



A · M · E · R · I · C · A · N
A N T H R O P O L O G I C A L
A S S O C I A T I O N

WILEY

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Grundformen der Verwandtschaft by Carl A. Schmitz

Review by: Lorenz G. Löffler

Source: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 67, No. 6, Part 1 (Dec., 1965), pp. 1582-1584

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Anthropological Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/669200>

Accessed: 27-11-2020 19:47 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Anthropological Association, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Anthropologist*

79); an attitude toward interpretation of myth and symbolism which seems to reject the possibility of meanings not conscious to those in whose literature they are found (pp. 81–86, 128–129, 286–288); a conception of the current anthropological scene as one in which “Ethnography is a dirty word, and whatever cannot be measured does not exist” (p. 107).

It is a book, in short, to which anthropological readers may react strongly. One can enjoy what seems quick-moving pungency when one’s own facts and prejudices coincide; when they diverge from those of the author, what seems offhandedness and arrogation may evoke a response ranging from annoyance to outrage. The margins of my copy are stippled with “*sic!*”, for what seem to me failures of evidence, logic or empathy. In particular, I find the book’s appeal for understanding relative to cultural context often belied by wit that appeals to the lack of understanding implicit in stereotypes and absence of context. Thus, despite the extended warning (Ch. I) against mistaking the quality of originals from that of their translations, a crude literal pidgin translation of a Samoyed song is the one piece of evidence that Polar World literature is poor stuff indeed (p. 139). (If the song was composed as pidgin, the irrelevance is compounded.)

Radin’s Winnebago work is handled with some sarcasm (pp. 85, 288), that of Lévi-Strauss dismissed (p. 86), and that of Jacobs not discussed as to its central purpose, sociopsychological interpretation. Other contemporary social and structural approaches are not noticed.

It *is* a pity that anthropologists are not more concerned with the literature of the world’s little known peoples (x); but this does not seem the book that will call them to their task, or which they will recommend readily to an uncritical reader. That the book can inspire an enthusiastic response, however, has been attested by a lead review in the Sunday *New York Times*.

Grundformen der Verwandtschaft. CARL A. SCHMITZ. (Basler Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnologie, Ethnologische Reihe Heft 1. Ergänzungsheft zu Regio Basiliensis.) Basel: Pharos-Verlag, 1964. 134 pp., bibliography, 38 figures. sFr. 14.50.

Reviewed by LORENZ G. LÖFFLER, *University of Heidelberg*

Traditional German “Ethnologie” had little concern for the study of kinship problems; failing discussion, concepts and terminology lack adequate development and precision. The last decade, however, was characterized by a growing interest in problems of social organization, and in the field of “Social Structure” Murdock’s book (1949) has become the classic on this topic. Schmitz’s publication cannot be fully evaluated without this situational background. The author’s intention was to provide the student with a German “primer” on kinship topics together with a useful reference list of books and smaller papers which will help him to pursue his studies.

Schmitz starts with the group concept, specifies it for “kin group” and discusses the connotations of kin terms. He then introduces the types of family, proceeds to the types of kin groups, discusses marriage regulations, marriage classes, incest and exogamy, and finally the rules of residence. The only author to be extensively cited is, to be sure, Murdock, but Schmitz is far from copying him. Instead of simply referring to and discussing the literature cited at the end of each chapter, Schmitz very often develops his own ideas, and here is where the book ceases to be a mere introduction for students and deserves general interest; not so much because of the new definitions proposed (I personally would not promote them), but primarily because of his basic concept, the “Verwandtschaftsgruppe,” in connection with methods of formal analysis.

To begin with I must openly confess that I am at a loss as to the correct translation of the term "Verwandtschaftsgruppe," differentiated into "echte" and "unechte Blutsverwandtschaftsgruppe," since Schmitz intermixes kin groups, descent groups, local lines, and even kin classes (term groups). But it is easier to mock at this mess than to learn a lesson from it, viz. that indistinct notions prevent us from perceiving fundamental differences. Since German ethnology has not developed discrete categories—and Schmitz hesitates to use the English terms—the "Verwandtschaftsgruppe" must cover all and everything.

It is not without reason that the first chapter deals with the concept of groups. For Schmitz there are ideal types of different varieties of groups which must be constantly or sufficiently often actualized in daily life, lest a new ideal type develop in the course of time (p. 11). These ideal types differ from Weber's "Idealtypen" in that they are "concept models," "classificatory types," and their basic forms and combinations are realities with a limited self determination (p. 9). Consequently these logical constructs become vested with functions, internal organization, integration, etc. In application of this idea Schmitz claims that, e.g., patrilineal "Verwandtschaftsgruppen" originate if descent from the maternal side is totally ruled out from the determination of kinship (p. 39), and in these "groups" where descent and authority rest with the males, the smallest segmentary unit is a "Linie" of four generations (p. 49). To be sure, the lineage concept of English language discussions contains a similar confusion. Otherwise Schmitz could not have put the question why, in section systems, two "Matrilinien" combine with only two, three, and four "Patrilinien," and not with five, six, etc., while theoretical examinations allegedly have shown that the question cannot be answered unambiguously (p. 76). Cf. Leach, "The structural implications of matrilineal cross-cousin marriage," *IRAI*, 1951: "Failure to distinguish between the notion of local line (indicating a local descent group) and descent line (indicating a set of kinship categories) has been the source of much confusion."

