

the meaning of these terms. For this reviewer the jury remains out on all three questions. Moreover, the authors responsible for the most effective chapters, Di Giovine and Swain, choose to frame their work with two yet further invented and highly imaginative expressions – *imaginaire dialectic* in the former case, and “*imaginarium*” in the latter (103). Swain describes this delightful term as “playful” and as being reminiscent of museums or toy stores. We might add that it also conjures up aquariums in which fish swim in all directions.

The collection of ethnographic miniatures described above is followed by Leite’s “Afterword” and preceded by the “Introduction” by the editors. It is these chapters to which we will now turn.

Leite’s essay, a model of thoughtful clarity, starts by drawing attention to the fact that the imaginary and imaginaries originated from a variety of disciplinary sources outside anthropology and that they appear routinely to be used with “a basic lack of conceptual unity” (260). They are used variously to apply to “tourism-related images, interactions, imagery, institutions, and imaginings ... [as well as other numerous terms] ... each involving different imaginative phenomena” (261). In an attempt to bring a common thread to such heterogeneity Leite follows Claudia Strauss’s (*The Imaginary. Anthropological Theory* 6/3.2006: 322) recommendation that we need to steer a passage through the maze with the idea of “shared mental life” without substituting the term the imaginary for culture. Indeed Strauss, as one of the definitive anthropological thinkers on the topic, warns, early on in her classic paper “The Imaginary”, that in some of the ways it is presently used the imaginary comes close to “just *culture* or *cultural knowledge* in new clothes.”

This brings us to the editors’ “Introduction,” most of which consists of a large number of quotations and accompanying reflections about the nature and meaning of the imaginary and imaginaries. Their own position on the meaning of these terms is not always clear to this reviewer. They assert early on, for example (1), that “it is hard to think of tourism without imaginaries or ‘fantasies’” seeming to imply that these two terms could, and possibly should, be elided, but they further tell us that imaginaries are “socially transmitted representational assemblages that interact with people’s personal imaginings” (and that they are) “used as meaning-making and world-shaping devices” (1). Some might find this assertion elliptical (assemblages of what?) but it appears to come close to Cornelius Castoriadis’ notion, which they quote, of the imaginary being similar or indeed the same as a society’s “cultural ethos” (3) thus calling to mind Strauss’s anxieties. In her own essay Strauss (2006: 322–344) is very clear: we should drop what she calls the “cultural model” altogether because imaginaries are properties of individual thinkers rather than collectivities. Societies (cf. Strathern, *The Concept of Society is Theoretically Obsolete*. In: *Group for Debates. Anthropological Theory* 1989: 4–11), nations, or other kinds of groups do not imagine. People imagine. Yet the editors seem to find Edward Tylor’s (*Primitive Culture*. New York 1889) use of the notion of “mental culture” congenial, suggesting to the reader that

for them imaginaries are indeed cultural realities – a position borne out by their notion of imaginaries *interacting* with people’s personal imaginings – suggesting that the former has a separate existence from the latter.

Some of the quotations and references are puzzling. Assertions are made on the basis of alleged quotations from others in ways that often make it impossible to follow up what the quoted authors actually said or what evidence was used to make the assertions in the first place. Readers are given names and dates but sometimes no actual quotes and seldom page numbers. For example, the editors assert that “for Said” (in “Orientalism”) “geographic imaginaries refer, literally, to how spaces are imagined” (4) while Selwyn is reported to have pointed to the similarity between myths and tourism imaginaries (3). But, given that neither Said (who wrote of “imagined geographies”) nor Selwyn actually used the term imaginaries in their work, it is hard to support either claim. These are just two examples of the editors’ system of referencing which sometimes seems to lack completeness or coherence. This turns out (unexpectedly) to constitute a route leading us to the main theoretical issue of the book itself. On the basis of quoting others the editors’ approach to imaginaries yields illustrations of “shared imaginaries” which are very general and very vague. One example of this is their assertion that “in the early 20th century European[s] imagin[ed] ... African people ... as cannibals” (3). *All Europeans? Some Europeans?* If so who, when, and in what context?

