

The Politics of Perspectivism

Alcida Rita Ramos

Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de Brasília, Campus Universitário Darcy Ribeiro, 70910-900 Brasília; email: alcida.ramos@uol.com.br

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2012. 41:481-94

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi:

10.1146/annurev-anthro-092611-145950

Copyright © 2012 by Annual Reviews.

All rights reserved

0084-6570/12/1021-0481\$20.00

Keywords

indigenous peoples, anthropological theory, Brazilian anthropology, poststructuralism

Abstract

In recent decades, ethnographic research in Brazil has been influenced by a model termed perspectivism that inverts the equation between nature (as a given) and culture (as variable). Focusing on the interaction between humans and animals, this model attempts to generalize about thought processes across indigenous Amazonia, resulting in the proposition that nature is the variable whereas culture remains the same. The model's generality has resulted in a remarkable similarity of ethnographic interpretations, giving the false impression that the Amazon is a homogeneous culture area. This critique of perspectivism highlights its theoretical and empirical flaws and points out that the recurrent use of certain laden expressions can have adverse consequences for indigenous peoples.

INTRODUCTION: PERSPECTIVISM IN PERSPECTIVE

The word perspective has gained a surprisingly inflated dimension since Brazilian anthropologist Viveiros de Castro began to apply it to a new theoretical offshoot of Lévi-Strauss's structuralism (Turner 2009). Viveiros de Castro has dedicated many years of his prolific career to intensive and extensive readings on lowland South American cultures. In analyzing the vast mass of ethnographic material in the Amazon region and elsewhere, he concluded that Amerindian philosophy—or ontology, as he prefers—about nature and culture inverts the Western model. Hence, for Amazonian Indians, nature is the variable, whereas culture is the constant. As a corollary, humans and nonhumans (especially animals, and game animals in particular) partake of the same ontological makeup, and what varies is their point of view, that is, their specific perspective. He dubs this dichotomy Amerindian multinaturalism versus Western “multiculturalism.” “One ‘single’ culture,” multiple “natures,” he asserts (Viveiros de Castro 1998, p. 478) and reiterates (Viveiros de Castro 2004, p. 6). These various natures would be literally incorporated in the body. In a plethora of articles, he persistently elaborates on this idea (Viveiros de Castro 1998, 2002, 2004, 2011). Each new publication takes his generalizing imagination a little further away from the nitty-gritty of indigenous real life. Structuralism is at once his inspiration and point of departure, whereas a certain facet of Western metaphysics is part of his motivation and rhetoric. Latour (2009) eagerly endorsed perspectivism as it reinforces his hyperbolic argument against modernity according to which the West is as “holistic” as any indigenous society. This review intends to survey perspectivism by pointing out its contribution as well as its shortcomings.

AMAZONIAN INDIANS BACK ON CENTER STAGE

In the past two decades, perspectivism has dominated a certain kind of ethnography both

in Brazil and abroad, influenced a growing number of professionals and students, and projected Brazilian anthropology beyond its national borders. Unlike the equally influential theory of interethnic friction proposed by another Brazilian anthropologist, Cardoso de Oliveira, in the 1960s and 1970s (Cardoso de Oliveira 1960, 1964, 1968, 1972, 1976), perspectivism bypasses the political reality of interethnic conflict to concentrate on the principles of ontology and cosmology internal to indigenous cultures. Under Viveiros de Castro's leadership, an impressive collection of monographic works on Amazonian Indians has been produced since the 1990s (Andrello 2006; Calavia Sáez 2006; Cesarino 2011; Fausto 2001; Gonçalves 2001; Gordon 2006; Lagrou 2007; Lasmar 2005; Lima 2005; Pinto 1997; Pissolato 2007; Vilaça 1992, 2006; among others).

However, most of this copious production fails to exhibit the talent of its mentor. In contrast to the theory of interethnic friction, which was enacted with similar aptitude by its creator and many of his followers, perspectivism suffers from what has troubled, for instance, Marxism: It is very interesting in Marx's hands, but not so in those of many of his disciples. A common feature of these perspectivism-inspired works is the uniformity of results. Most focus on cosmology, shamanism, categories of otherness, eschatology, mythology, and associated symbolic systems. Such similitude of ethnographic products reinforces the notion that perspectivism is the most appropriate theoretical strategy to apply in indigenous Amazonia, thus creating a feedback effect that propels further research projects in the same direction. The Indians thus portrayed, regardless of where they are in the Amazon, what their linguistic affiliation is, and which historical paths they have trodden, differ very little from each other. Perhaps the model's excessive generality and its prêt-à-porter character render it easily applicable even when it is not quite appropriate. Regrettably, it has become a facile recipe for producing copies without the flair of the original. The ease with which one can deploy perspectivism facilitates its dissemination and capacity to travel far and wide.

Just like Lévi-Strauss's structuralism, when used in local cultures, perspectivism leaves out such a large sociocultural residue that the final product is a suspect ethnographic homogeneity covering over the Amazon and beyond. The creativity and specificity of each indigenous group are thus drowned under the run-of-the-mill Kuhn (1970) called "normal science."

I do not delve into particular perspectivist ethnographies, important as it is to assess the merit and shortcomings of this theory when applied to the specificity of ethnographic work. My purpose is rather to delineate perspectivism in terms of its theoretical, methodological, and political profile.

PERSPECTIVISM IN A POLITICAL NEVERLAND

Most ethnographers who spend more than a couple of months in an Indian village recognize in Viveiros de Castro's "discovery" of animal-human interaction a very familiar phenomenon. Intercourse between human and nonhuman beings is a recurring fact in fieldwork, regardless of one's research focus. Nevertheless, this does not entitle us to propose that, for the Indians in general, culture is constant and nature is variable. First, because there are no Indians in general; second, because the very idea of nature as we use the word, be it one or many, is mostly alien to indigenous peoples; third, because to attribute so much uniformity to native thinking—Amerindian thought, Amerindian mind, Amerindian soul, even Amerindian *Bildung* are favorite phrases (Viveiros de Castro 1998, pp. 470, 476, 478, 481, 482; 2004, pp. 6,19; 2011, p. 3)—is to flatten down (if not deny) their inventiveness and aesthetic sophistication and to ignore their specific historical trajectories. Essentialism may be an apt label for such an approach. There is no reason why we should expect indigenous peoples to behave according to this or that academic model. And fourth, because to squeeze the ethnographic imagination into a rigid cast is to rob anthropology of its best asset, namely, to expose the heedless "West" to the

intellectual wealth of the "Rest." The novelty in Viveiros de Castro's theoretical proposition hinges on its philosophical rhetoric, which is more appropriate to generalizations than to the understanding of specific worlds of meaning, a feature he candidly admits: "[M]y strong (or weak) point has always been the synthesis, generalization, and comparison rather than the fine phenomenological analysis of ethnographic materials" (Viveiros de Castro 2011, p. 3). Unfortunately, this inclination has skidded into the terrain of reductionism, oversimplification, and overinterpretation. For a West-trained mind, to break up with deeply rooted dichotomies would take much more effort than required to simply invert the terms of an equation. Indeed, perspectivism replicates structuralism, (Turner 2009) without the latter's ambitious quest to arrive at a universal human mind frame.

