the consumption of commodities, medicines. In this chapter the author shows how in traditional therapeutics, money could be a negative factor in therapy management.

The beauty of this book lies in the rich anthropological data gathered and the deep analytical insight that the author brings to bear on the data. Going by the Malinowskian tradition, the author took residence among the people, learned their language, and made considerable use of local concepts "to grasp the native's point of view, his relation to life, to realise *his* vision of *his* world" (Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London 1922: 25). The reader is thereby well-informed through the use of local concepts and idioms.

Like any anthropological work, the study was time-bound; it was undertaken between the 1980s and 1990s when the entire nation was undergoing very difficult economic transformation which could have exacerbated the tension arising from gender differentiation regarding health care. Clearly, today, life for many women in northern Ghana has changed considerably, thanks to the new global focus on poverty, the works of many nongovernmental organisations in the poverty-stricken northern regions of Ghana and the state's policy regarding the attainment of the Global Millennium Development Goals, all of which aim among others, at poverty reduction, empowerment of women, and the reduction of maternal and infant/child mortality. The net result of this global paradigm shift is increase in women's access to land, education, credit facilities, and the labour market. Consequently, the old social structure which tended to restrict women's role in health production is gradually giving way. The author clearly recognises this point in the concluding part of the book.

This book is indeed an important addition to the stock of general literature on ethnic groups in northern Ghana. The literature on these societies has not seen much update since the production of monographs by earlier anthropologists such as Fortes (The Dynamics of Clanship among the Tallensi. London 1945), Goody (The Social Organisation of the LoWiili. London 1956), Oppong (Growing up among the Dagbon. Accra-Tema 1973), and others. In the area of health and medicines in particular, and the issues arising from their introduction in traditional Ghanaian societies, this book complements the works of such scholars as Field (Religion and Medicine of the Ga People. London 1937), Twumasi (Medical Systems in Ghana. Accra-Tema 1974) and Senah (Money Be Man. The Popularity of Medicines in a Rural Ghanaian Community. Amsterdam 1997). In all, the book should serve as a springboard for further studies into the commoditisation of health in traditional societies in Africa. It also offers a wide range of topics for further study and theoretical approaches to interrogate field studies. On a practical note, the book is also recommended for use not only by students of society but also by development and change agents whose activities in communities require a careful understanding of the usages and nuances of their beneficiary communities.

Kodjo Senah

Bošković, Aleksandar (ed.): Other People's Anthropologies. Ethnographic Practice on the Margins. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008. 238 pp. ISBN 978-1-84545-398-5. Price: £ 37.50

The essays that comprise "Other People's Anthropologies" offer fresh perspectives on the history of anthropological ideas and practice. The book consists of eleven case studies of "national" anthropological traditions: those of Russia/Soviet Union, Netherlands, Bulgaria, Kenya, Turkey, Argentina, Cameroon, Japan, former Yugoslavia, Norway, and Brazil. An introduction by Aleksandar Bošković and Thomas Hylland Eriksen, on the one hand, and a postscript by George E. Marcus and an afterword by Ulf Hannerz, on the other, offer broader theoretical and historical frames for these rich, if at times uneven, analyses of "other" anthropological traditions.

Acknowledging their debt to previous studies of "marginal" anthropological traditions, Bošković and Hylland Eriksen inquire into the continued relevance of the language of center/periphery for discussing anthropological approaches other than those of the "great traditions" of Britain, France, the United States, and Germany. They imply that the notion of marginal anthropologies maintains some conceptual purchase, given that it informs their guiding questions: "Do peripheral anthropologies create their own centers, or do they slavishly adapt to the latest fashions of the metropoles? Do they at all perceive themselves as peripheral? Do they represent alternative theoretical or methodological perspectives which should have been better known at the center, or is their work either second rate or similar to metropolitan anthropology?" (4). The range of anthropological traditions discussed here, however, underscores the relative (and unstable) nature of center and periphery within the global anthropological discipline. This leads Hannerz in his afterword to question more forcefully the salience of the center-periphery distinction and Bošković and Hylland Eriksen to admit that divergences between peripheral anthropologies may be just marked as similarities.

This axis of difference and similarity pivots around questions such as the historical relationship of the specific traditions to colonialism and nation-building projects; the development of "native" theories or the reliance on imported ideas; the kinds of training anthropologists receive; who, what, and where the anthropologists study; and the languages and venues in which anthropologists publish. The Russian/Soviet, Japanese, and Dutch traditions analyzed by Anatoly M. Kuznetsov, Han F. Vermeulen, and Kaori Sugishita, respectively, have direct roots in projects of colonial expansion (although Kuznetsov gives too little emphasis to Russian/Soviet anthropology's role in documenting internal others, such as the "small peoples of the North"). A history of anthropology in service to imperial power, however, has produced strikingly divergent engagements with hegemonic Anglo-American anthropology. In the Soviet case, ethnographers sought a theoretical "self-sufficiency," embracing homegrown concepts such as

stadialism and later a Soviet theory of *ethnos*. In contrast, Japanese anthropologists have imported much of the theoretical apparatus of Western anthropology; they have established a field of research that is global in scope but with little impact on Western anthropology, given that Japanese anthropologists publish almost exclusively in their own language.

