
Reviewed by IVAN KARP, Bloomington.

Conventional wisdom holds that a serious shortcoming of the British tradition in social anthropology is its failure to consider psychological factors when it analyzes social action. Doubly serious, then, is the British tradition's neglect, in its symbolic studies, to examine the connection between symbols and sentiments: for any interpretation of symbolism must examine the symbol's intrinsic connection with sentiment, must take into account both cognitive and affective dimensions of symbolic behavior. As his title suggests, the editor of the present collection has brought this group of studies together in order to correct the British tradition's neglect of psychological considerations in its studies of symbolism. In doing so he has illustrated the force of conventional wisdom.

His brash introductory essay is devoted to describing the reasons for the shortcomings he sees in the British tradition. In his view these reasons are many. Primarily, he suggests, there is the party line of British social anthropology, which is descended from Durkheim via Radcliffe-Brown. This ideology eschews "psychological" explanations as inadmissible in the analysis of social facts. But, Lewis argues, Durkheim himself admitted to psychological explanations, at least on occasion, and psychological explanations are essential for the analysis of symbolic behavior. So essential are they, he argues, that social anthropologists do use them, but in an ad hoc and uncritical fashion. Lewis also adduces a number of subsidiary reasons as to why psychological, that is, affective, factors are missing from symbolic studies. The two most important are these: First, the American culture and personality school of cultural anthropology committed errors so egregious that British social anthropologists have recoiled in horror from attempting the same task. Second, the influence of Lévi-Strauss's insistence on viewing affect in symbolism as derived from a more primary cognitive base has resulted in a lack of interest in sentiments.
The remaining essays in the book are devoted to illustrating the value of examining the significance of the affective dimension of symbolic behavior. They are written by social anthropologists and psychologists invited by Lewis to take part in a symposium that he organized at the University of London. The essential question to ask of a collection such as this is not whether individual contributions have merit (many of them are excellent). Rather, it is whether taken together they advance our understanding of the affective element in symbolic behavior, as the editor claims. The answer must be that they do not, and the reasons are twofold. First of all, they do not present any novel perspectives that allow a better understanding of the role of affect on symbolic behavior. Second, they do not consider in any systematic fashion what aspects of psychological approaches might be useful to anthropologists studying symbolic systems.

The heart of the problem is that Lewis fails to recognize that social anthropology already has a fairly well-developed social psychology of symbolism and that any further advances may be impeded by the same difficulties that beset this social psychology. I have used the notion of social psychology here in the review for the first time because the editor does not differentiate psychology and social psychology, and his failure to do so leads him to ignore both the merits and problems in the social psychological approach to symbolism that is characteristic of social anthropology.

British social anthropology has been characterized by two approaches to the analysis of symbols and sentiments. The first is a crude correlationism of the kind that is found in Durkheim's classic *Suicide*. The author assumes that universal and commonsense psychological principles can explain the association between some rates and the organization of society. A modern example is Lewis's own *Ecstatic Religion*, where he regards the subordinate status of women as the cause of the high rate of spirit possession among women in societies where they are prone to this form of religious experience. For Lewis the fact of possession is a direct symbolic expression of women's pursuit of goal in the face of disenfranchisement by men. There is no attempt in this type of study to discover the meaning of the symbol for the actor. The assumption is made that the symbol is really a mask for some universal psychological drive such as gratification, pursuit of power, release of pain, and so on.

