

Is it not better to be incompetently adventurous than to be competently restricted?

Peter C.W. GUTKIND
McGill University

*

*

*

Manual for Kinship Analysis. Ernest L. SCHUSKY. (Studies in Anthropological Method Series.) New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965. vii-84 pp., 41 figures, 19 exercises, glossary, bibliography. \$1.50 (paper).

Ernest Schusky's *Manual for Kinship Analysis* appears in a series presumably designed to give both students and outsiders a view of accepted anthropological methodology in particular sub-specialties of the discipline. This volume would have perhaps sufficed for this end had kinship studies ceased 25 years ago, but they did not, and the publication of this small book does advances since that time a serious injustice.

This may sound severe, but the comfort size, the attractive format, and the crying need for a concise introduction to 'kinship studies' all mean that this book likely will be used by a great many students — students who will accept the contents as a precise statement of the basics of kinship analysis, and who will assume that more advanced kinship studies are built upon this. Herein lies the trouble, for much recent methodology and theory suggest that a fundamental *rejection* of many of our previous tenets of 'kinship' (those which Prof. Schusky appears to accept without question) is required in order to get further. Our time is precious little at best, so to read and assimilate materials which must be 'unlearned' in order to advance seems to me extremely inefficient. Students today can ill-afford such sterile exercise.

The small book is divided into two major sections — the first dealing primarily with mechanics, principles of kin reckoning, and definition; the second portion chiefly with "patterned kin behavior" and marriage (of which Prof. Schusky says, "Marriage customs, as well as patterned kin behavior, are closely related to the study of kinship [p. 57]."). This is the tenor of the entire book. On the first page of the text, 'kinship' emerges as a phenomenon *sui generis*. Prof. Schusky is certainly not alone in this view, but the serious student should also know that neither is it accepted everywhere.

If this does not convince the reader of Prof. Schusky's orientation, he is left with no doubts at all when brief mention is made of recent kinship studies. Prof. Schusky refers to Murdock's paper (*American Anthropologist*, Vol. 66, No. 1, 1964, pp. 129-132) which he says (p. 65) provides a "most recent analysis" of bilateral groups, but without any reference whatsoever to Mitchell's excellent statements on the kindred, to which Murdock was in fact replying. From the same *American Anthropologist*, Prof. Schusky quotes Ackerman (Vol. 66, No. 1, 1964, pp. 53-66) as having "seriously questioned Needham's analysis (p. 62)", as if to dismiss it. The next issue of Vol. 66

of the *American Anthropologist* brought several convincing statements of the inadequacy of Ackerman's critique, but apparently Prof. Schusky's book had gone to press by that time. And the bibliography is missing Lévi-Strauss' *Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté* — surely a *loci classicus* for the most basic kinship analysis.

The text of this small manual is attractive and the presentation clear, even if not systematic. Printing errors, however, occur on pp. 2, 15 and 23. The book throughout presents a number of genealogical diagrams to illustrate points, and the student is provided with a number of exercises with these diagrams — some even oriented toward improving his draftsmanship. These are certainly helpful, but they are not kinship. The glossary, on which introductory students will rely heavily, shows a lack of attention. Prof. Schusky opts for Murdock's definition of the clan — a queer breed which is empirically rare. This is his prerogative, of course, but if it is to be clear (or useful), there must be a much more extended treatment of the incorporation of in-marrying spouses than Schusky gives. His definition of exogamy is: "A rule of marriage that requires a person to marry outside such groups (p. 75)." — utterly incomprehensible without reading the previous entry, endogamy. And *marriage* does not appear at all.

This reviewer cannot recommend the book for his students, but then there is a totally different perspective of 'kinship' involved. I do not think, however, it is impossible to anticipate a text which will satisfy anthropologists of different orientations as well as answer to the fully-legitimate aims toward which the present manual is, unsuccessfully, directed.

James FARIS
McGill University

*

*

*

Manus Religion. R.F. FORTUNE. Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, (Bison Books edition). No date, xv-391 pp., 10 Plates. \$1.50.

This paper-back is apparently a photographically reproduced copy of the original 1935 edition published by the American Philosophical Society. It is already a classic. Its analysis of a religious system where each individual has his own guardian spirit (Sir Ghost) and where seances divining the actions of these spirits in causing human sickness are the major sanctions for a Puritanical moral code, forms an integral part of most texts on primitive religion. As such, a review of the book as a new study would be impertinent

Instead this reviewer will attempt to consider how such a classic can contribute to modern controversies in anthropology — thereby justifying its reissue, making it available to a wide audience, and not just to scholars with recourse to university libraries. To anticipate, let me say that I feel that this reprint is fully justified.