world—in essence, a metaphoric presentation of the new situation. Stone-Ferrer's paper on depictions of spinning and weaving in Dutch painting shows how a traditional symbol of feminine virtue, with its own traditional opposite (male incompetence at the work and licentiousness in the mixed-sex spinning room), was transferred into a new subgenre celebrating the industry of male and female workers in the technologically advanced and profitable "large-loom" weaving workshop.

An important consideration here, not really addressed by materialist approaches, is voice and viewpoint: who is writing (or painting) what, for whom? In considering the malignancy of the spirit helpers it is important to recognize that work such as that of the Grimms has a literate, bourgeois authorship, audience, and—as recent scholarship shows—sources. It is difficult to determine to what extent the depiction of the spirit helpers represents a response to destruction of the natural realm or a bourgeois appropriation and didactic rendition for a specific audience. Compelling as is Schneider's hypothesis, especially in view of the continuing popularity of this theme (as in Tolkien's work), one would like to see some consideration—especially where authorship is identifiable—of such reinterpretations within their specific context. Similarly, one wonders if the paintings documented by Stone-Ferrer represent a public relations effort, since innovations that increased productivity frequently met with resistance from workers (as in England's Luddite movement). Factory owners might have an interest in attaching the new technology to well-known symbols of virtue. In this case, there is none better than the spinner whose artistic analogue is the spinning Virgin Mary.

In perhaps the most telling paper in the volume, Waterbury links international demand for "traditional" embroidered Mexican wedding dresses with the collapse of the indigenous production, traditional use, and symbolism of these items and the development of a "putting out" system and piecework wage labor as local entrepreneurs attempted to meet demand for them. I might add that I have also seen India- and Pakistan-made copies of Mexican dresses, indicating the global nature of relationships linking producers and consumers. The sad thing is that demand for "traditional apparel" can be met only by destroying the original community in which such apparel is produced—by transforming the embroiderers and seamstresses into wage laborers.

In essence, the papers in this volume suggest that industrial and protoindustrial forms of manufacturing and distribution powerfully affect local producers. As Murra's paper on cloth in the Inka state demonstrates, claims of reciprocity and mutuality are incompatible with large-scale production and distribution—and such claims may say more about those making the assertion than about the productive system itself. Power, politics, economics, and symbols are among the factors that collide when the subject is cloth, and it appears that "small-scale" and "large-scale" societies are not so fundamentally diffferent after all. Those interested in the intersection between ideas and material factors will find a great deal to consider in this volume.

CAROL HENDERSON
*Department of Anthropology,*
*Emory University,*
*Atlanta, GA 30322*

"This children's dance group [in Madagascar, 1971], honoring a visiting government official, is led by a man who dresses as a woman and is also known as a spirit medium." Saklava peoples in Madagascar "like clothing with writing on it, expressing their views on such subjects as love, wealth, children, and royal service." Political rallies preceding the revolution of 1972, however, "evoked comments that people also dress to mislead. . . . Politically appropriate clothing may belie stated intentions. So many people felt that they had to wear [cloth imprinted with the face of then-President Tsirinana's face] that merchants selling [it] were accused privately of profiteering." [From G. Feeley-Harnik's paper in *Cloth and Human Experience*]

## Domestic Arrangements

**The Household Economy**. Reconsidering the Domestic Mode of Production. RICHARD R. WILK, Ed. Westview, Boulder, CO, 1989. viii, 266 pp. Paper, $36.95.

What, exactly, is a household? Differing in membership, functions, sentiments, and history, households are much easier to recognize than they are to define. Indeed, what makes them interesting to anthropologists is that there seems to be an infinite number of ways of making them. Among the definitions of "household" used by anthropologists have been (i) all those people sharing a common kitchen; (ii) those sleeping under a common roof; (iii) those forming the basic productive unit of a society; (iv) those forming task-oriented residence groups; and (v) those who pass through a common ritual—marriage—and their resulting offspring.

Cross-cultural research on households has changed considerably in recent years. Early studies concentrated on developing formal models setting forth what households should look like given cultural norms and generative rules about marriage, descent, and residence. Through evolutionary reconstructions, whether based on Freudian assumptions about primeval hordes and the growth of sexual regulation or on more materialistic approaches tracing household

development to private control of property (including women), pure household forms were abstracted from the disparate and messy evidence of ethnography.

Positing a few key organizational principles allowed anthropologists to develop elegant models of social structure. Thus, East African nomads were said to use kinship to build an ever more inclusive hierarchy of patrilineally linked descent groups extending from the family through the lineage and up to the clan and tribe. Given an ideal type, the variance reported in field data could be explained by environmental factors that distorted attainment of the ideal. In the prototypical analysis of this type, nearly half of the researcher's supposedly patrilineally linked informants actually traced their descent links through their mothers' families.

