

time, except in those cases when they are recontextualized by Friedl's commentary, elaborated together with her Luri interlocutors. For example, the apparently existential considerations of the song "I'll go to God with a complaint. / I want to know what is my purpose in this realm" (15) – Friedl explains – are "a complaint-verse" of a 19th-century Boir Ahmad's leader caught up in war, but the same lines, when jokingly recited by a mother in 2015, are instead a complaint about her educated but unemployed son hanging around with other idle friends. Here the historicizing commentary makes meaning literal, while also highlighting the power of poetry to remake situations and be remade by them.

In other instances it is affects, body parts, things, animals, plants, and place names that jump out from the black and white page and make poems resonate in the new format: desire, anger, pain and grief, eyes, legs, hands, mixed with skirts, buttersacks, shoes, pans, Brno rifles, cradles, roses, ibexes, mountains, Mamasani, Abadan, Shiraz. At times, these combinations effect a story suspended from time and place but no less powerful: a secret love, a difficult marriage, a good hunting.

Friedl organized the Luri songs in thematic chapters covering spheres of social life in Sisakht, though as she admits, songs in one chapter could often have been located in another (the one quoted above, for example, fits several categories). The reader is presented with a complex picture of social life, with particular attention devoted to relationship between women and men, mostly portrayed from men's perspective: even if women sing more than men, "[r]arely do we hear a woman's bona fide opinion of her relationships" (115). This caveat notwithstanding, Friedl is careful to explain that the songs are dialogical in the full sense of the word, many entailing dialogues but also encapsulating a multiplicity of views. One gets the sense that the volume as a whole is equally dialogical, the product of fifty years of conversations. This is poetic history.

Setrag Manoukian

Han, Min, and Se Yin (eds.): *Anthropological Perspectives on History, Culture, and Museum. Theoretical Practice in Japan and China*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 2018. 383 pp. ISBN 978-4-906962-62-4. (Senri Ethnological Studies, 97)

As explained by the authors in their foreword, this volume contains the proceedings of the international symposium "Theoretical Renewal of Anthropology and Ethnology in China and the Development of Field Work" jointly organized by the National Museum of Ethnology (Minpaku 民博) of Japan and the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (IEA) of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS) on November 18th–19th, 2013, in Beijing. It was part of the achievement of the research project "Generation and Dynamism of Discourses on Family, Ethnicity, and State in China" (coordinator: Han Min 韩敏, April 2012–March 2015) which belonged to the core research project "An-

thropological Studies of Inclusion and Autonomy", sponsored by the Minpaku.

All contributions are published in Chinese with English abstracts. Eighteen articles by anthropologists from Japan and China are assembled in three sections. Additionally, an "Introduction" and "Afterword" by the editors Min Han and Se Yin 色音 provide contextual information on the symposium. 14 authors are from Japan, including 3 Chinese scholars who are working and living in Japan, namely Han Min, Haiquan Li 李海泉, and Xing Zhou 周星. Alongside the thematic contributions, there are an "Appendix" with two addresses of the director of Minpaku, Ken'ichi Sudo 须藤健, on the opening of project conferences held in Osaka respectively in 2012 and in 2014, and an "Index" of approximately 160 Chinese ethnological keywords. Altogether, this volume demonstrates strength and achievements of actual sino-ethnological research in Japan, and it seems to express the intention of Japanese sino-ethnologists to enforce intellectual exchange with their Chinese counterparts.

Six chapters make up the first part of the volume "Anthropology, Fieldwork, and Museum." The initial contribution by Michio Suenari 末成道男 reviews his fieldworks in Japan, Mainland China, Taiwan, Korea, and Vietnam with methodological reflections. Since 1922, comparative cognition, paying attention to social and cultural relevance, long-term stay in the field, using the local language and participant observation have become generally accepted methods of ethnographic fieldwork. According to Suenari's experiences, the decisions of how fieldwork is carried out, e. g., how long the stay is, whether a re-study should be done, and how deep the investigator involves himself in participant observation, depend on the researcher himself and the concrete situation he faces. In respect to the duration of stay in the field, repeated short-term visits are sometimes more effective than one long-term stay and may also produce great achievement. However, the difference between varied investigation models and their influence on research results should be pondered and discussed from the viewpoint of anthropological methodology.

Three articles focus on the topic of ethnological museum. Min Han evaluates the history and methods of Japanese anthropological research on China since 1884 when a group of young Japanese scholars discovered and established anthropology as a research field. She then takes Minpaku as example to show how it conducts research on China through collecting, exhibiting, and research projects. While in the 1980s, research interest focused on Chinese ethnic boundaries and the cultural relevance between Japan and Chinese ethnic minorities, it turned to ethnic transferability and representations in the 1990s. In the new century, the themes of joint research projects with China were extended to include varied topics, e. g., revolution and continuity of traditions, socialistic modernity, globalization and localization, cultural symbols as resource, etc., while the study on ethnic groups in southwestern China remains as a

traditional research area of Minpaku. Parallely, taking the ethnological collection of the IEA at the CASS as an example, Wuyungerile 乌云格日勒 reviews the history of collecting ethnic cultural relics in modern China and discusses the categories, functions, and characteristics of part of the current preserved ethnic cultural relics. Shiro Sasaki 佐佐木史郎, a professor of Sociology at Kōbe University, analyzes the exhibition of a local ethnological museum on history and culture of the Nanai-Heje 那乃-赫哲 people in the village Aoqi 敖其 near Jiamusi 佳木斯 in northeastern China. He finds that the historical-cultural representation of local people is quite different from the contents of ethnography written by anthropologists. Thus, it is necessary to re-examine the ethnographic records with a historical and contextual perspective. Meanwhile, museums are obliged to indicate clearly the historical background of objects exhibited or films presented to an audience.