It will be clear by now that for this reviewer the answer to Leite’s question is that the “cultural model” adopted by the editors remains unsupported by proper evidence and thus has little new to offer us. That said, if we follow Tine Gammeltoft’s (*Toward an Anthropology of the Imaginary. Specters of Disability in Vietnam. Ethos* 42/2.2014: 153–174) reading of the anthropological uses of the imaginary in her brilliant essay on the imaginings of a pregnant mother in Vietnam who knows (through the hospital’s ultrasound) that her baby will be born disabled, we may partially redeem the efficacy of the terms in question here. Thus, if we, as ethnographers, closely observe the imaginaries of a single individual as her/his mind interacts with state policies and commercial imperatives – in this case to “improve” the physical health of the population after the depredations of the war and to sell formula milk to new mothers –, then we can not only agree with Leite (274) about the “centrality of the human capacity for imagination” but also finally begin to understand where and how the imaginary and imaginaries may and may not be usefully employed in anthropological work.

Tom Selwyn

Sanjek, Roger (ed.): *Mutuality. Anthropology’s Changing Terms of Engagement*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015. 374 pp. ISBN 978-0-8122-4656-8. Price: \$ 65.00

This volume includes 16 essays concerning mutuality, organized into four sections (each with four chapters). Editor Roger Sanjek, who also wrote the book’s introduc-

tion and its lengthier conclusion, calls these sections “Orientations,” “Roots,” “Journeys,” and “Publics.” Thoughtful and provocative, it remains interesting to me (but also somewhat surprising) that the volume is so U.S.-centric in its choice of contributors. True, not all contributors were born in the U.S. but nearly all regularly live and work in the U.S., with the one exception, Rogaia Mustafa Abusharaf, listed as living in Qatar though employed by George Washington University. In addition, all contributors got their PhD in the U.S. with one exception, though this is someone who later moved to the U.S. This overwhelming, tacit U.S.-centricity is something to note and ponder, especially as this volume hopefully gets read both inside “American” anthropology and outside it.

This topic, after all, is one that colleagues outside the U.S. have been exploring and debating for some time, and reference to that work appears all too infrequently for my taste, except in some footnotes and a small number of chapters. It may be that Sanjek’s intended audience is primarily U.S. academic anthropology, and that he hopes to invite (indeed encourage) them to broaden their audiences, do more applied work, and indeed do more work that openly changes and improves society. Perhaps the title was intentional but not necessarily an engagement with the existing anthropological literature on “mutuality,” its strengths, and limits. And perhaps Roger Sanjek had a clearer idea about this work outside the U.S. than many of his contributors in this volume, but that he still thought that the set of essays taken as a whole works to advance his goal, including his take on “mutuality” and indeed “engagement.”

Sanjek asks the apparently simple question at the start of this book, “Why do people do social-cultural anthropology?” It is clear that he believes there are social values and goals that motivate people to become sociocultural anthropologists. As the book jacket openly says “*Mutuality* explores the values that anthropologists bring from their wider social worlds, including the value placed on relationships with the people they study, work with, write about and for, and communicate with more broadly.” That point is clear and shared by all contributors.

Readers will find it in Part I, called “Orientations,” in chapters called “Anthropology and the American Indian” by Garrick Bailey; “The American Anthropological Association RACE. *Are We So Different?* Project” by Yolanda T. Moses; “Mutuality and the Field at Home” by Sylvia Rodríguez; and “‘If You Want to Go Fast, Go Alone. If You Want to Go Far, Go Together.’ Yup’ik Elders Working Together with One Mind” by Ann Fienup-Riordan). We see it, too, in the chapters in Part II (“Roots”) titled “The Invisibility of Diasporic Capital and Multiply Migrant Creativity” (by Parminder Bhachu); “A Savage at the Wedding and the Skeletons in My Closet. My Great-Grandfather, ‘Igorotte Villages,’ and the Ethnological Expositions of the 1900s” (a gripping essay by Deana L. Weibel); “Thinking about and Experiencing Mutuality. Notes on a Son’s Formation” (a personal and engaging essay by Lane Ryo Hirabayashi); and “Cartographies of Mutuality. Lessons from Darfur” (by Rogaia Mustafa Abusharaf).

