The Return of the Animists

Recent Studies of Amazonian Ontologies

Luiz Costa and Carlos Fausto

ABSTRACT: The ethnography of lowland South American societies has occupied a central place in recent debates concerning what has been called the 'ontological turn' in anthropology. The concepts of 'animism' and 'perspectivism', which have been revigorated through studies of Amerindian ontologies, figure increasingly in the ethnographies of non-Amerindian peoples and in anthropological theory more generally. This article traces the theoretical and empirical background of these concepts, beginning with the influence of Lévi-Strauss's work on the anthropology of Philippe Descola and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, and proceeding with their impact on Amazonian ethnography. It then investigates the problems that two alternative traditions—one combining a cognitivist with a pragmaticist approach, the other a phenomenological one—pose to recent studies of Amazonian ontologies that rely on the concepts of animism and perspectivism. The article concludes by considering how animism and perspectivism affect our descriptions of Amerindian society and politics, highlighting the new challenges that studies of Amerindian ontologies have begun to address.

KEYWORDS: Amazonia, animism, hunting, ontology, perspectivism, Phenomenology, pragmatics, shamanism

> A lingoa de que usam, toda pela costa, … carece de tres letras, convem a saber, nam se acha nella F, nem L, nem R, cousa digna despanto porque assi nam têm Fé, nem Lei, nem Rei, e desta maneira vivem desordenadamente sem terem alem disto conta, nem peso, nem medida.[1]
>
> —Pero de Magalhães Gandavo, *História da Província Santa Cruz, a que vulgarmente chamamos Brasil* (1576)

Since the beginning of European colonization, the people of lowland South America were characterized by a triple absence: they had no faith, no law, and no king. In other words, no religion, society, or state; three things that, at the time, necessarily implied each other. Indigenous people could therefore only live in total disorder, which was the verdict of the Portuguese chronicler Pero de Magalhães Gandavo, the first person to capture this triple absence in a concise formula. To these deficiencies, Gandavo added a fourth: there was no rule, no standard of measurement. Everything was settled on an ad hoc basis in a *hic et nunc* world.

Religion and Society: Advances in Research 1 (2010): 89–109 © Berghahn Books
doi:10.3167/arrs.2010.010107

Four centuries later, anthropology is still struggling to come to terms with this very same imagery. A large part of mid- to late-twentieth century South American anthropology has been dedicated to working out this 'obscure enigma', as Von Martius labeled it in the nineteenth century. What kind of existence is possible for people living outside of the sacred triangle of law, religion, and the state? Modernist anthropology (which surfaced late in our anthropologically forgotten corner of the world), would respond to this question in the 1960s and 1970s in an optimistic vein: life outside of the sacred triangle is, quite simply, the best life possible. If Amerindians have no law, no religion, and no state, they have the conviviality of kinship, a heterodox form of religiosity and chiefs-without-power who are serfs to their people.

Pierre Clastres is probably the anthropologist most responsible for this shift in tone. He founded a new political anthropology, whose aim was to explain how indigenous peoples had resisted the unifying thrust of the state, which he argued to be dependent on an irreversible division within society. Clastres was more diffident concerning religion, accepting that powerful shamans could potentially become authoritarian leaders and sow the seeds of the state. What kind of religious leaders, then, were Amerindian shamans? What kind of politics resulted from shamanic ontologies and practices? If there was a political anthropology against the state, what would an anthropology of religion against religion look like?

Clastres's premature death prevented him from answering these questions in his witty and provocative manner. The issues behind them, however, lingered among us, marking the subsequent developments of what one could call an anthropology of religion in lowland South America. Unexpectedly, the answers came not from any political model, but from the dissolution of the concept of society and a widening of the field of social relations. In the wake of a new environmental awareness, an old lesson taught by Irving Hallowell finally came to be fully appreciated:

> In the social sciences and psychology, 'persons' and human beings are categorically identified. This identification is inherent in the concept of 'society' and 'social relations'. … Yet this obviously involves a radical abstraction if, from the standpoint of the people being studied, the concept of 'person' is not, in fact, synonymous with human beings but transcends it. (Hallowell 1960: 21)

In this case, studies of so-called social organization could not be limited to relations among humans, but would have to incorporate non-human persons within their scope:

> [I]f in the world view of a people, 'persons' as a class include entities other than human beings, then our objective approach is not adequate for presenting an accurate description of 'the way a man, in a particular society, sees himself in relation to all else'. (ibid.)

If the study of social organization must include 'relations to all else', and if 'all else' includes 'other than human beings' that can appear as persons, then it is no different from the study of religion. Both are part of a wider field, which incorporates all that we used to exclude from the realm of social relations (and included in other domains, such as nature and artifacts). The consequences of Hallowell's insights were not appreciated at the time, although a few specialists on the sub-Arctic and Arctic partially followed his hints.[2] It was arguably only in the late 1990s that it had a real impact on anthropological theory, particularly through the work of Tim Ingold (2000). It was subsequently incorporated by almost all authors writing on shamanistic ontologies in South America, North America, and Siberia.

There was a theoretical shift underway in the early 1990s, which has changed how we define the frontiers between things and persons, individual and society, as well as nature and

culture.[3] The three key figures behind this intellectual movement are Ingold (1986, 2000), Strathern (1988, 1999, 2005), and Latour (1993, 1996, 1999), but this time Amazonian anthropology did not take the backseat.[4] Two Amazonianists have actively contributed to the redefinition of what counts as a person and as a social relation, and consequently of what anthropology is meant to study: Descola (1986, 1992, 1996, 2005) and Viveiros de Castro (1996, 1998, 2002, 2009b).

Despite their wide resonances, the contributions of these two anthropologists have a particular Amazonian flavor and theoretical inflexion: emerging from the monumental Americanist legacy of Claude Lévi-Strauss, they resuscitated a long-buried anthropological concept (animism) and refigured an enduring philosophical one (perspectivism).

The Triumph of Chromatism

Lévi-Strauss's impact on the anthropology of the Americas stems not only from his theories, which have had an enormous influence on the discipline as a whole. It also stems from the fact that these theories were primarily developed from the ethnography of the New World and that they propose theses that specifically engage with the anthropology of the native peoples of the region (Coelho de Souza and Fausto 2004; Gow 2001: 298–302; Viveiros de Castro 1999: 150–51). Nowhere is this more evident than in Lévi-Strauss's study of the transformations of Amerindian myths in space and time (Lévi-Strauss 1964, 1966, 1968, 1971, 1985, 1991). At the heart of this colossal enterprise is the idea that, in their diversity, Amerindian cultures and societies are transformations of an underlying logic that does not reveal itself in the ethnography of any given group, but which is partially and differentially manifest in all of them (Gow 2001: 300). The *Mythologiques* is the necessary starting point for our reflection on Amazonian anthropology insofar as it draws the contours of issues that have constantly re-emerged in the literature since the 1970s.

This does not mean that anthropologists working in the region have simply given continuity to Lévi-Strauss's project. On the contrary, during the 1980s and 1990s most English-speaking authors either explicitly rejected the structuralist legacy (Hill 1988; Overing 1999; Turner 1991) or withdrew from it by focusing on new themes and looking for new approaches (Basso 1987; Graham 1995; Urban 1996). Most criticism was directed against Lévi-Strauss's distinction between cold and hot societies, the privilege of synchronic models, the absence of human agency in his models, and the under-thematization of gender relations. If these authors were admittedly working outside of the structuralist tradition, there were a number of others, most of them settled in Brazil or in France, who continued to work from within Lévi-Strauss's legacy, even when they were critical of it.[5]

Descola and Viveiros de Castro, for example, had been exploring aspects of Lévi-Strauss's work since the early 1980s. The common thread underlying both Descola's treatment of the relation between nature and culture among the Achuar (1994) and Viveiros de Castro's study of the relation between humanity and divinity among the Araweté (1992), is the privilege that they confer to the continuous over the discrete. If Lévi-Strauss had stressed the classificatory and analytical reason common to all humanity, which he argued to be at the root of both our science and their science of the concrete, Descola and Viveiros de Castro were more interested in exploring the continuity existing, respectively, between animals and humans (nature and culture), and humans and gods (culture and supernature). They thus took a central theme in Lévi-Strauss's work—one he had brandished against Lévy-Bruhl's legacy—and subverted it, by exploring the undercurrent of the sensible logic he had investigated.

