Epistemophilia: Slowness, fractures, self-research paresis towards a non-anthropocentric anthropology

Epistemofilia: Lentidão, fraturas, paresia da autopesquisa rumo a uma antropologia não antropocêntrica

■ MASSIMO CANEVACCI[a]
University of São Paulo, Advanced Studies Institute. São Paulo – SP, Brazil

ABSTRACT
The present essay follows my personal experience before and after entering university, when I started teaching and conducting research. After criticizing the methods of dialectics and synthesis, the researcher's identity is pluralized to affirm a transitive perspective based on a moving constellation which designs certain mutant and fundamental concepts: Fetishism, syncretism, polyphony, heteronomy, diaspora, friendship, surprises, ubiquity, gender, indiscipline, and Marx66. Ethnography emerges as the attempt to interweave anthropology and philosophy for being at the crossroads of the chiasmus.
Keywords: Constellation, Chiasmus, Philosophy, Anthropology, Ethnography

[a] PhD in Modern Languages and Philosophy from the Università degli Studi de Roma La Sapienza. Visiting professor at the Advanced Studies Institute of the University of São Paulo (IEA-USP) Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8269-0564. Email: maxx.canevacci@gmail.com

RESUMO
O ensaio passa pela minha experiência pessoal antes de entrar na universidade e depois, desde que comecei a ensinar e fazer pesquisa. A identidade do pesquisador é pluralizada após ter criticado o método da dialética e da síntese, para afirmar uma visão transitiva baseada em uma constelação móvel que desenha alguns conceitos mutantes e fundamentais: fetichismo, sincretismo, polifonia, heteronomia, diáspora, amizade, espanto, ubiquidade, gênero, indisciplina e Marx66. A etnografia é apresentada como a tentativa de cruzar antropologia e filosofia por estar na encruzilhada do quiasmo.
Palavras-chave: Constelação, quiasmo, filosofia, antropologia, etnografia

M Y MEETING WITH theoretical and successively empirical research – that is, first with philosophy then with anthropology and finally with ethnography – was long, tortuous, dense, full of immovable stagnations, sudden fractures, unpredictable surprises. Currently, all that earthquake seems to have calmed down, as if the winds have ceased to blow and my boat continues to motionless undulate on an ocean from which neither shore nor dock can be seen.

The slowness was determined by my opaque condition in trying to see and interpret what was happening to me, both around me and within my weakened identity. After High School, I felt myself sinking into a swamp of unknown meaning to me. I decided to enroll in Political Science without any intention, an intention that was breached by confronting a professor who failed me just because we had different ideas about De Gaulle. My position was correct, but too insecure in exposition. Hence a mix of apathy and curiosity.

In 1967 I used to go a lot to bookstores and was falling in love with atypical magazines (*Quaderni Piacentini*, *Montley Review*, *Quaderni Rossi, Film Critica*) displayed at Feltrinelli or in small bookstores that were proliferating like mushrooms. Since the previous year, for reasons unnecessary to remember, I had started working in air transportation and, to my great surprise, I was elected a member of the Internal Commission by the CGIL Union. Fracture had exploded. A mix of spontaneous studies, political activities, and amorous practices made me decide and enroll in Philosophy always at Sapienza. The year 1968 arrived.

In the creative chaos of those years I managed to coordinate politics, university, and family. Participation in the movements exalted me, brought me out of my doldrums, we used to meet and discuss for hours, eating, smoking, flirting. At university, the walls of authoritarianism suddenly opened and I managed to pass every exam by studying at night or on buses until I discovered the *Frankfurt School* and was fascinated. The family had an unexpected *eploit*. A dear Venezuelan friend offered me two tips: find a professor of Cultural Anthropology who loved the "*Francofortesi*" and publish a book, which she did not like at all. From this fluke, I became a researcher at the university and published *Dialética della Famiglia* which was translated and published without my knowledge by Editora Brasiliense, at the time headed by Caio Graco Prado of whom I became friends after my first invitation to São Paulo, which changed my life.

Both my thesis on *Dialética dell' Illuminismo* and the book were based on dialectics, as can be seen in the titles. And dialectics at the time was for me a logical and political tool, through which I confronted the subject-object issues in a vision of mutual liberation, to free humans and goods from the reciprocal process of reification that transformed both, subject and object, into alienated

beings. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit, particularly the chapter Servant-Boss, was determinant for me. The master loses their relation with the object that is taken by the servant; but the servant, having full connection and knowledge with the object, already separated from the master, who placed the servant between the subject-self and the thing-object, ends up dethroning the master. That is so considering that labor establishes political and gnoseological power between subjects. Marx resumed this dialectic and applied it to wage labor, even though in the *Manuscripts of 44* (1967) his position also faced the relationship with nature, thus a philosophical reflection broader than that of the industrial age.