It is there as well in Part III (“Journeys”) and Part IV (“Publics”), though I suspect that Sanjek could easily have placed individual chapters in different sections. These last two parts contain essays by Robert R. Alvarez, Alaka Wali, Susan Lobo, Renée R. Shield, Zibin Guo, Brett Williams, Lanita Jacobs, and Catherine Besteman. Their topics cross the personal and professional in multiple but appropriate ways. Under “Journeys,” Alvarez wrote about the discipline’s “fault lines” exploring the canon and his personal practice. Wali wrote about “listening with passion” and detailed her mix of engagement and exchange, while largely based at The Field Museum in Chicago. Lobo wrote an essay “on doing anthropology and life” exploring her passion but also the strengths and challenges of being “an independent scholar.” Shield explored being “embedded in time, work, family, and age.” While these clearly suggest personal lifetime engagements, they also reflect on audiences and publics. And yet Sanjek thought four other essays focused on “Publics,” placing in this section Guo’s essay on “developing and implementing wheelchair Taijiquan”; Williams’ essay on fragmentation in contemporary life (indeed inequality) and the limits that imposes on mutuality; Jacobs’ gripping essay on studying African-American children with acquired and traumatic brain injuries; and Besteman’s delicate and inspiring essay “on ethnographic love,” photography, and its limits (where, to be transparent, I should note that she engages with one of my own published essays).

In all these texts, the personal is explored, the question of empathy is implied or discussed head on, and much emphasis is placed on the people anthropologists study, the relationships they develop, the limits and strengths of those relationships, and what it all says about anthropology. Louise Lamphere is right in her endorsement of the book when she writes that this collection of essays goes deeper than the more “conventional concepts of ‘collaboration’ and ‘engagement,’” yet I wonder if it explores *mutuality* enough.

Of course, a key question is what we mean by mutuality, what others mean by it, how utopian a concept it may or may not be, and whether there is honestly any form of sociocultural anthropology that can really be described that way, in this era where so many anthropologists seek to be post-colonial, post-imperial, post-racist, post-sexist, and even post-nationalist. That people try is to be praised; how well they succeed remains to be seen.

Overall, then, this book is a welcome addition to the contemporary literature on anthropology, for it indeed struggles openly and appropriately with questions of ethics and power, but I also think that it may be especially good to read this book as a window onto contemporary U.S. anthropology, with special attention to U.S. cultural anthropology, U.S. practicing or public anthropology, and U.S. politically-oriented anthropology. While many of its contributors worry about past exoticizing and even racist practices in which the field of anthropology participated, many are now seeking alternative ways to be and do anthropology despite those past legacies, though acknowledging them, nonetheless. I am not sure how successful all those efforts are, but I do know that such concerns are

very present in the lives and works of many anthropologists outside the U.S. that I wish the volume's contributors had explicitly acknowledged and not just in some of the volume's footnotes or in a handful of chapters.

As many know, a key favored concept in current U.S. anthropology is "engaged anthropology," and it was Sanjek who chose to relate that to the larger world anthropologies' discussion of "mutuality," even "mutualities." The book itself then is both more than it appears to be and less than it appears to be, but readers interested in "American anthropology" today, ethics and anthropologists' struggle to be ethical, power relations and hierarchies in the practice of anthropology, and even the history of anthropology would do well to read it. Sanjek has gathered interesting and strong representatives of contemporary U.S. anthropology in this volume, and I highly encourage readers to read it.

