

Soccer Supporters in the US'. In it, Gerke presents the exceptionality of the US soccer fan groups. Namely, they differ from other American Big Four sports fan groups and are all related to progressive politics.

The Epilogue is the fifth and final part of the volume and has only one chapter: 'What Is about Association Football – the Arrogantly Self-Appointed “Beautiful Game” – That Renders Most (Though Not All) of Its Fan Cultures So Ugly?'. In it, Andrei S. Markovits emphasises how identity construction and in-group orientation of team sports and fan groups facilitate sports stadiums as arenas of discrimination. Other related cultural manifestations, such as masculinity and tribalism, nurture it, especially hegemony. Through this collection of articles, the editors and contributors give us valued insights, shedding light on the intricate ways in which discrimination intertwines with football. The volume has the potential to not only academically facilitate our understanding of discrimination in football but also to initiate impactful practices against it.

Goran-Pavel Šantek

University of Zagreb

E-mail: gpsantek@ffzg.hr

ORCID: 0000-0003-1232-5454

Francisco Martínez, Lili Di Puppo and Martin Demant Frederiksen (eds) (2021), *Peripheral Methodologies: Unlearning, Not-Knowing and Ethnographic Limits* (London: Routledge), 198 pp, £75.99 (hb), ISBN: 9781350173071.

If I were to compile a list about good things happening in our troubled times, I would definitely put the volume *Peripheral Methodologies* on that list. It is a book about things that are hard to explain, verbalise and communicate, about phenomena that slip through the neatly knit webs of orthodox methodological tools and representational techniques, the off-limits, abandoned or rarely visited territories of anthropological knowledge production.

In the Foreword, Paul Stoller recollects an event from Songhay fieldwork to forecast the merits and puzzlements of the anthologies' endeavour. This is followed by the Introduction, a thick text of descriptive and more heated tones of a call.

Part one, *The Suspension of Clarity*, begins with Lili Di Puppo's beautiful chapter about a 'beautiful failure' (24), an episode of her fieldwork conducted on Sufism in the Volga-Ural region. In the reflective,

personal, poetic, intentionally vague representation, Di Puppò means to transmit the intimacy of a mystery through textual means, claiming that ‘silence and unknowing are not absence or a lack; instead, they invite us to listen and acknowledge the limits of our knowledge’ (28). It is not only the post-Soviet field site that brings the next study by Martin Demant Frederiksen into proximity with Di Puppò’s chapter, but rather the problems they highlight regarding rituals. While Di Puppò’s study could be interpreted as a case in which the orthodox interpretative tools of anthropology cease to work, Frederiksen’s study is critical of the mainstream models of rituals for ‘getting it a little too right’ (32). With the in-depth account of a young Georgian man’s wedding gift, he suggests that rather than ‘analytically carving out what the meaning of the meaningless’ (39) is, it might be a legitimate approach for the anthropologist to leave a veil of uncertainty regarding the intentions of human actions. The following chapter by Sevasti-Melissa Nolas and Christos Varvantakis on children’s everyday lives lightly draws a parallel between the parenting model of ‘considerable adult investment of time, concern and thought’ (46) and that of the attentive researcher. The study challenges the latter by recollecting field experiences in which they shortly and suddenly lost themselves in their past memories. They argue that such cases of inattentiveness open up human relations, unmask the researcher as a person with a biography, and open the somewhat underscored bodily ways of knowing, ‘a full engagement with the textures, tastes and sounds of the sensorium’ (56).

Opening the next section of *Unlearning*, Lydia Maria Arentes’s chapter introduces the very peculiar problem of the researcher knowing the research topic too well, of being in ‘a body that appeared to know too much’ (64). Besides recounting instances which enabled the author to distance herself from her own pre-existing knowledge, the chapter unveils knowledge on how the researcher’s subjectivity unfolds during different phases and instances of researching and being, and also through the creation and revision of different mediums. The body is also a pivotal part of the ethnographer’s toolkit in the following chapter, in which Ewa Klekot sheds light upon the complexity of the seemingly banal act of centring the clay on the potter’s wheel. Out of this small lump of clay, a theoretically formulated, elegantly presented argument leads us back to the very roots of Western ideas, to fundamental ontological and epistemological questions of categorising and evaluating the different kinds and sources of knowledges. A form of knowledge which is ‘bodily, situated, alien