Viveiros de Castro's book (1992) on the Tupi-Guarani speaking Araweté is an excursion into sacrificial flux against classificatory totemic reason. This contrast is framed through an ethnographically concrete counterpart: the socially amorphous and cannibalistic Tupi-Guarani are described against the backdrop of the dialectical and crystalline Jê-speaking groups of central Brazil. Whereas the latter are obsessed with establishing clear-cut internal social divisions and the relations between them, the former are geared toward the violent incorporation of the exterior. In Lévi-Straussian (1962a, 1962b) terms, this opposition is framed as one between totemic and sacrificial (or metaphorical and metonymical) societies.

Araweté sociology does not display any particularly remarkable pattern unless one takes relationships with their gods as a part of the total social field. It is then that they become particularly interesting because their gods are cannibal others, who convert the Araweté dead into immortals by eating them. Araweté eschatology appears as a structural transformation of sixteenth-century Tupinambá cannibalism.[6] The classical sacrificial triad is here converted into a relation of predation between the living and the gods. The latter occupy the position of the enemy, and are at the center of Araweté social life, much as the captive, killed and devoured in the plaza, was the focus of Tupinambá ritual. The center of society, concludes Viveiros de Castro, is the enemy: "[T]he relationship with the enemy is anterior and superior to society's relationship to itself, rescuing it from an indifferent and natural self-identity" (1992: 301).[7]

The interplay of identity and alterity, the self and the other, which is given prominence in Viveiros de Castro's work is, in fact, a characteristic theme of twentieth-century French philosophy (Descombes 1979) that had an exceptional impact on Amazonian ethnography.[8] Indeed, it became a hallmark of French Americanism, strengthened by Lévi-Strauss's emphasis on alterity, which can be traced back to an article published in 1942 on the social use of kinship terms among Brazilian indians and forward to the *Story of Lynx* (see Coelho de Souza and Fausto 2004), thus covering almost the full breadth of his Americanist work.

This influence makes the Amazonianist tradition into one of the most philosophically oriented regional anthropologies—a state of affairs that has led it to be criticized by Africanists for being far too 'idealistic' (see Taylor 1984). With a clear predominance of structuralist and, later, post-structuralist paradigms, Amazonian anthropology has always had an eye toward Parisian intellectual debates. It is therefore not by chance that Viveiros de Castro's work combines Lévi-Strauss's anthropology with Deleuze's philosophy. In fact, Deleuze and Guatari's *A Thousand Plateaus* makes its mark on much of the book on the Araweté: the notion of 'becoming' (*devenir*), or more precisely 'other-becoming', which confers emphasis on alteration (versus identification) as the basic operation of the cannibal cogito, is an underlying thread of Viveiros de Castro's ethnography.

Unlike Viveiros de Castro, who engaged with post-structuralist French philosophy, Descola's ethnography sought to reconfigure the relationship between nature and culture in opposition to American eco-functionalism and vulgar Marxism. His monographic study of the Jivaroan Achuar is explicitly framed as an effort to bridge the antinomy between two approaches that accord different weight to the polar extremes of the nature/culture dichotomy: one that considers nature "an object upon which to exercise thought," and another that sees "cultural manifestations as epiphenomena of nature's 'natural' work" (Descola 1994: 2).

If Lévi-Strauss's somewhat humble assertion that the *Mythologiques* is a study of the passage from nature to culture (e.g., Lévi-Strauss and Éribon 1990: 186–87) is taken literally, Descola's work explores the interface between these poles by showing how Achuar praxis straddles the great divide and forces us to reconceptualize this overarching dichotomy. If, furthermore, the passage from nature to culture is coterminous with a passage from the con-

tinuous to the discrete, Descola's ethnography of Achuar relations with their socialized environment suggests that they impose a continuity between the social and natural domains.

As such, Achuar engagement with the environment is a symmetrical inversion of Lévi-Strauss's definition of the logic of totemic classification, in which natural discontinuities are seen to be homologous to social segments. Where totemism postulates analogies between the discontinuities of different series (Lévi-Strauss 1962b: 20), the Achuar establish a continuity between humans and non-humans, as the Araweté do between humans and gods. If the questions that guided Descola's ethnography differed from those of Viveiros de Castro, his conclusions nonetheless stress the metonymical qualities of Achuar praxis over the metaphorical divisions of totemic thought.

A new way of reading Lévi-Strauss's work was taking form through these two monographs; it privileged the continuities of socio-cosmic relations with others against the discreteness of an analytical reason, which imposes itself on a material substrate. This was something of a backtrack movement, a sort of Lévi-Bruhlian revenge against Lévi-Strauss, but carried out in name of the latter and with his blessing (Lévi-Strauss 1993; Lévi-Strauss and Viveiros de Castro 1998). This is probably due to the inflection that writing the *Mythologiques* produced in Lévi-Strauss's work. Vilaça (2010) stresses this point, by reminding us of a well-known passage of *The Raw and the Cooked:* "In seeking to imitate the spontaneous movement of mythological thought, this essay … has had to conform to the requirements of that thought and to respect its rhythm."[9]

One thus understands how Lévi-Strauss could have been recovered by authors who had been constantly exploring "the dark side of the Structuralist moon" (Viveiros de Castro 2008: 106). This radical engagement with Lévi-Strauss's project and with the ethnography of the Americas has led many to argue that the *Mythologiques* already contained and preempted much of the criticism that was later to be leveled at it. Peter Gow (2001), for example, would render myths as historical objects, affirming Lévi-Strauss's importance in our understandings of Indigenous conceptions of history against Eurocentric ones.[10] Viveiros de Castro (2009b: 11), for his part, would recognize in Lévi-Strauss "the founder of post-structuralism", re-reading the latter's work as Deleuze used to read his favorite philosophers: by applying a twist, which in this case means exploring the consequences of Deleuze and Guattari's project of a 'generalized chromatism' (see also Viveiros de Castro 2009: 9).[11] Finally, Descola (2005, 2009) would not only resume the study of 'systems of transformations' begun in *The Savage Mind*, but would also show that the opposition between nature and culture, so often criticized as being an immutable dualism of structuralist anthropology, can equally be read in a chromatic register that takes into account the specificities of local conceptions of 'nature' and 'culture'.

From Structure to Ontologies

The restoration of chromatism is part of a more general revolt against the 'moderns' and return to the 'ancients'. Even though the modernist flame began to extinguish itself after 1968, the process was only vested with a gripping phraseology in the social sciences with Bruno Latour's *We Have Never Been Modern* (1993). Modernity came to be seen as an objective illusion that filtered the continuity of the world, purifying it into discrete, clear-cut categories. The modern constitution had been established through an epistemological dichotomy between nature and culture, and it was overturned by an ontological movement: the proliferation of hybrid entities. A new vocabulary substituted our basic categories: in place of the 3 Ss

(structure, system, society), we started using an entirely different set of concepts (ontology, network, sociality) to describe the social world.

The 'ontological turn' in the social sciences, or the project of an ontological anthropology (or of anthropology as 'comparative ontography', as Holbraad [2003] has phrased it), stems from this movement back into pre-modernity that is at the same time a step into post-modernity.[12] If Lévi-Strauss dignified the savage mind by approximating it to science, because both are expressions of the same analytical reasoning, our contemporary movement goes in the opposite direction. It dethrones science by making it a specific chapter of a specific ontology that exists among a whole range of different ontologies that all have the same value. Symmetry is the name of the game.

In this context, we have witnessed the resurgence of 'animism', an old anthropological concept that used to define religious beliefs of a number of 'non-civilized' people. The anthropologist who is most responsible for refashioning the concept and renewing it within the Americanist tradition is Philippe Descola (1992, 1996, 2005). His theory of animism, initially set out in 1992, is a generalization of his conclusions on the relationship between nature and society among the Achuar. Having identified a conceptual substrate of Amazonian societies in which "the human imputation of an interiority identical to their own to non-humans" (Descola 2005: 183) is widespread, if not universal, Descola proceeded to investigate its logical counterpart in the fact that relations between beings with an identical interiority is necessarily social. If humans and non-humans—including animals, spirits, plants, and objects—have an identical interiority, then animism establishes a world in which everyone and everything can be a subject, and in which the default mode of interaction between all beings is that between subjects.

In his early work, Descola followed Lévi-Strauss's opposition between metonymical and metaphorical systems by opposing animism (then called 'animic systems') to totemism (or 'totemic systems') as differing "modes of use and representation of the natural environment" (Descola 1992: 109). In this scheme, the societies of Amazonia are defined as either 'animic systems' or as combinations of 'animic and totemic systems', and although they may coexist, they are seen to be inversions of one another.

