

sin mal” y la mitología son algunos de los tópicos abordados en este trabajo.

Dejando ya el norte argentino, Catalina T. Michieli describe las religiones indígenas del centro del país, la región cuyana y las sierras centrales al momento de la llegada de los españoles. A diferencia de lo que ocurre en la mayor parte del norte argentino, en esta región “las creencias y prácticas religiosas originarias fueron diluyéndose a medida que desaparecían los idiomas y costumbres que las acompañaban. Ni siquiera puede advertirse que existiera un proceso de sincretismo o transposición, salvo en los últimos años, cuando se trata de revivir culturas indígenas desaparecidas hace mucho tiempo” (243). Por su parte, el arqueólogo Eduardo A. Crivelli M. caracteriza a los grupos que habitan las pampas y la región norpatagónica desde los tiempos prehistóricos hasta la actualidad: los ritos de iniciación y de tránsito, así como la praxis shamánica y la hechicería, son los ejes de su trabajo.

Siguiendo hacia el sur del país, Alejandra Siffredi y Marina Matarrese presentan un estudio de la religión de los tehuelche meridionales que habitaban la provincia de Santa Cruz. Dado que la documentación etnográfica original utilizada data de la década de 1960, la complementan con datos más actualizados publicados más recientemente. Más allá de un pequeño esbozo histórico, las autoras se dedican a describir y analizar las ideas fundamentales relacionadas con la cosmología y la antropogonía tehuelches.

El último artículo también es obra de Juan A. Gonzalo, quien resume la parte de la monumental obra del padre Martín Gusinde para ofrecer una descripción detallada de las ideas y prácticas religiosas de los antiguos habitantes de Tierra del Fuego: los selk’nam o cazadores terrestres, los yámana o canoeros pescadores, y sus pares occidentales halakwulup en el litoral pacífico. Las creencias, los héroes culturales, la mitología, las prácticas shamánicas son parte del rico material expuesto.

En términos generales, podemos afirmar que la edición del libro es cuidada y prolija, y que el libro brinda un anexo de excelentes fotografías en color y blanco y negro de las fiestas y rituales descriptos que le agrega un valor suplementario. Otro punto a destacar es la bibliografía sobre cada grupo al final de cada artículo, que permite al lector interesado acceder a un corpus bibliográfico sumamente útil para profundizar cada tema. Como en toda obra colectiva los aportes de los diferentes artículos son desiguales: hay trabajos con mayor énfasis histórico, otros con una mayor inclinación teórica o etnográfica, y otros escritos fundamentalmente a partir de datos arqueológicos o bibliográficos. Por otro lado es evidente que los estudios consagrados al Gran Chaco superan comparativamente a los dedicados a otras áreas culturales. Sin embargo, debido a la magnitud de la meta propuesta creemos que se trata de un libro que cumple bien el objetivo pretendido: abrir al lector las puertas del complejo horizonte religioso de los pueblos indígenas de la Argentina.

Loirena I. Córdoba

Candea, Matei: *Corsican Fragments. Difference, Knowledge, and Fieldwork.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010. 202 pp. ISBN 978-0-253-22193-3. Price: \$ 21.20

Matei Candea’s book “Corsican Fragments” can be located somewhere between an ethnography and a series of anthropological essays based on ethnographic experience. One of its central aims is to use the Corsican case to carve out a middle ground in between an extreme anthropological essentialism, that takes cultural difference/identity as the starting point for investigation and analysis, and an equally extreme social constructivist approach which deauthenticates experiences and discourses of difference. Candea succeeds in this effort by providing nuanced and sensitive accounts of cultural and discursive processes that illustrate that the movement between these poles of anthropological models of analysis is also at the heart of individual and collective experience on Corsica, where it generates tensions, contradictions and is subject to situational adjustments and transformations.