In the drama that the whole of Europe went through (and not only) because of the two world wars, the theme of the reification of human beings and the fetishism of merchandise was taken up again first by the young Lucaks who, having been linked to Stalin, was forced to abjure that text. Then by a new generation of scholars – Adorno (1937, 1955, 1966), Benjamin (1986), Marcuse, Fromm, Horkheimer, and others – detached from the myth of communism realized in only one country, refused to submit to the PCUS and tried to extend reification beyond the production of goods and thus beyond the centrality of the factory.

The fundamental research that turned my education around was *L'autorità e la Famiglia,* directed by Horkheimer. It clearly showed the insufficiency of the so-called Marxist dialectic that would have affirmed the centrality of the economic structure to define the various cultural forms, among which I point out to family. Enlightening essays were those of Marcuse, who shifted the origin of authoritarianism in the family to Luther, therefore, before the post-war crisis. And even more so those of Fromm, who did empirical research applying psychoanalysis to social research and revealing that workers – rather than being "objective" bearers of a revolution that would free the whole world – practiced sexual violence and replicated violent, sexist authoritarianism within their families. In short, the capitalist mode of production was not solely responsible for Nazifascism, for being an authoritarian tradition it was based on both Lutheran religion and worker sexuality.

The problem was more complex: the dialectic seemed to jam. The relationships between human beings, commodities, and nature were intermingled, and results appeared non-synthesized to my partial conclusions of the time. The body had its eroticism, the family its dramas, nature its violations, instincts their irregular and decomposed autonomies, arts had their indispensable imaginations of creative freedom, religions themselves were unresolved from being a vicious addiction, young people were beginning to manifest not only rights but also pleasures of a generation entering history to change it.

D

DENIAL

Adorno was the one who understood one of the insoluble aspects of dialectics. The synthesis, in fact, in his view, dumped the irreducible tension of denial, a concrete critique of the existing into a new positive (*aufhebung*). Although dialectics was based on a process of infinite change, the positive affirmation of dialectics through synthesis transformed critical thinking into an apologia for the existent. This view was very clear to the philosopher, not so much for politics, and I would say especially for building the party according to a very clear historical model, for the final reflection on aesthetics that was based on negative dialectics. In art, he argued, the irreducible tension lies in dissolving the forms of the existent into totally different visions.

This deep position of Adorno's fascinated me, and yet I felt it was a partial and almost desperate attempt to maintain, even partially in life, the thought from which it had been originated. If Hegel and Marx had clearly centered the most vital moment of dialectics in contradiction (and thus in the power of denial), Freud's discovery made him further sharpen the tragic view of impetuses and culture in general.

In that period, some importance of sociobiology in its connections with ethology and anthropology was spreading. Wilson's text was the stage for heated debates, and became well-known for its radically opposed position. In short, anthropologists rejected *en bloc* the Selfish Gene hypothesis and the so-called *meme*. I was in agreement about this position, but nevertheless felt there was something missing in the culturalist critique. While attending a conference on the topic, I presented a paper based on the concept of *hypo-structure*. And I should say that my professor at the time, Armando Catemario, liked it very much. Briefly, I tried to see human issues related not only to the dialectic-structure-superstructure, while on this last dimension I had already pointed out Gramsci's fundamental criticisms. Published many years after his death, in the Prison Notebooks, Gramsci strongly asserted the relative autonomy of culture, seen no longer as deterministically derived from structure, i.e., from the Industrial Revolution. This view was of enormous importance in the birth of *cultural studies* that, as is well-known, started facing empirical research based on an urban ethnography verse youth cultures in Britain.

In my view, the dialectic ignored the power of the magmatic dimensions underlying not only the evolution of Homo Sapiens, but of the entire process of civilization. Instincts, emotions, impulses, "centered" attitudes (Eurocentric, phallocentric, etc.) have had and continue to have strong influences on cultural and industrial production, on diffuse behaviors in both leisure and work times. Therefore, I tried to design a kind of dialectic

reform that could no longer bear the same name, based on a triangular interaction between drives, culture, production: that is, between hypostructure, superstructure, and structure.

