

contemporary anthropology that all too often is guilty for the “glaring omission” of living and breathing human beings in its analyses due to theoretical trends that focus rather on the trans-individual *ethnos* than on the singular *anthropos*; rather on culture, structure, power, economic forces than on the lived experience of the creatures who find themselves, for better or worse, in such super-individual conditions (4). However, disagreement as to the depth of the analytical ambition of existential anthropology is traceable between the lines of the introduction and comes explicitly to the fore between the two authors’ respective chapters.

Whereas Jackson, as he puts it in an earlier programmatic exposé (Existential Anthropology, New York 2005), is less interested in “new interpretive vocabularies” than in the anthropologist’s “ability to sustain interaction and conversation with others, in their place, on their terms, under troubling and trying circumstances,” Piette is expressly interested in the development of a new interpretive vocabulary; or more precisely, he wants to add to the Heideggerian vocabulary of so-called “existentials” his own *a priori* existential categories (notably the categories of the “minor modes of being” which form the existential backdrop of intentional activity (183). The theoretical clarity of the introduction somewhat suffers from not having reconciled, or at least explicitly related these almost polar views of the analytical ambition of existential anthropology. The result is the sense of a not elucidated alternation between these poles throughout the introduction. Symptomatically, we hear, on the one hand, that existential anthropology can be defined “without reference to philosophy” (3), while, on the other hand, we hear that existential anthropology, in its refusal to “reduce the human to a specific assemblage of social, cultural, psychological, historical, and biological characteristics ... presumes a ‘fundamental ontology’ whose focus is on what is there before the human is constructed in terms of a particular worldview, be this a local cosmology, theory of mind, or scientific model” (25) – which to this reviewer’s mind brings existential anthropology right into the very *heartland* of philosophy. According to this last description, we should now “think of [existential] anthropology not simply in terms of social, political, economic, or cultural anthropology but as an anthropology *tout court*,” (25) whereby existential anthropology comes very close to what the early 20th-century German philosophical tradition with Scheler, Plessner and Gehlen has termed philosophical anthropology. And where Jackson in earlier writings (Lifeworlds, Chicago 2013) has proposed an ethnographically based philosophical anthropology (i.e., an anthropology *tout court*), he has, to my knowledge, always been very wary of the kind of transcendentalism that lurks in such notions as the Heideggerian *fundamental ontology* invoked in the passage quoted above.

Given this looming theoretical disagreement in the background of the general project, it seems reasonable to ask whether the book actually does provide answers to the question, which its very title poses; namely, what is existential anthropology? The short answer is; yes it does – but not in the sense that it programmatically draws up *the*

grand theoretical architectonic of existential anthropology. Rather, it presents a wide register of existential sensitivities that spans the ontic or *radical empiricist* (with Jackson following William James) at one extreme to the properly *existential-ontological* focus (with Piette following Heidegger) at the other extreme. And distributed within this scope we find the individual chapters that to varying degrees combine ontic, ethnographic analyses with the ontological-existential hypotheses. Sadly, I cannot go into the individual chapters provided by Premawardhana, Lambek, van de Port, Lucht, Silva, and Denizeau in any depth that does justice to the their respective engagements with existential anthropology. I shall instead foreground a theme that curiously is shared by several of the contributors; namely that of mobility. Especially in Premawardhana’s and Silva’s chapters the experience-near analyses of mobility and migration gives rise to not only politically and ethically critical points, but at the same time to properly ontological considerations of the *existential* conditions of human life (in Piette’s Heideggerian sense of the term).

The book under review, “What Is Existential Anthropology?” is – not despite but because of the theoretical tensions between Jackson and Piette – a highly recommendable collection of essays. The explicit and implicit “Auseinandersetzung” between the founding fathers of existential anthropology qualifies the question raised by the title of the book and indicates a wider range of possibilities for existential anthropological analysis than either of the works published individually by the two frontrunners have hitherto accomplished.

Rasmus Dyring

**Jebens, Holger** (ed.): Storibuk Pairundu. Tales and Legends from the Kewa (Southern Highlands, Papua New Guinea). Collected by Alex Yapua Ari. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2015. 356 pp. ISBN 978-3-496-01549-9. Price: € 49.00

Ethnologists as well as linguists stress the importance of texts for studying either the culture of the people they have been researching or the grammar of the language the people speak, or the interdependencies of culture and grammar. As to the field linguist, one could define a good description as complete when the trilogy of grammar, dictionary, and texts is available; with respect to the ethnographer, texts show how ethnographic knowledge comes into being, as was the case, for instance, in the exemplary ethnographies of Malinowski on the Trobriand Islanders or Strauss and Tischner on the Mbowamb in Central New Guinea. While nowadays linguists documenting endangered languages (re)discover the dignity of texts (and dictionaries), Jebens states that in recent times “anthropologists and missionaries appear to have lost interest not only in collecting stories, but also in documenting vernacular languages” (8). Though a good number of previous works on the Kewa language as well as on Kewa ethnography and ethnolinguistics are evaluated, this loss is tangible through the absence of “original texts” (8) in the publications of Jebens’ predecessors.