The second tradition is more sophisticated. It is associated with the works of Evans-Pritchard, Beidelman, and Lienhardt, among others. It views symbolic behavior as a means of both expressing and mediating experience. In this second approach there is a relationship between belief and symbol, and symbolic behavior becomes a means for actors to give an image to conflict and contradiction, and hence organize their attitudes and feelings about their experience of the natural and social worlds in which they live. The social psychological function of symbolic behavior in the public and private worlds. Often the relationship is achieved are based on objects and cultural creations. This is one such metaphor. The question in the second psychology that this second approach are that they are raised by some benefit as he might, were to take part in a symposium taken together they advance our understanding of the affective element in social psychology. I have used the notion of social psychology here in the analysis of symbols and sentiments. The first is a crude correlationism of the kind that is found in semiotics, even if it is not a common metaphor that symbolic forms such as etymologies of the self that allow for persons to the organization. In a remarkable essay, the concept of a symbol used by Gell is an important part of his order. Hence, the ambiguity of a symbol, among the Umeda of New Guinea, is a form of non-discursive meaning that symbolism as a means of communicating identity of objects and cultural creations. The second is an important part of the symbolic expression. In this Rycroft brings psychological works, such as Dar es Salaam provides a possible basis for some parts of the other essays -- most notably symbolism in childhood and adolescence. Through intimacy in English royal mother themes in Sikh society. It is among private and public meanings, and cultural dimensions of symbolism and the arguments provocative. A's which raised issues that the contributor would have made this collection important.
function of symbolic behavior in this second type of study is to relate actors' public and private worlds. Often the symbolic forms through which this relationship is achieved are based on metaphorical relations between naturally found objects and cultural creations. The human body as a symbol for the body politic is one such metaphor. The question of "why natural symbols" is thus a perennial one in the social psychology of symbolism. These considerations associated with this second approach are not raised by Lewis in his introduction. Hence when they are raised by some of the contributors to this volume, the reader does not benefit as he might, were there an introduction relating the collected studies to problems that arise out of such ongoing concerns in British social anthropology.

That said, there is much in this book that is of value to an audience interested in semiotics, even if it remains implicit. An important issue raised by a number of papers is the increasing awareness among anthropologists that they have tended to confuse the different sign systems of ritual and language. Alfred Gell's brilliant paper, "Magic, Perfume, Dream," argues forcefully that ritual symbols communicate messages whose essential ambiguity and indeterminacy is an important part both of their meaning and their relationship to the social order. Hence, the ambiguity of a symbolic code based on smells, such as found among the Umeda of New Guinea, is a more appropriate vehicle for the expression of non-discursive meaning than language. Abner Cohen examines symbolism as a means of generating messages about the nature of the self. He argues that symbolic forms such as ethnicity and religion provide common definitions of the self that allow for persons to reunite in the absence of corporate group organization. In a remarkable essay the psychoanalyst Charles Rycroft subjects the concept of a symbol used by orthodox Freidians to a rethinking that argues that symbolic expressions combine both abstract, rational thinking (secondary process thinking) with non-discursive, condensive, thinking (primary process thinking). In this Rycroft brings psychoanalytic theory in line with some recent anthropological works, such as Dan Sperber's recent *Rethinking Symbolism*, and provides a possible basis for some genuine interdisciplinary collaboration. Many of the other essays -- most notably those by John Payne on violence and symbolism in childhood and adolescence, by David Starkey on representation through intimacy in English royal ritual, and by Paul Hershman on virgin and mother themes in Sikh society -- contribute case studies of the relationships among private and public meanings, individual and social aspects, or natural and cultural dimensions of symbolism. The data are rich and well presented and the arguments provocative. A systematic and thoughtful introduction which raised issues that the contributors then sought to answer in their essays would have made this collection important rather than simply interesting.
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Reviewed by ANN SHUKMAN, Oxford.

It is now over a decade and a half since Soviet semiotics sprang Minerva-like, full-armed, onto the Soviet intellectual scene, and more than a decade since Western commentators first became aware of the phenomenon. But such is the nature of Soviet semiotic writings, often fragmentary, often obscure, always difficult to obtain, that in spite of the volume of the output it is only very recently that they have become available in the West in any kind of organized presentation. Daniel Lucid is to be congratulated on being one of the pioneers in this respect with his well-chosen anthology. (For other anthologies in English, see Baran 1976; O'Toole and Shukman 1975-1979; New Literary History, Volume 9, 1978; a special issue of PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature, Vol.3, No.3 1978. For anthologies in French, German, and Italian, see Lotman and Ouspenski 1976; Lotman 1974a; Eimermacher, forthcoming; Faccani and Eco 1969; and Lotman and Uspenski 1973. For bibliographies of works available in English see Eimermacher and Skishkoff 1976 and Shukman 1978).

Looking back from the perspective of today to December 1962 and the heady days of the Moscow Symposium on the Structural Study of Sign Systems, which was when Soviet semiotics began its public existence, it is possible to discern three fairly distinct stages of development, each marked by the prominence of particular personalities and the predominance of particular leading ideas or central concerns.
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