

knowledge of “deviant” cases it is extremely rare that anthropologists discover these through statistical analysis and then go back to understand why the “cases” don’t follow a statistical norm. However, many anthropologists undertake long-term research and collect structured information, e.g., census data. This chapter might inspire some anthropologists to employ similar techniques.

The following chapters five and six exemplify two sides of one “method coin,” i.e., they present the same approach but vary the research phenomenon. The “Neighbourhood History Calendars” (chapter five) and the “Life History Calendars” (chapter six) are described as “new, single hybrid method[s]” (103). Both methods offer ways to capture past changes and innovations through retrospective interviews. Similar to chapter four, data from the Nepalese Chitwan Valley Family Study is used to illustrate the approach. People from 171 neighbourhoods were interviewed on the inauguration of different types of infrastructure, especially schools and health institutions. Data was elicited through a calendar which includes different categorizations of time (e.g., recorded in years, but also significant events like floods). This information was supplemented with expert interviews and archival records. At the end of the chapter the authors discuss how geographic information system technologies were used to analyse the spatial dimensions of change. This seems to be an especially interesting extension of mixed method data collection strategies that also many anthropologists might find promising. The “life history calendar” presented in chapter six follows the same logic as the “neighbourhood history calendars.” Here, the focus lies on capturing changes within individual life histories. This “hybrid method” works well to collect life history behavioural data, e.g., dates of births, marriages, and years in school. However, it is very problematic to elicit information on ideational phenomena, i.e., norms, attitudes, or beliefs (159).

According to the authors, research on such kinds of phenomena might be part of a “Longitudinal Data Collection” strategy, the last method mix of the book, discussed in chapter seven. In this chapter, the U.S. Intergenerational Panel Study is described. In this study a group of people born in 1961 and their mothers were “followed,” i.e., repeatedly interviewed, for 31 years. The main point of this chapter is that a long-term scope allows to include all of the other previously discussed method combinations into the research design.

Chapter eight concludes by repeating the many advantages of combining methods, especially less and more structured methods. In the brief discussion of “new frontiers in mixed method approaches” some further areas of application and innovation in mixed method research, e.g., the use of archival data and geographical information systems, are mentioned.

The book’s central message that combinations of methods lead to a much better understanding of social realities is laudable and important. Further, the five method combinations discussed in detail will certainly inspire future social research. Much more method mixing can be imagined! However, the book’s general

agenda would have been even more convincing with a closer look at anthropology’s many contributions to mixed method research. It is surprising that the work of anthropologist H. Russell Bernard is only mentioned in a brief footnote and that his book “Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches,” now in its fourth edition (Lanham 2006), is only mentioned in its first edition from 1988. Further, the journal *Field Methods* (Sage Publications; editor H. Russell Bernard), which offers a plethora of examples of mixed method combinations in each issue, is not mentioned at all. Maybe part of the academic energy invested into the emergence and establishment of a subdiscipline like anthropological demography has to be devoted into convincing the different fields of each others theoretical and methodological values. Axinn and Pearce have done this in an excellent and detailed fashion for demographers and sociologists who prefer to use large-scale surveys to collect data. However, an anthropologist’s account of the history and current applications of mixed method research within anthropological demography (and also beyond) still has to be written. For such an endeavour, Axinn and Pearce’s book will be a valuable inspiration.

Julia Pauli

Bamford, Sandra (ed.): *Embodying Modernity and Post-Modernity. Ritual, Praxis, and Social Change in Melanesia*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2007. 293 pp. ISBN 978-0-89089-476-7. Price: \$ 37.00

“This collection of essays considers the relationship between ritual, embodiment, and social change in the South Pacific,” according to its editor, addressing “two interrelated themes: (1) how has globalization and the rise of new social and economic forms influenced the way(s) in which Melanesians think about, experience, and act upon their bodies? and, (2) in what ways do these new forms of bodily experience contribute to the emergence of new social and cultural identities?” (3), themes echoed in an afterword to the book by Eric Hirsch (283–293).

Geographically, the book’s scope does not actually encompass “the South Pacific” and only just qualifies for the “Melanesia” of the book’s subtitle. Nine of the ten case studies included derive from fieldwork in Papua New Guinea, and the tenth – Lamont Lindstrom’s ruminations on a small personal collection of picture postcards which could have had almost any area of the world as their subject – only happens to concern Vanuatu. As for “ritual, embodiment, and social change,” most of the essays concern “rituals” to some degree, “embodiment” is a recurrent conceit if only in the sense that all human life involves the body in some way, and “social change” is a presumed driving force for the situations described by all of the authors.

Jerry Jacka and Thomas Strong explore the anguished reminiscences of Ipili and Upper Asaro men, respectively, about a past when initiation ceremonies ensured male growth and power, both now thought to be on the wane since the abandonment of such rites.

Marta Rohatynskyj regards the cessation of tattooing of men, with its “localized” associations, as one of the factors involved in a geographical expansion of Ömie “identity,” while Pamela Stewart and Andrew Strathern see recent changes in Hagen and Duna self-decoration as being related, somehow, to social change and globalization. Sandra Bamford discusses the self-suppression of nasal septum piercing of Kamea initiates as an accommodation to mission pressure and, in the process, a step toward new concepts of the “body/mind” dichotomy. Accommodation to changes with missionization is also the focus of John Barker’s examination of modern Maisin notions of “personhood,” just as Tony Crook perceives Angkaiyakmin regimented work on machines at the Ok Tedi Mine as both reflecting and influencing changing notions of the individual’s relationship to broader social identities. Margaret Holmes Williamson speculates that Kwoma men’s sense of identity may even extend to the national level as they distinguish Europeans from “Papua New Guineans” on the basis of the latter’s observance of menstrual restrictions. Away from mainland Papua New Guinea, Karen Sykes considers the impact of Western contraceptive medicine on “traditional definitions of body and agency” for the Lelet Mandak of New Ireland (211).