This conceptual dilemma becomes obvious when Schmitz discusses ambilineal descent and ambilineal descent groups. He realizes that (contrary to his unilineal groups) additional rules will be necessary to establish a group, infers erroneously from his diagram that foreign elements begin to dominate in the fifth generation, and concludes that it "seems" that five generations constitute an exogamous group. He then maintains that a society made up of these five generation groups has no solidarity, as nobody will be responsible for the continuity of what he calls "Komplex von Wertzusammenhängen" on the one hand and "Exekutive" on the other hand (p. 82), unless these societies use new devices: either prescriptive marriage or special residence rules. In that way they can form groups nearly as big as a state, and Schmitz also tells us that ambilineal descent combined with ambilineal residence result in what is called a "deme" (p. 116), whereas it cannot be consistent with a clan in the sense of Murdock (p. 101).

Apparently the author could not spare the time to read his references himself. He even missed checking his own manuscript: e.g., he notifies the reader that in all diagrams roman numbers will designate ascending generations, whereas in fact, with one exception, they are used contrarily. There are, moreover, quite a number of overt blunders, e.g.: classificatory kin terms allow the reduction of the thousands of possible kin types (p. 24), terms for parallel cousins, brothers, and Ego can be merged (p. 26), "telescoping" of lineages means diagramming only two sons (p. 40), prescriptive marriage causes continued predominance of descent qualities of lineage ancestors (p. 53), structural consequences of preferential and prescriptive marriages are of minor importance (p. 63), matrilineal cross-cousin marriage is possible in six- and eight-section

systems (p. 76), cultural incest taboo prevents marriage within the "Verwandtschaftsgruppe" (p. 95 contrary to p. 69).

Even if some of the shortcomings of Schmitz's book may be valuable for a self-conscious reconsideration of vaguely defined concepts and methods, these muddled misinterpretations must be laid to the author's account. Thus at least, we may hope that his standard will not be mistaken as representing the general level of German social anthropology. German (and other) students should learn from this book, although not the "Grundformen der Verwandtschaft," but the basic requirements of scientific work.

Process and Pattern in Culture: Essays in Honor of Julian H. Steward. ROBERT A. MANNERS, ed. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964. ix, 434 pp., bibliography of Julian H. Steward, chapter bibliographies, chapter notes, contributors, frontispiece, index, maps, tables. \$8.75.

Reviewed by JOHN P. GILLIN, *University of Pittsburgh*

As a long-time acquaintance of Julian Steward and as a two-time collaborator a good many years ago on projects under his direction, I am delighted to see the publication of a Festschrift in his honor. The present volume has 25 contributors, including the editor.

Although books of this kind are intended to honor a scholar, they are difficult to review in any reasonable space, because the respective contributions are relatively short and usually not organized together in the form of a symposium. As editor Manners says in the present case, "there was no preconceived attempt to give the volume any unity or to impose upon the contributors any restrictions as to subject matter." He has tried to group them under six headings, but "many of the essays could be placed just as handily within a division other than the one to which we have arbitrarily assigned them." In the present notice, then, I shall merely mention a few of the papers which were of particular interest to me, trusting that readers will explore these and the others at their leisure.

Casagrande and his two students, Thompson and Young, describe a new field for research particularly in the emerging and underdeveloped nations, the study of internal colonization. Their descriptions of two areas in Ecuador as of 1962 convinced me of the progress of internal civilizing, since I had visited them many years ago. I am glad that there is now a road north of Puno in the Oriente. In 1934 we were almost up to our necks in mud on some of that stretch.

As a former believer in Santa Claus I was interested in Eric Wolf's unmasking him as a symbol of the old-fashioned market place of Adam Smith. Unfortunately, Wolf does not venture to tell us the shape and size of the replacement that will introduce children to the newer economics.

Morton Fried contributes an interesting short discussion of Chinese communist theory, partly in terms of Steward's notions of core and superstructure. He indicates that if Maoism succeeds, it will show that ideology combined with power can overcome ecological factors.

The persistence of "residual peasantry" in certain Moslem Arab villages of Palestine, despite the abolition of feudalism, increased wage labor, and improved farming techniques is the subject of an interesting chapter by Henry Rosenfeld. Something similar may be taking place in other multicultural, developing countries.

In what he calls a preliminary essay on the topic Harry Shapiro shows that it took the Europeans several centuries after the beginning of the Age of Discovery to develop