

und Otto, der das Konzept der Ergriffenheit gegen Faktensammlung setzt, und zum späteren Eranos-Kreis. Die Bedeutung der Mythentheorie und Erzählungen Frobenius' im Collège de sociologie, etwa in den Mimesis-Konzepten (Mimikry) bei Caillois, kommt nicht vor. Die sehr kritische Aufnahme des Négritude-Konzepts in den Kreisen der *créolitude*, so bei Édouard Glissant, hätte ebenfalls einen eigenen Beitrag verdient. Die beeindruckende Ausstellung der Felszeichnungen im Gropius-Bau, die der Rezensent besucht hat, präsentiert in einer Vitrine die Frobenius-Rezeption im Frankreich der 30er Jahre. Sie kann aber nicht wirklich einen Eindruck von der ungeheuren Wirkung der Sammlungen, Konzepte und Übersetzungen von Frobenius im frankophonen Raum vermitteln. Leider fehlt ein Namen- und Sachregister.

Das Fazit: der Band ist nur zu empfehlen, die Beiträge bewegen sich durchweg auf einem hohen Niveau und geben den neuesten Stand der Frobenius-Forschung wieder. Sie demonstrieren sehr schön, was ein grenzüberschreitendes und transdisziplinäres Forschungsprojekt zu leisten imstande ist.

Thomas Keller

Gudeman, Stephen, and Chris Hann (eds.): *Oikos and Market. Explorations in Self-Sufficiency after Socialism*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015. 195 pp. ISBN 978-1-78238-695-7. (Max Planck Studies in Anthropology and Economy, 2). Price: \$ 95.00

The edited volume "Oikos and Market" examines two themes of longstanding interest to anthropologists: the house economy and self-sufficiency. Drawing on ethnographic research and theoretical debates that emerged from a postdoctoral research group on economy and culture at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology (Halle, Germany), the contributors investigate how citizens in postsocialist settings (primarily rural European regions) navigate contemporary economic activities, with particular emphasis on multiple scales ranging from households to national and international markets. In so doing, the contributors seek to understand what, precisely, constitutes "self-sufficiency" as both an ideal and a practice, and, how "self-sufficiency" informs and produces particular configurations of "the market." The contributors suggest that the unique circumstances of state socialist and postsocialist systems provide a useful vantage point outside conventional capitalist frameworks for rethinking how individuals and the communities in which they live understand and practice fundamental economic concepts such as labor, commodities, and value. What becomes apparent from the essays is that even as the state socialist legacy departs from more conventional capitalist-oriented market economies, there are intriguing similarities and synergies that show that capitalist and socialist systems may be more alike than dissimilar. As such, the volume's ethnographic materials offer a productive lens for examining contemporary capitalism.

The research on which the essays are based comes from a collaborative project in which the participating authors went to their respective field sites with a shared set of theoretical interests and methodological approach-

es. The authors conducted research in six countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Moldova, and Romania) with different experiences with socialism and its aftermath: some were part of the Soviet Union, while others were outside the USSR but were part of the Soviet Bloc; some are members of the European Union, while others are at the peripheries of both the EU and the new Russia-focused bloc of allies. All are settings where solidarity, social welfare, and community-based economic practices have been common, but yet where their contemporary permutations are playing out in different ways and with varying consequences. In setting up their essays, the authors attend to the particular historical trajectories of their respective field sites, with special emphasis on transitions within the 20th century. As a result, one of the contributions of the volume is its comparative dimension, both ethnographically and historically.

The volume begins with a detailed overview of theoretical and ethnographic approaches to self-sufficiency by the editors, Stephen Gudeman and Chris Hann. Gudeman and Hann's excellent discussion starts with the premise that economic theories that privilege markets and logics of maximization ignore non-market institutions such as households that are just as significant and productive. By focusing on the household, even as they interrogate what might constitute the "household" or its analogue, Gudeman and Hann persuasively argue for prioritizing the social dimensions within economic activities – social relations, norms, and belief systems, among others – in order to understand what is at stake when members of local communities balance needs against interests, debts against obligations, and tradition against the realities of contemporary life. To set up this argument, they draw on Aristotle's formulation of *oikos*, "the well-ordered house that was set within the community and *polis*" (3), as fundamental to self-sufficiency. Gudeman and Hann link Aristotle's ideas within an intellectual debate that includes Mandeville, Smith, Polanyi, and Chayanov, and then situate these debates within both anthropological approaches to economy and household (Malinowski, Sahlins), and ethnographic studies of socialist and postsocialist societies. The result is a detailed overview of economic theory that grounds abstract concepts in historical and empirical realities, thus illuminating the shortcomings, contradictions, and paradoxes within economic models about the role and value of house economies.