But how is this continuity between species manifested ethnographically? If humans and non-humans are somehow identical, how are they to differentiate between themselves? Viveiros de Castro's (1998, 2001) answer is that it is the Amerindian concepts that we usually gloss as 'soul' or 'spirit' that are formally identical across species, while it is the body that establishes differences. This observation has certain implications for how each species sees itself and others. The common soul guarantees that each species sees itself as human, sharing in human culture and language, but different bodies ensure that each species sees others differently. The first characteristic is the principle tenet of animism, and the latter is the minimum condition for perspectivism.[13]

Viveiros de Castro's article on Amazonian perspectivism (1998) is a reply to Descola's revival of animism (1992). Instead of taking 'animic systems' to be a 'scheme of praxis' regulating interactions with nature, Viveiros de Castro explicitly frames 'animism' as "an ontology which postulates the social character of relations between humans and non-humans: the space between nature and society is itself social" (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 473). No longer a way of knowing (an epistemology) and engaging with nature (a praxis), animism is now primarily defined as a way of being (an ontology).[14]

In thus defining animism, Viveiros de Castro criticizes Descola's characterization of it as being a symmetrical inversion of totemism, which he sees as being primarily classificatory rather than cosmological: "it is not a system of *relations* between nature and culture … but

rather of purely logical and differential *correlations*" (1998: 473). Instead, Viveiros de Castro argues that animism is a symmetrical inversion of Western naturalism, which postulates a (biological, evolutionary, genetic) continuity of bodies, and situates difference at the level of the spirit (culture, mind). In this sense, perspectivism is different from relativism, an epistemology characteristic of naturalist and multiculturalist ontologies, in which a single nature is apprehended differently by a variety of cultures. Instead it is *multinaturalist* in that a world that is dependent on bodily perspective is always different, but this difference is apprehended in the same (human) way by each type of being.[15]

Descola now (2005: 323) agrees with Viveiros de Castro that animism is the polar opposite of Western naturalism, rather than of totemism. He questions, however, the attribution of the perspectivist idiom to all Amazonian peoples, let alone to all inhabitants of the 'animist archipelago'. For Descola, perspectivism—the theory through which different bodies apprehend the same thing differently insofar as they apprehend different things through the same cultural logic—is a secondary epistemological elaboration of a more basic animist ontology, and for this reason it is quite restricted ethnographically (ibid.: 196–202). Because it requires the introduction of "a supplementary level of complexity in a positional ontology … in which it is already difficult, in all of the daily situations in which one engages, to attribute stable identities to beings" (ibid.: 202), it remains limited to certain peoples and certain contexts, having much less of the scope of animism in Amazonia.[16]

For many Amazonianists, the return to Lévy-Bruhl paradoxically reveals itself to be Lévi-Strauss's triumph: the vindication of sacrificial flux over totemic logic charts some of the more interesting (though remote) corners of Lévi-Strauss's thought. Indeed, if one reads Lévi-Strauss in light of the developments outlined here it is difficult not to agree with Viveiros de Castro (2009b: 11) that the father of structural anthropology is also the founder of post-structural anthropology.

Structuralism and Pragmatics

Although it is post-structuralist, the 'ontological turn' conserves a defining element of classic structuralism: a privileging of the order of concepts over the order of practice. In defining their object as an ontological cartography—a "combinatory analysis of the modes of relationship between beings" (Descola 2005: 13) or as a "new anthropology of the concept" (Viveiros de Castro 2009b: 7)—these authors choose to play in the same field as Kant and Plato, even if they situate themselves on its opposite, Heraclitean side. It is therefore no accident that ritual remains a secondary and underdeveloped theme in their work.

Ritual has always been something of a poor cousin of Amazonian studies, obscured by the brilliant descriptions of cosmology, the analysis of myths or of Amerindian social philosophies.[17] There are, to be sure, certain classic ethnographies of specific rituals (Agostinho 1974; S. Hugh-Jones 1979; Melatti 1978), and some more recent work (Barcelos Neto 2008; Graham 1995; Teixeira-Pinto 1997), as well as ethno-musicological researches (Hill 1993; Menezes Bastos 1978; Piedade 2004). Globally, however, these studies are not only limited to few ethnographic areas (mostly the Upper Xingu), they also maintain a limited dialogue with theories of ritual.

It is therefore interesting to note the growing influence of Carlo Severi's work on Amazonian anthropology, particularly of his relational approach to ritual (Houseman and Severi 1998) and of the key concepts of complex enunciator and chimera (Severi 2004, 2007). Severi's work is tributary of a more classic structuralism (closer to "The Story of Asdiwal"

than to the *Mythologiques*), which allows him to establish a dialogue with the cognitivism of Sperber (1974; Sperber and Wilson 1986) and Boyer (1990, 1994). Sharing with these authors an emphasis on a sharp distinction between an ordinary ontology and a 'religious' ontology, Severi is concerned with determining the conditions through which certain representations that contradict common expectations become not only possible, but also memorable, and therefore the object of cultural transmission.[18]

The distinction between an ordinary and an extraordinary ontology leads Severi to question not only the nature of the act of believing, but also the condition of its efficacy. How is a belief constructed and how does it propagate? What is the relationship between this belief and the person who "does the believing"? How does this psychological state act on the world (Severi 2007: 240–42)? He is not concerned with an ontology that underlies each and every act of the members of a given human collectivity. Instead he is concerned with the investigation of the sociological and psychological conditions that lead certain people, at specific times, to conceive of the existence of spirits, words that cure, sorcerers, humans who become jaguars, divinities—and how they act in accordance with these representations.

Severi's exchange with Sperber and Boyer thus builds on a specific problem, since he seeks to explain "apparently irrational beliefs" (Sperber 1982) not only through a semantic conception of counter-intuitivity, but also through the notion of a pragmatic counter-intuitivity. Severi here moves away from classical structuralism toward a field in which Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations,* rather than Kant, is the key player. This enables a curious conjunction of French cognitivism and the North American pragmatic tradition, allowing Severi to establish a dialogue with the linguistic anthropology of Hanks (2000), Sherzer (1998), Tedlock (1983), and others (see Severi and Bonhomme 2009).[19] What is at stake is the construction, through (ritual) language, of extraordinary ontology itself: "It is at the heart of this process of evocation, linked to the recital of chants ordered in sequences of constants and variants, that these ambiguous beings in continuous metamorphosis that we have called 'parallelist creatures' are born" (Severi 2007:211).

Ontology is therefore a function of ritual enunciation which, in turn, depends on the construction of certain characters, whom Severi characterizes as "complex enunciators," whose identity is transformed in the simultaneous expression of contradictory connotations. This paradoxical "condensation" (Houseman and Severi 1998) is less the result of an abstract theory of the (dividual, composite, fractal) person than of the specific pragmatic context of ritual. Complexity, characterized by the conjunction of contradictory elements, is not, however, limited to human ritual actors. It is, instead, a mark of all ritual images. Severi calls these images "chimeras," since they weld heterogeneous traits that originate in different beings within a single figure, intensifying their cognitive efficacy.[20]

We can thus see how ritual comes to occupy a central place in Severi's work, moving his anthropology away from the pure order of concepts toward a position where it can consider their generation, retention, and transmission. The order of reasons is thereby inverted: 'religious' ontology is pragmatically produced by ritual action that induces certain psychological states in individuals, leading them to act in accordance with certain ideas and to communicate them to others. Ritual efficacy does not depend on clear concepts and discrete categories; rather, it thrives on complexity and paradox.

The Phenomenology of Perspectivism

The priority of practice over concepts is not, of course, a new idea in itself, nor is it the privilege of Severi's brand of structural-cognitivist anthropology. Neither must it necessarily focus

on ritual at the expense of a more inclusive theory of 'practical engagement'. In the ecological phenomenology of Tim Ingold, for example, knowledge is seen to emerge through different ways of being involved with the world and its inhabitants, and not specifically—and certainly not preferentially—from ritual acts. Owing little to the academic tradition associated with French structuralism, Ingold's anthropology draws inspiration from Gregory Bateson's *Steps to an Ecology of Mind,* Heideggerean philosophy, and James Gibson's ecological psychology. In Ingold's work (2000), the notion of categories disengaged from human involvement with their environment, and analyzable as an abstract set of concepts, is replaced by a stress on the context-specific generation of the 'life process'. This re-positioning of the relationship between humans and non-humans in ongoing processes that are a part of the world in which different species dwell and interact has exerted a growing influence on Amazonian anthropology where, as we know, the matter of what is and can be a human being, an animal, or a spirit is of vital importance.

