more detailed discussion of the process through which villagers—and anthropologists—interpret such dreams.

The conclusion is brief and to the point. In addition to providing a re-encapsulation of this volume's overall purpose, it also contains an intriguing and amusing episode: a heavily laden granary falls on a respected, wealthy man who is sleeping beneath it. Lambek—guided, of course, by Evans-Pritchard's writings on the Azande—searches in vain for special meanings local villages assign to this event. He finds the sorcerer is irrelevant: the granary fell, the man was hurt. Upon returning to the field, interpretations have changed, but only after the man has experienced tragedies that leave him emotionally and financially weakened. There is an important lesson here: interpretations of knowledge—and associated power—change over time.

Overall, this is a strong and detailed study of three traditions that define the core of community life. There are, perhaps, a bit too many excerpts from Lambek's field notes. Yet among the book's greatest strengths is the care with which Lambek has documented each of the traditions, rooting his examples in everyday events. As noted, Lambek occasionally includes himself as a character in these narratives, carefully straddling what has become thorny territory in anthropology. The push for greater self-reflexivity has far too often produced heavily egocentric texts that attempt to pass as ethnographies. Lambek, in contrast, uses his own experiences—as observer, apprentice and, at times, the confused, young anthropologist—to reveal the manner in which an understanding of knowledge unfolds with experience. This is the work of a gifted field worker, whose new study offers theoretical contributions that extend far beyond the societies of the Indian Ocean. This book will prove useful to anyone interested in the cross-cultural study of Islam, sorcery and/or spirit possession; the dynamics of power is small-scale communities; the relationship between religion and healing; or knowledge as a cultural construct.

Living on the Land: Change among the Inuit of Baffin Island
John S. Matthiasson
Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 1992. 172 pp. N.p. (paper)

Reviewer: Derek G. Smith
Carleton University

Matthiasson reports research, undertaken during a long visit in 1963 and a short one in 1973, that has already been represented in a series of scholarly articles. The present work is intended as a "personalized ethnography," a "reflexive and extended" treatment of "the Tununermiut camp life that disappeared shortly after [Matthiasson] encountered it" (p. 10). It is the work of someone who cares deeply for the people whose lifeways he describes.

It is valuable for its concentration on camp life, for most Northern ethnographic work by the 1960s had an intensive concern with settlement life and its social problems, in part because "contact-traditional" camp life was much attenuated by 1960. The volume deals with social-problem issues, but emphasizes contact-traditional camp life.

The work intentionally shies "away from discussion of anthropological issues of theory and methodology" (p. 158), which permits a fairly pleasing plain-language

style, but which also raises serious issues for professional readers. In his earlier work the author attempted "to keep himself out of the picture," but "always felt a sense of artificiality in doing so" (p. 22). So here he opts for a "reflexive and extended" (p. 10) approach. However, suppressing implicit theory and method is at least as problematic as suppressing the ethnographer's voice.

Matthiasson asserts "that the writings of the anthropologist can never be divorced from the anthropologist him- or herself," because our "thoughts and feelings . . . are the filters through which [our] observations are transformed into data." He argues that "the personal responses of the anthropologist deserve to be more than anecdotes recounted year after year to classes of undergraduates" (p. 22). In my view, this conjunction of personal and theoretical issues *may not* be left implicit. Matthiasson does so at great cost to the work's reflexivity.

The work is profoundly compassionate and personal, indeed it is evocative and touching, but only in a restricted sense is it reflexive. It does not seem to benefit from intense recent debate among ethnographers over "reflexive methods" in theory and critical practice. Ethnographers sorely need to "reflect" on much more than *personal* practices and reactions (a pretty minimalist notion of reflexivity), but must also engage in a comprehensive reflection on the concepts and practices of ethnography as a way of working, and not least on the unquestioned entitlement we claim in going where we go, doing what we do and writing what we write in the ways we do it. Matthiasson touches none of this. These are *very* difficult issues of theory, method and practice, as recent debate has shown, but the work lacks reference to any item in this debate, nor indeed to any item more recent than 1976. This seems striking in context of the author's statement (p. 8) that he has come to understand Foucault, whose work is deeply implicated in the debate.

It is strange and ultimately unacceptable that a "personal and reflective" ethnography aims to make space for the temperament and personality of the ethnographer, but explicitly excludes those of other powerful Eurocanadians (government officials, RCMP officers, traders and missionaries) and to treat these persons neutrally as occupants of roles and statuses (p. 93).

I value Matthiasson's personal and compassionate account and could readily visualize its use in undergraduate teaching, with appropriate discussions of its strengths and weaknesses. Its minimalist reflexiveness is a pity, for I suspect he has more to say on some of the bigger issues I have noted.