Virginia R. Dominguez

Schauert, Paul: *Staging Ghana. Artistry and Nationalism in State Dance Ensembles.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015. 343 pp. ISBN 978-0-253-01742-0. Price: \$ 30.00

Six decades after the nationalist leaders of African independence movements promoted the showcasing of African performing arts, there are more African music-dance groups, companies, ensembles, and practitioners across the globe today than at any other time in history. The subject of performing arts, and in particular the connection between music-dance groups and nationalist movements, has been extensively addressed (see Gilman, Castaldi, Ebron, Agawu, Askew, Nketia, Chernoff, Shipley, and Donkor, among others), but Paul Schauert's new book is among the first scholarly treatises exclusively about Ghana's national dance companies.

Ghana was one of the first sub-Saharan African nations to gain political independence from colonial Europe. Schauert's work focuses on the Ghana Dance Ensemble, the dance troupe whose history is linked directly to the nationalist ideologies of the 1950s that led to Ghanaian independence. "Staging Ghana" also juxtaposes those ideologies with the post-independence strategies of contemporary nation building, in which the needs of ensemble members are intertwined more with harsh economic realities and individual aspirations than with the rhetoric of Ghanaian independence. Schauert's examination of the institutionalized music-dance practices of Ghanaian performances highlights one of the central themes of "Staging Ghana": how the members of performance ensembles balance or reconcile their personal priorities and goals with the (sometimes opposing) objectives of the nation-state.

In the introduction, the author lays out the historical narratives and issues patent to the development of Ghanaian music-dance ensembles and examines how their members constantly negotiate between serving their nation through music-dance performances redesigned for stage presentations and focusing on concerns salient to their daily existence and livelihood. He describes efforts to unite the many ethnic representations of the Ghanaian societies through choreography ideas based on histori-

cal narratives of the early years of Nkrumah's Pan-Africanism, independence, liberation, and cultural nationalist project. With this background in place, he then addresses issues of authenticity and how ensemble members find ways to balance their ethnic cultural affiliations with the need to adopt performance practices that appeal to and satisfy the entertainment preferences of cosmopolitan audiences.

The author discusses the clever ways in which ensemble members use to their own advantage the alternative education (and, often, strict discipline) they have gained under the leadership of the group's successive artistic directors. For example, the members' ingenuity has led them to pursue business opportunities that draw on their experiences with the University of Ghana (such as its study-abroad programs) and with the arts markets in Accra, Aburi, and beyond. The theme of performers intentionally crafting their own message continues in Schauert's analysis of how Ghanaian performers rely on their cultural knowledge and skills in indirect communication to reinterpret long-gone (or still-present but less functional) nationalist rhetoric of the past for contemporary Ghanaian audiences. In this way, Schauert does a superb job of highlighting how individual performers create and share their own understandings and practices.

He also takes a more macro-level view of the music-dance performance scene in Ghana, through his exploration of the 1992 split of the Ghana Dance Ensemble into two troupes and how that controversial division led to increased competition and significant shifts in onstage representations of the nation. His explication of the performers' ideas about self-expression and the creative ability of artists in ensembles and other groups in Accra is particularly interesting.

With theory well grounded in (and balanced by) richly textured ethnography and analyses, "Staging Ghana" is a valuable addition to the literature in the ever-growing fields of African studies and performance studies. Its examination of nationalism, creativity, postcolonialism, culture, music, and dance give it great multidisciplinary relevance, particularly to scholars and students of ethnomusicology, ethnography, dance, cultural anthropology, African diasporas, and African politics and history in general.

Habib Iddrisu

Scherer, Andrew K.: *Mortuary Landscapes of the Classic Maya. Rituals of Body and Soul.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015. 291 pp. ISBN 978-1-4773-0051-0. Price: £ 45.00

Scherer's book is about the treatment of body and soul among the Classic Maya in the form of different mortuary practices. His main concern is the variations in burial rites and he explains them against the background of widely held body and soul conceptions (13). To do this he employs a variety of methodological approaches. As anthropological archaeologist and bioarchaeologist, he enriches archaeological with epigraphic and iconographic data. In particular, he takes advantage of his own field experience at sites like El Kinel, El Zotz, and Piedras Negras along