As in the structuralist era, the enormous indigenous diversity is currently in danger of being compressed into formulas and principles of an alien philosophy. For this reason, and for the automatism with which it has been applied, perspectivism, started as a brilliant idea, runs the risk of spawning a new ethnographic species: a generic Amerindian forever trading substances and viewpoints with animals in a cosmological orgy of predation and cannibalism. Closely associated, but somewhat in competition with perspectivism, and equally inspired by French structuralism, is the model concept of animism, an anthropological defunct that has been resurrected by French anthropologist Descola (1996a,b; Bird-David 1999). Whatever its theoretical sequels may be, the perspectivist model for constructing ethnographies has stamped its brand on Brazilian anthropology and has become a reference point in international ethnology.

By and large, perspectivism is indifferent to political considerations regarding the predicament of indigenous peoples in adverse interethnic contexts, but it can be the object of political scrutiny. If we agree with Austin (1975) that words can shape behavior and, hence, reality, it should not go unnoticed that perspectivist vocabulary has the disquieting potential to add

to indigenous political difficulties and intellectual fragility. I exemplify this point by focusing on some terms that, as anthropological commonplace, frequently appear in perspectivist discourses without a necessary critical appraisal.

Take, for instance, cosmology. A perfectly sound concept in its dictionary sense, it becomes problematic in its vulgar rendering. As the study of the cosmos, it maintains its scientific integrity, but as worldview, its most current anthropological usage, it has opened up an unnecessary gap between indigenous and Western science. A theory of knowledge along the lines Evans-Pritchard (1937) spelled out for Zande witchcraft merits the name epistemology rather than cosmology. In this sense, the creation and popularity of the notion of “pensée sauvage” (Lévi-Strauss 1962) has contributed to widening the gap between Western and indigenous knowledge systems, despite Lévi-Strauss’s caveat that savage, wild, nonscientific thinking is also present in the West. Even in the academic milieu, one easily forgets this Lévi-Straussian appeal to the “psychic unity of mankind” and often regards savage thought as mere folklore pertaining exclusively to native peoples. Moreover, to characterize, as Lévi-Strauss did, indigenous intellectual activity as a manifestation of the “science of the concrete” contributes to reducing indigenous thinking to an infrascientific level. We should recall that Lévi-Strauss’s way to demonstrate indigenous acumen was to present a patchwork of curiosities very likely to be read by laypersons as a collection of assorted beliefs rather than as expressions of empirical knowledge. His cut-and-paste multiethnographic demonstration was intended to show that indigenous classifications are mostly an intellectual endeavor not limited to merely pragmatic considerations. Ultimately, however, Lévi-Strauss did not distance himself from Lévy-Brühl (1910) as much as he claimed. Both induced the uninformed reader to imagine indigenous worlds as turning around mystical and mythical relationships, thus favoring the exotic at the expense of the empirical. In short, the “science of the concrete” has very little of the concrete and even less of science.

With this Lévi-Straussian canon guiding the profession for more than two decades, it is understandable that anthropologists have stuck to the reduced model conveyed in the concept of cosmology. As a result, the Indians have cosmology, whereas Westerners have theory. Furthermore, Lévi-Strauss’s proposition has been deemed so efficient as to induce us to believe that it equips us to reach out into the most intimate corners of indigenous cosmological systems. In perspectivism, a label Viveiros de Castro (2004, p. 5) uses to refer to “a set of ideas and practices found throughout indigenous America,” cosmology is a key concept. “This cosmology imagines a universe peopled by different types of subjective agencies, human as well as nonhuman, each endowed with the same generic type of soul, that is, the same set of cognitive and volitional capacities” (Viveiros de Castro 2004, p. 6). Here cosmology is an instrument of reductionism, a conceptual cookie cutter leveling out all differences both trivial and important that make a difference between being a Makuna, a Ye’kuana, or a Yanomami (to invoke the examples by J.A. Kelly, unpublished information¹). Myth is another loaded term. Like any other word, it is not semantically neutral. Myth is part of the common language used by both anthropologists and nonanthropologists. Precisely because we share the same idiom with our readers, nonspecialists can read what we write. However, the fact that our work is read does not mean it is understood as we intend it to be. And this is where the problem arises. The meaning anthropologists attribute to myth has very little or nothing at all to do with its popular sense. In the latter,

¹In an unpublished paper titled “Multinatural Perspectivism,” J.A. Kelly assembles a number of assorted short passages from ethnographic works on the Yekuana in Venezuela, the Makuna in Colombia, and the Yanomami in Brazil. From these unconnected passages, he concludes that such “fragments of indigenous discourse” (p. 1) provide “substantial evidence of MP [multinatural perspectivism] as a phenomenon, as a constitutive part of Amerindian’s socio-cosmological regimes” (p. 11). At no point does the author justify having chosen those and not any other fragments out of the rich ethnographic material he selected.

myth is very often a synonym of lie, pretense, falsehood, a way of thinking opposed to scientific and logical thought. The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* reinforces this notion by including among its definitions of myth “a person or thing having only an imaginary or unverifiable existence” (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/myth>). Although some anthropologists may not disagree with these meanings, most would be uncomfortable as they witness the Indians telling their fascinating narratives that, perhaps with innocent license, they call myths. To do justice to the philosophical depth of these narratives, it would be more appropriate to abandon the term myth, for it occupies a niche in Western perception that has no correspondence with the indigenous narratives mislabeled as myths.