I wrote an essay on this hypothesis of "reform" that I tried to state in some conferences, but I did not have the strength or the ability to develop it into a complete book. I needed funding, for sure, but even more, I needed time to get away from academic life, from its daily commitments, which I loved, to devote myself solely and exclusively to the structure of hypostructure. It was a failure. However, sometimes I think it was important because it allowed me to turn to something unexplored.

EPISTEME

In the late 1980s, which are generally considered dark if not reactionary years, I began to notice and approach a listening to epistemology out of tune. In the sense that it sounded out of scientific harmonies given by the major and therefore emanated a pulsating, obsessive, undisciplined cry. Science, in its historical meaning in the West, was determined by the *logos*, thus meaning the logic's objectivity. In those years, a different approach was being developed: perhaps here *logos* had the similar meaning of anthropo-*logy*: that is discourse, dialogic, polyphony. The problem area, when directed toward a different approach, was named *complexity challenge*. Powerful project between very different scholars who did not seek any synthesis, but rather respected the coexistence in the complex constellation of different guidelines.

Dialectics had retired and with it the binary logical relations between subject and object.

My readings in the 1980s rested quietly and reflectively on the work of Gregory Bateson, about whom I wrote much and applied much in my ethnographic research. *Towards an ecology of mind* (1976) is a fragmentary text, perhaps the fundamental book of an author who was opening spaces, perspectives, interpretations other than the traditional ones. Metalogue, double link, sacred, mental ecology, the entanglement-that-connects, nature-culture, coevolution human being and environment, map-territory: joint concepts that opened epistemology and from the *logos* approaching it to *philia*. An enterprising student of mine who had gone to New York to attend the Academy sent me a priceless book that Gregory wrote and filmed together with his wife Margaret Mead: *Balinese Character*. The trance captured in a ritual showed long-haired women dancing and violently beating themselves on the chest with the *kriss*. Equally and more aggressively, so to speak,

Dmen twisted the blade of daggers that did not penetrate the flesh, stiffened by the alteration.

Gregory retired from anthropology and anthropologists; however, an innovative scientist, Norbert Wiener, invited him to participate in the first meeting that would take place among a group of scholars where cybernetics was "invented." Wiener had read Gregory's complex book based on his only field research among the Iatmul of New Guinea, where a "complex" concept emerged: schismogenesis. The trend among various groups or clans to divide or remain united, very soon. Anyway, the cybernetic hypothesis was based precisely on feedback or retroaction that had strange proximity to schismogenesis. The search is bizarre. A concept that emerged during a ritual – where maternal uncles try to seduce their nephews by dancing and rubbing their backs on the children's bodies – was similar to the model of nascent computing. A nice epistemological problem that can perhaps be tackled with episteme-philia.

The relations between nature and culture are no longer considered dichotomous. The structuralism that radicalized such a model exhausted itself like the dialectic of which it was a distant descendant, perhaps its last follower. The ecology of mind was the first and most radical step beyond dialectics. The connection between beings that exchange information, be they human, animal, plant, mineral, divine, extends the concept of mind and diffuses it among every entity that is crossed by the communication flows. Nature finally becomes a living being that breathes, moves, changes; human beings, as part of nature, co-create genetic and stratigraphic mutations. This definition makes any synthesis impossible. The many and different minds interact by continuous metamorphic assembling, mutating fragments, like a mosaic whose tiles do not stay clued, but move continuously creating new images. In fact, the same tiles incorporate transformations that make them to some extent strange to their neighbors, in turn strange to themselves and to others. The expansion of what is called "mind" to the farthest diversity creates a multifaceted model of communication in its deep connection between every living entity. One could argue that the *subject-object* dialectic decays as the ecology of mind diffuses subjectivity to every sacral creature.

Imagining that a glorious pine tree, a bizarre rock, a majestic elephant, a mysterious cave, a restless book, the unknown smile are individuals with their biologies and biographies: and that their stories are a constituent part of me, my "I" that slips into their fluid identities along with all these subjectivities. It is time to assert a different anthropology: the one that, for now, I will tentatively try to call *non-anthropocentric anthropology*.

CONSTELLATIONS

This whole theoretical process, still quite nebulous, has precipitated into a kind of Maelstrom in reverse. For me, already a castaway of dialectics whether synthetic or negative, I was sucked into a multiverse I did not know, except for passionate but distracted or distant readings. The event took place under the sign of the divine *Kairós*, the god of sudden chance should be immediately grasped by the top of his forehead hair, because behind, he is bald and smooth as the ball on which his winged feet roll. One day my editor at Savelli calls me and says that a book has arrived for me, translated, the *Dialectic of the family*. Of course I run to withdraw it and see that it is a great edition, much better than the Italian one, and that it has a preface by a philosopher: Olgaria Matos.