Chapter 1, “Arbitrary Location,” describes the village where Candea lived during his fieldwork in 2002–2003. In line with recent approaches in both anthropology and geography, Candea approaches place as experiential, discursive, and relative. On this basis, the village itself cannot be thought of as having a fundamental unity – or even of providing unified forms of social interaction or intimacy. Rather, he takes the village as a place from which both small and large unities and small and large disunities, fragments and inconsistencies can be studied. These points are well-taken and nicely articulated. At times, however, Candea’s critical deconstruction of notions of unitary sites, coherent experiences and relationships, unified translocal cultural formations and fixed categories overstates, in my view, the extent to which they are dominant features of contemporary approaches to doing fieldwork or anthropological analysis. Chapter 2, “Mystery,” begins with a reading of the way that Corsica as place has been imagined and figured as both “essential” and “unknowable” in historical and contemporary French discourses about the island. These images and “French prejudice” are mobilized in the construction of an insider subject position and “create” Corsica as a locus of interpretation and intervention. Candea writes that these historical and contemporary discourses also produce and reproduce the binary opposition between the “real” and its representations, and posit an elusive reconciliation as the goal of both anthropology and its subjects.

Chapter 3, “Place,” explores discourses about “essential” connections of Corsicans to physical place. Candea is careful to say that characterizing “attachment to land” as a politicized trope does not mean that this attachment is not felt, or that it is “only” a trope. He goes on to describe the different positionalities – both taken up and ascribed – as locals and tourists observe a fire. The event is used as the focal point for a notion of distributed cognition, and the emergent, social, and situated nature of knowledge. While this view locates both insiders and outsiders in a complex assemblage, these connections are in fact misrecognized by participants: locals retreat into stereotypifi-

cations of tourists as rude and uncaring and Candea speculates that tourists too may have reduced the meaning of the interaction to a typification of Corsican others. This chapter illustrates both the strengths and limitations of the ethnographic essay: on the one hand, the choice of fire (and its links with relationship to place) is a rich one, as witnessed by the recurrent, culturally saturated discourse of causality and blame on the island. However, the thinness of the ethnography here – it boils down to a few exchanges and comments on one occasion by locals – leaves both the residents of Crucetta and the tourists they comment on a bit one-dimensional. The reader is left wondering about other comments about other fires, other debates about the meaning or use of space or place, other interactions between locals or between locals and tourists that might demonstrate a different participant orientation to or enactment of the distributed nature of knowledge (which is slimly illustrated by the content in the chapter). In other words, the chapter is a reflection on processes and issues that one feels sure could have been enriched and developed with additional ethnographic data; this is also the case to varying degrees in the other chapters of the book.

However, the themes in Chapter 3 are indeed illustrated by other ethnographic “fragments” in the following chapters. Chapter 4, “Things,” explores another kind of focus (what I would be tempted to call a “stance object”) for the articulation of Corsicanness. Candea notes both the ubiquity of discourse about the Corsicanness of things, and the shifting referents of that discourse and the notions of authenticity that lie behind it. That authenticity can be constructed around different (and potentially competing) criteria. Thus one knife is authentic as a used, inherited thing; another is authenticated with reference to mode of production. The chapter nicely illustrates the power of an always deniable indeterminacy (described long ago by Falk-Moore, *Law as Process*. Boston 1978): while multiple sources of authority and authenticity circulate, what remains unscathed is the notion that there *are* Corsican things. A similar perspective informs Candea’s discussion of how people are defined as Corsican or not-Corsican in the next chapter. Here, Candea evokes the interplay between fixed categories and the flexibility/fluidity of the connections that cut across and between their constitutive elements and situationally make them real. He closes the chapter by writing that “it is precisely at their most ambiguous that assertions of identity are the most powerful,” because they are felt as embodied wholes that “go without saying,” and yet remain indeterminate in their precise composition. This is a crucial and interesting point that could further be enriched with an analysis of processes of regimentation and power: that is, an attention to the conditions in which people are able to benefit strategically from indeterminacy vs. conditions in which other social actors, institutions or contexts impose or encourage or make relevant fixed categories.