If terms such as cosmology and myth can potentially diminish the intellectual value of indigenous thinking, what to say of cannibalism, one of the favorite themes in perspectivist theory? “[T]he omnipresence of cannibalism [is] the ‘predicative’ horizon of all relations with the other, be they matrimonial, alimentary or bellicose” (Viveiros de Castro 1998, p. 480). Contributing to the pejorative connotations of this term, the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* provides as synonyms of cannibalism “savage cruelty; barbarism.”

A companion to cannibalism, the concept of predation is equally ubiquitous in the perspectivist lexicon. Cannibalism-cum-predation constitutes the medium of interaction between humans and nonhumans, be they animals or spirits. Whether these terms make sense in the confined ambiance of academic theoretical debates is a matter of intellectual frustration or gratification. However, as mentioned above, our anthropological products can reach out, potentially or actually, into the real world, and when that happens, the words we use are, we may say, up for grabs. How can we expect the general reader, nonspecialist in the ethnography of lowland South America, to be able or willing to convert words such as predation and cannibalism into a metaphor, a figurative way of speaking, rather than take them literally and

then dub the Indians as savage predators? Is it reasonable to imagine that anthropological eloquence has the power to convince laypeople to discard the overload of archetypes coming down the centuries about man-eating brutes, primitive warmongers, and doomed heathens (Ramos 1998, pp. 11–59)?

The issue of ethics and social responsibility came home to North American anthropologists with the publication of *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon* by US journalist Tierney (2000). The massive scandal it provoked is still in the profession’s living memory and led to a number of actions and events aimed mostly at minimizing the harmful effects that ethnographic research and writing can have on the people studied (Borofsky 2005). An array of abusive reports in the mass media, allegedly based on Chagnon’s work (1968, 1988), portrayed the Yanomami as killers, warmongers, baboon-like, etc. This negative publicity provided the Brazilian military in the late 1980s with arguments to dismember the Yanomami lands into “19 small ‘islands’: being too violent, they have to be separated in order to be ‘civilized,’ as the Military Chief of Staff, General Bayma Denys, [...] commented to journalists” (Albert & Ramos 1989, p. 632). His source of ethnographic information was a series of newspaper articles reproducing fragments of the 1988 *Science* article by Chagnon (Ramos 1995, 1996).



Apart from the real political risks that the use of such vocabulary entails for the Indians, the generalized perspectivist use of predation imputes characteristics to indigenous peoples that are often insufficiently established by solid ethnographic data and analyses. In many cases, rather than an empirical demonstration, this problematic term is no more than a discursive device.

Frugality in humbleness and self-criticism, albeit often unconscious, can constrain anthropologists in several ways. On the one hand, it is quite uncomfortable to face the increasingly evident indigenous challenge regarding our capacity to interpret their worlds. Lack of self-criticism painfully exposes our analytical

limitations. There are many ethnographic scenarios where Indians have shown a clear mistrust of anthropologists' work, which comes as no surprise if we consider that theoretically ambitious anthropologists have distinguished themselves in their ability to take local precepts from around the world as raw material to construct grand descriptive or explanatory schemes. Each theory derived from fieldwork among indigenous peoples has transformed research material into something different from the sum of its original parts, hence reducing each native theory of knowledge to the anonymity of ethnographic data.

At different moments, concerned anthropologists have taken our discipline to task for having deprived the peoples we study of certain Western prerogatives. Fabian (1983) called our attention to the denial of coevalness in much ethnographic writing. Perhaps unconsciously (which is not an excuse, instead quite the opposite), anthropologists habitually write about their hosts in the past tense as if the latter lived suspended in a fixed, unchanging time slot, usually bounded by the ethnographer's sojourn among them. In so doing, anthropologists consign these "natives" to the past, thus depriving them of historicity and participation in present events. We should also recall Goody (2007) in his condemnation of the West for the theft of other peoples' history. When historians, perhaps absent mindedly, ignore achievements, such as inventions, originated in other milieus, they contribute to the West's self-aggrandizement. Anthropology, as a Western artifact, often inadvertently, has added to this theft of histories, but its greatest responsibility lies in its contribution to the theft of native theories.

Furthermore, the intellectual arrogance found in some academic quarters limits anthropology's potential to build a truly theoretical *ecumene*² (Ramos 2011), that is, the coexistence on equal terms of academic and

indigenous epistemologies, and to create the conditions of possibility for the establishment of a common cross-cultural field of intellectual debate. Still worse, this arrogance can intensify the potential for discrimination via discourses that obstruct the dissemination of knowledge about indigenous peoples and, hence, preclude respect for them.

OUT ON A LIMB

Proponents of perspectivism assert the importance of "taking the Indians seriously" (Viveiros de Castro 2002, p. 129; 2011, p. 5), a rather startling enterprise, considering that anthropologists, of all people, should take it as a matter of course, a *sine qua non* condition for fieldwork and subsequent analysis. Yet, this truism is surprisingly overlooked, beginning with Viveiros de Castro. The oft-repeated quote extracted from Lévi-Strauss (1976) about the sixteenth-century episode in which the natives drowned white people to see whether their bodies were real and capable of rotting away has taken up an iconic status in perspectivism. Whereas the Spaniards busied themselves with debates about whether the Indians had souls (spirits), the Indians experimented with the corporeal reality of the Spaniards (Viveiros de Castro 2004, p. 8). This anecdote so excited Viveiros de Castro's imagination as to lead him to state that it "encapsulates the anthropological situation or event par excellence, expressing the quintessence of what our discipline is all about" (Viveiros de Castro 2004, p. 10).

A critic of Lévi-Strauss's dualism between nature (as given) and culture (as variable), Viveiros de Castro aspires to break away from it. Nevertheless, this breach is more apparent than real, for what he proposes is a mere reversal of the terms—culture (as given) and nature (as variable). He then proceeds to demonstrate this maxim by adding more ethnographic tidbits by means of the cut-and-paste technique, as

²The term *ecumene*, from the ancient Greek *Oikoumenê*, has been used in anthropology at least since the mid-1940s. In its current anthropological use, it roughly refers to the

global recognition of distinct, legitimate voices (Hannerz 1996, Kroeber 1945).



did Lévi-Strauss before him, and as does one of Viveiros de Castro's followers in a tenaciously persistent way (J.A. Kelly, unpublished information). The selective choice of ethnographic passages picked out of their usually very complex contexts assures the possibility of achieving a much-coveted elegance of analysis, by juxtaposing statements that point in the direction of the analyst's choice.