Two articles are dedicated to material aspects of Northern Eurasian shamanism: the introduction and analyse of Khorchin 科尔沁 Mongolian formative arts written by the Mongolian Chinese anthropologist Se Yin, and the study on Sami shaman drums by Wenling Wu 吴文玲.

The second part of the book under the heading “Symbolism, Society, and Cultural Identity” also includes six contributions. Using firsthand data collected through fieldwork in the coastal city Qingdao 青岛 of Shandong 山东 Province, Mamoru Sasaki 佐佐木卫 analyzes the social structure in three modern Chinese communities: a suburban, a fishing, and a central urban community. As basic organizations involved in the management of community, the community committee assumes part of the governance responsibilities taken over from the local government; a property management company takes care of the living environment and social activities in the community; an industrial company is often founded in order to manage the land and other properties owned by the villagers. These three types of organizations can be combined in varied forms. In general, the structure of a modern Chinese “community” has the underpinning of traditional social organizations such as family lineage or rural village.

Kazuhiko Tamura 田村和彦, a folklorist and anthropologist from Fukuoka University, rethinks the concept and research history of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) in Japan and China. He observes that many Chinese folklorists and anthropologists take ICH as research object while Japanese scholars seldom set foot on this field. In fact, the discourse of ICH causes the expansion of culture concept. As a discipline focusing on the life of the people and their living culture, anthropological research could dissolve or disintegrate the conceptual framework of “intangible cultural heritage.”

Applying the metaphor of “raw” and “cooked” introduced into anthropological theory by the French structuralist Claude Lévy-Strauss, Xing Zhou finds many corresponding expressions in Chinese language used for distinguishing ethnic minorities. While “raw” is often

used to refer to ethnic groups living in remote regions and who share few cultural characteristics with the Han-Chinese, the “cooked” ones are considered more progressive and civilized. The structure of “raw/cooked” classification regarding to the “other” people is based on the cultural conceptions of early times as recorded in historical documents and, thus, is deeply rooted in the Chinese culture.

Three articles are dedicated to theoretical reflection on the effectiveness of culture in the age of social transformation (Haiquan Li), the discourse and practice of lineage in Pearl River Delta of Guangdong 广东 Province (Yukihiro Kawaguchi 川口幸大), and the identity and cultural representation of Hakka 客家 Chinese immigrants in Sabah 沙巴, Malaysia (Hironao Kawai 河合洋尚).

In the last part of this volume, “History in Anthropology,” Haitao Liu 刘海涛 reviews the emergence of ethnohistory in American academic circles after the Second World War. Yoshio Watanabe 渡边欣雄 gives a brief introduction to Feng-shui 风水 science and techniques in ancient China and of its diffusion into Japan since about the 7th century. Shigeyuki Tsukada 塚田诚之 investigates the belief in Lady Xian 洗夫人 on the Hainan 海南 island and its representation in varied historical periods. Jingwei Li 李静玮 studies the popular Mao 毛 cult among rural Chinese people by analyzing folk narratives about him.

In her evaluation of historical records on the *huobajie* 火把节 (torchlight festival) of the Bai 白 ethnic group in Yunnan, Hiroko Yokoyama 横山广子 emphasizes that the historical aspect can inspire fieldwork and let us realize the importance of deciphering the traces of cultural change. Toru Shimizu 清水享 explores the provenience of Yi manuscripts preserved in the Academia Sinica (Taipei 台北) through analyzing form and contents of these documents in comparison with the academic history of Yi studies. According to his investigation, the manuscripts were partly collected in the areas of Yunxi 玉溪, Honghe 红河, and Wuding 武定 in Yunnan 云南 province, partly in Luquan 禄劝, Yunnan Province, and in Liangshan 凉山, Sichuan 四川 Province. The latter ones had been definitely gathered by the Chinese ethnolinguist Ma Xueliang 马学良 (1913–1999) in the 1940s. A remaining problem is, how Ma got the documents from Liangshan, Sichuan Province, since he stayed in Luquan, Xundian 寻甸, and Wuding in Yunnan only during his two years of fieldwork.

Most of the contributions in the volume are written on the basis of professional fieldwork or long-term investigations of the authors and have been carefully edited. One can get many methodological inspirations through reading. Japanese sino-ethnology is actually leading in the world, even if its achievements have not been adequately recognized by anthropologists in Europe and the United States because of language and cultural barriers. From a Chinese point of view, these studies not only give an overview of Japanese anthropologi-

cal studies in China but also provoke a question to think about: Why do few Chinese anthropologists do fieldwork in Japan and study Japanese problems, while Japanese anthropology has taken China as one of its main fields for a long time being? This unbalance of research may become a topic in itself and deserves intensive studies.