In Chapter 6, “Language,” Candea traces the historical legitimation of the Corsican language and its connection to essentialist models of language and identity to its more recent inclusion in a bi- or plurilingual imaginary associated with cultural openness and wider forms of cultural

citizenship. At the same time, Candea pays careful attention to the myriad of ways in which language, and the attribution or denial of competence and participation, is used to draw boundaries. He also shows the shifting and situated nature of the linguistic markers mobilized in this process: making the point that distinct languages (and social distinctions and or intimacies based on language) are created (like Corsican things and people) out of a mass of complex and indeterminate elements and practices. It is no surprise, then, that mixed and hybrid forms – including Candea’s own “unexpected” competencies as a non-native speaker – are focal points for discursive and definitional “trouble.”

In Chapter 7, “Knowing,” Candea focuses on how people take up evaluative stances towards and via the widely-shared discourse that “everyone knows everyone else” on Corsica. Echoing the theme that closed Chapter 5, he claims that it is precisely at moments when people are disconnected or not known to each other that this claim is the most powerful. Candea draws the parallel between his own experience of disconnection at a public event he attended and what he interprets as the lack of “groupness” for other participants. In other words, the intimate whole emerges as an idealized figure. He also provides interesting accounts of how people he met in the village of Crucetta did the work of social integration on his behalf by inserting him as a “known” person in the fabric of social relations and connections. He contrasts the potential inclusiveness of the discourse of “knowing everyone” with the discourse of “we are all related,” in which the idiom of kinship includes only those defined as “Corsican.” He closes the chapter with a reflection on the impenetrability of these combined discourses and networks of relations: the difficulty for the incomer to become known, or to become someone who knows. This chapter leads me to several observations. The first one is that discourses about “knowing everyone” are not just about having but about having the potential to acquire knowledge of and connections to others. That is, while people are sometimes, even often bound together by actual knowledge of one another and other (third parties), they are also bound together by participation in a social system in which others can be made known – traces and connections and information are figured as accessible. The notion of “distributed cognition” – introduced briefly in Chapter 3, might have been deployed to useful effect in this chapter in this vein. Secondly, being known or knowing is not a binary opposition, just as “belonging” is not a unitary thing that one either has or does not have. While this is not at all incompatible with the framework Candea lays out in this chapter, it occasionally moves out of sight. My own long-term fieldwork and connections with Corsica have multiplied who and what I know, how knowable I am, and how knowable others are to me but all of this is subtly inflected by questions of degree, intensity, and type of knowledge. This accretion of participation in networks of knowledge and knowability over time also does not have a definitive outcome (of either “belonging” or “not belonging”). Candea’s approach, then, offers an interesting model that could be further developed to account for the element of

time and the complexities of types of knowledge that are evoked and deployed in practice and discourse.

In Chapter 8, “Anonymous Introductions,” Candea describes one of the modalities of becoming known through the seemingly paradoxical process of *not* being introduced to strangers by name, especially not at the beginning of an interaction. This process allows disconnection between people to be held in abeyance until a chain of connection can be established through interaction; the process itself presumes what I have characterized above as “knowability.” Thus its function contrasts with popular explanations that fall back on stereotypes of Corsican “secrecy” or “closedness.” Candea concludes with a reflection on how this process relates to the anthropological enterprise, which by default often posits entities (Corsica, Corsicans) as “known” before engaging readers in a necessarily partial, situated process of discovery of connections, practices and relationships.