Elegance, however, can be a sort of mermaid's song. Enticing as it is, its very allure can disclose its shortcomings. Viveiros de Castro evokes the success Sahlins attained with his lavishly elegant analysis of the story about Captain Cook's fatal blunder in Hawai'i as he miscalculated his luck as god Lono's impersonator. A native Hawaiian intellectual was required to unravel Sahlins' elegant equivocation (a concept to which I return below). Hawaiian political scientist Silva (2004) describes the work of US missionaries in nineteenth-century Hawaii. For the purpose of translating the Bible, these missionaries opened schools and printing presses. In due time, the native peoples learned to use them and began to write copiously about their own history, literature, worldview, etc. Published in the indigenous language, these documents were only superficially understood by the missionaries owing to the extensive use of figures of speech intended for Hawaiian readers only. These writings served as political tools in the Hawaiians' struggle against US annexation of the archipelago. But they also recorded quantities of narratives that account for the emergence and maintenance of Hawaiian ethnic integrity. They contain a long inventory of local divinities, of which Lono is but one, and a catalog of European explorers, including Captain Cook. Had Sahlins read that literature and chosen to explore Hawaiian written history in the Hawaiian language, very likely his analyses (1981, 1985) would not display such trim and glittering elegance. More often than not, cultural complexity gets in the way of analyses that meet the criteria of economy, parsimony, and elegance, as in canonical linguistics. The mismatch between neat analyses and the complexities of life is

an old anthropological habit that, as so many others, dies hard. No wonder V. Turner, impatient with the elegance of formalism, used a quote from poet Robert Browning—"On earth the broken arcs, in heaven the perfect round"—to affirm the following:

Complex, urbanized societies have generated classes of literate specialists, intellectuals of various kinds, including cultural anthropologists, whose paid business... is to devise logical plans, order concepts into related series, establish taxonomic hierarchies, denature ritual by theologizing it, freeze thought into philosophy.... Anthropologists have assigned overmuch prestige to the models held up to them by these and similar professionals and imposed upon the living tissues of dynamic social reality in non-Western cultures the branding irons of Western scholarly thought. (Turner 1975, p. 146)

Drawing a parallel to his own interpretation about bodies and spirits, Viveiros de Castro (2004, p. 10), apparently oblivious of these criticisms, incurs Sahlins's aesthetic temptation. Whereas the latter used European documents as research material, the former singled out fragments collected in the field, in written ethnographies, or in personal communications (Viveiros de Castro 2002, pp. 132–40) to compile grandiose interpretations about indigenous souls, minds, and "natures." "Since the soul is formally identical in all species, it can only see the same things everywhere—the difference is given in the specificity of bodies" (Viveiros de Castro 1998, p. 478). Such interpretations often exceed ethnographic good sense (Turner 2009) or lack significance in local contexts. This is clearly a syndrome of what Eco (1992) criticizes as overinterpretation. He shows, for example, the futility of finding signs of occultism in works such as Dante's *Divina Comedia*, because, even if they were found—and given the size and depth of the oeuvre, they may be found—they would contribute little or nothing at all to the understanding of the text and the author's purpose. In short, it would

be an idle exercise in “looking for hair on an eggshell,” as the Brazilian saying goes.

A high point in Viveiros de Castro’s (2004) more recent work is his reflections on the concept of controlled equivocation. Akin to the notion of equivocal compatibilities presented by Portuguese anthropologist Pina Cabral (2002), and to the familiar idea of productive misunderstanding, controlled equivocation is, indeed, the quintessence of the ethnographic métier. If communication among same-language speakers is a sort of gamble in which the chances of being misunderstood are considerable, what to say of the interaction of people who live in different social worlds and speak different languages? To do ethnography is to translate and, as Viveiros de Castro (2004, p. 10) rightly points out, to “translate is to presume that an equivocation always exists; it is to communicate by differences, instead of silencing the Other by presuming a univocality—the essential similarity—between what the Other and We are saying.” We cannot overstate the importance of this statement. Image-making hinges upon it. Cross-cultural fairness depends on it. Intercultural interaction is possible only if the engaged parties are aware of it. The 12 cases explored in the volume *Pacificando o Branco* (*Pacifying the Whiteman*) (Albert & Ramos 2000) are examples of the indigenous effort to control equivocation in their encounters with non-Indians. Each case brings up representations of interethnic contact, “true devices . . . for the symbolic and ritual domestication of the whites’ alterity and neutralization of their evil powers (pestilence and violence)” (Albert 2000, p. 10). Bateson’s concern about the spreading of exoticism by anthropology is another example:

If it were possible adequately to present the whole of a culture, stressing every aspect exactly as it is stressed in the culture itself, no single detail would appear bizarre or strange or arbitrary to the reader, but rather the details would all appear natural and reasonable as they do to the natives who have lived all their lives within the culture. (Bateson 1958, p. 1)

Bateson’s “if” sets the limits of cross-cultural communication and spells out the inexorable domain of equivocation. But even if that “if” were eliminated, there would be no guarantee of an adequate degree of intercommunication. If the desired grasp of a culture’s totality falls short of utter transparency, what can we say about the patchy cut-and-paste method current among theoreticians such as Lévi-Strauss, Viveiros de Castro, and many others?

The methodological convenience of selecting ethnographic fragments as building blocks for grand theories creates an illusion of universalization. When put back in context, these fragments lose much of their weight. One of Viveiros de Castro’s most frequently evoked indigenous people to prove that perspectivism is the antidote for anthropology’s “intellectual narrowness” (Viveiros de Castro 2002, p. 135) are the Makuna of Northwest Amazon, according to Århem, one of their ethnographers (Viveiros de Castro 1998, pp. 469, 472, 475, 477). Viveiros de Castro’s use of Makuna ethnographic traits is not wrong, but it misses the point about what holds together the Makuna logical system. Over and above the fact that jaguars and humans exchange substances and viewpoints, the yurupary complex, which includes jaguars, humans, spirits, ritual objects, as well as spaces and times both of origin and currently obtained (and a great deal more), is so pervasive that one has to resort to Western high science as a mental aid to appreciate its full dimension. At one and the same time, yurupary is institution, ideology, theory, and practice. It is the power that moves the world and the major source of knowledge. In sum, it is at the basis, so to speak, of the atomic constitution of Makuna society. Like thought itself, it is anywhere and everywhere. Like the DNA of Western genetics, yurupary is constitutive of both micro and macro phenomena, making sense of apparently disparate elements, bringing together ideas and actions that, at first sight, seemed disjointed to the ethnographer’s eye (Cayón 2010). It is, in other words, impervious to cutting and pasting.