This influence is particularly evident in the study of what has been called Amazonian "venatic ideologies" (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 472). The relationship between hunting and shamanism is a classic theme in the study of animism, and it plays a central role in the recent work on Amazonian ontologies, particularly in what concerns the relationship between the positions of predator and prey (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 471; see also Århem 1996).[21] The predator-prey relationship is constitutive of the play of perspectives that frames Amazonian ontologies, and it is therefore anterior to any point of view. In other words, all perspectives are immersed in a socio-cosmic matrix in which the positions of predator and prey are presupposed, and in any context of actual interaction it is these relative positions that are in dispute. Furthermore, predator and prey distribute a series of parallel values—such as subject and object, human and non-human—which can be variously occupied by different terms within the relation. The distribution of each position in any given relation is of paramount importance in defining who retains intention and volition and is therefore able to impose their point of view on another (see Fausto 2007a: 513).

Yet if the architecture of perspectival inversions is built on an idiom of venatic activity, it is by no means self-evident that hunting is the privileged sphere for their manifestation. Not only do Amazonian peoples who are mostly horticulturalists confer as much weight to the predatory idiom as those who are mostly hunters, so too is the predator-prey relationship a feature of all domains of human life. These include kinship, gender relations, eschatology, onomastics, and all can be measured through a predator-prey standard, which manifests itself as relative or gradual differences between types of beings (see Descola 2001).

The predatory scheme that underwrites Amazonian animism is thus dissociated from its assumed constitution in the practical activity of hunting, being promoted to the status of an all-encompassing cosmological operator. There is no need, in the animism of Descola or the perspectivism of Viveiros de Castro, to derive these concepts from the actual involvement of predators and prey during the hunt and to generalize their applicability to other spheres. Descola, for example, explicitly states that both animism and naturalism are "mental models which organize the social objectification of non-humans" (1996: 87).

According to Ingold's phenomenology, an appeal to 'mental models' places Descola's contrast between animism and naturalism within the terms of the latter. It therefore explains away native understandings of animism through the characteristically anthropological exercise of positing the cultural construction of a nature that is conceptually independent of the beings that inhabit it (Ingold 2000: 107; see Descola 2005: 342–52 for a reply). Instead Ingold proposes that: "[T]he world is not an external domain of objects that I look *at*, or do things *to,* but is rather going on, or undergoing continuous generation, with me and around me" (2000: 108).

In Amazonia, a cognate approach has been developed by Kohn in his ethnography of the Avila Runa of Ecuador. Proposing what he terms "an anthropology of life," he not only questions the analytical division between human meaningful worlds and non-human natural worlds, but also stresses that all life contains semiotic capabilities, and that we must take into account not only how humans represent animals, but also how animals represent themselves to humans (Kohn 2002, 2005, 2007a).[22] In human encounters with non-humans, then, the ways that animals come to know us are pivotal in determining how we represent animals, and how we react to their representations (and vice versa). It is decisive in establishing who comes to be predator and who is prey in any specific engagement.[23]

According to Kohn, Amazonian perspectivism must address how one comes to inhabit the *umwelt* of another being, which gives access to how "attributes and dispositions become dislodged from the bodies that produced them and ontological boundaries become blurred" (2007a: 7). By allowing that semiosis is not the preserve of human symbolic systems, we not only make significant ontological claims, but also break down the opposition between epistemology and ontology.

For Kohn, the main problem of animist and perspectivist theories in Amazonia is not their reliance on a specific concept of the person that is not exclusive to human beings, but rather on "the simple fact that these Amazonian understandings of personhood are in important ways the product of intimate day-to-day interactions with nonhuman beings" (Kohn 2007b: 516). Conversely, Fausto (2007a: 523) emphasizes that this presupposition needs to be investigated in specific ethnographic cases. Not only do we not know to what extent perspectivism is dependent on hunting and if it would cease to operate in instances where hunting is or becomes less important, but we also need to include other factors into the equation, such as gender relations and ecological differences between ethnographic areas. Is perspectivism the ontology of male hunters only? Is the grounding of animism in hunting a result of focusing on ethnographic studies of environments such as the boreal forest, in which predator and prey often come face-to-face (Ingold 2000; Willerslev 2007)? How is this carried over into the dense tropical forests of Amazonia, where sight must give way to the other senses (see Fausto 2007a: 523)?

Furthermore, the priority of hunting as an activity and engagement seems to consider that food procurement is somehow more real and practical than shamanic séances, acts of mythical narrative, and ritual activity (Fausto 2007a: 524; see also Uzendoski et al. 2005). In ontogenetic terms, we have no a priori basis for assuming that people are first exposed to hunting, or that hunting is the privileged arena for the constitution of ontology. Neither can hunting as an activity be readily isolated from the transmission of verbal and non-verbal knowledge between generations, from the memorization of formulas and narratives, and from participation in ritual and shamanic activity. If phenomenological approaches to hunting are thus important in anchoring Amazonian ontologies in an activity that puts into practice the predatory scheme which constitutes them, they nonetheless skim over the fact, abundantly attested to in Amazonian ethnographies, that the idiom of predator and prey is a cosmological operator of great breadth and amplitude.

This tension between structure and practice in animism and perspectivism is evidently a specific ethnographic playing out of a more general anthropological dilemma. Descola explicitly addresses this problem when applying Kant's schematism to mediate between concepts and practice. His notion of 'schemes of praxis' occupies an intermediate level between Lévi-Strauss's cognitive notion of innate structures and the on-the-ground notion of practice. Unlike Bourdieu's *habitus,* Descola aims at compiling a limited number of interiorized schemes of practice; a matrix from which "the habitus derive their source," which synthesizes

"the objective properties of every possible relation between humans and non-humans" (2005: 139). Because early studies of Amazonian ontologies focused on cosmology, myth, and systems of classification at the expense of practical activity, they are therefore open to criticism on these grounds, in much the same way as Lévi-Strauss has been criticized for privileging structure over action, myth over ritual, *langue* over *parole.* Whether it be a pragmatic counter-intuivity in ritual or specific practical engagements between humans and non-humans that is stressed, it is the generative potential of action that is now seen to root the conceptual tools of Amazonian ontologies. The present emphasis on practice is necessary and welcome, but the degree to which it exhausts the precepts of Amazonian ontologies, or even explains more adequately their constitution, remains to be seen.

Conclusion

To conclude, we must return to the question with which we started, because it is not only the relationship between an ontology and certain practical activities that is at stake in this discussion. Those who have developed theories of animism and perspectivism have also associated them with specific socio-political forms, in such a way that to a certain relation of power there corresponds a certain ontology. This is a key element in the work of Viveiros de Castro: a multinaturalist world is a world with no center, irreducible to state power. The only asymmetry possible is internal to the difference between perspectives. More than an asymmetry, what we have is a disjunction of perspectives that are never reducible one to the other, nor to a global figure of the One. Viveiros de Castro's perspectivism thereby corresponds to the politics of Pierre Clastres—it is a religion against the state.

This is not so for Philippe Descola (1988), as he has affirmed. However, by associating the South and Mesoamerican highlands with what he terms an analogist ontology, thus distancing it from animism, he implies that the apparatus of the state is necessarily incompatible with animism. The latter tends to survive at the local level, at the fringes of the system, but to no longer function as a global ontology. In the world of pre-modern states (Inca, Aztec, Chinese), analogism favors the establishment of a holistic and total(itarian) ideology through multiple analogical correlations between the micro- and the macro-level.

The correlation of an ontology with a socio-political form is far too complex a theme for us to do any more than to raise the issue. We would nonetheless like to see it discussed in terms that are defined less in reference to 'the state' and more in conjunction with an Amerindian idiom of power. Following recent ethnographic work (Bonilla 2007; Costa 2007; Déléage 2009), one of us has proposed that this Amerindian idiom is that of the master-ownership relation, a relation that traverses a myriad of social domains: from hunting to warfare, from shamanism to ritual, not to mention, of course, the relationships between chiefs and followers (Fausto 1999, 2001, 2007a, 2008).

All Amazonian languages possess a term that designates a position involving control and/or protection, engendering and/or possession, and that applies to relations between persons (human and non-human) and between persons and things (tangible or intangible). This term is normally translated as 'master' or 'owner', and implies a certain relation. The reciprocal category for owner-master is usually 'child' or 'pet', both implying an underlying idea of adoption. One of the important features of the relation is its asymmetry: owners control and protect their creatures. This asymmetry is often conceived as a form of encompassment, involving a complex interplay between singularity and plurality: the owner is a plural singularity, who contains other singularities within himself. The owner-master is, therefore, the form

through which a plurality appears as a singularity to others. It is in this sense that the chief is an owner. He is the form through which a collectivity is constituted as an image to others. As Sztutman rightly states, mastery is "a cosmological notion that inflects on the sociopolitical plane, referring in very general terms to this capacity to 'contain'—to appropriate or dispose of—persons, things and properties, and to constitute domains, niches and groups" (2005: 261).

