

TABLE 1
*Residence Mode After First Years of Marriage (v216)
 and Anadromous Fishing for Subsistence (v858)*

Anadromous Fishing Primary Mode of Subsistence	Not Virilocal	Virilocal	Total
No	14	13	27
Yes	1	7	8
Total	15	20	35

$$\chi^2 = 3.9, p = .048$$

more typical of agricultural societies than of foragers (Testart 1982).

While Otterbein's hypothesis about why hunting and fishing favor virilocality is not borne out by male subsistence contribution, it led me to discover the anadromous-fishing effect. When the anadromous-fishing complex foragers are excluded, foragers are even less virilocal measured by my preferred variable (early and later years of marriage) than I had concluded. Only 8 societies (30%) are virilocal, while 7 (26%) are uxorilocal and 12 (44%) are multilocal. I thank Otterbein for stimulating this discovery.

References Cited

- EMBER, CAROL R. 1975. Myths about hunter-gatherers. *Ethnology* 12:439-48.
- KELLY, R. L. 1995. *The foraging spectrum*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- KERNS, VIRGINIA. 2003. *Scenes from the high desert: Julian Steward's life and theory*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- MARLOWE, FRANK W. 2003. The mating system of foragers in the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample. *Cross-Cultural Research* 37:282-306.
- . 2004. Marital residence among foragers. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 45:277-84.
- . n.d. Hunter-gatherers and human evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. In press.
- MURDOCK, GEORGE P. 1949. *Social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- OTA, H., W. SETTHEETHAM-ISHIDA, D. TIWAWECH, T. ISHIDA, AND M. STONEKING. 2001. Human mtDNA and Y-chromosome variation is correlated with matrilineal versus patrilineal residence. *Nature Genetics* 29:20-21.
- OTTERBEIN, KEITH F. 1978. *Comparative cultural analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- . 2004. *How war began*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- RODSETH, L., R. W. WRANGHAM, A. M. HARRIGAN, AND B. SMUTS 1991. The human community as a primate society. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 12:221-54.
- SEIELSTAD, M. T., E. MINCH, AND L. L. CAVALLI-SFORZA. 1998. Genetic evidence for a higher female migration rate in humans. *Nature Genetics* 20:278-80.
- SERVICE, ELMAN R. 1962. *Primitive social organization: An evolutionary perspective*. New York: Random House.
- STEWART, JULIAN. 1955. *Theory of culture change: The methodology of multilineal evolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- TESTART, A. 1982. The significance of food storage among hunter-gatherers: Residence patterns, population densities, and social inequalities. *Cultural Anthropology* 23:523-36.

World Cultures. 2001. *Journal of Comparative and Cross-Cultural Research* 12(1).

On the Definition of Shamanism

PIETER JOLLY

*Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town,
 Private Bag, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town, South
 Africa (jolly@age.uct.ac.za). 26 VIII 04*

Klein and Stanfield-Mazzi (CA 45:404-5) cite Lewis-Williams as saying that shamanism is restricted to hunter-gatherer societies. In fact, Lewis-Williams (2002:132) remarks that shamanism is not so restricted, as Furst (2002) has pointed out and a survey of the literature on shamanism will confirm (see Thorpe 1993, for example). Quite a number of agriculturist and pastoralist cultures have shamanic features. Since the rites and experiences associated with shamanism differ considerably, even within the "classical" shamanic complex of Siberia and Central Asia (Siikala 1985, 1992), close definition of the term is difficult. Nevertheless, there are some features which are common to all shamanic cultures. The following could perhaps serve as a definition: cultures that can be classified as shamanic are those which, as a minimum requirement, possess religious functionaries who draw on the powers in the natural world, including the powers of animals, and who mediate, usually in an altered state of consciousness, between the world of the living and that of the spirits—including the spirits of the dead. This excludes those religious functionaries, such as Christian priests, who do not draw on the powers of nature, including animals, and it incorporates the meaning of the word from which "shaman" is derived, the Tungusic term *saman*, denoting as a noun "one who is excited, moved, raised" and as a verb "to know in an ecstatic manner" (Grim 1983:15)—that is, through an altered state of consciousness.

Reply

CECELIA F. KLEIN, EULOGIO GUZMÁN, AND
 MAYA STANFIELD-MAZZI

*Department of Art History, 100 Dodd Hall, University
 of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1417, U.S.A.
 (cklein@humnet.ucla.edu). 16 IX 04*

Jolly offers a thoughtful and in some respects fresh response to our recent reply to David Lewis-Williams, who in the June 2004 issue of *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* responded to our earlier (2002) article criticizing use of the term "shaman" in scholarly studies of Mesoamerican art.

Like so many scholars he is still unwilling to abandon the term altogether and so proposes a new definition of "shamanic cultures." His citation of Lewis-Williams to the effect that shamanism is not restricted to hunter-gatherers does not really engage and therefore does nothing to invalidate our lengthy argument that there are no reliable criteria for diagnosing shamanism cross-culturally. For Jolly, these are cultures in which "religious functionaries" mediate between living human beings and the spirit world by drawing "on the powers in the natural world, including the powers of animals." His definition of shamanism therefore differs from more traditional definitions in emphasizing the source of the powers of "shamans" rather than the means by which they acquire them.

