

Pilotstudien zu Themen wie “Ökonomie im Studentenleben”, “Ökonomie in Paarbeziehungen” und “Ökonomie des Trinkgeldes”. Somit bot sich die Gelegenheit, das Einführungsbuch nicht nur zu rezensieren, sondern es direkt in die Lehre zu integrieren und in der Praxis zu testen. Der Sammelband hat sich, so meine Bilanz, in mehrfacher Hinsicht bewährt: Die Studierenden erhielten durch die (Pflicht-)Lektüre insbesondere der fachhistorischen und theoretischen Beiträge einen sehr guten Einblick in die verschiedenen Schulen, Begriffe und Konzepte und konnten dieses Wissen für ihre eigenen Studien fruchtbar machen. Obschon nicht alle Fallstudien im Rahmen des Seminars gelesen werden konnten, so zeigte sich bei der Auswahl der zur Diskussion gestellten Texte großes Interesse für viele der im Band versammelten Forschungsthemen. Auch seitens der Studierenden gab es Worte des Lobes: Das Einführungsbuch und die darin enthaltenen Artikel seien sehr klar strukturiert, leicht verständlich und auch das Schaubild wurde als hilfreich bewertet. Während der Vorbereitung und Durchführung der Pilotstudien haben die Studierenden das Buch immer wieder zur Hand genommen. Als Fazit lässt sich festhalten, dass der vorliegende Sammelband einen sehr guten Überblick über das Forschungsfeld der Ökonomischen Anthropologie bietet und damit ein empfehlenswertes Instrument im Studium und in der Lehre ist.

Oliwia Murawska

Severi, Carlo, and William F. Hanks (eds.): *Translating Worlds. The Epistemological Space of Translation*. Chicago: HAU Books, 2015. 324 pp. ISBN 978-0-9861325-1-3. Price: \$ 25.00

This pioneering anthology reminds us that translation sits at the very heart of anthropology. Whether we take field notes, analyze social institutions, or craft ethnographic descriptions, our anthropological work is essentially translation. Moreover, translation is present in every step of the social life we study, be it “religious conversion, cultural mimesis, or messianic movements” (10). How so? Translation is more than traditional cross-language translation; also, it is about intralingual translation (paraphrasing and reporting within one language) as well as cross-modal translation between different modes of expression (speech, gesture, writing, dance, painting, etc.). Throughout the chapters, an abundance of fascinating ethnographic examples of translation processes are brought forward, from encounters between tourists, interpreters, and local Korowai of Papua to mythology being transmuted into weaving and music in Amazonia. Although each chapter engages with different arguments relating to ontology, mimesis, and other contemporary debates in anthropology, they all converge in a concerted thesis. Even though translation of worlds may seem unsurmountable in theory, translation processes occur all over, and we should take them as fruitful sites for anthropological theorization, be it our own translations or our informants’. “In order to understand ‘cultures’,” the editors Carlo Severi and William F. Hanks contend, we should focus on “the constant *work of translation* of languages,

nonlinguistic codes, contexts of communication, and different traditions, which constitutes the field of ‘cultural knowledge,’ both within a single tradition and in different societies” (16).

This introductory proposition is substantiated throughout the chapters with excellent cases of translations between or within “*worlds*,” defined as “oriented contexts for the apprehension of reality” (10). In chapter one, Hanks shows us from his Yucatec Maya field the ethnographic importance of paying attention to the intralingual translations of our informants. In the second chapter, Severi takes us to the Upper Orinoco region and shows that our informants’ work of translation between different modes of expression (mythology, weaving, music) is a formidable “chance to observe the dynamics of thought processes, and to study how they operate, both in adapting to constraints and in exploiting possibilities.” In the third chapter, Rupert Stasch shows us the respective power of knowing and of not knowing languages in his Papua field of Korowai people and Western tourists. In chapter four, Anne-Christine Taylor takes translation as a prism for understanding Jivaroan Achuar shamans and their alternations between and domestications of heterogeneous discourses. In the fifth chapter, we are back in New Guinea, this time with Alan Rumsey who introduces us to highland children who establish equivalence between three different languages and social words. The sixth chapter is a study of the ostensibly simple word “menu” (i.e., restaurant menu) by Adam Yuet Chau, and he analyzes how closely words and worlds are connected with a point of departure in a thought exercise: Imagine the task of translating the word “menu” into the language of a tribe of hunter-gatherers. This, Chau argues, would take countless supplementary explanations of our social world: What is a restaurant? What is eating out? Why entrust a stranger to cook for you? Why do people talk while eating? What is money? Why can’t we sleep in the restaurant? This is indeed food for thought for ethnographers trying to convey knowledge from far-away fields to Western readers. In chapter seven, Bruce Mannheim argues from his field among the Southern Quechua that ethnography has to be seen as an updated version of Quine’s “radical translation”; that “[e]very translation requires the ethnographer to make substantive claim about Quechua ontological commitments” (215). In chapter eight, Carlos Fausto and Emmanuel de Vienne present a fascinating Amerindian case of a self-proclaimed prophet who for a period of time managed to identify with both the local Sun-God Taugi and the Christian God by the means of what Fausto and de Vienne term *translating acts*. In the ninth chapter, John Leavitt identifies in historical retrospect – from the Tower of Babel to Renaissance Italians, late 18th-century German philosophers, and Franz Boas – two principal lines in European attitude towards translation, namely a *domesticating* and a *foreignizing* practice. The tenth and final chapter is a reflection “On the Very Possibility of Mutual Intelligibility” in which the author, G. E. R. Lloyd, concludes that good ethnography demands “suspending disbelief and being prepared to revise just about everything we normally take for granted

about those key concepts of person, agency, causation, space, time” (308).