In Amazonia, mastery relations produce magnified persons, which contain in themselves the device both for generating potency and for undermining power. The fact that the master is necessarily affected by his pet, combined with the plurality of the relationships he contains, produces a relational dispersion and an instability in the ownership relation. This may help to explain why mastery has seldom crystallized into an institutional locus of power in Amazonia.

A properly Amerindian idiom of power allows us to approach the matter of the constitution of relations of dominium without translating them into relations of domination. On the other hand, it allows us to consider the passage from systems of dominium to systems of domination (state or otherwise) without establishing absolute discontinuities. This may also help us to interpret the Amazonian past, by establishing a more productive dialogue with the growing archaeological evidence for the existence of densely populated regional systems that extend over large areas, which were characterized by complex sociopolitical organizations, possibly involving hierarchies of power and prestige (Denevan 2001; Erickson 2010; Heckenberger 2005; Heckenberger and Neves 2009; Heckenberger et al. 2003, 2007; Neves and Petersen 2006; Schaan 2008).

If the discussion of mastery points toward the past, it also draws us into the present and the future. As Fausto has noted:

> The mastery relation served to conceptualize the asymmetries that have marked the region's colonial and post-colonial history. This is a recurrent fact that appears in Amerindian interactions with missionaries, slave raiders, rubber bosses and, more recently, officers from government agencies. (2008: 345)

If the whites were associated with the figure of the Amerindian master, contemporary interactions between indigenous and national societies have produced a much more complex topology, which saturates indigenous relational categories. Moreover, the increasingly intense and diverse interaction with national societies seems to put into question the global continuity of Amerindian ontologies. What relationship is possible between two ontologies as distinct as Amerindian perspectivism and non-indigenous naturalism?

A series of contemporary studies have begun to address this question. There are four themes that have been privileged: the conversion to Christianity; the insertion of Indigenous groups in a monetary economy and in state systems; the experience of urban life; and, finally, the effects of schooling and literacy.[24] There is no space in this article to discuss each of these themes, nor the dilemmas that they create in forcing us to imagine the internal and external limits of Amerindian ontologies. These studies corner us into asking an even more delicate question: What kind of entity, after all, are these things that we call 'ontologies'?

■ **Luiz Costa** is associate professor of Cultural Anthropology at the Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Sociais of the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. He has been carrying out fieldwork among the Kanamari of western Amazonia since 2002, and has published articles on kinship and the body, history, and myth; luizcosta10@gmail.com.

Carlos Fausto is associate professor at the Graduate Program of Social Anthropology at the Museu Nacional, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro. He has been conducting fieldwork among Amazonian Indigenous peoples since 1988 on warfare, shamanism, ritual, and more recently on art. Among his many publications, four of them are particularly relevant for the study of religion in Amazonia: "Of Enemies and Pets" (1999), "Feasting on People" (2007), "If God Were a Jaguar" (2007) and "Too Many Owners" (2008). He is also the author of *Inimigos Fiéis: História, Guerra e Xamanismo na Amazônia* (2001) and co-editor (with Michael Heckenberger) of *Time and Memory in Indigenous Amazonia* (2007); cfausto63@gmail.com.

NOTES

1. "The language that they use, throughout the coast … lacks three letters, to wit, one does not find in it the F, nor the L, nor the R, a fact that is worthy of observation since they do not have Faith, nor Law, nor Royalty, and live disorderly lives also without accounting, weights and measurement" (the authors' translation).
2. This is the case of Tanner (1979), Scott (1989), and Fienup-Riordan (1990). This spate of work on the person-like quality of animals would converge in Brightman's *Grateful Prey* (1993), one of the best books published on human-animal relations among Amerindian peoples.
3. One only has to list some of the titles of edited volumes published on this latter opposition to know that there was something in the air: *Signifying Animals* (1990), *Animals and Human Society* (1994), *Redefining Nature* (1996), *Nature and Society* (1996).
4. Roy Wagner (e.g., 1981), whose influence on Strathern (1988, 1992) and Viveiros de Castro (2001, 2009a) is significant, could also be added to this list.
5. There are a number of British and American authors whose relationship to Lévi-Strauss's work is more acquiescent. In the 1970s, for example, many sought to explore, through detailed ethnographies, either the substance of some of the oppositions that recur in Lévi-Strauss's work, such as that between nature and culture (C. Hugh-Jones 1979; Seeger 1980), or to investigate how Lévi-Strauss's work articulates with domains of human activity that remained peripheral to the *Mythologiques,* such as ritual and shamanic practice (Crocker 1985; S. Hugh-Jones 1979). See S. Hugh-Jones (2008) for a review of attitudes toward Lévi-Strauss's work among British Americanists.
6. One that implies an inversion of the hegemonic point of view, since the Araweté are prey to their cannibal gods whereas each Tupinambá regional group struggled to retain the position of predator in face of other equivalent groups (on this inversion see Bonilla 2007; Fausto 2007b; Rival 1998).
7. This privilege of the other (and of affinity, which is the specific Amerindian idiom for expressing alterity) would mark the subsequent developments of Viveiros de Castro work, particularly his approach to what he would term the "symbolic economy of predation" (1993). Here, again, he takes Lévi-Strauss's famous distinction between diametrical and concentric dualism and establishes an opposition between the discrete Ge and the gradualist peoples of the Guiana shield. Once more, the continuous is privileged over the discrete, chromatic gradation over clear-cut categories.
8. See, among others, Menget (1985, 1988); Taylor (1985); Erikson (1986); Vilaça (1992); Descola (1993); Fausto (2001).
9. As Viveiros de Castro (2009b: 171) affirms, "Lévi-Straussian structuralism should be understood as a structural transformation of Amerindian thought."
10. See Fausto and Heckenberger (2007) for a general discussion on the tension between 'indigenous history' and 'the history of the Indians'.
11. In *A Thousand Plateaus,* Deleuze and Guatari (1980) made use of the musical metaphor employed by Lévi-Strauss to attack the postulates of generative linguistics, opposing the major mode of the

diatonic scale to the minor mode of the chromatic scale. Composed of twelve semitones, the chromatic scale generates a de-centered and labyrinthine flux, which answers for an instability that is constitutive of tonality. The passage from Lévi-Straussian chromatism to Deleuzian chromatism is thus comparable to the passage from musical tonality to atonality: from a minor position, in which chromatism is the background against which the diatonic scale moves (Wisnik 1990: 130), the chromatic scale comes to assume a major position in Deleuze's work. From a "dualism in perpetual disequilibrium" in Lévi-Strauss' *The Story of Linx* we move toward pure, continuous, and immanent variation.

12. In *The Logic of Sense* (1969), Deleuze affirms that philosophy merges with ontology. One of the dangers of the ontological turn in anthropology is, precisely, that the latter comes to be taken for philosophy, allowing itself to be domesticated by philosophical discourse even when this is of a non-hegemonic inspiration. The aims of an ontological approach in anthropology are exactly the opposite: to conceptually destabilize Western concepts via alternative ontologies as a way to overcome the post-modernist epistemological angst (Henare et al. 2007). But as one of its main proponents admits, "the image of Being is obviously a dangerous analogic soil for thinking about non-western conceptual imaginations, and the notion of ontology is not without its own risks" (Viveiros de Castro 2003: 18). For a debate on this issue and on the relation between two basic conceptual tools—culture and ontology—see Carrithers et al. (2010).
13. Bodily differences do not mean that different bodies perceive specific differences 'as they really are', but rather that each body, seeing itself as human, perceives other bodies (and the 'natural world') in a way that accords with their humanity. There is thus one single, human culture, shared by all beings, and a variety of different somatic perspectives on an always changing nature.
14. See Bird-David (1999), particularly Viveiros de Castro's commentary on it, as well as her reply.
15. For a critique of the anti-realistic implications of perspectivism, see Stépanoff (2009), who reinterprets all the main postulates of this theory in terms of either a positional logic or an essentialist conception of body differences. See Santos-Granero (2006) for an argument, inspired by Lima (2000), on the asymmetry of human and animal perspectives, which, in his view, fosters an anthropocentric orientation of Amerindian cosmologies. For a more general critique of animism, perspectivism, and 'late structuralist' approaches, see Turner (forthcoming).
16. Although Descola accepts that his opposition of animism to totemism was hasty, and that animism is best seen as an inversion of Western naturalism, he has also engaged in a reinterpretation of the data through which Lévi-Strauss recast totemism as a classificatory device. He argues, against Lévi-Strauss, that this view is only possible if certain residually 'animic' aspects of totemism are brushed aside. In showing that totemism established a homology between relations (the differences between human groups and natural species), Lévi-Strauss had little to say concerning the homology established between terms (a clan and its eponymous species). See Descola (2005: 203–40); on the debate between Descola and Viveiros de Castro, see Latour (2009).
17. On Amerindian social philosophies, see Overing (1999) and Overing and Passes (2000).
18. Severi stresses the faculty of imagination as much as he relies on categorical and modular theory of cognition. Severi's anthropology of memory thereby combines the notions of order and expressive force: order serves to organize memory and retrieval, while expressiveness and relevance make something memorable and favors inscription.
19. In Amazonia, it is probably the work of Pierre Déléage (2007a, 2007b, 2009) that comes closest to Severi's conjunction of French cognitivism and North American linguistical pragmatics. See also Cesarino (2008a) for an approach that makes use of a similar methodology, but does so from a more ontographic perspective.
20. For analyses inspired on the notion of 'chimera' in Amazonia, see Fausto (in press) and Penoni (2010).
21. The literature on the predatory scheme framing Amazonian cosmologies is vast. See, for example, Chaumeil (2000: 220–24); Erikson (1984); Vilaça (1992); Århem (1993); Lima (1999a). On recent approaches to this relationship see Lima (1999b, 2005); Fausto (2002, 2007a); Vilaça (2002, 2005).

