

REVIEWS

THE UPPER TANANA INDIANS

By ROBERT A. MCKENNAN. *New Haven: Yale University. Yale University Publications in Anthropology, No. 55. 9¾ X 6¾ inches, 226 pages, 4 plates, 7 text figures, paper, \$3.00.*

This is another paper in the *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* dealing with northern Athapaskan peoples. Dr. McKennan's work continues in the sound tradition established for the series. The volume presents in standard ethnographic form the results of Dr. McKennan's field work among the Upper Tanana during the season 1929-30. Each aspect of the culture of these people is described, starting with economics and ending with mythology. No criticism can be made of this approach since this is the first major study of these people and especially since at the time the field work was done this was the accepted approach to ethnographic reporting. The great need for descriptions of subarctic peoples gives value to accounts such as this, unembellished by theoretical concepts and "bones of contention".

Several minor points regarding Dr. McKennan's study should, however, be mentioned. Perhaps the most important is his remarks on the absence of hunting territories among the Upper Tanana (p. 128). Although they lack hunting territories as defined by Speck and others, the "bands" of Upper Tanana do exploit particular areas. The size of these bands, which are on the average slightly larger than the twentieth-century land-owning groups of the eastern Subarctic, does fall within the range found in the latter area. Accordingly, a variant type of hunting territory appears to exist among the Upper Tanana and it may be similar to that which existed in the eastern Subarctic at the time of the first meeting between the white man and the Indians. A second point is his discussion of clans among the Upper

Tanana. The inclusion of specific case material to document the organization and structure of these clans would have been welcome. Third, there are a few statements that are misleading, for instance, p. 18, "Tetling Village, nine miles 'south' of Last Tetling . . ." should read 'north'; p. 71, his description of the winter lodge is confusing and only becomes intelligible when he quotes Tappan Adney.

The above comments are not meant to detract from Dr. McKennan's work. It is a sound ethnographic study, well written, and certainly a worthwhile contribution to the literature pertaining to the peoples of the Subarctic.

EDWARD S. ROGERS

RUSSIAN-ENGLISH GLOSSARY AND SOVIET CLASSIFICATION OF ICE FOUND AT SEA.

Compiled by BORIS N. MANDROVSKY. *Washington: Reference Department, Library of Congress. 1959. 10¼ X 8 inches; vi + 30 pages; mimeographed; \$0.30; obtainable from Card Division, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.*

This useful work reproduces and provides English equivalents for the sea ice terms in N. I. Yevgenov (Evgenov, according to the system of transliteration used by the Library of Congress and in *Arctic Bibliography*): *Al'bom ledovykh obrazovaniy na moryakh* (Leningrad, 1955), now in official Soviet use. The English equivalent terms, often exact fits, are those in current United States use, taken from Hydrological Office Publication No. 609: *A functional glossary of ice terminology* (Washington, 1952), or failing that, from the World Meteorological Organization Publication: *Abridged international ice nomenclature* (Geneva, 1956). Some of the divergences between the three systems

become apparent; in particular the compiler's chart showing three sets of definitions of terms for size and concentration of floes are interesting. At first one is saddened to see how two countries that both approved the W.M.O. classification and nomenclature in practice ignore it. But perhaps after all it is the amount of common ground between them that is the more noteworthy. One point of detail might be mentioned. For the Russian "*massiv l'da*" the compiler rejects this reviewer's term "ice cluster". Agreed that it could be improved; but is "pack, or ice pack" in fact any better, in view of likely confusion with "pack ice", which means something rather different?

TERENCE ARMSTRONG

SCHAMANENTUM (SHAMANISM).

By HANS FINDEISEN. *Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Urban-Bücher No. 28. 1957. 7¼ X 4½ inches, 240 pages, sketch map, 4 plates with 14 Figs. Paper, DM 4.80.*

DAS TIER ALS GOTT, DAEMON UND AHNE (THE ANIMAL AS GOD, DEMON, AND ANCESTOR)

By HANS FINDEISEN. *Stuttgart: Frankh'sche Verlagshandlung, Kosmos-Bändchen. 1956. 7½ X 5 inches, 80 pages, 14 Figs., DM 2.80.*

Hans Findeisen is a German ethnologist specializing in the peoples of northern Asia. His record of publications extends over three decades, and among his earliest writings is an excellent article on fishing in northeastern Siberia; in it he relates the economic activity to the social, religious, and artistic life of the Palaeo-Asiatic peoples (*Die Fischerei im Leben der altsibirischen Völkerstämme. Z. Ethn. 1928, 1/3*).

During the past decade Findeisen has published a number of books and articles, usually brief, on shamanism in northern Asia. A recent publication, "Siberian shamanism and magic," first issued in 1953 (*Sibirisches Schamanentum und Magie, Inst. für Menschen- und*

Menschheitskunde, Augsburg, 2nd ed. 1958) has a technical purpose: Findeisen rejects the oft-proposed relationship between magic and shamanism and attributes to the Siberian shaman a direct relationship with spirits, mediums, and parapsychological practitioners of western cultural tradition. Findeisen has been working closely with a spirit medium, Alfred M. of Augsburg and joins this sphere of investigation to that of shamanism.

The relationship between shamanism and spiritism has recently been developed by him in the first book under review, a popular paperback, "Shamanism", 1957. Here he proposes that the shaman is an Upper Palaeolithic priest possessed by spirits. The relationship of the shaman's practice with hunting magic has been suggested by Findeisen in yet another study, "The animal as god, demon and ancestor".

The parallel that Findeisen draws between shamanism and the practice of the spirit medium appears to me to defy usual ethnological procedure. In all his descriptions the folk or public plays no role. The cultural context is not sketched in. The relationship of shamanism to psychiatry on one side and to religion on the other is not treated. Moreover, Findeisen has not resolved his views on the relationship between shamanism and magic. This relationship may be (a) erroneous, (b) genetic, but later divergent; or (c) inherent and inseparable. Findeisen appears to adopt in recent times now view (a) and now view (b); view (c) is firmly rejected, but chiefly by appeal to authority (Ruth Benedict and others).

Considering the Upper Palaeolithic priest possessed by spirits as a shaman can lead to confusion. In counterposition to this point it may be suggested that the term priest should be reserved for members of a religious hierarchy trained for their role. The shaman is sometimes trained, but he is characteristically charismatic, he is not a member of a religious community or hierarchy.

There is an alternative view, namely, that shamanism is neither a magical nor a religious phenomenon, but a proper