In a mix of pride and curiosity, I write to the *Brasiliense* on the address shown in the inside pages. The times when the Post Office services were slow, and the Brazilian ones were even slower. However, the letter signed by Caio Graco Prado finally arrived, in which he explained the case: he was walking through Milan when he entered the Livraria Feltrinelli, a very well-known bookstore in Italy, saw my book, bought it and asked to have it translated. He published four editions in a short time and continues to be quoted, according to the information that reaches me daily.

To sum up, they invited me to deliver a course at the University of USP. I obtained financing from the Italian Institute of Culture to disseminate and present some of Pasolini's films at the MIS. This is how I ended up living in Frei Caneca and discovered Augusta, a street that made me fall in love immediately and became my teacher by opening up all the other streets to me, not only in São Paulo, but all over Brazil. I reported my difficulties of arrival in the preface of *Città Polifonica* (2019), referenced in the text, for anyone interested. From that distant year, 1984 was marked by a frosted forecast by a famous book, I began, without stopping, the crossing of Brazilian complexity challenging the classical principles on which the theory, method, writing, images were based, and that difficult to decipher feeling that mixes beauty, emotion, disorientation.

One night, walking by myself on Rua Augusta, teacher and lover, I saw a strange drawing on a store window, maybe a fashion design or a poster of a movie in my favorite theater. I drew it in my notebook because it reminded me of something from high school: a χ. Many years later, seeing that notebook with the drawing, I had an idea. For some years I was in Florianópolis teaching in a village, an offer made by the teacher who had invited me, located on a hill, from where I could see the *Lagoa* (lagoon) on one side and the sea on the other. The panorama spanned the linear extension of calm waters and the undulating movement of the rough waters. From that *Hill*, a first confused image of a

D constellation and graphic came to me that could configure the slow and conceptual mobility (*festina lente*) with the shape of the χ (pron. chi, *ch* aspirated).

The straight line evoked to me **Philosophy**, so calm, decided and oblique, with a strong mark between its formidable history and an uncertain present forever "friend of knowledge". The contorted line struck me as **Anthropology**, so restless, corsair and sinuous. Both have European matrices (from Talet to Zenone, from Xenophon to Tacitus, from Malinoski to Levi-Strauss), lit from understanding the cosmos in general, and intrigued by diverse non-European cultures. One solidly settled in its own polis, the other lightly traveling through different worlds: both seemed to me relatively inadequate due to their growing divergences.

Then I realized a third decisive point: at their liminal meeting point, a bewitching and undefined cross, I imagined that **Ethnography**, the indiscipline of empirical field research, could intersect. If it was begotten from anthropology with a dense curriculum of Philosophy, ethnography chose some time ago to belong to no one, since *it* could define itself as both heir and traitor to both. In rejecting completed systems, fixed paradigms, generalist theories, scattered stereotypes, *it* probes concepts, rituals and myths, symbols and cultures from everywhere, claims singular micrologic passions, observes everything with reflexive arts, collects details, scraps, leftovers, margins. It disdainfully rejects the interview and loves the dialog between different and therefore equal subjects, in fact equal because it is not identical; sometimes it photographs or films always together with the other, involving people or roads, forests or buildings. It loves the "native" self-representation that the digital facilitates, observes with participatory glances the excesses in social networks. In this unforeseen, familiar and strange present – instead of getting apart – seems to mix to release openings and intend isolations.

Ethnography is a solitary research in the strangest or most familiar contexts, trying to interrogate and question itself surrounded by partial and elusive micrology. Because, among other things, ethnography is reflexive: the researcher always questions themselves when confronting the other, thing or person; they learn to make explicit their own emotions not removed or suppressed; sometimes desires, phobias, anxieties, passions, imaginations can be decisive features of the research. The ethnographer *observes the self while observing*, dialogues with the other and with the self, jumps with delicate attention between the inside and outside of the empirical context frame, because the epistemological framework sometimes need to be unmolded. Step outside the established and perhaps rigid paradigm; indulge into unexpected methods; imagine complex epistemologies.