THE LIMITS OF GENERALIZATION

The yurupy case in the Makuna context demonstrates that it is not sound anthropology to assert that multinaturalism is universal in the Amerindian world. What a people's jaguar perceives is not what all peoples' jaguars perceive (a point stressed by Turner 2009), let alone the perception of the jaguars themselves! Each new text takes Viveiros de Castro a notch up in extravagant statements that become increasingly self-indulgent, verging on irreverence. The following trying translation effort provides an example: "a model we might label 'quasi-ergative' (or, who knows, 'split ergativity,' if I knew what that is)" (Viveiros de Castro 2011, p. 4). The ease with which overstated generalizations are made in the name of an "Amerindian perspectivist cosmology" (Viveiros de Castro 2004, p. 11) can astound seasoned anthropologists familiar with indigenous Amazonia. Carried away by his own eloquence, Viveiros de Castro has taken unwarranted liberties with indigenous ethnography. Consider the following passages: "Amerindian thought can be described as a political ontology of the senses, a radical materialist pan-psychism." It is a thought that conceives of "a dense universe, saturated with intentions that are avid for differences" in which all relations are social. These relations "are schematized by means of an oral-cannibal imagery, a topic obsessively trophic that inflects all conceivable cases and voices of the verb to eat: tell me how, with whom and what you eat (and what you eat with whom)—and I'll tell you who you are. One predicates through the mouth" (Viveiros de Castro 2011, p. 3). Despite the numerous analyses of the ritual use of the human body (Seeger 1975, Turner 2007), Viveiros de Castro goes out on a limb with gratuitous tirades such as these. With sweeping flamboyance, entire indigenous traditions, such as the highly valued arts of oratory, ceremonial dialogues, shamanic séances, ritual singing and chanting, and other powerful verbal expressions, meticulously constructed and diversified through untold

generations, are reduced to a gluttonous gaping mouth!

One cannot but wonder about the merit of grand theories as exemplified by perspectivism. Although it has inspired—and continues to do so—younger anthropologists, it entails a number of risks, as V. Turner pointed out decades ago. First, it is open to vulgar replication, inviting interpretative excesses. Second, it is easily replicated, leading to an implausible uniformity of results and often taking the disquieting shape of a dogma. Third and foremost, by reducing ethnographic complexity to a single model, it virtually refuses to acknowledge indigenous creativity. Moreover, such a reduced model, interesting as it may seem to perspectivists, is not so for the Indians. By abdicating the central role of ethnographic research as a means to arrive at a deeper understanding of and respect for indigenous peoples, perspectivism fails to incite ethnographers to use their anthropological imagination for new discoveries. Moreover, as a theory, perspectivism is, at best, indifferent to the historical and political predicament of indigenous life in the modern world. It may be fair to say that the more extensive and deeper ethnographic knowledge is, the less arrogant we become and the more clearly we perceive the folly of projecting our theoretical ambitions on indigenous peoples. It is not without a shade of nostalgia that we look back at Viveiros de Castro's superb "O Mármore e a Murta" ("Marble and Myrtle"), a fine analysis of missionary work in sixteenth-century Brazil (1992), and his contribution to the *Annual Review of Anthropology* (1996) on images of nature and society in indigenous studies in the Amazon.

Perspectivism's theoretical goal, rather than a down-to-earth hermeneutical effort (phenomenological, in Viveiros de Castro's parlance) (see Viveiros de Castro 2011, p. 3), attempts to arrive at the equivalence between native and academic epistemologies. It is interested in "anthropological knowledge involving the fundamental presupposition that the procedures which characterize research are conceptually of the same order as those investigated" (Viveiros de Castro 2002, pp. 116–17;

see also Gordon n.d.; J.A. Kelly, unpublished information). As a philosophical proposition, it is a welcome change from the anthropological inclination to dodge this issue. Nevertheless, pretentious rhetoric and outlandish generalizations are at odds with the ethnographic works singled out as material for building a “symmetrical” anthropology (a cherished phrase as, for instance, in Gordon n.d.). It is, after all, in the actual products of ethnographic research that theoretical changes are likely to occur and new anthropological patterns emerge, as some classical texts demonstrate. The great majority of perspectivist products have yet to show convincingly that they are heading toward a “trans-epistemic” anthropology in the sense of taking indigenous systems of knowledge on equal intellectual terms (Ramos 2010, pp. 40–42). **Between theoretical propositions and empirical results there seems to be a vacillation that reveals the distance between the perspectivist philosophical postulation and its ethnographic practice.** After all, cultural theories are tools to understand real cultures. Let us not call this substantialism or essentialism, for labels are not good substitutes for content. Why not hear the Indians first hand?

It seems that many ideas generated in university offices do not travel well to the fields of research. Intellectual efforts notwithstanding, we still find the old ethnographic division of labor between those who know (the ethnographers) and those who let themselves be known (the natives). This matter is much too complex to be resolved only with theoretical aspirations. Indigenous intellectuals in Brazil begin to follow on the steps of their counterparts around the world (Alfred 2009, Churchill 1997, Deloria Jr. 1988 [1969], Díaz 2007, Fixico 2003, Kowii 2007, Mamani Ramírez 2005, Mihesuan & Wilson 2004, Sampaio 2010, Sioui 1992, Smith 1999, and many more). A new political scenario has brought out new challenges to anthropology. One such challenge has to do with the indigenous rebellion against academic hegemony in ethnographic research. Luciano, a Baniwa Indian from the Uaupés region in Northwest Amazon who recently received his

doctoral degree in anthropology, states that now,

instead of a white subject studying Indian subjects as objects of knowledge, which allowed him [her] to claim an alleged objectivity and epistemic neutrality, a new situation emerges where Indian subjects study themselves as agents who think and produce knowledge, and soon there will also be indigenous subjects studying whites, including anthropologists. (Luciano 2011, p. 105)

Auto-ethnographies as Luciano proposes, in fact, should be regarded as the culmination of the political effort on the part of generations of Brazilian anthropologists who believe that **academic work and political engagement should go hand in hand (Ramos 1990). Nevertheless, it is high time we evaluate disengagement as the ultimate result of engagement, as indigenous peoples progressively occupy political and academic spaces. Anthropologists should be prepared to welcome them to center stage. Indeed, “[h]ow much more engaged can an anthropologist be in renouncing not only the status of ethnographic authority, but also the decades-long role of nursing the wounds of subjugated indigenous people?” (Ramos 2008, p. 481).** Other roles await the committed anthropologist, such as that of supporting actor in political arenas and responsive peer in intellectual endeavors.

