Makassar in the ethnographic literature and a description of Bontolowe, the village where he did his fieldwork. This first part ends with a summary of the process in which he obtained his data.

After an introduction to the social organization with its bilateral kinship groups, the second part deals with traditional religious beliefs and the "adat" in Bontolowe and provides information about the history and characteristics of Islam in the village. The villagers believe in Allah but also worship sacred places and their ancestors, and the worship of the holy mountain "Bawakaraeng" takes up a central position in upland Makassar belief.

The third part is allotted to the analysis of 48 case studies. The data presented by the author show that there are traditional farming rites, protection rites, curing rites, and rites of passage; magic and sorcery are excluded. The author gives a brief description of each case study, describing the background of all participants involved. Numerous genealogical diagrams help to clear up the often difficult relations.

Rossler contextualizes the rituals in several orders of meaning. First, he interprets the performances in the light of interpretations drawn from interviews with the participants. Second, he contextualizes the rituals in the light of knowledge of Makassar society and history. It seems that the rites are a forum to calm down and to solve social conflicts. Discussions about whether the ritual was carried out properly or not, or about whether people deliberately did not accept an invitation, or had not received an invitation at all, are very helpful. But solving conflict is the main concern of Makassar society.

One theme is the expansion of traditional ritual performance in the face of change. It seems that the people have intensified their ritual activities, and persons whose wealth and standard of living have risen are especially keen to perform rituals.

Rossler's dissertation is well organized, full of details, and suitable as an interesting study of the Makassar in South-Sulawesi.

Doris Gröpper
Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz
Berlin


When Clark E. Cunningham, in his classic paper on the Atoni house, used the expression "comparative sociology of the house," the idea of such a field of study was so new that he added a footnote crediting Godfrey Lienhardt with the suggestion (Cunningham 1964, 67). This bespeaks the situation in the sixties when it was as yet quite uncommon for social anthropologists to focus research on the house. However, in the seventies and eighties anthropological studies dealing with the house steadily grew in number, so that by now even comparative and synthetic works are becoming possible.

Roxana Waterson's book belongs to the latter category. As the text on the jacket rightly claims, it is "the first of its kind to present a detailed picture of the house within the social and symbolic worlds of South-East Asian peoples." The main focus is on
Indonesia, where the author has done most of her field research. Numerous firsthand observations, references, and quotations from anthropological and ethnographic literature (many translated from the Dutch) make the book an unusually rich source of information, while a thought-provoking and well-written text, supplemented by photographs and other illustrations, makes its reading an intellectual adventure and a pleasure. As a work that both mirrors the state of research and invites to test new interpretations, this book may justly be called a milestone on the rugged way to a better knowledge and understanding of vernacular architecture in Southeast Asia.

In the introduction, the author comments on the history of research in what is now sometimes called "anthropology of architecture," a field of study to which scholars from various disciplines, including architecture and history of architecture, are making contributions. In the first chapter, which deals with the question of prehistoric origins, Waterson discusses linguistic theories and archaeological sources from southern China and Japan. Open to new ways of understanding, she sides with the as yet uncommon view that we had better try to understand the "Indonesian-type" house in a wider "Austronesian" perspective rather than continue to explain some of its most conspicuous features by reference to a hypothetical late influence from bronze-age Dong Son culture (24-25). From the problem of remote origins the author then turns to the more recent past by asking how Southeast Asian houses and villages were perceived, praised, and criticized by earlier European visitors.

Having dealt with some of the historical questions, Waterson enters into a thematic treatment of the many different aspects of her subject. To mention here only the main topics: interrelations between buildings of different function (including origin-houses, temples, altars, granaries, and temporary structures); technology and its symbolic aspects; the house and the village as reflections of the cosmos; the notion of semangat and the "living" house; the house as an organizing principle of kinship systems; rules regarding the use of space; the interplay between spatial contrasts and social categories; gender symbolism and the association of women with agriculture and buildings (house and granary); the houses of the dead; recent developments of traditional styles. As it is quite impossible to characterize in a few sentences the contents of a work so rich in interesting discussions, ideas, and references, I restrict my further comments to four topics discussed in the central parts of the book.

In the chapter "Technology and Symbolism" the author ends by drawing attention to the fact that construction systems often display features that cannot be explained neatly in terms of practical considerations (88-90). The point is a very important one, but it could be better illustrated. One of the examples given in this context is not really convincing (I doubt that the rope mentioned in the quotation on page 88 is "not essential structurally"), while some others would seem to fit better into other chapters where the question is how ordinary ("practical") parts of the house are often subject to symbolic interpretation. Surprisingly, some of the most conspicuous "parafunctional" aspects of many Indonesian house types—gable horns, projecting beam ends, cantilever-like gable constructions—are not discussed in this context at all, although they are mentioned in other parts of the book.

