CR (B. Malinowski’s mentor) and Father I. Radziszewski, who was the first to introduce to the Polish scientific circles the concept of Father Wilhelm Schmidt’s (SVD) theory of pre-monotheism. Similar issues are dealt with in chapter four, which is concerned with “Religious Studies among Ethnic Minorities” and falls into the confessional stream of research, meaning Protestant, Orthodox, and Jewish.

I find chapter five very interesting. It is entitled “Contribution of Ethnographers, Anthropologists, and Sociologists towards the Development of the Polish Scientific Study of Religions.” Scholars of religious studies mentioned in this chapter treated religion as a part of culture or a social fact. In this chapter we learn about the contribution to religious studies by, among others, anthropologist B. Malinowski and sociologist F. Znaniecki, both well-known throughout the academic world. Also recognized on an international scale is the Polish scholar of religion S. Czarnowski, a student of M. Mauss and H. Hubert. Czarnowski’s monograph “Le culte des héros et ses conditions sociales. Saint Patrik, héros national de l’Irlande” (1919) is still considered the classical position in world sociology and Celtic culture. In this chapter, Hoffmann also devotes a section to Polish researchers who studied the peoples of Siberia. One of the most outstanding among several researchers of this region is a woman, A. M. Czaplicka, who was a contemporary and a friend of B. Malinowski. She did her anthropological studies at the London School of Economics under the tutelage of R. R. Marett. In the years 1914–1915, she went to do fieldwork in Siberia, which resulted in her famous pioneering publications on Siberian shamanism, two of the best known being “Aboriginal Siberia, a Study in Social Anthropology” (1914) and “The Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day” (1918). After

her return to England in 1915 she joined the faculty of anthropology at Oxford, being one of the first female lectures at the Oxford University.

In chapter six, “Psychological Studies of Religion and Religiosity,” we learn that even though the psychology of religion was taught at Polish universities in the period between the two World Wars, yet it did not attain status as an independent discipline. In chapter seven, “Contribution of Orientalists towards the Scientific Study of Religion,” the author acquaints us with several Polish scholars studying the religions of the Far and Near East. The final chapter is devoted to the study of antique Hellenist, Byzantine, and Latin cultures and religions and is entitled “Contribution of Classical Philologists towards the Scientific Study of Religions.” From this chapter one should mention R. Gansiniec who at one point was a student of Father W. Schmidt SVD at St. Gabriel, Mödling near Vienna. Scholarly interests of Gansiniec focused on history of Greek religions, ethnology, and theory of magic. He is also known as a member of the Lvov-Warsaw School of philosophy.

Hoffmann’s book about the scientific output of Polish scholars in the area of religious studies from its nascence in 1873 until 1939 is a systematic work of immense range and erudition, deeply informative, and rich in facts. It is unfortunate that the book does not have a summary in English, which would make it even more valuable in the circle of scholars of comparative religion.

Stanisław A. Wargacki

Horstmann, Alexander, and Reed L. Wadley (eds.): *Centering the Margin. Agency and Narrative in Southeast Asian Borderlands.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2006. 238 pp. ISBN 1-84545-019-1. (Asian Anthropologies, 4) Price: \$ 75.00

The studies in this collection take as their justification the assumption of the inherent ambiguity of borders. “Many borders exist only on the map.” As many of us know from experience, national borders may cause difficulties or at least inconvenience for people wishing to move back and forth across them. Many of the issues in the collection have to do with borders of states, but certainly not all of them, or if so only coincidentally in some cases. That borders may be arbitrary should be obvious to anyone who has paid attention to the literature on colonialism and on postcolonial states. Persistently mobile peoples have always been regarded as posing problems by both ancient and modern states, which typically have wanted to settle them. The ambiguity of borders was a prominent theme of te Velde’s “Seth, God of Confusion” (1967) about ancient Egyptian mythology and religion. It is doubtful, for example, that the editors are correct in claiming that, “some of our basic assumptions in social-cultural anthropology ... are unconsciously bound to a spatial system characterized by more or less exclusive state boundaries” (3). Any reasonably informed layman would know of examples that contradict such assumptions. Any social anthropologist whose work is in a post-colonial nation may be expected as a matter of profes-