ment! Il suffit d'en retoucher la théorie simplificatrice comme on l'a fait du fétichisme et de l'animisme. Après relecture d'Evans-Pritchard, de Radcliffe-Brown et même de Sartre, Adler remarque justement qu'une déférence spécifique envers le monde caractérise ces types d'attitudes, de comportements, de morale qualifiés de totémiques. De Michel Cartry, un "Père Noël", beau comme les katchina hopi, est dit opérer une transaction entre deux générations, les croyances des adultes au bonheur reposant dans beaucoup de sociétés sur la crédulité des enfants. Si Philippe Descola démolit le triangle culinaire, il met encore plus en cause l'ambiguïté de l'opposition nature-culture. Chacun de ces auteurs, tout comme Gérard Lenclud voyant dans "l'identité" un foyer virtuel, a l'insigne mérite d'aller au-delà de la pensée de Lévi-Strauss après l'avoir interrogée avec précision.

Ensuite certains soupèsent dans l'oeuvre les parts du symbolique, de l'inconscient, de l'architecture de l'esprit, tandis que d'autres nous perdent dans les modèles mathématiques et formels de l'anthropologie ou dans une philosophie boursouflée à propos du Finale des "Mythologiques". La plupart des étrangers excellent dans un bilan des recherches structuralistes en leur pays. Au Japon, l'émotion et le sentiment lient la nature aux mythes, et Kawada au Maître. Si la Belgique tend fort l'oreille vers les Hautes Etudes et le Collège de France, l'anthropologie britannique se veut sociale plutôt que structurale (et Leach insiste sur la manipulation des règles de mariage); l'Espagne suit l'Angleterre plus que la France. Si au Québec, on teste sur les Inuit les structures de parenté et d'échange, aux Etats-Unis, l'anthropologie culturelle ne reçoit que tardivement des échos brouillés du structuralisme. En Russie, seulement des traductions récentes forcent des folkloristes à l'écoute et à la réception de l'oeuvre de Lévi-Strauss. Au Portugal, da Silva réduit l'importance de la relation avunculaire. En Italie, on a été attentif aux accents marxistes du structuralisme.

Je suis conscient d'avoir omis bien des grands noms et caricaturé en comprimant. Ce dont je suis sûr, c'est qu'aucun historien de l'anthropologie ne pourra se passer désormais de cette synthèse critique et réhabilitatrice, dans laquelle on lit (avec réponse) parmi les reproches adressés au structuralisme: 1) une philosophie ondoyante, tantôt idéaliste tantôt matérialiste, à visée holiste mais souvent individualiste, dont la prétendue rigueur formaliste cacherait une certaine téléologie de la structure (cf. Scubla, 207); 2) une incapacité à saisir la praxis, le sujet, les acteurs, à partir souvent d'étude de données récoltées par d'autres; 3) une certaine imperméabilité à la causalité historique et à la saisie du changement (cf. Hartog, 313; Ortiz Rescaniere, 385). Il n'empêche que le structuralisme est désormais intégré aux acquis de l'anthropologie de la parenté, des mythes et rites, des arts premiers ou de l'échange. Lévi-Strauss (peut-être l'anthropologie avec lui) est entré sous la coupole de l'Académie française en 1973 au fauteuil de Henri de Montherlant avec un discours de réception de Roger Caillois. Il reste à son égard, même chez ceux qui ont suivi d'autres voies que lui, la *saudade* qui est mélancolie sans morosité ni tristesse (Nathan Wachtel). F. Héritier profile à la fin un avenir pour le structuralisme: une anthropologie moins structurale que structurante, peut-être moins intellectualiste mais plus liée à des corps sensibles et à des cultures aux chaînes de significations et aux cadres relativement invariants. Découverte passionnée de gens et de culture, rigueur mentale dans l'observation et l'interprétation, espoir d'une unité ultime des savoirs, voilà la modélisation d'un idéal pour l'anthropologue, selon Denis Bertholet! Que vienne le temps où structuralistes et dynamistes se réconcilieront! Pour se structurer et se dynamiser l'esprit, rien de mieux que de fréquenter quelques grands noms de l'ethnologie actuelle réunis dans ce riche service de cru et de cuit et dans ce magnifique ouvrage de paroles données autour de l'histoire d'un Sphinx!

Claude Rivière

Jackson, Jason Baird: Yuchi Ceremonial Life. Performance, Meaning, and Tradition in a Contemporary American Indian Community. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003. 345 pp. ISBN 0-8032-2594-6. Price: £ 60.00

The Yuchi (or Euchee) are a people speaking a unique language of the Uchean stock distinct from other Native American languages. They answer to Yuchi, but also know themselves as Tsoyaha, "Descendants of the Sun." A population estimate of 1715 numbered them at only 400 people. The present numbers are obscure because they are enrolled as members of the Creek Nation or another tribe and an undetermined number is dispersed across the United States. First encountered by White settlers in the Southeast of what is now the United States, in the eighteenth century they were gradually absorbed into the Creek Confederacy. The removal policy of the government of President Andrew Jackson led to the expulsion of southeast Native Americans west of the Mississippi. The resulting journey west is popularly known as the "Trail of Tears." The Creek peoples, among whom the Yuchi were included, were sent west in 1836 and 1837. Today the Yuchi inhabit an arc of land south and southwest of Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Yuchi identity tends to be absorbed into that of their Creek allies. "In the eyes of United States federal Indian policy, the Yuchi do not exist. They are Creeks" (4). At first contact they inhabited primarily what is now eastern Tennessee and Georgia, with a small number living in present South Carolina. Whereas other southeast groups, including the Muskogean Creek, had matrilineal descent groups, Yuchi society is characterized by patrilineal men's societies assigned political and ritual functions reserved for clans among the Creek. Jackson interprets the available evidence as indicating that the Yuchi were culturally distinct from the Creek and other Muskogean peoples among whom they lived interspersed and that, "they are positioned as a cultural bridge between more distinctly Northeastern and Southeastern cultural groups." Despite living at present in the west, they are

to be situated historically and culturally in the east, a fact of which present Yuchi are aware and about which they take a comparative interest.