22. Making use of Peirce's semiotics, Kohn argues that anthropologists have focused on conventional, human representation of the type that Peirce terms 'symbols'. For Peirce symbols are built out of 'more basic non-symbolic sign processes, which are not unique to humans' (Kohn 2007a: 5).
23. A somewhat different interpretation of the inter-subjective actions of hunter and prey has been developed by Willerslev (2007) in his ethnography of the Siberian Yukaghirs. Inspired by Viveiros de Castro—an author whose influence on Siberian ethnography is significant (see Pederson 2001; Pederson et al. 2007)—Willerslev argues for "a possible grounding if not origin of perspectivism in the mimetic encounter between hunter and prey" (2007: 27).
24. On conversion, see specially Wright (1999) and Vilaça and Wright (2009); on the role of money and state systems, see Turner (1992), Fisher (2000), Gordon (2005); on city life, see Lasmar (2005), Andrello (2006), Cesarino (2008b); on formal education, see Weber (2006), Rival (2002), and Franchetto (2008).

REFERENCES

Agostinho, Pedro. 1974. *Kwarìp: Mito e Ritual no Alto Xingu.* São Paulo: Edusp.

Andrello, Geraldo. 2006. *Cidade do Índio.* São Paulo: ISA/Unesp/Nuti.

Århem, Kaj. 1993. 'Ecosofia Makuna', in F. Corvea (ed.), *La Selva Humanizada: ecologia alternativa en el trópico húmedo colombiano,* 106–26. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología/Fondo FEN Colombia/Fondo Editorial CEREC.

———. 1996. "The Cosmic Food Web: Human-Nature Relatedness in the Northwest Amazon." Pp. 185–204 in *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives,* ed. P. Descola and G. Pálsson. London: Routledge.

Basso, Ellen. 1987. *In Favor of Deceit: A Study of Tricksters in an Amazonian Society.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Barcelos Neto, Aristóteles. 2008. *Apapaatai: Rituais de Máscaras no Alto Xingu.* São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.

Bird-David, Nurit 1999. "'Animism' Revisited: Personhood, Environment and Relational Epistemology." *Current Anthropology* 40 (Supplement): S67–S91.

Bonilla, Oiara. 2007. "Des Proies Si Desirables: Soumission et Prédation pour les Paumari d'Amazonie Brésilienne." PhD diss., Écoles des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris.

Boyer, Pascal. 1990. *Tradition as Truth and Communication: A Cognitive Description of Traditional Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1994. *The Naturalness of Religious Ideas.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Brightman, Robert A. 1993. *Grateful Prey: Rock-Cree Human-Animal Relationships.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Carrithers, Michael, Matei Candea, Karen Sykes, Martin Holbraad, and Soumhya Venkatsen. 2010. "Ontology Is Just Another Word for Culture: Motion Tabled at the 2008 Meeting of the Group for Debates in Anthropological Theory, University of Manchester." *Critique of Anthropology* 30 (2): 152–200.

Cesarino, Pedro. 2008a. "Oniska: A Poética da Morte e do Mundo Entre os Marubo da Amazonia Ocidental." PhD diss., Museu Nacional, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

———. 2008b. "Babel da Floresta, Cidade dos Brancos? Os Marubo no Trânsito Entre Dois Mundos." *Novos Estudos* 82 (novembro): 133–48.

Chaumeil, Jean-Pierre. [1983] 2000. *Voir, Savoir, Pouvoir: Le Chamanisme chez les Yagua du Nord-Est Péruvien.* Geneva: Georg.

Coelho de Souza, Marcela, and Carlos Fausto. 2004. "Reconquistando o Campo Perdido: O Que Lévi-Strauss Deve aos Índios." *Revista de Antropologia* 47 (1): 87–131.

Costa, Luiz. 2007. "As Faces do Jaguar: Parentesco, História e Mitologia entre os Kanamari da Amazonia Ocidental." PhD diss., Museu Nacional, Unversidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

Crocker, Christopher. 1985. *Vital Souls: Bororo Cosmology, Natural Symbolism and Shamanism.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
Déléage, Pierre. 2007a. "Trois Points de Vue sur les Revenants Sharanahua." *L'Homme* 183: 117–46.
———. 2007b. "A Yaminahua Autobiographical Song: *Caqui Caqui.*" *Tipití. The Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 5 (1): 79–95.
———. 2009. *Le Chant de l'Anaconda: L'Apprentissage du Chamanisme chez les Sharanahua (Amazonie Occidentale).* Nanterre: Société d'ethnologie.
Deleuze, Gilles. 1969. *Logique du Sens.* Paris: Minuit.
Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guatari. 1980. *Milles Plateaux.* Paris: Minuit.
Denevan, William M. 2001. *Cultivated Landscapes of Native Amazonia and the Andes: Triumph over the Soil.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Descola, Philippe. 1986. *La Nature Domestique: symbolisme et praxis dans l'écologie des Achuar.* Paris: Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
———.1988. "La Chefferie Amérindienne dans l'Anthropologie Politique." *Revue Française de Science Politique* 38: 818–27.
———. 1992. "Societies of Nature and the Nature of Society." Pp. 197–226 in *Conceptualizing Society,* ed. A. Kuper. London: Routledge.
———. 1993. "Les Affintés Sélectives: Alliance, Guerre et Prédation dans l'Ensemble Jivaro." *L'Homme* 33 (2–4): 171–90.
———. 1994. *In the Society of Nature: A Native Ecology in Amazonia.* Trans. by Nora Scott. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1996. "Constructing Natures: Symbolic Ecology and Social Practice." Pp. 82–102 in *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives,* ed. P. Descola and G. Pálsson. Londres: Routledge.
———. 2001. "The Genres of Gender: Local Models and Global Paradigms in the Comparison of Amazonia and Melanesia." Pp. 91–114 in *Gender in Amazonia and Melanesia: An Exploration of the Comparative Method,* ed. T.G.a.D. Tuzin. Berkeley: University of California Press.
———. 2005. *Par-delà Nature et Culture.* Paris: Gallimard.
———. 2009. "The Two Natures of Lévi-Strauss." Pp. 103–17 in *The Cambridge Companion to Lévi-Strauss,* ed. B. Wiseman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Descombes, Vincent. 1979. *Le Même et l'Autre: Quarante-Cinq Ans de Philosophie Française (1933–1978).* Paris: Minuit.
Descola, Philippe & Gísli Pálsson (eds.). 1996. *Nature and Society: an Anthropological Perspective.* London: Routledge.
Ellen, R. F. and Fukui, Katsuyoshi 1996. *Redefining nature : ecology, culture, and domestication.* Oxford; Washington, D.C.: Berg Publishers.
Erickson, Clark. 2010. "The Transformation of Environment into Landscape: The Historical Ecology of Monumental Earthwork Construction in the Bolivian Amazon." *Diversity* 2: 618–52.
Erikson, Philippe. 1984. "De l'Apprivoisement à l'Approvisionnement': Chasse, Alliance et Familiarization en Amazonie Amérindienne." *Techniques et Cultures* 9: 105–40.
———. 1986. "Alterité, Tatouage et Anthropophagie chez les Pano: La Belliquese Quête de Soi." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 62: 185–210.
Fausto, Carlos. 1999. "Of Enemies and Pets: Warfare and Shamanism in Amazonia." *American Ethnologist* 26 (4): 933–56.
———. 2001. *Inimigos Fiéis: História, Guerra e Xamanismo na Amazônia.* São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.
———. 2002. "Banquete de Gente: Comensalidade e Canibalismo na Amazônia. *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia Social* 8(2): 7-44.
———. 2007a. "Feasting on People: Eating Animals and Humans in Amazonia." *Current Anthropology* 48 (4): 497–530.
———. 2007b. "If God Were a Jaguar: Cannibalism and Christianity among the Guarani (Sixteenth-Twentieth Centuries)." Pp. 74–105 in *Time and Memory in Indigenous Amazonia: Anthropological Perspectives,* eds. C. Fausto and M. Heckenberger. Gainesville: The University Press of Florida.