Research in the field is the most alive and worthy part, not so much for those at the university, but for anyone who wants to put their certainties into play and challenge them. Researching is to abandon oneself in the unknown that surrounds us to try to clarify some parts – from arts to communication, from analog to digital, from architecture to kinship. Surrendering in the sense of *giving up*, which in a certain ethnography means letting go of the flows of spontaneity, decentering or loosening theoretical beliefs and implicit biases. Ethnography rejects generalist statements or universalist theories: it always looks for fragments, pursues them with passion, sometimes elaborates an assemblage of these fragments collected over time and space, of destiny (*telos*) to almost always present themselves as temporary. The fragment may partially light up a context or suggest trends, but not the entire reference culture. Collecting fragments and stringing them into a necklace of undefined conceptual seeds is an initiatory metaphor for the ethnographic obsession: glimpse the movement of the constellation.

Composing an essay became collecting spaced conceptual fragments that at a given moment I decided to "fix" – that is, observe them and observe myself in the process of writing. Among the indigenous cultures of Brazil, especially Bororó and Xavante, where I developed my research (Canevacci, 2013, 2017), necklaces consist of pierced seeds, sometimes with part of shells, often with multicolored feathers, or white cotton extracts. I have many necklaces that were gifted to me by my friends but that I dare not wear. Some are beautiful and I would say almost unique: so I transfigure them into rows of geometric conceptual fragments that try to draw the enigmatic meaning of the other: a ritual, a friendship, a panorama. A conceptual necklace in calm and agitated movement, with motto and endless.

The Greek letter χ draws my endless necklace: the central point is the mythical crossroads from which the ethnography departs, which evokes the dissonant depth of Polykleto and *re-actualizes his sculptural philosophy in the form of a chiasmus*. In seeking the aesthetic beauty of the body to be trans-figured into statue, the artist Polykleto should not achieve the perfection of harmonic beauty. Through the figure of the chiasmus, the body generates asymmetrical intersections for each statuary work. Contrary to what is usually stated, the chiasmus has no letter χ with two symmetrical terms to cross (**X**), but it is χ with three divergent signs, whose central point is an intersection that belongs to no one: it is the *limen* where **Ethnography** grafts diverging exchanges between **Anthropology** and **Philosophy**, where *she ethnographer* is no longer a philosopher, but not yet an anthropologist, she is the liminal point where everything can change.

D

Constellation incorporates the intrusive traffic of ethnography that wants to break and chew the flavors/knowledge of Anthropology and Philosophy. Ethnography is the cake chewed with gluttonous wisdom – *mystical-chewing* – when it stops at orality-anthropology, before being swallowed in the throat-philosophy. At the intersection "between" no longer chewed and not yet swallowed, Ethnography stands where it undergoes its liminal mutation (the "changing" of skin).

Constellation does not suggest any pragmatics. Its task is to clarify the perspective offered by a set of concepts that I will try to present, and that has grown over the years during the entanglements of doing empirical research in contexts too familiar and too strange. Out of these "plots" emerges *an empirical and conceptual movement* that is the brilliant outcome between *fieldwork* and *desktop*. Empiricism and theory challenge each other with quiet reciprocity, bouncing between disorderly action and sedentary calm. It is not about making reason emotional: during fieldwork research, reason is already emotional in its sensitive immanence.

Constellation takes up the concept designed last century by some increasingly current philosophers, and thrusts it into the territories – material and immaterial – of ethnography, suggesting the death of dialectics. I will only speak occasionally of the Bororó, Xavante, and Krahó – my research experiences in the most emotional and wise field – the rituals of juvenile initiation, of funeral transfiguration or mental alteration are present among the white spaces of lines, words, margins. George Marcus' (1995) *multi-sited ethnography* perspective is as enlightening to me as the assemblage of quotations for Walter Benjamin or the data set for Gregory Bateson. With such an approach, ethnography no longer focuses on a single context to narrate it with the "dense" interpretation when the subject approaches Yatmul, Samoan inhabitants, Balinese, Trobrians.

In the process of my ethnographic research in the *village* of Meruri (the same village as Levi-Strauss in *Trópicos Tristes*) the Sangradouro (which Maybury Lewis defines as "dialectic"), I could understand that these cultures could not be understood as an isolated phenomenon only through relations with neighboring cities (Cuiabá or Primavera Dell'Est), far metropolises (São Paulo, and even Rome or New York) the self-managed use with the social networks of *Aldeia Digital* or *Etnomida* could help me alleviate the so-called "native" cultures. This term is hopelessly Eurocentric, since even the "natives" exercise a multi-sited life jumping between local and global. My friends Kleber Meritororeu, Felix Adonuenau, Domingos Mohoroe'o – and even more the new generations – have always physically transited between *village* and metropolis, traveling, studying, delivering lectures or political demonstrations; or ubiquitously with the digital

that has fostered connections between them and the rest of the world. Currently, I can say that their cosmologies can be affirmed thanks to cosmopolitan perspectives. Multi-sited ethnography reviews their concrete experience and can redraw the neocolonial sense of being labeled "native".