The Kewa people live in the Southern Highlands of Papua New Guinea; their language is a member of the West-Central Family of the Trans-New Guinea Phylum. Since 1958 their language and culture have been studied: Karl J. and Joice Franklin published a grammar, anthropological materials, e.g., on ritual languages and argots, and a model dictionary. Various aspects of Kewa culture were studied by Lisette Josephides and Mary MacDonald; John LeRoy interpreted Kewa tales and legends. Several Kewa tales have been published in anthologies assembling stories from all parts of New Guinea (cf. Jebens' detailed discussion, pp. 6–12). Jebens' research, realized in 1990–91, 1995–96, and 2008 in Pairundu, “a small and remote rural village” (3), focussed on “[c]onstructions of ‘cargo’” (x) and “on the indigenous appropriation of Catholic and Adventist Christianity” (6). The present work is a by-product of his first field trip: the ethnographer, taking notes and collecting stories, served as a model for his consultant, translator, and “inspiring companion” (xi), Alex Yapua Ari, who accepted the anthropologist's invitation to cooperate, “mimicking” fieldwork and presenting “a collection of 62 stories, carefully hand-written on 139 pages” (3), before Jebens' first fieldwork among the Kewa was over.

These stories were written in the Neo-Melanesian Pidgin English (Tok Pisin) and referred to as “stori,” while the vernacular differentiates between *iti*, “story handed down by the ancestors,” and *rema*, “new story telling of a more recent past or the present” (3f.; a detailed discussion of the terms is found on pp. 9f. and in the notes on pp. 19–21). The original Pidgin texts have been edited, and Jebens has added, first, notes, mainly consisting of valuable explanations related to the material culture (for instance earth oven, armband) or to features of social life, or the Kewa spiritual world (for example killing a pig as a ritual ending a period of mourning, pp. 146 and 180); second, an English translation; third, comments, which name the source, i.e., the original narrators, assign the genre to the stories, namely *iti* or *rema*, refer to parallel sequences and motifs in other anthologies, and offer Alex' summaries and his hints at the meaning of the story. About forty images illustrate the context of research and the collection of the stories; a list of narrators and a list of plots (sequences), as drawn up by LeRoy, and an index, which may serve as a valuable motif index (cf., among others, the rather important or interesting entries “bridge,” “eyes,” “snake”), complete the edition. Jebens' introduction together with the references presents the reader with a precise overview of oral (ethnic) literature as well as the beginnings of a national literature in Papua New Guinea.

The plots as well as the constellations of the protagonists of the stories form part of what is known from other anthologies: a more or less peaceful co-existence of, for instance, siblings, two brothers or a man and his wife is interrupted by one partner's leaving for garden work, to pay a visit to another hamlet, or to hunt. Something bad, a theft, a failed hunt, an unintentional attack, or an irregularity (for example related to rules of giving) happens, a bush spirit, an old woman, an old man show up, a path or a river is no longer passable, climbing a tree leads into

the sky, following a possum takes the hero into underworlds, helpers like a nice man, birds or snakes appear. While the single parts of a story, constellations, irregularities, encounters, and adventures (in the literal sense of the word) are given, and the loose concatenation of episodes is common, in other Papuan speech communities, restorations and solutions seem to be more culture-specific: while a Kewa story typically ends in an account of the protagonists' metamorphoses (cf. 83, 109, 114, 157, 174), explaining the existence of mountains, features of the landscape or the coming into being of plants or birds, the same story told in the communities I know (the Eipo and Yalenang in West New Guinea), for example, would end in the foundation of a new family or subclan. Another difference comes to light when one compares the rules of open naming. The Kewa of Pairundu “would often use the names of living villagers in order to make a tale sound ‘more smart’” (236), a procedure which is strictly forbidden among the aforementioned western communities, where open naming is an offence and where the art of telling stories consists in veiled speech, that is, in hiding references to members of the community.

Such differences of style and etiquette are found between different speech communities; another characteristic feature leads the reader to look for developments within the Pairundu, or, probably, within Kewa communities: Jebens has quite often to clarify the subject in sequences of clauses and sentences, for example, “... and the man went to stand on a tree ... he was opening his hand, and the man [husband of two women] shot right into his hand, and the man died” (124f., cf. 132, 184f., 199). In Kewa the tracking of the subject is facilitated by a mechanism called switch reference: a special set of verbal suffixes indicates whether the subject of the next clause will be the same or not. Here, in Pidgin and in the translation, referential clarity is lost; in the example above, with regard to the etiquette of naming, clarity is avoided. Other features, too, may have been lost during the translation from the vernacular to Pidgin, probably, as I believe, features related to the wording and style of genres and to performance, the act of telling stories. The original Kewa language only shows up sporadically, in notes explaining the meaning of phrases and words (cf. 185, 203, 208). Thus, though the back cover of this anthology may still be right in saying that the stories “present a kind of ‘indigenous auto ethnography’”, its importance consists, I believe, in illustrating the transitory moments and developments, the changes from unknown authors to named narrators, from the vernacular to Pidgin as a national language, from ritual to entertainment, from secret traditions to individual wording and narrative, from a local culture to pathways to a general public, that is, from local identity to nation-building, from oral literature to a written national literature. The edition teaches the interpreter that not only identities of plots, constellations, motifs, and sequences are important, but that differences should be highlighted as well; one should rephrase Schleiermacher: only differences establish the sameness of facts and things. In conclusion: The “storibuk” is clear, thoughtfully introduced and philologically carefully edited, it should form part of a

history of Kewa literature and anthropology in particular, as well as of the history of Papua New Guinea literature in general. One looks forward to the sequels mentioned in the introduction.

