must undergo contortions to which patrilineal systems are not subject. (Incidentally, there is a metaparadox here: the contrast itself was proposed by a female anthropologist.)

With the fresh analyses emerging, we now see that the situation was never this simple, owing to the fact that women, as "sisters," often held important positions of authority. In fact, one might suggest that there is also a "patrilineal puzzle." Consider, for example, the case of a woman returning alone or with children to her natal patrilineage. We used to interpret this as society's way of coping with the isolated, perhaps aberrant, female. But turn it about. Suppose that a woman has certain rights and duties as a wife in one lineage and authority as a sister within another. Where she lives and what rights she exercises appear then as positive choices, made under pressures and torn loyalties not unlike those experienced by males in matrilineal systems. From this perspective, certain "odd" patrilineal customs, such as woman-to-woman marriage or females as founders of patrilines, suddenly become explicable. They are responses of females to the divided authority and responsibilities they have. Still, this is an example for the anthropological theoretician. For the rest of us, it again underlines that anthropological data can help liberate us from our own, socially determined, self-images.

But this is not the only conclusion Sacks would urge upon us. She holds that the feminine role is generated by the place of the female within the prevailing mode of production. Indeed, she proposes that kinship relations, such as sister and wife, "are relations of production" (p. 73). Her argument is twofold. She collapses or reduces kinship to production; and she claims that male-female relations are created by the relative control each has over the means of production. Sacks suggests that only such a Marxist view can emancipate our thinking. Some readers, however, might question the argument as well as its relation to Marxism.

In most of the cases Sacks considers, and in most cases anthropologists encounter, relationships between people have a multiplex character. They are at once familial, political, religious, and economic. By contrast, in our own society, relationships appear to have an institutional singularity—for love or money, but not both. Our situation permits the argument that one or another institution ultimately determines the shape of the society. But can such an argument about determination be transported to other contexts? For example, in the case of the patrilineal Lovedu, which Sacks analyzes, women can be said to have "equality" only if their considerable ritual powers are included in the accounting. But this poses a problem. Either Lovedu female-male equality is a mystification (because it occurs at the level of ritual), or the normal slicing into a determining politico-economic base and a determined superstructure is not applicable. Sacks herself indicates that ritual power of females is to be counted as part of their real equality. But in that case what has been said about determination? Ritual roles become not the determined but part of an indissociable whole. One escape from this impasse would be to show how a determining function or "moment," such as the environment, the technology, or production requirements, sets the social roles of the society. Sacks, however, does not suggest this line of reasoning; in fact, she never analytically defines the productive base in order to show that it occupies a separate and determining position. What emerges, therefore, is not a materialistic argument about determination of the sister and wife roles, but a set of holistic contrasts and comparisons concerning females as they engage in the productive process. To recast the argument in this way, however, is not to demean it, for comparison of this type is in the finest of anthropological traditions. If the master key has not been presented, at least Sacks has raised the level of the debate about the position of females in society.

STEPHEN GUDEMAN
Department of Anthropology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 55455

Anglo-Americans Observed

Portraits of "the Whiteman." Linguistic Play and Cultural Symbols among the Western Apache. KEITH H. BASSO. Illustrations by Vincent Craig. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1979. xxii, 120 pp. Cloth, $14.95; paper, $4.95.

This is an unusual study in several ways. It deals with patterns of joking, make-believe scenes in which "Whitemen" are burlesqued, that have developed among the Western Apache of Cibecue, Arizona, in relatively recent years. The preconditions for this complex of behaviors are that the use of English is widespread, even though it is rarely used among Apaches by themselves, and that contact and social interaction with various white people have been regular and experienced by many of the Apache. In order to observe the behavior, the ethnographer has to control the Apache language and be well accepted within the community.

The data consist of a total of 39 performances, of which 12 were observed and 27 are known through report. The performances involved are examples of code switching, where English is used instead of Apache in social situations where Apache is normal. They frequently occur during drinking parties when the joker is relaxed but not drunk, and they involve the collaboration of one other, the butt, with whom the joker enjoys good relations, so that he will not take offense.

Most of the Whitemen portrayed are easily recognized categories of employees of the Indian Agency: doctors, nurses, schoolteachers, clerks. Traders and missionaries as well as whites encountered in nearby towns and cities add to the composite symbol of "the Whiteman," who is always present in Apache minds even when physically absent.

Most instances cited contrast the differences in deference and demeanor and the presentation of the self in social encounters between Apaches and whites. At the end of a joking performance, the butt usually comments that the Whiteman is brash, unthinking, ill-tempered, arrogant, vain, or lacking in respect or goodwill.

But the most important aspect of this study is that it shows a living, creative part of a culture, not reduced to the categories of the standard monograph. All the scenes are created on the spur of the moment. Code switching sets the scene and announces a joking performance to follow. This is quite different from the performances of the Pueblo clowns, whose acts are often planned and rehearsed for days ahead.

The significance of the study can be best summarized by a quotation (p. 82): "Imitations of Anglo-Americans are also statements about what can happen to dignity and self-respect when two systems of sharply discrepant cultural norms collide in social encounters. In the long run, the damage done by such collisions may be just as injurious as mishandled disputes over water rights, land claims, and the sovereignty of native courts."

EDWARD A. KENNARD
Department of Anthropology, University of Nevada, Reno 89557