

and more participatory planning in the future - a very optimistic assessment.

The chapter on Rajasthan's state finances is, in my opinion, too descriptive for a study which emphasizes the close relationship between political and economic questions. Considering how extraordinarily delicate relations between the central state and provinces are in India, I would have expected to find more about this in the context of budget development. In addition, the chapter contains a table which is hardly to be interpreted (see p.501), but from which one must infer that between 1956 and 1981 the per capita income in Rajasthan sank by almost thirty percent.

In all, however, Peter Meyer-Dohm's and Shantilal Sarupria's study offers everyone interested in this increasingly significant developing country important information, an interesting portrayal of historical and political developments, as well as thought-provoking regional and economic-political analyses. It illustrates the problems of a large developing country by a case study of one of its states.

Hans-Bernd Schäfer

GEORG PFEFFER: *Status and Affinity in Middle India.* (Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung, 76). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982. 104 pp., DM 20.-

This book by G. Pfeffer contains a lot of valuable information (partly from written sources, partly from his own field research).

'Status and affinity' contains two parts, one on Hinduization and dual sovereignty, the other on alliance systems. This second part gives us new material on a hotly debated issue.

Part one treats the dual sovereignty in Indian populations in the sacral and secular realm. Especially in the hills (I.3) duality is shown in kinship as well and thus this theme is not restricted to the second part. Although there are chapters on nomenclature, dual leadership, and dual organization, dualistic conceptions are the main subject of this part.

The chapter on nomenclature contains some ideas which are repeated in the second part, i.e. that persons who are identified terminologically are treated in an identical manner as regards marriage regulations, a theory, stemming originally from Radcliffe-Brown, but which does not convince me. In the following paragraph Pfeffer says that all matrilineal cross-cousins are named elder siblings and proscribed, which of course can hold water only when 'male speaking' (or the contrary) is added. Further, it is said that Rona and Parenga label all cross-cousins as 'elder siblings'. If this is true, everybody is 'senior' to the other.

The second part deals with the same region and populations, but mainly

from another point of view: alliance and the distance of seniority in kinship or between moiety-like groups or categories, esp. the negative and positive rules regulating marriage behaviour and the kinship terminologies seen in relation to these norms. Since the research of Louis Dumont on India and Needham's work on symmetric and asymmetric alliance systems there has been a great specialization and sophistication, so that texts along these lines are more and more difficult to understand for anthropologists belonging to the descent camp in the 'muddle of the models' (David Schneider). The style is very technical and some expressions are nowhere explained. So we do not learn whether the term 'cross-cousin' means the real ones only or also those described by Lounsbury as "cross-cousins" (in double quotation marks).

We do not know whether 'descriptive' means the same as with Morgan and the critique of this term is not mentioned. I think it is very problematic to contrast 'individual terms' and 'collective categories' (p.90 and *passim*). Of course individual kin terms are categories, too.

These critical remarks should not diminish the value of this study, which places a lot of well ordered and interpreted material on Indian systems at the disposal of the interested anthropologist.

The discussion between descent-theorists and alliance-theorists (the terms were coined by Dumont and elaborated on by Schneider 1965) has been characterized by mutual misunderstandings. Leach reproached Fortes 1957 with disguising affinal ties as complementary filiation. As proof of his thesis, he adduced ethnographic material on the Kachin, but Fortes never said anything about their customs.

Scheffler brings forth some arguments against weak points in Dumont's work and continues in a vein which shows that he has understood nothing of marriage in alliance systems. Insofar he is rightly criticized by Pfeffer. The latter attacks the reviewer in another paper for reducing affinity to one generation (which of course, I did not) and presuming that everybody uses the concepts of primary and secondary kin-relations, which, according to Pfeffer, is not generally true. I, of course, presume that everybody uses these concepts and find it confirmed in reading Pfeffer's book, because he uses concepts of primary and secondary (and tertiary for that matter) relations, too, but implicitly.

Pfeffer has shown that the realm of alliance systems is very diversified indeed, and that in some systems there is a marriage behaviour which does not differ much from those in descent systems. So I think it would be better to drop mutual accusations and to discuss concepts, the ambiguity of which has often blurred understandings. Pfeffer's book could be a good starting point for this effort towards mutual agreement.

Ernst Wilhelm Müller