We know that translation is difficult. One might even say that *theoretically* “full transference from one to another normal linguistic frame ... is impossible” (262). We all know and probably agree to some extent with the well-known aphorism *traduttore traditore* (“translator [=] traitor”) about the inevitable loss, distortion, or betrayal in translation. The problem is, as Franz Rosenzweig puts it concisely, that translation means serving two masters: the source language and the target language. These two masters might seem utterly incommensurable with very fundamental differences in tense, number, deixis, obligatory categories, ontological commitments, etc. “And yet in practice is it both possible and necessary” to translate Leavitt insists (262), and this is demonstrated very convincingly in this book, for example in Leavitt’s own thorough translation of Kumaoni narrative poetry.

Commercial translation tends to favor the target language and, thereby, warp the source language into “a usable text, that is, a normal-sounding or normal-reading text in the target language” (262). Anthropology, on the contrary, should recall the methods of good, old philology and be fearless, even welcoming, of the “monstrous” translations that professional translators shun at all costs. By “monstrous” Leavitt means translations which by any means necessarily try to convey to the reader a holistic understanding of not only the content of something but also its poetry, rhythm, intertextuality, etc. All these dimensions may easily disappear if the anthropologist is not willing to venture into elaborate explanations of the context, creating neologisms when necessary, and staying fearless of producing a far-from-normal-sounding text.

After having turned the last and 324th page of this comprehensive anthology, I find myself a good deal more familiar with classic language theory (Jakobson, Saussure, Boas, Sapir, etc.) as well as state-of-the-art linguistic anthropology in which several of the contributors must be considered spearheads. There are next to no shortcomings to put one’s finger on in this book, however, one could perhaps want an epilogue that tied in with Severi and Hank’s principal lines from the introduction. Nevertheless, I would not hesitate to call this a masterpiece of great relevance to any ethnographer whose struggles with translating has piqued her or his curiosity about the epistemological space of translation.

Anders Norge Lauridsen

Tae, Jonathan: *The Patient Multiple. An Ethnography of Healthcare and Decision-Making in Bhutan.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2017. 220 pp. ISBN 978-1-78533-394-1. (Wyse Series in Social Anthropology, 4). Price: \$ 110.00

Jonathan Tae’s monograph is a medical anthropological plea to view “patient-hood” as a multiple event, not just as an anthropological exercise but with a view of multiplicity in mind that could potentially affect patient care on the ground. With the rare access of a full year for research in Bhutan, Tae was able to carry out fieldwork in

the capital Thimphu as well as in urban areas around Mongar in eastern Bhutan. He presents an in-depth ethnography of the scarcely studied medical landscape of Bhutan.

Firmly based in detailed ethnographic accounts on healthcare-seeking in Bhutan, Tae argues for a nuanced view that integrates the various medical approaches patients choose from in the pluralistic health care field in Bhutan. His examples call for expanding the predominantly biomedical public health care system, taking into account patients’ needs for divinatory and other forms of what he calls “traditional” (state-sponsored *sowa rigpa*) and “alternative” (all types of other religious and folk healing) medical practices. While his divisions between “biomedical,” “traditional,” and “alternative” might serve us to understand and categorize various healing traditions, they could seem artificial when looking at the book’s ethnographic examples, since people locally do not think in these categories and make use of all kinds of medical practices. The ethnographies themselves show that “in the everyday reality of decision-making processes, patients are rarely troubled by or rejective of mutually exclusive views of practices, healths and bodies” (103). Many different types of practices (diet, calling lost souls, taking medicines, undergoing surgery, visiting diviners, etc.) are all perceived as part of “healing,” and, as Tae himself admits, this “ethnographic diversity makes it difficult to theoretically manage an assortment of practices” (41). However, Tae navigates this problem more successfully by relying on theories of “assemblages” trying to grasp the synthesis that different materialities (e.g., a scalpel) across practices (e.g., surgery and ritual) might have for patients.

The book is an important contribution to our understanding of how a small country like Bhutan handles the diversity of healing practices in their emerging public health system. Tae describes the efforts that have been made to integrate native healing practices into biomedical health care in ethical ways that “preserve culture and traditions, but ensure they don’t hurt people” (17). The reader will get a good understanding of how this is implemented and how this process has its risks, failures, and benefits.

Based on Annemarie Mol’s ontological notion of the “body multiple” (2003), Tae introduces the practices of “patient multiple” over five chapters. One of the main ethnographic patient accounts is of the young woman Pema, introduced in chapter 1, who over years travels through the landscapes of different medical practices in Bhutan in an attempt to receive cure for two diseases. Tae sees “disease” as it is enacted by patients who go through it and which exists “both in and out of biomedical interpretations” (58). Thus, in Pema’s example, her nosebleed can have both a spiritual physiology and a Buddhist etiology. Both are informed by biomedical biologies and offer a good example of what it means to be a “patient multiple” as well as a “body multiple” that experiences surgery, traditional cutting, and sucking therapies, seeks out diviners, and takes bitter herbal pills.

Chapter 2 explains the multiple medical contexts of Bhutan and introduces *sowa rigpa*, a complex medical tradition elsewhere known as “Tibetan medicine” and