

zum Begriff "Stammfamilie". Dabei zeigt sich viel Neues, und hier vor allem Einsichten, die einer bisher oft vertretenen vereinfachenden Sicht widersprechen. Und es zeigt sich, dass sich bei den Autoren die Einsicht in die Komplexität des Phänomens durchgesetzt hat. Letzten Endes machen viele der Beiträge dieses Sammelbandes den Eindruck von Berichten aus der laufenden Arbeit; es wird immer wieder darauf hingewiesen, dass noch viel Arbeit notwendig sei, um die Fragen zu Form, Funktionen und Geschichte der Stammfamilie in den unterschiedlichen Regionen beantworten zu können. Und der Eindruck entsteht: Man ist auf dem besten Weg, dieses Ziel zu erreichen.

Hans Dieter Ölschleger

**Fikentscher, Wolfgang:** *Law and Anthropology. Outlines, Issues, and Suggestions.* München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009. 505 pp. ISBN 978-3-7696-0977-6. (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften; Philosophisch-Historische Klasse: Abhandlungen, 132) Price: € 123.00

This book is an impressive piece of scholarship that may have some difficulties in finding the right audience. The book is daunting as well as challenging, and not only for good reasons. A key factor is the decision by Fikentscher to produce a volume that is intended not simply to synthesize the literature on Anthropology of Law, but instead takes on the much broader terrain of Anthropology and Law. In its strong moments, this strategy allows him to draw out the broad significance of law for anthropology, and of anthropology for law. In its less enjoyable moments, the volume takes on many of the features of a textbook of anthropology. The drawbacks of this textbook aura are intensified by his insistence on taking a five-field approach to anthropology (including applied anthropology). In part, this is a product of his theoretical perspective, which argues that culture and biology are the "two sides of anthropology equally relevant to all its sections" (250). The intriguing argument here is that there are fundamental constraining elements in human biology that legislators neglect at their peril. In passing, he dismisses social anthropology and argues for the centrality of culture, a perspective that occasionally flirts with cultural determinism. In any case, the result is that long sections may be of little interest to the busy reader. Perhaps this is a product of our attention-deficit times; this notable endeavour may have been more in tune with an earlier scholarly era. Who then would most benefit from the book? Undergraduate students will probably find it too challenging. Experts in legal anthropology will probably find themselves scanning for the numerous pearls of wisdom. Overall, this is a book that I would definitely like to have any of my graduate students interested in legal anthropology read.

The limited space here might be best devoted to summarizing some of his insights. I was particularly interested in his discussion of alternative fora, which he defines as "several ought-mechanisms." These include law, religion, and morals, distinguished by the presence or not of authority and sanction (131). He complicates this

simple analysis, however, by pointing out that this only applies if supernatural sanctions are omitted, but to do so is ethnocentric. The author considers "fora" to be theoretically preferable to Sally Falk Moore's concept of "semi-autonomous social fields." He considers "field" to be "too narrow a metaphor. It refers to territory, and thus does not cover multiplicity of laws in terms of belief systems, constitutional ranking, or time." I find this criticism too narrow, Moore's approach does cover many issues relevant to these topics, and there is no reason it might not be applied to the others. I would have liked to see more positive engagement with the social fields approach. One theorist that is regrettably completely absent is Bourdieu, who has much to contribute to analyses such as that of fora, such as his study of *champs*.

Good contributions are made in a variety of areas, including useful clarification of the emic/etic distinction. Noting that the usual distinction is an ethnocentric frame for Western forms of thought, he suggests that clarifying the different levels of analysis is key to providing a better ground for comparative analysis of legal systems. This is done within the context of serious investigations into the philosophical basis of anthropological analyses. He also provides illustrations of his approach through consideration of the treatment of aboriginal groups under American Federal and State law, part of an effective examination of the important and growing issue of the conflict of laws between different national and quasinalational jurisdictions. His exploration of the cultural construction of personhood and its implications for legal process is worth careful consideration. He also spends considerable attention on the interface between kinship and legal research. Other readers will undoubtedly focus on other significant contributions to the intersection between anthropology and law.

Alan Smart

**Forth, Gregory:** *Images of the Wildman in Southeast Asia. An Anthropological Perspective.* London: Routledge, 2008. 343 pp. ISBN 978-0-7103-1354-6. Price: £ 95.00

This book is the fruit of long-term fieldwork, library research, and regional comparison-making in a special ethnological arena. Prof. Forth's remit is wide, and his scholarly scope is correspondingly deep. He has covered a huge terrain of materials across Southeast Asia and including parts of the Pacific region, all in pursuit of the elusive topic expressed in his title, "Images of the Wildman." Forth is not averse to many different forms of speculation, interpretation, and deduction in relation to the array of materials he has marshaled, and the result is an impressive testimony both to his persistence in following leads into byways and corners of ethnography and to the acuity of his thoughts about the topic as a whole.

There are two main aspects of his enquiry. One is to establish the distribution of a particular set of images of "wildmen" or "hominoids," partly human creature, who appear to be neither simply fictional/symbolic nor entirely a product of empirical observation. The other is to