gleichberechtigt ihre Stimmen und Interessen einbringen konnten und den "Beforschten" für ihre Mitarbeit und ihr Wissen etwas zurückgegeben wurde. Wer sich eingehender mit Geschichte und Bedeutung partizipativer und kollaborativer Forschungsansätze in den Kulturwissenschaften auseinandersetzen möchte, den lässt das Buch mit einem tieferen Verständnis der besonderen menschlichen und wissenschaftlichen Dimension und Herausforderung eines dialogischen Forschungsprozesses zurück.

Friderike Seithel

Van der Donck, Adriaen: A Description of New Netherland. Ed. by C. T. Gehring and W. A. Starna; transl. by D. W. Goedhuys. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008. 176 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-1088-2. Price: £ 24.00

Originally brought out in 1655, and again as expanded in 1656, Adriaen van der Donck's "Description of New Netherlands" is famous among scholars of colonial history for both its centrality and its elusiveness. Although a crucial colonial record of seventeenth-century Dutch New York, the "Description" has nevertheless remained sidelined, for – failing fluency in seventeenth-century Dutch – scholars could not be certain of the text. To date, the only extant English version was the ham-fisted translation of Jeremiah Johnson dating to 1841, a version so notoriously (and, sometimes even laughably) inaccurate as, at times, to leave no certain idea at all of what van der Donck had been trying to convey. In one, well-worn example highlighted in the preface, Johnson had New York Native men hairless but Indian (and European!) women, as "quite hairy" (xviii). Furthermore, some of the most important content of the original, its information on mid-seventeenth-century New York Indians, was omitted from the 1841 translation. Despite its frailties, the Johnson translation was reprinted in 1968, remaining until now, all that was available to non-Dutch scholars.

Finally, the subtleties of the original have been apprehended by the native Netherlander, Diederik Willem Goedhuys. Using his extensive knowledge of his home language, in its various as well as historical permutations, as strategically aided by the resplendent "Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal" (a Dutch equivalent of the "Oxford English Dictionary"), Goedhuys has produced what had been lacking for the last four centuries: a reliable and highly readable English translation of van der Donck's entire "Description".

The work is divided into a naturalist section featuring the land, its configuration, flora, and fauna; an ethnographic section on the Indians of the area, their lifeways and customs; a short section devoted entirely to beavers; and a mock, point-counterpoint dialogue of the sort popular in seventeenth-century Europe.

The detailed description of Long Island and New York, including van der Donck's important map, circa 1648 (often mistakenly dated to 1656) is as useful today as it was in the seventeenth century. Tidbits potentially important to climatologists and forensic naturalists are strewn throughout, such as van der Donck's discussion of the severity of New York winters, snow depths and duration, and temperature readings (2 f.), or the intimate details on waters, forestation, tides, animals, and even the incidence of whales swimming forty miles upriver and inland, before beaching themselves (11 f.). Early wineries are canvassed, along with the details of the other crops imported from Europe. The gold mania of the nineteenth-century New Yorkers clearly had antecedents in earlier settler fantasies, as van der Donck enthused almost comically about gold mining prospects in New Netherlands (40 f.), even as Jacques Cartier had so foolishly done, a century before, concerning Quebec. Unlike Cartier, who sent iron pyrite back to be essayed, at least the Dutch seemed to have found trace glacial deposits, but nothing to sustain mining.

Together with the final dialogue, which explored quotidian questions of the defensibility and fiscal soundness of New Netherlands, the "Description" makes clear a main purpose of the entire work as an advertisement for settlement. The main questions surround the feasibility of supplying a sufficient population to New Netherlands and the advisability of planting a Dutch colony so far from Europe, ringed as it was by potential enemies. The British and the Indians are treated as the only serious enemies, with both dismissed using fairly rationale arguments, that hardly predict the British takeover in 1664. Of course, the author was Eurocentric, so that the British-Dutch proxy war fostered between the Mohawks and the Mahicans from 1624 to 1628, so devastating to both native nations, as well as the fur trade, so devastating to the fauna of North America, were not considered. In fact, van der Donck went out of his way to insist that the cornucopia of New Netherlands could never be run through (20, 49, 54, 58–59, 128, 137–140). Today, the beaver section seems rather idiosyncratic, but it was of great importance in 1656, because beaver was the glue, then promising to hold European-North American trade together, as van der Donck acknowledged (138). Knowing the ruin wrought on the species and the environment by the fur trade, solely for the sake of European fashion, makes the beaver section grim and sad reading.

The section on the "First Nations" of the area mixes the Algonkins, mostly Lenapes and Mahicans, and the Iroquois, mostly Mohawks, without distinction, while local monikers are tossed about, sometimes with confusing results. For instance, the "Sinnekens" do not denote the Senecas, or even, at times, necessarily the Iroquois, as a naive reader might suppose. The editorial annotations are crucial in clearing up potential confusion here. Moreover, van der Donck imposed suppositions of patriarchy on the Indian groups, even as he briefly noted their matrilineality. By way of explaining it, he blithely assumed that the Natives' promiscuous sexual habits required matrilineage "for greater certainty" (85). Unfortunately, no annotations save the day here. No one not going in already aware of the great woodlands' matriarchies would leave van der Donck understanding that they existed. Thus, caution in reading assignments to undergraduates is urged, lest students cheerfully deduce that the First

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2010-2-626
Generiert durch IP '3.144.90.50', am 27.09.2024, 00:01:21.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Nations were the patriarchal monolith that van der Donck portrayed.