———. 2008. “Donos Demais: Maestria e Domínio na Amazônia.” *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia Social* 14 (2): 329–65.
———. In press. “La Masque de l'Animiste: Chimères et Poupées Russes en Amérique Indigène.” *Gradhiva.*
Fausto, Carlos and Michael Heckenberger (eds.). 2007. *Time and Memory in Indigenous Amazonia.* Gainesville: The University Press of Florida.
Fienup-Riordan, Ann. 1990. *Eskimo Essays: Yup'ik Lives and How We See Them.* New Burnswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
Fisher, William. 2000. *Rainforest Exchanges: Industry and Community on an Amazonian Frontier.* Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
Franchetto, Bruna. 2008. “A Guerra dos Alfabetos: Os Povos Indígenas na Fronteira entre o Oral e o Escrito.” *Mana: Estudos de Anthropologia Social* 14 (1): 31–59.
Gordon, Cesar. 2005. *Economia Selvagem: Ritual e Mercadoria entre os Índios Xikrin-Mebêngôkre.* São Paulo: ISA/Unesp/Nuti.
Gow, Peter 2001. *An Amazonian Myth and Its History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Graham, Laura. 1995. *Performing Dreams: Discourses of Immortality among the Xavante of Central Brazil.* Austin: University of Texas Press.
Hallowell, Irving. 1960. “Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and World View.” Pp. 19–52 in *Culture in History: Essays in Honor of Paul Radin,* ed. S. Diamond. New York: Columbia University Press.
Hanks, William F. 2000. *Intertexts: Writings on Language, Utterance, and Context.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Heckenberger, Michael. 2005. *The Ecology of Power: Culture, Place and Personhood in the Southern Amazon, A.D. 1000–2000.* New York and London: Routledge.
Heckenberger, Michael, Afukaka Kuikuro, Urissapá Tabata Kuikuro, J. Christian Russell, Morgan Schmidt, Carlos Fausto, and Bruna Franchetto. 2003. “Amazonia 1492: Pristine Forest or Cultural Parkland?” *Science* 301: 1710–14.
Heckenberger, Michael J., C. Russell, Joshua R. Toney, and Morgan J. Schmidt. 2007. “The legacy of cultural landscapes in the Brazilian Amazon: implications for biodiversity”. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B (Biological sciences). 362, 197–208.
Heckenberger, Michael, J.C. Russell, C. Fausto, J. R. Toney. M. J. Schmidt, E. Pereira, B. Franchetto, and A. Kuikuro. 2008. “Prehistoric Urbanism, Anthropogenic Landscapes, and the Future of the Amazon.” *Science* 321: 1214–17.
Heckenberger, Michael, and, Eduardo Neves. 2009. “Amazonian Archaeology.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 3: 251–66.
Henare, Amiria, Martin Holbraad, and Sari Wastell, eds. 2007. *Thinking through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically.* London and New York: Routledge.
Hill, Jonathan, ed. 1988. *Rethinking History and Myth: Indigenous South American Perspectives on the Past.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
———. 1993. *Keepers of the Sacred Chants. The Politics of Ritual Power in an Amazonian Society.* Tucson and London: University of Arizona Press.
Holbraad, Martin. 2003. “Estimando a Necessidade: os Oráculos de Ifá e a Verdade em Havana.” *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia Social* 9 (2): 39–77.
Houseman, Michael, and Carlo Severi. 1998. *Naven or the Other Self : A Relational Approach to Ritual Action.* Leiden and Boston: Brill.
Hugh-Jones, Christine. 1979. *From the Milk River: Spatial and Temporal Processes in Northwest Amazonia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hugh-Jones, Stephen. 1979. *The Palm and the Pleiades: Initiation and Cosmology in Northwest Amazonia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2008. ‘A Courtship but Not Much of a Marriage: Lévi-Strauss and British Americanist Anthropology.” *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 94 (2):17–28.
Ingold, Tim. Ingold, T. 1986. *The Appropriation of Nature: Essays in Human Ecology and Social Relations.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

———. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London and New York: Routledge.
Kohn, Eduardo. 2002. “Natural Engagements and Ecological Aesthetics among the Ávila Runa of Amazonian Ecuador.” PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
———. 2005. “Runa Realism: Upper Amazonian Attitudes to Nature Knowing.” *Ethnos* 70 (2): 171–96.
———. 2007a. “How Dogs Dream: Amazonian Natures and the Politics of Transspecies Engagement.” *American Ethnologist* 34 (1): 3–24.
———. 2007b. “Comments to ‘Feasting on People: Eating Animals and Humans in Amazonia’, by Carlos Fausto.” *Current Anthropology* 48 (4): 515–16.
Lasmar, Cristiane. 2005. *De Volta ao Lago de Leite: Gênero e Transformação no Alto Rio Negro*. São Paulo: ISA/Unesp/Nuti.
Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Trans. by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
———. 1996. *Petite Réflexion sur le Culte Moderne des Dieux Faitiches*. Le Plessis-Robinson: Synthélabo groupe.
———. 1999. *Politiques de la Nature: Comment Faire Entrer les Sciences en Démocratie*. Paris: Découverte.
———. 2009. “Perspectivism: Type or Bomb?” *Anthropology Today* 25 (2): 1–2.
Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1962a. *La Pensée Sauvage*. Paris: Plon.
———. 1962b. *Le Totémisme Aujourd’hui*. Paris: PUF.
———. 1964. *Mythologiques I: Le Cru et le Cuit*. Paris: Plon.
———. 1966. *Mythologiques II: Du Miel aux Cendres*. Paris: Plon.
———. 1968. *Mythologiques III: L’Origine des Manières des Tables*. Paris: Plon.
———. 1971. *Mythologiques IV: L’Homme Nu*. Paris: Plon.
———. 1985. *La Potière Jalouse*. Paris: Plon.
———. 1991. *Histoire de Lynx*. Paris: Plon.
———.1993. “Um Autre Regard.” *L’Homme* 126–28: 7–10.
Lévi-Strauss, Claude, and Didier Éribon. 1990. *De Près et de Loin*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
Lévi-Strauss, Claude, and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro. 1998. “Lévi-Strauss nos 90: Antropologia de Cabeça para Baixo (Entrevista).” *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia Social* 4 (2): 119–26.
Lima, Tânia Stolze. 1999a. “The Two and Its Many: Reflections on Perspectivism in a Tupi Cosmology.” *Ethnos* 64 (1): 107–31.
———. 1999b. “Para uma Teoria Etnográfica da Distinção Entre Natureza e Cultura na Cosmologia Juruna.” *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais* vol. 14, n. 40: 43–52.
———. 2005. *Um Peixe Olhou Para Mim: O Povo Yudjá e a Perspectiva*. São Paulo: ISA/Unesp/Nuti
Manning, Aubrey and Serpell, James. 1994. *Animals and human society : changing perspectives*. London; New York: Routledge.
Melatti, Júlio Cezar. 1978. *Ritos de uma Tribo Timbira*. São Paulo: Ática.
Menezes Bastos, Rafael. 1978. *A Musicologia Kamayurá: Para uma Antropologia da Comunicação no Alto Xingu*. Brasília: Funai.
Menget, Patrick. 1985. “Jalons Pour une Étude Comparative.” *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 71: 131–41.
———. 1988. “Note sur l’Adoption chez les Txicão du Brésil Central.” *Anthropologie et Sociétés* 12 (2): 63–72.
Neves, Eduardo G., and James B. Petersen. 2006. “The Political Economy of Pre-Columbian Amerindians: Landscape Transformations in Central Amazonia.” Pp. 311–40 in *Time and Complexity in Historical Ecology: Studies in the Neotropical Lowlands*, ed. W. Balée and C. Erickson. New York: Columbia University Press.
Overing, Joanna. 1999. “O Elogio do Cotidiano: a Confiança e a Arte da Vida Social em uma Comunidade Amazônica.” *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia Social* 5 (1): 81–107.
Overing, Joanna, and Alan Passes, eds. 2000. *The Anthropology of Love and Anger. The Aesthetics of Conviviality in Native Amazonia*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pederson, Morten. 2001. "Totemism, Animism and North Asian Indigenous Ontologies." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 7: 411–27.
Pederson, Morten, Rebecca Empson, and Caroline Humphrey, eds. 2007. "Special Issue: Perspectivism." *Inner Asia* 9.
Penoni, Isabel. 2010. "Hagaka: Ritual, Performance e Ficção entre os Kuikuro do Alto Xingu." MPhil diss. , Museu Nacional, Universidade do Rio de Janeiro.
Piedade, Acácio. 2004. "O Canto do Kawoká: Música, Cosmologia e Filosofia entre os Wauja do Alto Xingu." PhD diss., Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
Rival, Laura. 1998. "Prey at the Center: Resistance and Marginality in Amazonia." Pp. 61–79 in *Lilies of the Field: Marginal People Who Live For the Moment,* ed. S. Day, E. Papataxiarchis and M. Stewart. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
———. 2002. *Trekking Through History: The Huaroani of Amazonian Ecuador.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Santos-Granero, Fernando. 2006. "Sensual Vitalities: Non-Corporeal Modes of Sensing and Knowing in Native Amazonia." *Tipití. The Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 4 (1-2): 57–80.
Schaan, Denise. 2008. "The Non-Agricultural Chiefdoms of Marajo Island." Pp. 339–57 in *Handbook of South American Archaeology,* ed. H. Silverman and W. Isbell. New York: Springer.
Scott, Colin. 1989. 'Knowledge Construction among Cree Hunters: Metaphors and Literal Understandings', *Journal de la Société des Américanistes,* Voume: 193-208.
Seeger, Anthony. 1980. *Nature and Society in Central Brazil: The Suyá Indians of Mato Grosso.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Severi, Carlo 2004. "Capturing imagination: A Cognitive Approach to Cultural Complexity." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 10 (4): 815–38.
———. 2007. *Le Principe de la Chimère : Une Anthropologie de la Mémoire.* Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure.
Severi, Carlo, and Julien Bonhomme, eds. 2009. "Paroles en Actes." *Cahiers d'Anthropologie Sociale* 5. Paris: L'Herne.
Sherzer, Joel. 1990. *Verbal Art in San Blas: Kuna Culture through Its Discourses.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sperber, Dan. 1974. *Le Symbolisme en Général.* Paris: Hermann.
———. 1982. *Le Savoir des Anthropologues.* Paris: Hermann.
Sperber, Dan, and D. Wilson. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Stépanoff, Charles 2009. "Devouring Perspectives: On Cannibal Shamans in Siberia." *Inner Asia* 11: 283–307.
Strathern, Marilyn. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift.* Berkley: University of California Press.
———. 1992. "Parts and Wholes: Refiguring Relationship in a Post-Plural World." Pp. 75–104 in *Conceptualizing Society,* ed. A. Kuper. London: Routledge.
———. 1999. *Property, Substance and Effect: Anthropological Essays on Persons and Things.* London: The Athlone Press.
———. 2005. *Kinship, law and the unexpected : relatives are always a surprise.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Sztutman, Renato. 2005. "O Profeta e o Principal: Ação Política Ameríndia e seus Personagens." PhD diss., Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade de São Paulo.
Tanner, Adrian. 1979. *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the Mistassini Cree Hunters.* London: Hurst.
Taylor, Anne-Christine. 1984. "L'Americanisme Tropicale: Une Frontière Fossile de l'Ethnologie?" Pp. 213–33 in *Histoires de l'Anthropologie: XVI-XIX Siècles,* ed. B. Rupp-Eisenreich. Paris: Klinsieck.
———. 1985. "L'Art de la Réduction: La Guerre et les Mécanismes de la Différanciation Tribale dans la Culture Jivaro." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 71: 159–73.