It is clear that our article failed to convince Jolly that there is no consistent set of "shamanic features" that relate more complex societies in any meaningful way to simpler, hunter-gatherer societies. He takes such features as a given in his comments. Although he apparently does not see any danger in lumping together disparate kinds and levels of social organization under the single rubric of "shamanic cultures," we continue to view this kind of homogenization as a mechanism, however unintentional, for "othering" the cultures included in the category. This perceived danger was a major impetus for our article that Jolly simply does not engage.

Fortunately, he does not include among the most important of these "shamanic features" either adherence to a particular cosmological schema or the use of hallucinogens, neither of which, we have argued, can be traced across the board. Moreover, to his credit he evades the problems inherent in the notion of a mandatory altered state of consciousness by acknowledging that not all "shamans" profess to enter into such a state. He does, however, cling to the notion that such altered states are usual in "shamanic cultures," thereby ignoring our homage (p. 388) to Roberte Hamayon's point that there is no empirical way to confirm or deny the existence of a trance. We also offered (p. 388) some examples of individuals often described as shamans who either do not profess to have attained an altered state of consciousness or make no semantic distinction between waking and dreaming. Since the claim to have entered into an altered state is found in societies of all levels of complexity, we do not see it, even if only "usually" found among "shamanic cultures," as a meaningful means of linking them together.

We do find intriguing Jolly's suggestion that what binds "shamanic cultures" together is their belief that certain individuals can work magic by means of their special relationship with the animal world. A wide array of cultures, both past and present, seem to meet this criterion. In Mesoamerica alone, this belief has been well documented time and again. However, the Aztecs—source of the slippery word *nagual*, which we (2002:391–92) showed had nothing to do with a belief in an animal co-essence—were not among them. Moreover, Mesoamericans seem to have come up with a variety of ways of relating to animals, in some places believing that certain individuals could transform themselves into animals and in others that virtually

everyone has an animal (or plant or other entity) alter ego. Where everyone has an animal alter ego, a relationship to a special animal obviously cannot serve as a diagnostic of a shaman. Moreover, we know that priests in some highly complex, centralized societies also claim to have a special relationship with one or more animals, as was the case in ancient Egypt, where some gods took the form of an animal or a part-human, part-animal being and their priests appear in art wearing headdresses representing those animals. It seems to us that, for Jolly's definition to work, the exact nature of the relationship between man and beast would have to be more carefully thought through and much more sharply defined.

Most important, to our mind, is the fact that Jolly's proposed definition of "shamanic cultures" is based solely on ideological grounds. He assumes from the start that the "shaman" is a "religious practitioner," a bias that we criticized in our 2002 article as eliding the social and political roles played by the individuals identified as "shamans." By excluding from his definition of "shamanic cultures" the political and economic roles of the individuals he describes as "religious functionaries," Jolly implies that their control of the spirit world was simply that and not a special means of implementing and maintaining social and possibly political control. It remains our opinion that any viable definition of "shamanic cultures" would have to take into account how the actions of the "shaman" serve the interests of a particular person or group. For us, the real base of power always lies in the material world. Thus, while we greatly appreciate the effort and creative thinking that Jolly has put into coming up with a new and, in some ways, improved definition of shamanism, to our minds he has neither fully confronted nor solved the problem.

References Cited

- FURST, P. T. 2002. Comment on: The role of shamanism in Mesoamerican art: A reassessment, by Cecelia F. Klein, Eulogio Guzman, Elisa C. Mandell, and Maya Stanfield Mazzi. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 43:383–419.
- GRIM, J. A. 1983. *The shaman: Patterns of Siberian and Ojibway healing*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- KLEIN, CECILIA F., EULOGIO GUZMAN, ELISA C. MANDELL, AND MAYA STANFIELD-MAZZI. 2002. The role of shamanism in Mesoamerican art: A reassessment. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 43:383–419.
- KLEIN, C. F., AND M. STANFIELD-MAZZI. 2004. On sharpness and scholarship in the debate on "shamanism." *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 45:404–6.
- LEWIS-WILLIAMS, J. DAVID. 2002. *The mind in the cave: Consciousness and the origin of art*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- SIKALA, A. 1985. Comment on: Mental imagery cultivation as a cultural phenomenon: The role of visions in shamanism, by R. Noll. *CURRENT ANTHROPOLOGY* 26:443–61.
- . 1992. "Finnish rock art," in *Studies on shamanism*. Edited by A. Siikala and M. Hoppál, pp. 56–67. Helsinki: Finnish Anthropological Society/Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- THORPE, S. A. 1993. *Shamans, medicine men, and traditional healers: A comparative study of shamanism in Siberian Asia, southern Africa, and North America*. Pretoria: University of South Africa Press.