Volker Heesch

**Jensen, Joan M., and Michelle Wick Patterson** (eds.): *Travels with Frances Densmore. Her Life, Work, and Legacy in Native American Studies*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015. 448 pp. ISBN 978-0-8032-4873-1. Price: £ 52.00

My review of this book, "Travels with Frances Densmore," was influenced by other materials I read that she had written. I had often wondered why her material was so dense and lacked a personal element, I now did find my answer. When I received this book my fears about having to study a non-Native's view of Indians was confirmed. What I wanted was to learn of the unique ancestral qualities of Indian people that have gone unrecognized and unappreciated.

After having read "Travels with Frances Densmore," I now have a better understanding of "her" mission regarding indigenous peoples. The reader learns that Frances Densmore did not have any official or formal education in Native American Studies and learned primarily as one would with an on-the-job-training arrangement. Experiential learning is not unfavorable if one is learning from a similar culture among similar people; otherwise the worldview of their own culture takes ownership in the material being presented, and the reader experiences what the author knows and in some cases what the author wants you to know. The readers do find that F. Densmore is self-taught in anthropology, musicology, and history. However, it was clear that her methods to analyze Indian music and singers were like that of trying to fit a square peg into a round hole.

Frances Densmore was motivated by self-promotion in a Western field where women were not acknowledged on the same level as men. In addition, anthropology (1904–1934) did not serve Native populations, it had more to do with colonizing Native peoples by funding anthropologists as representatives of Western institutions and Western governments to justify their superiority over Native cultures. If one were to address gender roles in Native culture, although distinct in some aspects, they were not seen as separate among most Native peoples because they helped to create the "whole" Native culture and community. The idea of feminist's work actually diminishes what Native cultures were trying to protect; their solidarity to one another and the Native world from which they emerged. Native cultures were/are never about separation or compartmentalization.

Densmore had considerable privilege beginning with the BAE (Bureau of American Ethnology) as a white female, a privilege that she knew was not afforded to Native women as researchers or participants. If F. Densmore had allowed for Native women to take the lead on her work, her work would have been very different and would have gone into a different direction. What the reader does find is how a non-Native self-proclaimed scholar interpreted

Indian music for primarily non-Native audiences. Even if she had the methodological and conceptual tools to examine the gendering of expressive culture, indigenous cultures in and of themselves are spiritual, intuit, and their productions are not methodological nor scientific reproductions. F. Densmore did not understand her own limitations.

Scholars and researchers frequently see white females attempt to provide a unique, alternative voice when interpreting expressive indigenous cultures. However, these very women borderline the same oppressive treatment directed to the women of those cultures in the same way they have been treated by the males in their professions and white cultures. One quote of particular interest to me is "purse string conscious congressmen." This clearly demonstrates that the government did in fact support her indirectly for her part of the colonization process during her work with the BAE. Yet throughout the book we hear her lament over the cut of funding. I believe this happened because the government did not understand what her message was nor did she get them any closer to understanding Native people which was due in part because Frances Densmore did not understand Native people either and would not say so.

Indigenous knowledge is a life-long process more accurately attained by qualitative research. For F. Densmore to have such a broad collection of songs, books, and articles written from trips to the "field" makes her work heavy, dense, and hard to internalize without years of study and reflection. If she had lived among the people during her years as a researcher, she would have found ways to express what Native people really meant, her interpretations would have been less condescending, and her credibility would have been accepted more readily by both Natives and Whites.

It was obvious that the work in the field did not take into account the diversity that exists among tribal nations; traditional fortitude, assimilation affects, levels of education, location, and political standing. Among indigenous peoples, Native American Studies came to light as a result of the genocide that encompasses loss of land, language, culture, bio-region identities, spirituality, and traditional governments. F. Densmore demonstrated her lack of attention directed to colonization efforts during her role as an anthropologist. This may very well be why she and other anthropologists received little to no praise for their work from Native peoples themselves.

At best, the chapter titled: "Gone but Not Quite Forgotten" could serve in a Native American Studies class where either a day or week or month is commemorated to indigenous peoples for their great accomplishments to this country and culture as a whole. However, in my opinion, to shed light on the entire book would best serve anthropologists, feminists, and some historians. I see no permission given, or granted now or ever to allow one person to collect information on such a broad scale as F. Densmore had done. I believe the spirit and knowledge of Native American music still awaits discovery on its own set of indigenous terms.

Vivian Delgado