The anthropological traditions of Kenya and Cameroon that Mwenda Ntarangwi and Jude Fokwang detail, respectively, have instead been shaped by the struggles of the formerly colonized to renegotiate their relationship to metropolitan anthropologies which bear the taint of imperial power politics. Given the political career of Jomo Kenyatta, whose training under Malinowski resulted in what Fokwang deems the "first ethnography written 'from a native's point of view'" (84), one might have expected a more prominent role for social anthropology in Kenya. Kenyatta's embrace of a national message of unity, however, led to a deprivileging of an anthropological focus on tribal identities. As a result, anthropology "never became part of the intellectual discourse of many scholars in the young nation" (87). Anthropology has likewise remained marginal within the Cameroonian academy, where many scholars with anthropological training nonetheless choose other disciplinary identifications (such as those of history or sociology) with less apparent colonial baggage. In the African examples discussed, both authors also point to problematic issues of funding that lead to short-term, "consultancy" research.

The politics of naming have also shaped the direction of anthropological research in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands, as evidenced in the pieces by Magdalena Elchinova, Aleksandar Bošković, and Han Vermeulen, respectively. In Bulgaria, a discipline formally known as anthropology only appeared after 1989, when its status as a Western discipline made it a marker of progressive politics and democratization (in contrast to the discipline's bad reputation in the African context). Likewise, in socialist Yugoslavia ethnology occupied a privileged place as a national project until the crisis of the late 1980s lent social anthropology new symbolic capital. During the same time period, many sociologists of non-Western societies working in the Netherlands also moved towards an explicit identification as anthropologists. In Bulgaria, as well as the Turkish case examined by Zerrin G. Tandoğan, formal departments of anthropology (as opposed to folklore or ethnology), emerged first in private universities, pointing to the diverse entanglements of anthropology with national academic cultures and projects of state formation and regime transition.

In his concluding comments, George Marcus highlights the complicated histories of complicity of several of the anthropological traditions analyzed in the volume. In her discussion of Argentinean anthropology, for example, Rosana Guber traces the development of two main streams of anthropological thought in the era of university reforms following Peronist rule (when several immigrants trained in fascist Italy had given anthropology a particular political inflection). Some of the anthropologists who challenged this "official anthropology" later ran afoul of the authoritarian politics of the 1970s and 1980s. The Argentinean situation underscores that most anthropological traditions contain elements of both oppositional critique of and complicity with centers of power.

In their respective accounts of the development of anthropology in Norway and Brazil Thomas Hylland Eriksen and Mariza G. S. Peirano make a case for traditions that lack the "guilty consciences" of the metropolitan traditions. While Norwegian anthropology has practically existed as an offshoot of British social anthropology, it possesses a popularity and visibility in Norwegian society unimaginable in the British context. Lacking a colonial past, Norwegian anthropology has enjoyed an enviable "reputation as an anti-elitist kind of activity, an unruly anarchist science of great-coated, ruffled men with unpolished shoes and strange views" (176). Hylland Eriksen's description should not blind us, however, to the fact that all anthropologies are complicit with power in different ways (if we accept an understanding of power derived from Foucault). Thus Peirano's account of Brazil's "anthropology with no guilt" reads as almost utopian in its contention that Brazilian anthropology's study of difference within the frame of the nation proves unproblematic. Peirano's argument that "an ideological link to Brazil is in order; there is no 'free' otherness, indeed no exoticism in sight" (193) eliminates from the outset a more nuanced (and likely unsettling) story of the role played by Brazilian anthropology in articulating difference.

As these comments suggest, the wide range of issues touched on in "Other People's Anthropologies" reveals that the object of analysis (anthropology) is not always consistent across the essays. Nor are the aspects of anthropology discussed necessarily of a piece. Relatively few of the authors (Hylland Eriksen and Tandoğan number among the exceptions) dedicate extensive attention to methods or the interplay between "native" and "Western" *methodological* innovations (as opposed to theoretical perspectives). Readers learn that "native" anthropologists trained abroad often take up university positions outside their home countries (sometimes because academic patronage networks effectively shut them out from university jobs at home, as in Serbia, or because of brain drain, as in Africa and Turkey) but the crucial question of *who* (in terms of class, gender, ethnicity, race, and so on) becomes an anthropologist in these nonmetropolitan traditions remains unasked. Nor do the authors themselves engage in any self-reflexivity that might help the reader situate them and their analyses within their respective traditions. In spite of these shortcomings, the volume makes an important contribution to understanding the diversity of the anthropological tradition and some of its possible futures. A valuable resource for teaching and research alike, "Other People's Anthropologies" rethinks canonical accounts of the discipline's history. Pamela Ballinger