This broad, informative introduction sets the stage for the six chapters that follow. The individual chapters each take up different aspects of self-sufficiency. Bea Vidacs explores the relational dimensions of self-sufficiency in a Hungarian village where local residents promote an ideal of being able to provide for their own needs. Yet the local community is only partially able to support itself and must rely on outsiders, including in-migrants, a situation that produces social tensions and introduces dependencies into self-sufficiency models. Jennifer R. Cash continues this theme of the partiality of household provisioning by considering the ways in which rural Moldovan households create symbolic identities of sufficiency that may or may not align with economic realities. As Cash

shows, the desirable social status of “having” is only attained when individuals and families perform appropriate displays of “giving,” whether that is materially or socially. For the case of Macedonia, Miladina Monova considers how ideologies and practices of self-sufficiency are activated in the relationships that exist between households, state, and market. Through a case study of a traditional red pepper dish called *ajvar*, Monova examines the ways in which local residents must balance their cultural beliefs about the need to keep this dish within family and friend networks of self-provisioning and sharing against the realities of a changing consumer market. Moving outside the explicitly European context, Nathan Light explores how Kyrgyz villagers convert their sharing activities into cultural capital. Ritual events bring together villagers in ways that subsume economic responsibilities beneath moral principles of being a good person and good member of the community. In this context, self-sufficiency and subsistence are privileged as moral qualities. This focus on moral performances of community subsistence appears in Detelina Tocheva’s chapter on rural tourism in Bulgaria. Through a discussion of the local concept of “working in a closed circle,” Tocheva examines how local residents who subscribe to an ethos of limited reliance on external actors creatively engage food tourism as an opportunity to generate revenue through promotion of explicitly local food production. Much like heritage farmers and food producers elsewhere in the world, Tocheva’s informants strategically exploit the values of quality and purity attached to their “local” products for a global tourist audience. Lastly, Monica Vasile turns her attention to ethics of autonomy and independence among a community of Transylvanian foresters. Vasile explores what happens when local residents who privilege “being one’s own master” reconcile the realities of dependency that exist within labor transactions. As Vasile points out, claiming self-mastery and self-autonomy is in direct conflict with other cultural values of mutual dependency and sociability.

Collectively, these chapters invite intriguing and important questions: How do people balance need with desire? How are claims of heritage, tradition, and authenticity complicated by global circulations of goods, consumers, and laborers? How do ethics of modesty, complacency, self-satisfaction, and even aspiration fit into or disrupt idealized practices of self-sufficiency? How might self-sufficiency’s presumed focus on “enough” be complicated by surplus? What kinds of ethical citizens emerge when an inward-focused sufficiency depends on consumerist production for others? How might the discomfort of being indebted to work for others be matched by the discomfort of being indebted to the labor of others? As such, the volume offers possibilities for fruitfully reconsidering enduring topics and issues in economic theory that are of great interest not just to anthropologists but to other social scientists and economic philosophers.

Melissa L. Caldwell

Hajovsky, Patrick Thomas: *On the Lips of Others. Moteuczoma’s Fame in Aztec Monuments and Rituals.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015. 194 pp. ISBN 978-1-4773-0724-3. Price: \$ 45.00

Lasting fame is of universal interest to humans, who display, cross-culturally, a concern with high status and its wide recognition. Some crave celebrity, others abjure it, but everyone’s attention is drawn to the idea of a positive renown that will ballast the living self and then cheat death. Monuments and texts from ancient cultures affirm a preoccupation with fame on the part of rulers, and we look to art history, linguistics, ethnohistory, and archaeology for examples of how each culture expressed this, how rulers tried to insure that their names would forever be, as Hajovsky notes for the Aztecs, “on the lips of others.”

A standard approach to this problem would first review what Aztec scholars call “the sources,” a set of accounts written in the 16th-century contact period, by natives and Spaniards. These documents are crucial to our understanding of Aztec culture and history, but their perspective, as Hajovsky points out, is warped, shaping known events and customs into established European behavioral molds.

How, then can we develop a more emic view, an Aztec perspective on that culture’s expression of fame? Hajovsky posits that the emperor’s celebrity was generated by his living presence in rituals and by his representations, including that of his name glyph, in graphic and plastic art. He analyzes sculpted monuments, particularly those displaying the mature unified style of the Late Imperial Period, ca. 1486 to 1520, covering the reigns of the last two emperors, Ahuítzotl and Moteuczoma (the younger, r. 1502–1520). The iconography of these sculptures and the attendant concepts as they were expressed in the Nahuatl language comprise a new line of evidence that illuminates Aztec kingship.

To properly interpret Moteuczoma’s fame, Hajovsky looks to family history, in particular the last emperor’s relationship to his great-grandfather, the elder Moteuczoma (r. 1440–1469) who together with his great-uncle Itzcóatl (r. 1428–1440) established the Aztec empire and set it on a path of expansion. The reuse of this name deliberately connected the baby born in 1467 with the *tonalli*, the warmth of the soul, of his great-grandfather, then near the end of his rule but still the most powerful man on the continent.

Tonalli is a Nahuatl (Aztec) word referring to the force of heat and light and time conferred by the sun, often simply translated as “soul.” It shaped each of the 260 days in the divinatory sequence, the *tonalpohualli* (roughly, “soul count”). Each of the uniquely named and numbered days specified a fate and set of character traits. The fated behavioral path could be emended, but a person’s day-name informed conceptions of self throughout life and throughout Aztec society. Many people used their day-names as personal names, thus publicizing their propensity toward certain personality traits, because, while only diviners could prognosticate, everyone was more or less familiar with the modes of the day signs.

Another aspect of soul, *ihiyotl*, pertained to breath,