If each *village* is no longer isolated (or nearly so), the "correct" term of *native* – successor to primitive, savage, unwritten, etc. – must apply to a Bororo as well as to a Roman. So if my German friend is not defined as a native because he was born in Berlin, why should I call Adonuenau born in Meruri a native? Perhaps because it is alluded that *more Berlin-born*, in the sense that he is or would be closer to nature from birth. A more original, pure, authentic, uncontaminated native. We know that no birth is only natural, but always culturally performed. These more polite taxonomies evoke and reproduce colonial values.

Current ethnographic research is transitive (in-between) and challenges Anthropology and Philosophy to get out of their captive chairs to listen to the tensions, conflicts, passions, liberations that ignite in *denativized* movements. One thing for me is certain: the full freedom of the Europeans, from which colonialism originated, also depends on the freeing of the so-called pre-Columbian "native" populations (and not only that). My own freedom has limits, since genocides have been going on for more than 500 years. The extreme fragility of the Yanomami and Kayapós, Bororo and Xavantes is also my own fragility, a fragility that I should find the way to reverse in liberation of every being, human and non-human. Liberation of trees cut down because they are precious like the stones encrusted in reserves, of sacred animals like the *jaguar* fundamental in rituals and today almost extinguished, liberation even of ancestral divinities expelled into exile by missionaries.

My freedom is also multi-sited.

GRAPHISMS

The nexus of *fetishes, polyphonies, syncretism* was my first multi-sited ethnographic approach, a transitive triptych through which the conceptual contours of a moving constellation between different spaces/cultures begin to be outlined. In the following, I will briefly present the design that has become clear to me over time and that still leaves me suspended. I emphasize that each concept of constellation has been developed in specific texts.

Fetishism is immediately imposed by the amazing theories of Marx and the successive ones of the young Lukács in *History and Class Consciousness*, and further with the continuous readings of Benjamin, Adorno, Kracauer; the transversal looks of Bateson, Taussig, Fanon (1971). The turning point,

D

for me, was lit in the last ten years when I was faced with an empirical research on objects, goods, things, bodies, films, advertising, to understand the mutations produced by the visual-digital expansion. I therefore had to articulate an anthropological genealogy about the spell in order to *de-reify* its concept, to tear it from its supposed objective use, and to break through the still hegemonistic colonial matrices. It is the *subjectivity* of dominant history that produces, at times, *objective* meanings applied to and often subordinated by the dominated (Canevacci, 2014; Freud, 1981, 1991).

Polyphony is the more sentimental concept, since it emerged from my first empirical investigation, an ethnography of urban communication in São Paulo. I had Bachtin's (1988) readings applied to literature. The observation of a large metropolis (its "narratives") led to a change of perspective, implying an unbalancing of my Benjaminian background on Paris, Berlin, and Naples. All thanks to a neglected and isolated Bachtin in the Soviets. The urban fragments became polyphonic and dialogical facts, no longer dialectical or synthetic. The strident metropolitan dissonance had to find multiple forms of composition, hence the choice to perform three solo voices: essayistic, ethno-poetic, visual.

Syncretism is all a Brazilian conceptual dance. Since my early experiences, this concept immediately emerged in the traditional Afro-Brazilian religious version applied to Candomblé, but even more on the cultural side constituted by music, fashion, food, cinema, architecture. In short, I believe to have absorbed the brilliant anthropophagic revolution of the Paulista avant-garde of the 1920s, to insert it into a different vision that I tried to define as *cultural syncretism*.

Heteronomy and **Diaspora** seem like heterozygous twin sisters. **Heteronomy** is manifested in my path thanks to the discovery of Fernando Pessoa and his *disquiet of selves*, that is, the restlessness of the self that is pluralized in the pronoun while keeping the preposition in the singular and defying grammars. The Portuguese word then has a baroque sonorous beauty punctuated by five "s" that make the rhythm sibilant beyond a plural. It is unfortunate that Bachtin has not read it: Pessoa is much more polyphonic than Dostoevsky and akin to the contemporary Pirandello, to dispense with literary value (Pessoa,1980).

