

viewees expressed such views, she felt compelled to infer a tendency among young Sunnis for an ambivalent relationship with their fellow Christian comrades. This is a major drawback of the smallness of the sample and the unwarranted generalizations of some of the findings.

One can dwell on many of the “findings” of the study. As indicated above, one may question their relevance. By and large, the book may have been a good academic memorandum, but as a published book its findings are to be taken with a good deal of reservation and healthy criticism. Among such drawbacks is the author’s lack of investigation of what has prompted young Sunnis to develop such an interest in religion. She tends to dismiss the

political developments in the region as peripheral to such transformation. One cannot isolate the rise of the religious dimension in the behaviour of Lebanese, as well as for Arabs for that matter, from the international and regional developments that took place, starting with the civil war in Lebanon, to Israel’s badgering of Lebanese and Palestinians, to the rise of oil power and the wave of Islamic fundamentalism, to the complacency of Western powers toward such rise that served their strategic interests. Also absent is the appeal of the successes achieved by militant Islam in the region against traditional enemies of Arabs and Muslims. Hence, in the opinion of this reviewer, the book is of limited relevance. Ziad Hafez

Errata. – In the issue 105.2010/2 of *Anthropos* the following errors have been identified:

1. In the article “‘Call Us Kow, Not Citak.’ Constitutive Factors for the Ethnic Consciousness of an Asmat Group,” by Alexander de Antoni, the citation from the book by Frank A. Trenkenschuh (“An Annotated Translation of ‘De Sociale Structuur van de Asmatbevolking’ by G. Zegwaard, M. S. C. and Dr. J. Boelaars, M. S. C.”), placed on page 418, was incorrectly edited. Below the corrected version:

[The] village of Jepem was a Jew with a companion Jew called [Jipim.] Jepem went pig-hunting and asked Jipim to care for their Jew. They did not, so when Jepem returned they found dog crap and other messes in their section of the Jew. A fight developed and the people of Jepem came down river past Fos, Jaosaker, etc, and settled on the coast (Trenkenschuh 1982a: 14).

2. In the section Rezensionen, the name of Carla Stang, the author of the book “A Walk to the River in Amazonia. Ordinary Reality of the Mehinaku Indians,” reviewed on pages 685–686, was erroneously written “Paula Stang.”

3. In the same section, in the review of the book “Einführung in die mongolischen Schriften,” written by Stefan Krist, and published on pages 618–619, an incorrect character Ж was used during the editorial and typesetting process to represent the sign Ж that was originally intended by the author of the review (p. 618, right column, par. 4). The corrected fragment reads as follows:

For the Buryat and Kalmyk Cyrillic scripts no full alphabet tables are given, but Chuluunbaatar names the few characters which are used to embody phonemes not existing in Mongolian and, therefore, added to the Mongolian Cyrillic script, used in both cases as the principle base. But here, concerning the Buryat Cyrillic alphabet, a mistake has happened: It is stated that the letter “ж” has been added to it. This is not true. Such a letter was never used in any Buryat script. But exceptions prove the rule. This is the only error the reviewer has detected in the whole book!

We apologize to the authors and our readers for those mistakes and reiterate our commitment to high editorial standards.

Darius J. Piwowarczyk
Editor

Anthropos 106.2011