The focus of this book is Yuchi ceremonial life as recorded since 1993. Fluency in Yuchi language has largely disappeared, and Yuchi economic and material life is much changed, but since the 1980s a renewed cultural interest has replaced an earlier pattern of ceremonial loss with a record of ceremonial retention and revival. Despite the fact that the medium of communication is now firmly English, cultural patterns which are traceable back into the precontact period remain vital. After an introduction to Yuchi history, culture, and society, the book discusses the general framework of ceremonial life, Yuchi oratory (albeit now in English), Indian football (a game which opens by throwing up the ball as a signal to the Creator), the stomp dance with attendant reciprocity and social interaction, the arbor dance, the green corn ceremony, and the soup dance.

Yuchi commissioned Jackson to do the research on which this book is based. One of the men told the author that, "We are trying to keep history moving and have an account of it," i. e., they want to continue to live their history while establishing a record of it for future generations. In many respects of dress and culture (except ceremonial dress and ceremonies), the Yuchi share a common Oklahoman pattern. Nevertheless they also have maintained in important ways distinctive aspects of culture which set them apart from the general Oklahoman society and from other, neighboring Native American groups. Not only does Jackson provide a sensitive description of these separate cultural features, he also maintains a comparative view. In this respect his focus is on the patterns of eastern and formerly eastern peoples. The Yuchi are definitely not a classic Plains culture. The writing is pleasantly fluent. The author includes many texts of oratory and commentary. The illustrations, maps, and tables are useful as are the two brief appendixes. The encouraging implicit message of this book is that extensive cultural change does not necessarily entail the extinction of ethnographic interest.

R. H. Barnes

James, Wendy: The Ceremonial Animal. A New Portrait of Anthropology. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. 384 pp. ISBN 0-19-926333-7. Price: $ 45.00

This portrait of anthropology is very vast and profound though sometimes rather longwinded. It is firmly based in the Oxford tradition which explains why the author frequently acknowledges her debt to the teachings of her predecessors and teachers Evans-Pritchard and Lienhardt. It also explains the importance she attaches to the writings of Durkheim, Mauss, and Lévi-Strauss. Outside anthropology she found an important source of inspiration with the historian/philosopher Collingwood.

This is neither a conventional introduction to anthropology nor a regular history of the discipline. The familiar headings of kinship, economics, politics, and religion as well as the names of many prominent anthropologists are missing. It is a discussion of the views of the author on the state of affairs in the discipline and about what she thinks anthropology should be and what its main problems are. As the title of the book (borrowed from Wittgenstein) indicates, the central notion in anthropology according to her is "ceremonial," a term that is close to that of "ritual" but has different connotations. Ceremonial is not something apart from other ways of thinking and behaving – she rejects the opposition secular/profane –, but it pervades the whole of human social life.

Another concept she regularly uses is the term "social form" but she does not indicate exactly what she means by it. One sometimes wonders what would have been the difference if she had used the familiar notions of culture and symbol instead, for instance, when she writes (5) that "culture is not an add-on extra to the maintenance and reproduction" of our organic life. It is "built in" to our activities and to our "capacity for sociality" in the same way as ceremonial does.

Though James insists on the distinctive identity of anthropology she does see its close relations with neighbouring fields. For instance, in the first chapter called "Key Questions in Anthropology" she enters into a discussion on what she calls the biological sciences and recognizes their value for anthropology but she rejects an approach that starts from the biological individual. She feels attracted to history and philosophy and comes to the conclusion (301) that "social anthropology . . . has . . . come closer to being a kind of historical inquiry."

Language also occupies much of her attention and she thinks (302) that "the pursuit of anthropology . . . rests to a very large extent upon the phenomena of language." She is, however, not so much interested in it in terms of linguistics or structuralism but sees language mostly as a means of communication in social life. She shows that an anthropologist even in a classroom can be confronted with language problems when she writes about her experiences with Sudanese students in Khartoum (129). Trying to provide these students with a glossary in English of anthropological terms in Arabic, she found that this appeared to be "almost impossible."

In view of this susceptiblity of James for language it is surprising that she informs us casually that her book is mainly based on English-language anthropology. I suspect that she has read the French books in her bibliography (Durkheim, Mauss, Bourdieu, etc.) in an English translation despite the fact that she herself cites Dumont (47) claiming that Evans-Pritchard's "The Nuer" has not been properly appreciated by English-speaking anthropologists because of its affinity with French structuralism. I personally remember having read somewhere about a book in German on British kinship theory that the author has not really understood what his British colleagues were saying. So not only Sudanese students have language problems but non-anglophone anthropologists from other parts of the world have them as well and are forced to read, speak, and write in a language which is not their own.