Diaspora came later as a result of post-colonial readings: Paul Gilroy (2003), Homi Bhabha (2001), Arjun Appadurai (1986) enlightened me with their texts and I rethought to the brilliant anticipations of Franz Fanon, whose thought is still active and growing over time. With my passion for Edward Said and Daniel Barenboim (2002), I tried to develop diaspora in an individual and no longer collective sense, a spatial uprooting that preserves some identity traits from the past to transfigure them into present-future life projects. Scenarios of cosmopolitan change in force cross well-localized subjective diasporas.

Stupefaction originates in the passionate epistolary discussion between Benjamin, surrounded by the Paris library, and Adorno already in exile in the United States. Adorno's critique of his more adult friend, defined with the use of "Mr./Ms." is based on a brilliant concept: the *impressive activity*, a magical circle within which Walter Benjamin would be locked. The latter's response is still brilliant, even now. Definitely, the dialogic between the two releases the possible relations between reification and petrification, between history and myth, whereby the mere political or intellectual struggle against commodity alienation is insufficient. The archaic implications return with the often blind, devastating, uncontrolled power of myth, and come together in the camouflage products or the cultural industry. From this unresolved discussion, philosophical astonishment intertwined with anthropological astonishment, which by other ways accompanied the research on visual communication: hence the arduous attempt to develop *methodological astonishment* through the arrangement of a porous body in the moment before the encounter of the other – the unknown.

Ubiquitously is the darling, as the last to arrive. A concept that emerged on its own, almost by parthenogenesis, during my diasporic conditions in São Paulo and especially in Nanjing, where for six months I taught with the privilege of using the Internet, while students (of communication) were denied it in their free time at night. Thus, being able to communicate – even simultaneously – with friends, relatives, acquaintances increased my habitability as an *absolute foreigner*. Whereas in Brazil I was a *relative foreigner* because I could disguise myself in a syncretic way and speak Portuguese, in China that was impossible. The mutations from the concept of the religious matrix (an attentive God who watches you everywhere) to the digital one implied diversified attitudes. The pleasure of feeling partially ubiquitous, communicating at the same time in different spaces, has corresponded to the growing parochial reactions of rejection to reestablish an unshakable territoriality – physical and psychic, family and work. A "pure" parochialism imagined as a salvation against the communicational accelerations from which not a few perceive to be marginalized (Canevacci, 2015, 2016).

Gender has its foundations laid in my last lessons, when I began to explain the translation of *anthropo-logy* (discourses about human beings beyond anthropocentrism) and culture (popular, mass, avant-garde, analog/digital, values, beliefs, behaviors, etc.). And successively I developed the concept of *gender*: arguing that if the sexes are two, genders are infinite, based on the relationship between biology and culture, evolution of species, and the Anthropocene that includes, since always, techno-cultural mutations.

Indiscipline arrived alone when it became clear that the declarations in favor of *multidisciplinary* led to little or nothing, and that the problem was

D

the nexus between the social division of labor and the disciplinary division of knowledge. Faculties, Curricula Departments were (are) strongly tied to a *disciplinary* system to encourage the expansion of research. Indiscipline is not a degraded do-as-you-ask, but rather favoring the choices of researchers or students who – based on precise projects – should have the right to insert knowledge-in-chiasmus (Said, 1978, 2006).

Friendship – which is close to gender – shows a relationship that emerges in its altruistic beauty. *It* leads us to rethink lost, rediscovered, augmented friendships, and even that "extended friendship" that, even within its limits, the social network ends up favoring. During the first phase of the pandemic, I was in a condition that I defined as *loneliness not solitude*. The casual and forced separation from my family in Brazil gave me the opportunity to experience expanded friendship with people I never knew in person: well, the results are largely vital and fruitful. It is true that friendship is based and grows on the sharing of experiences, rather than just the ideas and comments on *social*. Put another way, exercising common experiences fosters the friendly growth of similar but not identical ideas. Without common experiences, Friendship is a feeling as beautiful as it is uncertain.

Marx66 is a target that arrives at the end or the beginning of a peripheral--central journey, with a biographical proposal that demands identity excesses. Pursuing my research on the neighborhood where I currently live (Pigneto), after a return to "my" city, I find that I have become partially foreigner in my own home. *The origin is the goal*, says Karl Kraus with irony, only on the return (*nostos*!) the origin is no longer the same. Fortunately. Experiencing domestic estrangement, trying to live with it more than to get rid of it, is a very common (and obsessive) trait for many people in their daily experiences inside or outside "their own" city that is discovered to be *inappropriate*. Hence the astonishment of having seen at night, in "my" Rome at Termini Station, *Marx* reduced to a bus stop heading for a suburb designated for philosophy. *Marx66* seems to invoke a regeneration of criticism, to address exactly this incomprehensible mutation "in" common. Therefore, I decided to divert Marx66 to the historic notary office located on a street devoted to a great Chamber president: Petroselli. Here I will address various trades to solve the problem related to my ubiquitous *identity cards*.