Tedlock, Dennis. 1983. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Teixeira-Pinto, Márnio. 1997. *Ieipari: Sacrifício e Vida Social entre os Índios Arara (Caribe).* São Paulo and Curitiba: Editra Hucitec/ANPOCS/Editora UFPR.

Turner, Terence. 1991. "Representing, Resisting, Rethinking: Historical Transformations of Kayapó Culture and Anthropological Conscisousness." Pp. 285–313 in *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge,* ed. G. Stocking Jr. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

———. 1992. "Os Mebengokre Kayapó: História e Mudança Social, de Comunidades Autônomas Para a Coexistência Interétnica." Pp. 311–38 in *História dos Índios no Brasil,* ed. M. Carneiro da Cunha. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

———. Forthcoming. "The Crisis of Late Structuralism. Perspectivism and Animism: Rethinking Culture, Nature, Spirit and Bodliness." *Tipití: The Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowand South America* 7 (1).

Urban, Greg. 1996. *Metaphysical Community: The Interplay of the Senses and the Intellect.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Uzendoski, Greg, Mark Hertica, and Edith Calapucha Tapuy. 2005. "The Phenomenology of Perspectivism: Aesthetics, Sound and Power in Women's Song From Amazonian Ecuador." *Current Anthropology* 46 (4): 656–62.

Vilaça, Aparecida. 1992. *Comendo Como Gente: Formas do Canibalismo Wari.* Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ.

———. 2002. "Making Kin Out of Others in Amazonia." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 8: 347–65.

———. 2005. "Chronically Unstable Bodies: Reflections on Amazonian Corporalities." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11: 445–64.

———. 2010. "O gosto pelo Outro: Lévi-Strauss e os índios." In *Revista Ciência Hoje.* Rio de Janeiro: SBPC.

Vilaça, Aparecida, and Robin Wright, eds. 2009. *Native Christians: Modes and Effects of Christianity among Indigenous Peoples of the Americas.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. [1986] 1992. *From the Enemy's Point of View. Humanity and Divinity in an Amazonian Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1993. "Alguns aspectos da Afinidade no Dravidianato Amazônico." Pp. 149–210 in *Amazônia: Etnologia e História,* ed. E. Viveiros de Castro and M. Carneiro da Cunha. São Paulo: NHII-USP/FAPESP.

———. 1996. "Os Pronomes Cosmológicos e o Perspectivismo Ameríndio". *Mana: Estudos de Antropologia Social* 2(2): 115-144.

———. 1998. "Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 4: 469–88.

———. 1999. "Etnologia Brasileira." Pp. 109–223 in *O Que Ler na Ciência Social Brasileira (1970–1995): Antropologia (volume 2),* ed. S. Miceli. Brasília: ANPOCS.

———. 2001. "GUT Feelings about Amazonia: Potential Affinity and the Construction of Sociality." Pp. 19–43 in *Beyond the Visible and the Material. The Amerindianization of Society in the Work of Peter Rivière,* ed. L. Rival and N. Whitehead. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2002. *A Inconstância da Alma Selvagem.* São Paulo: Cosac & Naify.

———. 2003. AND. *Manchester Papers in Social Anthropology* 7. Manchester, University of *Manchester.*

———. 2007. "Immanence and Fear: Keynote Speech to the 'Fear' Conference." Unpublished manuscript. Canadian Anthropological Society, Toronto.

———. 2008. "Xamanismo Transversal: Lévi-Strauss e a Cosmopolítica Amazônica." Pp. 79–124 in *Lévi-Strauss: Leituras Brasileiras,* ed. R. Caixeta de Queiroz and R. Freire Nobre. Belo Horizonte: UFMG.

———. 2009a. "The Gift and the Given: Three Nano-Essays on Kinship and Magic." Pp. 237–68 in *Kinship and Beyond: the Genealogical Model Reconsidered,* ed. S. Bamford and J. Leach. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.

———. 2009b. *Metaphysiques Cannibales: Lignes d'Anthropologie Post-Structurale.* Paris: PUF.

Wagner, Roy. [1975] 1981. *The Invention of Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weber, Ingrid. 2006. *Um Copo de Cultura: Os Huni Kuin (Kaxinawá) do Rio Humaitá e a Escola.* Rio Branco and Rio de Janeiro: UFAC/Nuti.

Willerslev, Rane. 2007. *Soul Hunters: Hunting, Animism and Personhood among the Siberian Yukaghirs.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Willis, R. (ed.) 1990. *Signifying Animals: Human Meaning in the Natural Worlds.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Wisnik, José Miguel. 1990. *O Som e o Sentido: Uma Outra História das Músicas.* São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.

Wright, Robin, ed. 1999. *Transformando os Deuses: Os Múltiplos Sentidos da Conversão Entre os Povos Indígenas do Brasil.* Campinas: Unicamp.