Recent work on kinship looks more closely at the interactions between what people say they should do and what they in fact do. *The Household Economy* is a collection of essays by anthropologists that make variation in household form and function the central analytic question, arguing that household economics must be understood through the filter of pre-existing social systems rather than as miniaturized, anonymous "firms" in the manner of neoclassical economic theory. The book is concerned with how internal patterns of authority and decision-making govern household economics; within households, gender and age are key factors determining who participates in economic activities and how their benefits are distributed.

*The Household Economy* contains three sections. The first gives an overview of recent developments in household studies. Particularly useful is Peggy Barlett's opening essay about why household diversity has become a focus of research interest for field anthropologists. Barlett underscores the methodological difficulties of studying social relationships within households, and particularly of selecting an appropriate time span for recording economic decision-making. Wilk also makes some good methodological points about household economics in non-Western societies: for example, microeconomic assumptions that households form pooled budgets and share decision-making do not stand up very well to field evidence from West Africa.

The second and largest section of the book consists of six ethnographic field reports, most of which appear to be abstractions of dissertation studies carried out in the early 1980s. By and large, the field data are well presented and convincingly explained. Case studies from Latin America, Africa, Europe, Asia, and the Pacific islands do a good job explaining why different household forms play major roles in how family members gain access to economic resources. Thus, for example, among the Asante of Ghana lineage loyalty overrides household commitment: spouses farm land belonging to their own lineage, borrow money from their lineage mates more than from their marriage partners, and often even live with their kin in preference to their spouses. As a result, despite an ideology requiring women to defer to men, Asante women maintain control over their own property and show high degrees of independent economic decision-making.

The third section of the book introduces a relatively new aspect of anthropological research on social structure: it discusses the implications of household variation for agricultural research and development programs. Here Poats, Feldstein, and Rocheleau, in an excellent summary of the results of the first generation of social science infiltration into international crop research programs, show why an analysis of the needs, constraints, and production possibilities operating on different households will affect crop-breeding and extension strategies. Recognized in theory by plant-breeding centers, location-specific research based on the needs of small farm households is only gradually becoming a part of agricultural improvement programs. After two decades of development projects that all too often have bypassed or marginalized women, poor people, and politically weak populations, Poats *et al.*'s demand that development projects pay more attention to beneficiary analysis is a timely one.

By and large the essays in this book are best when they report ethnographic data. The book's theoretical generalizations tend toward the well known (losses in individuals' control over economic resources are correlated with losses in household decision-making) or are questionably phrased (Netting's contention that household farms involved in labor-intensive crop production are more "effective" than agricultural businesses). Periodic attempts to link up the analysis of intrahousehold processes with theories of political and economic development only underscore the absence of solid theory in this area.

Although in general the contributions are well written and ably edited, there are lapses into the fractured syntax that remains *de rigueur* in social science graduate programs. The book would have benefited from the inclusion of maps with the ethnographic reports so that the different cultural groups could be located.

SCOTT GUGGENHEIM
*World Bank, Washington, DC 20433*

## An Enduring Puzzle

**The Moon Illusion.** MAURICE HERSHENSON, Ed. Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ, 1989. xvi, 421 pp., illus. $69.95.

The moon seen close to the horizon appears to be quite a bit larger than when viewed at its zenith. Similar apparent size changes occur for the sun and the distances between stars. This odd phenomenon is called the moon illusion and has been the subject of speculation since the time when the most obvious explanation—that the moon actually changes either size or distance from the observer during its nightly passage—had to be abandoned.

The extent of interest in this phenomenon is documented in this volume, which includes an extensive bibliography (285 sources, beginning with Aristotle). One would hope that the accumulated wisdom of 22 centuries of speculation followed by half a century of experimentation would result in some agreement as to the cause of the moon illusion. This book demonstrates that such agreement has not been realized.

On the assumption that the image of the moon on the retina remains the same whatever the moon's location, it might be expected that differences in perceived size are related to differences in perceived distance. This is in accordance with traditional visual perception theories, which postulate (i) that perceived size is derived subsequent to perceived distance and (ii) that for a constant visual angle an object that appears farther from the viewer should also appear larger and vice versa (this is known as the size-distance invariance hypothesis). Such an account would suffice were it not for the fact that viewers often report the horizon moon as appearing both larger and closer than the zenith moon.

By far the most influential account of the moon illusion is that proposed by Kaufman and Rock about 30 years ago and defended by them in this volume. Sometimes referred to as the further-larger-nearer theory, this theory postulates that the horizon moon is, in agreement with the size-distance invariance hypothesis, perceptually registered as being farther, and therefore larger, than the zenith moon; the anomalous distance aspect is a result of subsequent inferences based on the moon's perceived size—since the moon appears larger, it must be closer. This explanation creates an incongruity between the perceptually registered distance used to compute the moon's size and that which forms the conscious basis for its apparent distance; however, such inconsistencies have been noted before in a number of other perceptual phenomena. A few authors in