For now, **Constellation** χ design stirs these concepts, challenges them, puts them in transit and assembly, even "informs" them; sometimes it uses these same concepts beyond or against themselves, often intersects them with asymmetrical aesthetics that pursue the unknown. *Syncretic ubiquity. Polyphonic heteronomy. Generative astonishment. Diasporic fetishism.* The wandering between

philosophy and anthropology of the various concepts inscribed in constellation establishes a reciprocal and somewhat uncoordinated influence of the "constellation"; the eye of the researcher observes it from afar after having been very close, indeed, within each small fragment collected with ethnography. The constellation becomes mutant in the assembling of the various concepts in transit, as its design *re-designs* in the reflective process donating anxiety and happiness. Constellation χ is the challenge of matching Anthropology and Philosophy in their known territories and, unavoidably, in the unexplored ones of Ethnography. Constellation χ seems to want to re-update a Latin saying that fascinated during the Florentine Renaissance: *festina lente*. The turtle that sails *slowly fast* on the seas and in the skies, seems to be appropriate to the current phase change between analog slowness and digital speed. The oxymoron, as is well known, cannot be solved, but is destined to be overcome. Constellation χ is illuminated by dissatisfaction with the state of things, because things, each thing, have no *state* but movement. Because *res* – the most advanced and outdated thing in politics – is *public*: and it is even singular-plural. Trying to detect some of these movements – crossed and unexpected – is the purpose of this constellation χ. Because if the origin is shifting and mutating, the goal is vague and wandering: in that blurry other place it is possible to train the *body of the eye* to fix, interrogate, and interpret blurry, mutating wandering drawings in the form of enigmatic *rebus* attractors that have the power to dissolve certainties acquired as soon as one tries to fix them on paper. **M**

REFERENCE

Adorno, T. W. (1937). Spätstil Beethovens. *Der Auftakt*, *17*(5-6), 65-67.

Adorno, T. W. (1955). *Minima moralia*. Einaudi.

Adorno, T. W. (1966). *Dialética Negativa*. Einaudi.

Appadurai, A. (Ed.). (1986). *The Social Life of Things*. Cambridge University Press.

Bachtin, M. (1988). *O autor e o herói*. Einaudi.

Bhabha, H. K. (2001). *Locais de cultura*. Meltemi.

Bateson, G. (1976). *Rumo a uma ecologia da mente*. Adelphi.

Barenboim, D., & Said, E. (2002). *Parallels and paradoxes: Explorations in music and society*. Pantheon.

Benjamin, W. (1986). *Parigi capitale del XIX secolo*. Einaudi.

Canevacci, M. (2013). *The line of dust: Bororo culture between tradition, mutation and self-representation*. Sean Kingston.

Canevacci, M. (2014). *Fetichismos visuais: Corpos erópticos e metrópole comunicacional*. Ateliê Editorial.

D

Epistemophilia

Canevacci, M. (2015, 20-24 di aprile). *Ubiquitimes: The ethnographic experiences of digital cultures and the syncretic mix of spacetimes* [Articolo presentato]. Seminário sul "Tempo", Instituto de Estudos Avançados, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, Brasil. https://bit.ly/3txW8sN

Canevacci, M. (2016). *Digital ubiquity in the Anthropocene. Antrocom Online Journal of Anthropology*, *12*(1), 5-12.

Canevacci, M. (2017). *Antropologia della comunicazione visuale*. Postmedia Books.

Canevacci, M. (2019). *La città polifonica*. Rogas.

Fanon, F. (1971). *Opere scelte*. Einaudi.

Freud, S. (1981). Fetichismo. In S. Freud, *Opere di Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 10, pp. 487-497). Bollati Boringhieri.

Freud, S. (1991). Il perturbante. In C. L. Musatti, *Opere di Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 9, pp. 81-114). Bollati Boringhieri.

Gilroy, P. (2003). *The Black Atlantic*. Meltemi.

Marcus, G. (1995). Ethnography in/of the World system: The emergence of multi-sited ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *24*, 95-117.

Marx, K. (1967). *Il Capitale*. Editori Riuniti.

Pessoa, F. (1980). *O eu profundo e os outros eus*. Nova Fronteira.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism: Western concepts of the Orient*. Pantheon.

Said, E. (2006). *On late style: Music and literature against the grain*. Pantheon.