Moore is heir to: the insistence placed on Soyinka’s training at the Royal Court Theatre, in London; his tutelage under G. Wilson Knight at Leeds University; and a general *je ne sais quoi* that makes at times for the uneasy feeling that one is being taken on a tour by a sleek guide, so disturbingly efficient as to substitute his oracular skills for the landscape. Shades of Prospero and Caliban!

Essentially, though, Moore’s book is good, solid spadework which, interestingly enough, strikes a nice balance with Ngugi’s *Homecoming*. Perhaps in that balance lies an answer to the debate regarding the proper interpreters of African literature and culture: the vision and its articulation can but be the African writer’s, the scholarship concerned with supplying the tools for analyzing the vision is for all to share.

McGill University
Montreal, Canada

**MAX DORSINVILLE**


Add to the growing bibliography of social network literature a collection of articles further demonstrating the diversity of research situations in which the method may be applied. Social networks is of course that nearly sociometric methodology pioneered by John A. Barnes’ study of Bremnes in the early 1950’s (“Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish” *Human Relations*, VII: 39–58) which many thought would deliver social science analysis from the static confines of structural functionalism. But social network is in fact a methodology rather than a theoretical replacement (it took us a while until this was recognized) and a thoroughly demanding methodology (in terms of time and effort) at that. Nevertheless it became a popular field orientation through the 1960’s and it seems that everyone nearly everywhere was employing it – or thought or said they were. Social networks, as a body of research, became confused. Like the centipede, the method had grown so many legs in preparing for its leap from structural functionalism that once it became aware of all of them it didn’t seem possible that they could all be made to work together. Researchers began to come together to discuss the method and the Boissevain/Mitchell collection is the product of one of the annually organized symposia of the Africa Studiecentrum at Leiden (1969) which focussed upon the critical topic of the theoretical aspects of the network approach with special reference to research in Africa. It is, however, a book much more concerned with the application of social network methodology, than with the geographical area in which it is applied.

It should be remembered that one of the editors, J. Clyde Mitchell, had presented a somewhat similar collection of network research, published in 1969 (*Social Networks in Urban Situations*: Manchester University Press). A fair question to ask would seem to be to what extent does the present volume represent an advance over the earlier one. (While the Leiden conference was held the same year that the Mitchell book was published, there were four years of development between actual publication dates.) Progress could be measured
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here as some drawing up of the loose methodological and conceptual strings of social networks. It is somewhat disheartening although not altogether surprising to read in this regard the editors' comments that many of their contributors are still working with "rough and ready methods which may be refined or discarded" (Boissevain, ix), and that "network analysis is still in its infancy" (Mitchell, 34). It is true that a bare twenty years have passed since the inception of the method. It is also true that the method's conceptual requirements are likely to drive a researcher to the brink of his or her capacity for coherent abstraction, and that the tracing out and analysis of interpersonal linkages in amorphous non-corporate social "bodies" in shifting arenas of activity is likely the most ambitious sort of inquiry for a social scientist. Taken together these factors indicate that this is an approach the details of which may take some time to be worked out. Yet one may begin to feel a bit anxious at this juncture about the current stage of development and begin to anticipate growing numbers of inquiries from critics as to the nature of the emperor's clothes. Bruce Kapferer, a contributor to the volume and himself one of the most capable practitioners of the art of network analysis, writes quite frankly that "The high expectations which have been advanced concerning the utility of the concept "social network" have largely not been realized even allowing for the recent introduction of the concept into sociological and anthropological usage" (83). But this is not the theme or tone of the book, and rather than a sense of urgency there is still that general sense of housecleaning through operationalization, and experimentation, that characterized the 1969 Mitchell collection. And, perhaps, this is the way for science to proceed in going about its business.

However, as it stands, the Boissevain/Mitchell book is not a replacement for the earlier collection treating the same general topics. Surely, anyone familiar with social networks will recognize the importance of Kapferer's piece where Elizabeth Botts' findings are reconsidered outside the structural functional framework which was implicit in her analysis. Mitchell makes an important clarification by indicating that the conceptual dichotomy between networks and corporate groups is a false one and that we may merely deal at different levels of abstraction by referring to one or the other. There is as always among network writers that self conscious attempt to tighten up the process of analysis and the conceptual definitions in all of the contributions. But the collection is in sum a catalogue of the possibilities and issues of the network approach; this and the earlier Mitchell collection together comprise a bigger, but not complete catalogue; and the big job of social networks remains to be done. The definitive statement remains to be made and any number of collections that leave the reader to his or her own devices as to how to make sense of it all can't do this nor can they really be faulted for failing to do it. At this stage a different format is required.

While the suggestion may seem to blow the approach out of all proportion in terms of its present importance in social science research, I would propose that there is a need for dialogue in the growing sub-field of social networks, and that movement which depends on the dialectics of exchange which in turn depends on the slow process of publication, critique, and reformulation is inadequate to serve the need for coherence in such a rapidly growing area. It seems that little less than a regularized interdisciplinary conference and periodically published forum providing a focus of attention for comparative