Dalsgaard, Steffen and Morten Nielsen (eds.). 2015. *Time and the Field (Afterword by George Marcus)*. Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books. vi+160 pp. Pb.: $27.95/£17.50. ISBN: 9781785330872.

The eight essays in this volume (originally published as a special issue of Social Analysis) engage the reader in varied reappraisals about the ethnographic encounter. The traditional "field", the site for ethnographic research finds innovative and contemporary expressions especially in the manner in which "field" is reinvented as "time". In traditional fieldwork, the anthropologist was considered as placed in the present while the "field" was in the past; there was a lack of coevalness between them. The present authors evoke many situations and concepts that present fieldwork in the form of an interactive moment in time in which past, present and future are seen as continuous and inclusive of both the anthropologist and her field.

The traditional "field" is teased apart to reveal "objects" of interest, such as micrometeorologists and climate modelers, the surface of an ordinary dining table, an envelope, a visiting card, an entire machinery of government, and ritual rhythms that focus on inaction rather than action. One of the aims of this volume is to orient field work in a more practical framework where long-term fieldwork stretching over several years may not be feasible as it may defeat the entire goal of research that aims at more imminent results. This is not to say that long-term fieldwork is being viewed as redundant but as the chapter by Whyte indicates, even extended fieldwork, stretching over several decades has to be understood not only as changes in the field but also as changes in the fieldworker. In other words, the coevalness of the field with the observer has to be maintained as has been described by Whyte in terms of transformations in his sociability and social personhood over the years.

An interesting aspect of most of the papers is their attempt to deal with the concept of the "present", which no longer is an encapsulated, eternal present as depicted in traditional ethnographic works. The "present" as well recognied in these papers, is only an intersection of the past and the future, the moment of time caught in the moment of fieldwork is fleeting and can only be understood in terms such as 'protospective' (p.129), put forward by Pederson and Nielson that refers to a composite of past and present that is reflected in the future. In other words, the distinction between the past, present, and future is redundant as social and natural time are both flows that never cease.

Thus, Sjørslev introduces Deluze's concept of "fold" to show how there are internal rhythms within a ritual, whichthat are composed of repetitive, "boring" interludes, marked by "happening" periods. Anthropological fieldwork should not focus only on what is happening but also be inclusive of these periods of boredom, in terms of "deep hanging out" for these too are integral aspects of the data. Otto has problematised the notion of coevalness by showing that the "present" may mean different things to different people (here the anthropologist and his informants) depending upon their conceptions of "time"; Bourdieu's concept of "habitus" being particularly meaningful here. However in order to steer clear of the controversy about "us" and "them", "our" time, and "their" time, Otto introduces the concept of historicity that should apply to all societies and that

refers to the 'construction of pasts and futures in relation to the present' (p.21). Building upon Bourdieu, Dalsgaard, in his study of the Manus (P.N.G), shows that for the local people, the government ("Gavman" in local terminology) is experienced not only in terms of a physical location but more as a moment or a time when actual positive interaction takes place with the human representatives of the government in terms of gifts, grants, and projects. At other times, the state remains shadowy and non-existent despite its legal and political incorporation into people's lives.

Time becomes translated into a momentous and subjective experience in Lutz's essay, in which the simple surface transformation of a dining table surface is used to illustrate the relationships between caregivers and the old in an institution that also reflects on how entities are constructed and deconstructed; how social obligations are met and culturally evaluated.

All the papers in this volume have made attempts to be theoretically innovative, drawing on many concepts and ideas from contemporary philosophy and social sciences. While appreciating the interpretative skills and explanatory power of the concepts used, there remains a slight doubt as to the limits to which interpretation can be stretched, unless backed by substantive data. How much can one interpret from an "envelope" or a "visiting card"? Certainly, these "intuitive" understandings are backed by the substantive fieldwork experiences of these authors The question remains: can there be a substitute for in-depth involvement with the field?

SUBHADRA MITRA CHANNA
Delhi University (India)