In the following chapter ("Cosmologies") the relationships between houses or villages and ideas of the world are treated, mainly by reference to the idea of a spatial "navel-center" and by means of the Lévi-Straussian concept of "concentric dualism." Insofar as this latter notion considers the importance of both center and periphery, it marks a progress over other views that focus on the "center" in a rather one-sided manner. But it may be doubted that as a heuristic tool it is really adequate to all problems involved in the subject. As I see it, only a diachronic approach—and one
that also pays full attention to spatial bipolarities—might eventually enable us to understand a contradiction such as is mentioned on p. 192 (the center as boundary) or not mentioned on p. 97 (the *terminal*, or *liminal*, spatial position of the "navel temples" in Bali). Another point to consider in studies of house/cosmos relationships is not only that houses and villages are known to be sometimes conceived as "reflections" of the cosmos, but that architecture may occasionally both *reflect* and *generate* a cosmology (Shanklin 1985, 146). It has even been suggested that we might have to assume a process of projection and reflection, starting rather from concrete models of human scale than from ideas about the structure of the big world (Topitsch 1958).

Waterson chooses not to deal with both of these two sides of the coin in her discussion of cosmologies, but she does display pioneering spirit when she comes, in a later chapter, to the subject of kinship systems. Following a new approach suggested by Lévi-Strauss’s concept of "house societies," she claims that "we can make more sense of the apparent irregularities of these systems only if we reverse matters and treat the *house* itself as the determining feature of the system." Accordingly, she argues "that the kinship systems of the archipelago, in all their variety, can best be understood only when the house is taken as their main organizing principle" (138).

Finally, a note on the all-important idea implied in the book's well-chosen title, which is also the heading of one of the central chapters. The "living" house is the house "as an animate entity," and it is animate due to a "pervasive life-force," often called *semangat*, which "in differing concentrations" may attach to it (115). The reasons for the presence of *semangat* in the house are various; the main sources mentioned by Waterson are: the life-force of the trees used for timber, the process of construction, the attendant building rituals, the association of the house with the idea of a living body (either human or animal), and, of course, also the fact that the house has people living in it (136). With regard to the architectonic aspect I find particularly interesting the native idea that the *semangat* of a house "comes automatically into existence as the various parts of the walls and roof are fitted together" (quotation on p. 118). If seen in combination with the Malayan principle of "one house, one tree" (118) and the "Austronesian theme" of "trunk" and "tip" (or "top"); 124-25), this idea seems to belong to a symbolism that interprets the house as a re-integrated living tree. And the house/tree metaphor not only calls to mind the old Indian idea, expressed in Purana literature, that the first houses had been conceived by reflecting on the structure of a primeval kind of "house-like trees" provided by nature for the benefit of mankind (Dumont 1973, 438); it also reminds us that true architecture is to transform the mere shelter into a living house.

Roxana Waterson's book should be read by all who are interested in an anthropological view of architecture.
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TIBET

One may think that My Tibet is a farfetched choice for a review in this journal.  It is, no doubt, neither a treatise on Buddhism nor a report of Tibetan folklore, it is a very personal document of Tibetan culture produced through the cooperation of one of the culture’s most eminent representatives with a most sympathetic outside observer.  This cooperation gives the book its character because many of the captions to the photographs are spontaneous comments by the Dalai Lama: memories and reflections elicited during a slideshow by Rowell.

The comments cover an astonishing array of aspects of Tibetan life, not just of the monks but also of the common people.  In fact, they become a direct illustration of an idea expressed in one of the essays, viz., that Buddhism is not the only philosophy to shape Tibetan culture, and that it itself is deeply shaped by the particular Tibetan environment.  These comments are naturally short but their ideas are more extensively argued in the six essays.  There the Dalai Lama explains in simple language the basic tenets of his thought, such as compassion, peace of mind, and happiness.  He speaks of these states of mind as being the source for an all-embracing peace that also includes the environment.  The essays reveal not only the author’s gentle assuredness concerning his own culture but also a great amount of tolerance.

I hasten to say that the photographs are as essential to this book as the comments and that the combination of both is a most happy one.  Rowell describes his own work as “participatory photography,” saying that he wants to be part of the events he portrays and not simply their spectator (17).  Whether his subjects are individuals, scenes from Tibetan life, or landscapes and wildlife, they all bespeak his own personal involvement without imposing his interpretation on the viewer.  Quite to the contrary, they invite the viewer to make his own discoveries under the guidance of the comments and so they come alive within a wider cultural context.  Such discoveries become richer and richer as the viewer or reader grows familiar with the book’s style and message.

The message is peace and so it is quite fitting that it starts with the citation of the Nobel Peace Prize awarded to the Dalai Lama in 1989.  How this peace is to grow out of compassion for all sentient beings and of a sense of responsibility for the whole environment is the topic of the essays.  Coming from a leader very much concerned for the culture of his people, this book’s message is something like a comment to the concerns treated in this issue of Asian Folklore Studies.  Seen from this angle, My Tibet is a document of how one can be deeply rooted in a culture, be confident and secure in this attitude, without becoming exclusive or judgmental towards other and different