If perspectivism is an indigenous anthropology, it is so only vicariously, through the ethnographers’ writings. This sort of ventriloquism [a concept Viveiros de Castro (2004, p. 12) evokes with a different key]—perhaps an inevitable feature of theory building—assures that the voice we hear is not indigenous, but an alien verbalization, an ersatz native, **a sort of hyperreal Indian (Ramos 1994) that is much easier to absorb than the real native. More appropriate in the new Brazilian context of widespread indigenous higher education would be to extinguish the ventriloquist and make room for the voices of the Indians themselves,** thus reducing

intermediacy and transforming the puppet into a cothinker and “symmetrical” interlocutor.

CODA

Once more, philosopher Langer, to whom Geertz (1973, p. 3) resorted in his critique of grand ideas in anthropology, can help us evaluate the just dimension of perspectivism as a theory. Overgrown concepts that seem omnipresent, all-encompassing, and even mandatory while in their prime pass through the sieve of time with greater or less success, greater or less durability. In Langer’s lucid assessment, it “is the most natural and appropriate thing in the world for a new problem or a new terminology to have a vogue that crowds out everything else for a little while.” She continues, stating

we try it in every connection, for every purpose, experiment with possible stretches of its strict meaning, with generalizations and derivatives. When we become familiar with the new idea our expectations do not outrun its actual uses quite so far, and then its unbalanced popularity is over. (Langer 1951, p. 31)

Eventually, the *grande idée* “no longer has the grandiose, all-promising scope, the infinite versatility of apparent application, it once had” (Geertz 1973, p. 4).

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holding that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my colleagues Wilson Trajano Filho and Luis Cayón for their invaluable comments.

LITERATURE CITED

Albert B. 2000. Introdução: cosmologias do contato no Norte-Amazônico. See Albert & Ramos 2000, pp. 9–21
Albert B, Ramos A. 1989. Yanomami Indians and anthropological ethics. *Science* 244:632

The wisdom of seasoned scholars leads us to forecast the future of perspectivism as an all-encompassing Amerindian theory. Overgrown and oversaturated notions with this degree of generality are destined to either burst out into oblivion or slim down to a proper size and realistic dimension. Once the current enthusiasm for “multinatural perspectivism” recedes, it will probably enter the array of concepts that are helpful in certain contexts. It will likely come to designate that which most, if not all, ethnographers of indigenous life have known for a long time, namely, the constant and, in various degrees, intimate intercourse, both symbolic and practical, between humans and nonhumans. The vast majority of indigenous ethnographies are brimming with examples of transformations, assimilations, associations, communion and exchange of substances, and antagonisms between human beings, animals, and supranatural entities, in short, the great reservoir of “facts” that has fed the perspectivist imagination. This plethora of data, however, does not lend itself automatically to theoretical experiments, let alone scholarly subtleties of vocabulary that can be misappropriated and misused, thereby putting the intellectual integrity and cultural security of specific peoples at risk. It is hard to overstate the demand that, regardless of one’s theoretical persuasion, anthropologists must not renounce their role as responsible political actors.

- Albert B, Ramos A, eds. 2000. *Pacificando o Branco: Cosmologias do Contato no Norte-Amazônico*. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp. 532 pp.
- Alfred T. 2009. *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. 2nd. ed. 202 pp.
- Andrello G. 2006. *Cidade do Índio: Transformações e Cotidiano em Iauaretê*. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp. 447 pp.
- Austin JL. 1975. *How To Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press. 2nd. ed. 169 pp.
- Bateson G. 1958. *Naven: A Survey of the Problems Suggested by a Composite Picture of a Culture of a New Guinea Tribe Drawn from Three Points of View*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Univ. Press. 343 pp.
- Bird-David N. 1999. "Animism" revisited: personhood, environment, and relational epistemology. *Curr. Anthropol.* 40(S):S67–91
- Borofsky R, ed. 2005. *Yanomami: The Fierce Controversy and What We Can Learn From It*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. 391 pp.
- Calavia Sáez O. 2006. *O Nome e o Tempo dos Yaminawa*. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp. 479 pp.
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1960. *O Processo de Assimilação dos Terena*. Rio de Janeiro: Mus. Nac. 266 pp.
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1964. *O Índio e o Mundo dos Brancos: A Situação dos Tukuna do Alto Solimões*. São Paulo: Difusão Eur. Livro. 143 pp.
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1968. *Urbanização e Tribalismo: A Integração dos Índios Terena numa Sociedade de Classes*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar. 237 pp.
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1972. *A Sociologia do Brasil Indígena*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro. 149 pp.
- Cardoso de Oliveira R. 1976. *Identidade, Etnia e Estrutura Social*. São Paulo: Pioneira. 118 pp.
- Cayón L. 2010. *Penso, logo crio: a teoria Makuna do mundo*. PhD thesis. Univ. Brasília. 409 pp.
- Cesarino PN. 2011. *Oniska: Poética do Xamanismo na Amazônia*. São Paulo: Perspectiva. 423 pp.
- Chagnon N. 1968. *Yanomamö: The Fierce People*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 142 pp.
- Chagnon N. 1988. Life histories, blood revenge, and warfare in a tribal population. *Science* 239:985–92
- Churchill W. 1997. *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books. 531 pp.
- Deloria V Jr. 1988 [1969]. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: Univ. Okla. Press. 278 pp.
- Descola P. 1996a. Constructing natures: symbolic ecology and social practice. In *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. P Descola, G Pálsson, pp. 82–102. London: Routledge. 310 pp.
- Descola P. 1996b. *In the Society of Nature: A Native Ecology in Amazonia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. 372 pp.
- Díaz F. 2007. *Escrito: Comunalidad, Energía Viva del Pensamiento Mixe*. Mexico City: Univ. Auton. Mexico. 437 pp.
- Eco U. 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. 164 pp.
- Evans-Pritchard EE. 1937. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande*. Oxford: Clarendon. 558 pp.
- Fabian J. 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press. 205 pp.
- Fausto C. 2001. *Inimigos Fiéis: História, Guerra e Xamanismo na Amazônia*. São Paulo: Edusp. 587 pp.
- Fixico DL. 2003. *The American Indian Mind in a Linear World: American Indian Studies and Traditional Knowledge*. London: Routledge. 207 pp.
- Geertz C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books. 470 pp.
- Gonçalves MA. 2001. *O Mundo Inacabado: Ação e Criação em uma Cosmologia Amazônica. Etnologia Pirabã*. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ. 421 pp.
- Goody J. 2007. *The Theft of History*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. 342 pp.
- Gordon C. 2006. *Economia Selvagem: Ritual e Mercadoria entre os Índios Xikrin-Mebêngôkre*. São Paulo: Unesp. 452 pp.
- Gordon F. n.d. "O sexo dos Caracóis": sugestões para uma antropologia reversa, disparativa e contra o estado. <http://nansi.abaetenet.net/abaetextos/o-sexo-dos-carac%C3%B3is-sugest%C3%B5es-para-uma-antropologia-reversa-disparativa-e-contra-o-estado-fl%C3%A1vio-gordon>
- Hannerz U. 1996. *Transnational Connections*. London: Routledge. 201 pp.
- Kowii A. 2007. Memoria, identidad e interculturalidad de los pueblos de Abya-Yala: el caso de los quichua Otavalo. In *Intelectuales Indígenas Piensan América Latina*, ed. C Zapata, pp. 113–25. Quito: Abya-Yala. 340 pp.