Overall, this is a stimulating and eloquently written book that highlights, with subtle examples, the complex interplay between fixity and fluidity in discourses and practices of identification. Candea succeeds in showing the fragmentary, situated, emergent, and inconsistent nature of these discourses and practices while pointing to the threads of shared or common experiences and sentiments about Corsican things, people and language that are (also situationally) constructed. Alexandra Jaffe

Coleman, Simon, and Pauline von Hellerman (eds.): *Multi-Sited Ethnography. Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods*. New York: Routledge, 2011. 219 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-96524-8. (Routledge Advances in Research Methods, 3) Price: £ 80.00

The collection of essays gathered in the book under review emerged out of intense sets of debates and conversations, prompted by a workshop entitled “Problems and Possibilities in Multi-Sited Ethnography.” This workshop held at the University of Sussex in June 2005, gathered people of different institutional backgrounds and affiliations in Europe, Africa, and the United States. As we can read in the “Introduction”, none of contributors – with the exception of Kaushik Sunder Rajan – has been part of Marcus’s “school” of anthropology. George Marcus himself was present at the workshop, but he contributed in a lively fashion to conversations during the coffee breaks. Simon Coleman and Pauline von Hellerman, editors of the volume, present the experiences of this specific workshop in a book that is not meant to be read as a program but as an “extended provocation.” They are working at the level of metamethod, examining the ways in which multi-sited practice might produce useful ethnography.

We all know the convention (in Marcus’s words, “Malinowskian complex”) that an ethnography has involved the idea of a relatively long stay in a field site of choice. This site was understood as a container of a particular set of cultural and social relations, which could be studied and compared with the contents of other sites. Ethnographic fieldwork involved intensive dwelling and interaction with “native” or “local” in order to understand his

or her “native point of view.” The field sites in this convention become a sociocultural unit, spatially and temporally isolated. Such a positing of people, places, and cultures is criticized. One of key voices in this critical discussion is Marcus’s project of multi-sited ethnography.

The project called “multi-sited ethnography” was broadly discussed for the first time in George Marcus’s article “Ethnography in/of the World System. The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography” (*Annual Review of Anthropology* 1995.24: 95–117). This article purports classic convention of ethnographic fieldwork. Looking at culture as embedded in macroconstructions of a global cultural order, this project uses traditional ethnographic methodology in various locations both spatially and temporally. Marcus suggests that multi-sited ethnography cannot be reduced to focusing on one single site. The “world system” was seen by Marcus as a framework within which the local (communities, values, norms, commodities, etc.) was contextualized or compared. In his terms, multi-sited ethnography involved a spatially dispersed field; the research tracks a subject across spatial and temporal boundaries. Marcus suggested those strategies like literally following connections, associations, and also putative relationship, which were at the heart of designing multi-sited research. Another important element of Marcus’s project was a great interdisciplinary approach to fieldwork, bringing in methods from cultural studies, media studies, science and technology studies, migrants studies, and many others.

The volume here, entitled “Multi-sited ethnography. Problems and Possibilities in the Translocation of Research Methods,” is organized in three parts. Part A contains articles which have used Marcus’s concept to follow transnational lives, one of the most popular and even “normal” applications of multi-sited ethnographies (Kanwal Mand; Ester Gallo; Bruno Riccio). In Part B we can find maps, “distributed knowledge systems,” within some global institutions and within the research team itself (Ingie Hovland; Dinah Rajak; Michael A. Whyte, Susan Reynolds Whyte, and Jenipher Twebaze). Part C is focused on more experimental forms of multi-sited strategies. These explorations also concern the limits and problems of this project, especially within the academic institutions (Werner Krauss; Kathryn Tomlinson; Kaushik Sunder Rajan).

Each of the three parts is furthermore prefaced by brief commentaries from persons who contributed in the original workshop in Sussex (Michael Crang; Andrea Cornwall; James Fairhead). The book as a whole is framed by an introductory chapter by Marcus and the final one by James Ferguson). Marcus expressed his contributions in the spirit of Carlo Ginzburg on microhistory. The title of Marcus’s article is inspired by Ginzburg’s essay “Microhistory. Two or Three Things That I Know about It” (*Critical Inquiry* 1993.20/1: 10–35). Like microhistory to famous Italian historians, multi-sited ethnography to American anthropologists is an attractive style or newer variant on an older tradition of inquiry. For Marcus this kind of ethnography is a reform or reimagination of the Malinowskian complex in which he was brought up as a student. Today, the Malinowskian ethos of ethnographic