Similarly, in company with most of his fellow chroniclers, van der Donck imposed Manichean monotheism on his discussions of traditional Native American spiritualities, so that it is impossible for an unprimed reader to descry the blood and breath (or the anthropological "earth" and "sky," respectively) that formed the twinned interdependence of the eastern woodlands' cosmos. The annotations provided by the editors, so helpful elsewhere, occasionally fail the reader here. In response to van der Donck's information that "the soul travels to a region to the southward" upon death (109), the editors merely comment that "northern Iroquois" thought that "one of the two souls of a deceased person" went west, while in one account, "a Mahican soul" went west (note 41, 168). There is nothing quite like fragmented, undigested information to confuse a reader thoroughly. In fact, there is a large body of tradition around each person's twinned (blood and breath) spirits, common throughout the eastern woodlands. Each spirit takes its separate direction at death. Blood (earth) spirits usually travel west, whereas breath (sky) spirit wind up in the stars via various routes, depending upon the nation. Among the Mahicans and Lenapes, breath spirits travel south, as noted severally in the primary sources, not the least in David Brainerd (Journal among the Indians. 1749: 314) and George Henry Loskiel (History of the Mission. 1794/1: 35).

Elsewhere, when van der Donck mentioned that a dead person's name was not uttered, to avoid inflicting pain on injury on a "deceased's kin, together with all those of the same family, jurisdiction, and those living in the same area and carrying the same name" (89), the editors struggled to understand whether a whole ethnicity, clan, or residential group were intended (note 20, 165). What this reference indicated, however, was that the personal name of the deceased was not said aloud, until the breath medicine of the name as connected to the individual had dissipated, usually about ten years after death. Consequently, clan mothers took great care not to give the same name to two living people, but sometimes, kin at a distance accidentally assigned a name already in use. Also, bonded friends (a status) used the same name as a sign of their bonding, as might certain medicine circle members. Speaking aloud a name worn by both a living and a dead person could, on the benign end, confuse the spirits into taking the living into the realm of the dead or, on the malign end, unleash a wrinkled spirit on the living namesake. This problem was what van der Donck alluded to. Not all of the Indian section is this problematic, however. Much of it is quite straightforward, and even when the signal must be parsed out from the noise, as in the two examples above, the section is rewarding to the scholar, and the endnotes, usually clarifying.

One distinct kindness that the editors imposed on the text is in rendering van der Donck's "*wilden*" (literally, wild ones) as "Indians," not "savages." Although van der Donck was fairly clear that the term was used in preference to "heathen," as a pejorative emphasizing the Indians' non-Christian state (75 f.), the racist content of the term is shameful today. Not only is it painful to any of the excoriated group to see itself constantly dehumanized in the old texts, but it is also very misleading to upcoming, unsuspecting students, who sometimes pick up antique slurs as viable modern terminology, as has happened with the racial insults "Mingo" (meaning "the sneaky people," *not* "Ohio Iroquois") and "mulatto" (meaning "sterile hybrid"). More editors should follow the bold lead of Charles Gehring and William Starna in refusing to replicate the "savage" calumny.

As one who has, in the past, perforce used the 1841 Johnson translation of "A Description," I admit to a thrill of excitement when I first opened the Goedhuys translation and realized what I had in hand. This start of joy only increased as I read his well-considered rendering. Alas, several times, I found myself wishing that the index had been more sumptuous, as I penned in my own notes. Also, a short bibliography containing, not only van der Donck's works, but also every source cited in the twenty-three pages of annotations would have been welcome. These drawbacks were little more than passing irritations, however, whereas Russell Shorto's foreword on the all-too-brief life of Adriaen van der Donck (1620–1655) was chockfull of handy information, even as the editors' preface on Goedhuys' translation was enlightening. The sources on this geographical area in the Dutch period are sparse, so that the addition of this superb translation of van der Donck is of high importance to scholars.

Barbara Alice Mann

Donovan, James M.: Legal Anthropology. An Introduction. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2008. 265 pp. ISBN 978-0-7591-0983-4. Price: £ 24.75

This book aims to be a coursebook for teaching social or cultural anthropology. It is divided into six parts and 21 chapters, plus a useful introduction and an index. The six parts of the book give a "General Theoretical Background" (chs. 1, 2) and cover the "Forerunners" (chs. 3, 4) of legal anthropology, its "Ethnographic Foundations" (the core part of this book: chs. 5–12), some "Highlights of Comparative Anthropology" (chs. 13–15) and "Issues in Applied Legal Anthropology" (chs. 16–19). The final parts of the book consist of two "Conclusions" (chs. 20, 21). Each of the chapters is accompanied by references and – more important here – suggestions for further reading, which stresses the teaching character of this work. These further readings are not only very useful for students but also for their academic teachers as they give plenty sources of information on various topics outlined in the book.

Thus, giving its clearly didactical character, one cannot expect many new theoretical insights or detailed case studies from recent fieldwork. Instead, this book is a well-written introduction into legal anthropology of law which covers most of the ethnographic "classics" at length, but also shows the author's consciousness of more modern problems in postcolonial times. As this book obviously serves English-speaking readers, it shows rather anglophone tendencies, ignoring studies in French, Ger-

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2010-2-626
Generiert durch IP '3.144.90.50', am 27.09.2024, 00:01:21.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.