- Kroeber A. 1945. The ancient *oikoumenê* as an historic culture aggregate. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst. G. B. Irel.* 75(1–2):9–20
- Kuhn T. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed. 210 pp.
- Lagrou E. 2007. *A Fluidade da Forma: Arte, Alteridade e Agência em uma Sociedade Amazônica (Kaxinawa, Acre)*. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks. 565 pp.
- Langer SK. 1951. *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*. New York: Mentor. 256 pp.
- Lasmar C. 2005. *De Volta ao Lago do Leite: Gênero e Transformação no Alto Rio Negro*. São Paulo: Unesp. 285 pp.
- Latour B. 2009. Perspectivism: a type or a bomb? *Anthropol. Today* 25(2):1–2
- Lévi-Strauss C. 1962. *La Pensée Sauvage*. Paris: Plon. 395 pp.
- Lévi-Strauss C. 1976. *Antropologia Estrutural Dois*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro. 366 pp.
- Lévy-Brühl L. 1910. *How Natives Think*. Transl. LA Clare, 1985. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. 391 pp.
- Lima TS. 2005. *Um Peixe Olhou para Mim*. São Paulo: Unesp. 399 pp.
- Luciano GJS. 2011. *Educação para manejo e domesticação do mundo: entre a escola ideal e a escola real*. PhD thesis. Univ. Brasília. 387 pp.
- Mamani Ramírez P. 2005. *Geopolíticas Indígenas*. El Alto, Qullasuyu: CADES. 129 pp.
- Mihesuan DA, Wilson AC, eds. 2004. *Indigenizing the Academy: Transforming Scholarship and Empowering Communities*. Lincoln: Univ. Neb. Press. 245 pp.
- Pina Cabral J. 2002. *Between China and Europe: Person, Culture and Emotion in Macao*. London: Continuum. 256 pp.
- Pinto MT. 1997. *Iepari: Sacrifício e Vida Social entre os Índios Arara (Caribe)*. São Paulo: Hucitec. 413 pp.
- Pissolato E. 2007. *A Duração da Pessoa: Mobilidade, Parentesco e Xamanismo Mbya (Guarani)*. São Paulo: Unesp. 445 pp.
- Ramos AR. 1990. Ethnology Brazilian style. *Cult. Anthropol.* 5(4):452–72
- Ramos AR. 1994. The hyperreal Indian. *Crit. Anthropol.* 14(2):153–71
- Ramos AR. 1995. *Sanumá Memories: Yanomami Ethnography in Times of Crisis*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press. 346 pp.
- Ramos AR. 1996. O papel político das epidemias: o caso Yanomami. In *Ya no Hay Lugar para Cazadores: Proceso de Extinción y Transfiguración Cultural en América Latina*, ed. MA Bartolomé, A Barabas, pp. 55–89. Quito: Abya Yala. 263 pp.
- Ramos AR. 2008. Disengaging anthropology. In *A Companion to Latin American Anthropology*, ed. D Poole, pp. 466–84. Oxford: Blackwell. 544 pp.
- Ramos AR. 2010. Revisitando a etnologia à brasileira. In *Horizontes das Ciências Sociais. Antropologia*, ed. LFD Duarte, pp. 25–49. São Paulo: ANPOCS. 487 pp.
- Ramos AR. 2011. Por una antropologia ecoménica. In *Antropología Ahora*, ed. A Grimson, S Merenson, G Noel, pp. 97–124. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno. 175 pp.
- Sahlins M. 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press. 84 pp.
- Sahlins M. 1985. *Islands of History*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 180 pp.
- Sampaio AF. 2010. *Doéthiro: Álvaro Tukano e os Séculos Indígenas no Brasil*. Porto Alegre: Karioka Multimed. Prod. 174 pp.
- Seeger A. 1975. The meaning of body ornaments: a Suyá example. *Ethnology* 14(3):211–24
- Silva NK. 2004. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press. 261 pp.
- Sioui GE. 1992. *For an Amerindian Autobiography*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press. 160 pp.
- Smith LT. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Zed Books. 208 pp.
- Tierney P. 2000. *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon*. New York: Norton. 417 pp.
- Turner TS. 2007 [1980]. The social skin. In *Beyond the Body Proper: Reading in the Anthropology of Material Life*, ed. J Farquhar, M Lock, pp. 83–106. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press. 704 pp.

Turner TS. 2009. The crisis of late structuralism. Perspectivism and animism: rethinking culture, nature, spirit, and bodiliness. *Tipiti J. Soc. Anthropol. Lowl. S. Am.* 7(1):1–42

Turner V. 1975. Symbolic studies. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 4:145–61

Vilaça A. 1992. *Comendo como Gente: Formas do Canibalismo Wari' (Pakaa Nova)*. Rio de Janeiro: ANPOCS. 363 pp.

Vilaça A. 2006. *Quem Somos Nós: Os Wari' Encontram os Brancos*. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ. 607 pp.