to any abstraction, normalisation, scalability, or universalisation' (90), Klekot elaborates what *mētis*, this 'crafty intelligence' (90) is in the narrower context of making pottery and in the wider context of sensing, coping and living. Michele Avis Feder-Nadoff's chapter, based on her long-term apprenticeship in a coppersmith's workshop in Mexico, takes a critical approach when it comes to touching the political character of the maker's corporeality and materiality, and, probably more importantly, when it comes to the concept of flow. According to the author, flow 'ignores its ambiguous and peripheral substrates' (100) and 'freezes the body into idealised perfection' (101), but the whole metaphor behind flow 'ignores the artisan's ways of comprehending variety, spatial extension, blockages' (102).

The third part, *Absence of Knowledge*, begins with the chapter written by Karen Waltorp and the ARTlife Film Collective. The paper brings forth some of the events of a collaborative film project and touches on issues of how the different roles are negated and performed and how this collaborative work is defined and redefined during the many stages of creation. One answer to these challenges does not only resonate with the previous problems but can also probably serve as generally applicable advice: 'Knowledge generated with people in earlier fieldwork should not stand in the way of listening closely, listening anew' (124). The following chapter by Kirsten Marie Raahauge connects the two seemingly distant fields of a former urban centre and the experiences of haunted houses with the position of the anthropologist. As we follow this entangled narrative in which notions simultaneously describe the field and its worker, Raahauge broaches several epistemological problems, most importantly how abstraction could be a way of 'explaining away the concrete phenomena' (141). The two key terms of the chapter – 'loss of control' and 'defocused gaze' – could be understood as a solution to the raised problems, of letting go of preset approaches and categories. A story of (accidental) becoming, Francisco Martínez's text revisits his past (pre-)professional experiences in Georgia, occurrences of unfollowed paths and missed opportunities. Busting myths and reflecting on such field *topoi* as friendship, the author rather unconventionally describes fieldwork as 'a journey that goes from knowing to not-knowing, gathering new questions in your pocket and challenging the preestablished significance and meanings of things' (156).

The three parts are tied together by a concluding chapter, which revisits, reinterprets and reframes the studies. It is followed by an afterword by Robert Desjarlais, which takes us back to a seemingly

distant path of peripherality, to the world-wide unknown of the coronavirus.

One of the great merits of the book that it is really a book, not just a collection of studies pushed under an umbrella term. It tells a story, in which researchers coming from the field of different sub-disciplines do not moor at the safe port of a specific research tool but set sail on a vast ocean of pre-existing methodological knowledge towards the wider horizon of ethnographic knowledge creation to discover something new.

Throughout the book, many authors play with paradoxes. I am referring to such ideas as the potentiality of vagueness being more authentic than clarity (Di Puppo), as fitting descriptions being unfitting (Frederiksen), as understanding by not listening (Nolas and Varvantakis), as gaining knowledge through unlearning (Arantes, Klekot, Feder-Nadoff), as seeing more clearly through a defocussed gaze (Raahauge), or as learning from something unlearnt (Martínez). Meditating upon these could be an enlightening experience, and these twists of plot certainly add to the value of the volume.

However, there is one paradox that should not be left to the reader to resolve: how does the transformation of the personal, the intimate, the mystical, etc. into commodified academic achievements challenges ‘late-modern paradigms of innovation and the need for everything to be useful’ (5) and ‘the neoliberalisation of academia’? (4). In my reading, this out-of-context, critical part of the Introduction stands out from the whole book, a good book, which does not try to forcefully follow the dark, critical path of anthropology. It looks at friendship, home, childcare, making, revelations and co-operating, and delivers soft, nuanced, clever, self-reflective, eye-opening analysis. A good book for better times? Maybe. A good book for a better anthropology? Definitely.

Áron Bakos  
Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania  
E-mail: aron.bakos@ubbcluj.ro  
ORCID: 0009-0002-9348-9564

Gérald Gaillard (2022), *Françoise Héritier* (New York: Berghahn Books), 193 pp, £107 (Hb), ISBN: 978-1-80073-334-3

The ‘world anthropology’ movement has increased interest in researchers who have contributed significantly to the discipline in their own countries but are little known or even unknown outside