Kendall 1982). This situation is due in no small part to the implicit methodological dictum "one man one tribe," which in practice has rendered it difficult, if not impossible in most instances, for one practitioner of the art to evaluate the success of another. Thus, the commentary of this sort, usually in the form of a review of a recently published monograph, may allude to the "richness" (i.e., quantity) of the ethnographic data but rarely to its quality, in the sense of whether or not the information reliably or adequately represents the social and cultural system of the people under consideration. Conclusions of this sort are, by the nature of the discipline, most often beyond the ken of the typical critic.

This guiding principle of allotment is reasonably legitimized by the perceived number and variety of human cultures available for novel anthropological inquiry. The perception of unlimited opportunity has remained constant even though Malinowski, the first modern ethnographer, simultaneously sounded both the birth and death knells of ethnography some sixty-odd years ago, in the very first sentence of *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Although less obvious, another reason for the anthropological avoidance of another's "people" for research may have to do with the eventual outcome of the endeavor. Those rare instances of restudy of an extant culture by a second anthropologist within a short time after the initial one have produced contradictory conclusions on basic issues.[1] There can be little doubt that such a tendency casts suspicion on the entire matter of the potential reliability of anthropological methods, and fieldwork in particular. In response to this situation, ethnographic reanalysis has more commonly taken the form of literary reinterpretation from afar, rather than replication of field research—a procedure which draws attention to volume as the prominent feature of the available data. However, even this approach has been relatively rare in the annals of anthropological scholarship. Moreover, published intellectual exercises of this type have produced their own share of controversy over the basic nature of the social system under scrutiny.[2] Those committed to the notion of social anthropology as a science can find little solace with this state of affairs.

---

and author of The Man-Eating Myth *(Oxford University Press, 1979). In 1978 he conducted field and archival research among the Shilluk of the Southern Sudan. Presently he is working on the publication of the Shilluk ethnography and with Ivan Karp is co-editing* The Creativity of Power *(Indiana University Press), a series of essays on the ideology and symbolism of power in selected African societies. Address: Dept. of Anthropology, State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, N.Y. 11794.*

[1] Although there are others see, for example, Fischer (n.d.) and Goodenough (1955) on the subject of residence rules on Truk, and Redfield (1930) and Lewis (1951) on community ethos in Tepoztlan. In both instances the data and interpretation were quite disparate.

[2] In recent years see McKenny's (1973) and Asad's (1972) respective reinterpretation of the Nyakusa and Swat Pathans.