Viveiros de Castro E. 1992. O mármore e a murta. *Rev. Antropol.* 35:21–74

Viveiros de Castro E. 1996. Images of nature and society in Amazonian ethnology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 25:179–200

Viveiros de Castro E. 1998. Cosmological deixis and Amerindian perspectivism. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.* 4(3):469–88

Viveiros de Castro E. 2002. O nativo relativo. *Mana* 8(1):113–48

Viveiros de Castro E. 2004. Perspectival anthropology and the method of controlled equivocation. *Tipiti J. Soc. Anthropol. Lowl. S. Am.* 2(1):3–22

Viveiros de Castro E. 2011. “Transformação” na antropologia, transformação na “antropologia.” *Sopro Panfleto Polít.-Cult.* 58: <http://culturaebarbarie.org/sopro/outros/transformacoes.html>



Contents

Prefatory Chapter

Ancient Mesopotamian Urbanism and Blurred Disciplinary Boundaries <i>Robert McC. Adams</i>	1
---	---

Archaeology

The Archaeology of Emotion and Affect <i>Sarah Tarlow</i>	169
--	-----

The Archaeology of Money <i>Colin Haselgrove and Stefan Krmnicek</i>	235
---	-----

Phenomenological Approaches in Landscape Archaeology <i>Matthew H. Johnson</i>	269
---	-----

Paleolithic Archaeology in China <i>Ofer Bar-Yosef and Youping Wang</i>	319
--	-----

Archaeological Contributions to Climate Change Research: The Archaeological Record as a Paleoclimatic and Paleoenvironmental Archive <i>Daniel H. Sandweiss and Alice R. Kelley</i>	371
--	-----

Colonialism and Migration in the Ancient Mediterranean <i>Peter van Dommelen</i>	393
---	-----

Archaeometallurgy: The Study of Preindustrial Mining and Metallurgy <i>David Killick and Thomas Fenn</i>	559
---	-----

Rescue Archaeology: A European View <i>Jean-Paul Demoule</i>	611
---	-----

Biological Anthropology

Energetics, Locomotion, and Female Reproduction: Implications for Human Evolution <i>Cara M. Wall-Scheffler</i>	71
---	----

Ethnoprimateology and the Anthropology of the Human-Primate Interface <i>Agustin Fuentes</i>	101
Human Evolution and the Chimpanzee Referential Doctrine <i>Ken Sayers, Mary Ann Raghanti, and C. Owen Lovejoy</i>	119
Chimpanzees and the Behavior of <i>Ardipithecus ramidus</i> <i>Craig B. Stanford</i>	139
Evolution and Environmental Change in Early Human Prehistory <i>Richard Potts</i>	151
Primate Feeding and Foraging: Integrating Studies of Behavior and Morphology <i>W. Scott McGraw and David J. Daegling</i>	203
Madagascar: A History of Arrivals, What Happened, and Will Happen Next <i>Robert E. Dewar and Alison F. Richard</i>	495
Maternal Prenatal Nutrition and Health in Grandchildren and Subsequent Generations <i>E. Susser, J.B. Kirkbride, B.T. Heijmans, J.K. Kresovich, L.H. Lumey, and A.D. Stein</i>	577
Linguistics and Communicative Practices	
Media and Religious Diversity <i>Patrick Eisenlobr</i>	37
Three Waves of Variation Study: The Emergence of Meaning in the Study of Sociolinguistic Variation <i>Penelope Eckert</i>	87
Documents and Bureaucracy <i>Matthew S. Hull</i>	251
The Semiotics of Collective Memories <i>Brigitte M. French</i>	337
Language and Materiality in Global Capitalism <i>Shalini Shankar and Jillian R. Cavanaugh</i>	355
Anthropology in and of the Archives: Possible Futures and Contingent Pasts. Archives as Anthropological Surrogates <i>David Zeitlyn</i>	461
Music, Language, and Texts: Sound and Semiotic Ethnography <i>Paja Faudree</i>	519

International Anthropology and Regional Studies

Contemporary Anthropologies of Indigenous Australia <i>Tess Lea</i>	187
The Politics of Perspectivism <i>Alcida Rita Ramos</i>	481
Anthropologies of Arab-Majority Societies <i>Lara Deeb and Jessica Winegar</i>	537

Sociocultural Anthropology

Lives With Others: Climate Change and Human-Animal Relations <i>Rebecca Cassidy</i>	21
The Politics of the Anthropogenic <i>Nathan F. Sayre</i>	57
Objects of Affect: Photography Beyond the Image <i>Elizabeth Edwards</i>	221
Sea Change: Island Communities and Climate Change <i>Heather Lazrus</i>	285
Enculturating Cells: The Anthropology, Substance, and Science of Stem Cells <i>Aditya Bharadwaj</i>	303
Diabetes and Culture <i>Steve Ferzacca</i>	411
Toward an Ecology of Materials <i>Tim Ingold</i>	427
Sport, Modernity, and the Body <i>Niko Besnier and Susan Brownell</i>	443

Theme I: Materiality

Objects of Affect: Photography Beyond the Image <i>Elizabeth Edwards</i>	221
The Archaeology of Money <i>Colin Haselgrove and Stefan Krmnicek</i>	235
Documents and Bureaucracy <i>Matthew S. Hull</i>	251
Phenomenological Approaches in Landscape Archaeology <i>Matthew H. Johnson</i>	269

Language and Materiality in Global Capitalism <i>Shalini Shankar and Jillian R. Cavanaugh</i>	355
Toward an Ecology of Materials <i>Tim Ingold</i>	427
Anthropology in and of the Archives: Possible Futures and Contingent Pasts. Archives as Anthropological Surrogates <i>David Zeitlyn</i>	461

Theme II: Climate Change

Lives With Others: Climate Change and Human-Animal Relations <i>Rebecca Cassidy</i>	21
The Politics of the Anthropogenic <i>Nathan F. Sayre</i>	57
Ethnoprimatology and the Anthropology of the Human-Primate Interface <i>Agustin Fuentes</i>	101
Evolution and Environmental Change in Early Human Prehistory <i>Richard Potts</i>	151
Sea Change: Island Communities and Climate Change <i>Heather Lazrus</i>	285
Archaeological Contributions to Climate Change Research: The Archaeological Record as a Paleoclimatic and Paleoenvironmental Archive <i>Daniel H. Sandweiss and Alice R. Kelley</i>	371
Madagascar: A History of Arrivals, What Happened, and Will Happen Next <i>Robert E. Dewar and Alison F. Richard</i>	495

Indexes

Cumulative Index of Contributing Authors, Volumes 32–41	627
Cumulative Index of Chapter Titles, Volumes 32–41	631

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Anthropology* articles may be found at <http://anthro.annualreviews.org/errata.shtml>