The essays’ authors largely depend on what used to be called “memory culture” in their depictions of “traditional” life in the communities they studied, with historical or earlier ethnographic sources seldom used (Rohatynskyj and Barker are the principal exceptions) to document whatever observable changes have in fact occurred in these societies. The younger contributors, especially, appear to be practitioners of what is sometimes referred to as the “New Melanesian Ethnography” (Barker; 138), with “personhood” and “agency” as the main topics, often deploying “ethnographic vignettes” (Crook; 69) rather than empirical evidence to convey their sense of what “modernity” is like in these out-of-the-way parts of the world. The title and subtitle of the book warn the reader to expect a certain amount of jargon, and a glossary would have been helpful to those of us who practice the “Old Melanesian Ethnography.” Perhaps more disappointing is a sense that, apart from occasional (and expected) citations of Bourdieu and Foucault, these essays seem to contribute in no clear way to any larger project, such as theories of “modernization” itself or accompanying changes in “identity.” One is left, regarding several of the essays, with a sense that critics’ characterizations of much of (at least American) cultural anthropology in recent decades as “literary criticism” might soon be replaced with “ethnographic journalism.”

Terence E. Hays

Barnes, Linda L.: *Needles, Herbs, Gods, and Ghosts. China, Healing, and the West to 1848.* Pbk. ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007. 458 pp. ISBN 978-0-674-02397-0. Price: \$ 24.95

Die umfassende Studie von Linda Barnes untersucht die bisher eher vernachlässigte Geschichte von Kennt-

nissen und Vorstellungen über Chinesen und ihre Heilweisen in Europa und Amerika. Die Autorin versteht ihre Arbeit nicht als eine Geschichte der chinesischen Medizin, sondern als eine Geschichte interkultureller Wechselbeziehungen, die sich, einem kulturanthropologischen Ansatz folgend, vor allem auf westliche Übersetzungen und Interpretationen stützt. Barnes greift auf ein bis ins 13. Jh. zurückreichendes Spektrum von Schriften und Korrespondenzen zurück, die von westlichen Gelehrten, Kaufleuten und Missionaren verfasst wurden. Auf diese Weise entsteht eine facettenreiche, lebendige und vielschichtige Darstellung der Entstehung und Entwicklung westlicher Vorstellungen von chinesischen Heilweisen. Zugleich wird in diesem Zusammenhang deutlich, dass der chinesischen Medizin eine bisher unterschätzte Rolle in der Entwicklung des medizinischen Diskurses im Westen zukommt.

Im Vergleich zu früheren Büchern zu diesem Thema, die sich vor allem der Rezeption der Akupunktur im Westen gewidmet haben (Joseph Needham and Lu Gwei-Djen, *Celestial Lancets*. Cambridge 1980; Roberta E. Bivins, *Acupuncture, Expertise, and Cross-Cultural Medicine*. New York 2000), beschäftigt sich Barnes’ Studie außer mit Akupunktur und Moxibustion auch mit der Anwendung von Arzneimitteln, Körpertechniken und anderen Heilweisen. Die Medizinethnologin und vergleichende Religionswissenschaftlerin geht dabei von einem sehr weit gefassten Begriff von “Medizin” aus, der nicht nur die genannten medizinischen Methoden einbezieht, sondern auch religiöse Praktiken bis hin zu Tätigkeiten wie “das Verbrennen von Papierhäusern und -möbeln, um sie durch ihren Rauch in die *yin* Welt der Toten zu befördern” (4).

Barnes stellt ihr Thema aus der Sicht von drei Hauptperspektiven dar, die sie “racializing”, “religionizing” und “medicalizing” der Chinesen nennt (2). Unter dem Gesichtspunkt “racializing” zeigt sie auf, wie im Mittelalter die christliche Geographie Mongolen und Chinesen (die in dieser Zeit kaum voneinander unterschieden wurden) mit Himmel und Hölle, Gott und Dämonen assoziiert hat (12). Im 16. und 17. Jh. betrachteten westliche Beobachter die Chinesen als Menschen “von unserer Qualität” und mit “einer fast so weißen Gesichtsfarbe wie Europäer” (79). Von der Mitte des 18. Jhs. bis zur Mitte des 19. Jhs. jedoch wurden weiße Europäer als überlegene Rasse angesehen und Chinesen entsprechend mit einer gewissen Verachtung als eine andersartige, minderwertigere Rasse beschrieben.

Was “religionizing” betrifft, war die Sicht der westlichen Welt auf die Chinesen ausschließlich von christlichen Kriterien geprägt und ignorierte die Kosmologie, die der chinesischen Philosophie, Religion und Medizin zugrunde lag. So wurden zum Beispiel die Lehren des Daoismus von dem Jesuiten Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) rundweg als “Urvater der Falschheiten und Vater der Lügen” (65) abgetan. Diese Haltung führte zu vielen Missverständnissen, wie etwa der grundsätzlichen Ablehnung von chinesischen alchemistischen oder exorzistischen Praktiken als reinem Aberglauben.

Bei der letzten Perspektive des “medicalizing of the