Xiaobing Wang

Han, Sallie, Tracy K. Betsinger, and Amy B. Scott (eds.): *The Anthropology of the Fetus. Biology, Culture, and Society*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2018. 298 pp. ISBN 978-1-78533-691-1. (Fertility, Reproduction, and Sexuality, 37). Price: \$ 120.00

With their opening assertion that the fetus is “both materially and metaphorically a product of the past, a marker of the present, and an embodiment of the future” (1), the editors of “The Anthropology of the Fetus” have put together a thought-provoking, engaging, and persuasive collection of chapters. The volume is organised into three sections – “The Fetus in Biosocial Perspective,” “Finding Fetuses in the Past: Archaeology and Bioarchaeology,” and “The Once and Future Fetus: Sociocultural Anthropology.” Authors were asked to respond to these questions: 1) What is a fetus? How is it defined and conceptualized in a particular field of study? 2) What methodological approaches are used – and challenged – in studying fetuses? 3) What does a study of fetuses in a given field contribute not only to scholarship in other fields but also to public concerns such as reproductive policies and practices? The responses, read across the introduction, eleven chapters, and conclusion, “present a perspective on the human fetus that is biosocial/biocultural, historical, and cross-cultural – in a word, holistic” (3).

Chapters in the first section (The Fetus in Biosocial Perspective) outline key elements of that holistic perspective. Rutherford, a biological anthropologist, sets the tone by disrupting conventional thinking about the fetus as a discrete biological individual. Drawing on research on epigenetics, the developmental origins of health and disease (DOHaD), and the placenta, Rutherford describes a “borderless fetus” (15) existing in a “complex gestational ecology” extending beyond its own gestation and life span, into the life and health of its mother, grandmother, and its own offspring. Arguing that bioarchaeology has tended to overlook fetal skeletal material, Blake reviews how perinatal remains can provide valuable and distinctive evidence about maternal and population well being and disease. From a sociocultural perspective, Han’s chapter highlights why we should attend to fetuses as simultaneously “a concept of social relations” (75), “matter, material, and bodies” (74) at the same time recognizing that what a fetus “is” “is an effect of particular historical and social processes” (5).

Archaeological and bioarchaeological approaches are expanded and illustrated in the volume’s second section

(Finding Fetuses in the Past.) As “the first review of fetuses within bioarchaeology [literature]” (100), Halcrow, Tayles, and Elliott discuss issues of terminology, burial type, and age estimation, what perinatal skeletal remains can reveal about health and disease, and how mortuary practices may indicate cultural ideas about personhood and infant loss. Lewis extrapolates from clinical literature to identify a variety of pathologies (infections, congenital disorders, trauma) which may be observable in perinatal skeletal remains. Chapters on fetal and perinatal burial location and grave goods in cemeteries – one from Neolithic Egypt (Kabaciński, Czekaj-Zastawny, and Irish), the other from 17th to 18th century Poland (Scott and Betsinger) – indicate the social value of the very young in these societies.

The third section (The Once and Future Fetus), contains four chapters by sociocultural anthropologists. Cromer untangles legal, economic, and moral aspects of frozen embryos “waiting” for adoption at a Christian adoption agency and at a stem cell research lab in California. Exploring how various actors in Moroccan national discourses on sexuality and abortion deploy the fetus, Newman demonstrates the erosion of women’s abilities to make authoritative claims about the fetus. Luehrmann’s analysis of anti-abortion activism in post-soviet Russia points to “dilemmas caused by the unstable status of the fetus as a being whose biological, social, and theological meanings do not always add up to one coherent whole” (228). Unpacking how the fetus is materialised through the sound of amplified heartbeats in US anti-abortion efforts and in biomedical maternity care in Oaxaca Mexico, Howes-Mischel theorises the nexus of diagnostic technology, emergent propositions, and fetal social presence.

The volume does an excellent job of confirming that there is no simple or universal answer, even within anthropology, to the question, What is a fetus? There is a wonderful breadth of examples in these chapters demonstrating the historical and cultural diversity of ideas about fetus, embryo, infant. However, I would argue the real strength of the collection is in pushing the reader to rethink the ontology of fetuses in order to see them as temporally diffuse, extending across multiple bodies, and simultaneously biological and social. Bringing the temporal and spatial dimensions of fetal ontology into visibility means attending to fetuses as distributed beings, as part of assemblages and ecologies, rather than as distinct individuals or even as maternal-fetal dyads. Such an approach links epigenetics, patterns of growth, development and disease, knowledge systems, social identities and relationships, cultural priorities, and political agendas. Significantly, understanding that the fetus develops across a multigenerational biosocial gestational ecology and NOT just in an individual woman’s uterus, yields a robust “foundation for interrogating the supposed primacy of the ‘personal responsibility’” (27).

As noted by the editors, the individual chapters in this volume are insightful and specialized readings from par-