2022 | Hau: *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 12 (1): 77–92

ARTICLE

Uywasiña in Aymara cosmopraxis: Ontogenesis and attentionality

Koen de Munter, *Universidad Alberto Hurtado*

This article revolves around the theoretical and ethnographic experiences of an ongoing anthropological study with contemporary Aymara families about how "education by attention" is produced throughout their cosmopraxis. At the same time, it explores how an anthropology of life and in particular Tim Ingold's fight for a recalibration of anthropology in a biosocially integrated sense are of intrinsically political-ethical interest, considering the messy and misaligned times we humans have worked ourselves into. Beyond romantic interpretations and essentialist representations, a committed inquiry into indigenous practices that habilitate people for ecological-cultural "correspondence" and affective reciprocity—*uywasiña*—enables the exploration of important educational attitudes and habits that can lead to necessary realignments of human relations with the world/earth. I discuss these enskilling practices through a conversation with theorizations of attentionality, *agencement* (the "doing-undergoing" of habit, in Ingold's terms), and affectionality.

Keywords: anthropology of life, Aymara, cosmopraxis, attentionality, uywasiña, ontogenesis

In memory of Carlos Yujra Mamani, yatiri-amawt'a*, and don Casto Choque, Copancare, Umasuyus.*

1. Dialoguing in between theory and ethnography

This reflection was inspired by accompanying Aymara families[1] in the ecological-cultural practices through which they (learn to) relate attentively with their dynamic life environments in Andean Bolivia. The reflection stems from conversations both with my Aymara interlocutors and with theoretical texts, drawing the wisdom of both into a philosophical-anthropological inquiry into the questions of attentionality and ontogenesis. This symmetrical approach draws no a priori divisions between studiers and studied. The concepts[2]

1. I have been privileged to work with Bolivian Aymara families as an anthropologist since 1995. The findings presented in this article stem from more recent ethnographic experiences (2018–2021) in the Department of La Paz, specifically in the provinces of Umasuyus, near Lake Titicaca (*comunidad* Kalaque-Tajokachi); Los Andes (city of El Alto, *comunidad* Cucuta; *comunidad* Santa Ana); Ingavi (*comunidad* Sullqa Titi), and Aroma (Santiago de Llallagua). Contemporary Aymara "culture" (in Bolivia, Chile, and Peru) is heterogeneous in many ways. In my research I opted to work with families in which Aymara cosmopraxis is still very much alive. However, some family members, for different reasons, prefer not to participate in these practices. All the Aymara participants in this ongoing study are mother-tongue speakers of at least Spanish and Aymara. Some of my findings are the result of a collaborative research project that I am coordinating, funded by the Chilean government (Fondecyt Regular 1190279). While this project also considers Aymara cosmopraxis in northern Chile, in this article I draw only on experiences with Bolivian Aymara. Wherever "we/our" is used, it refers specifically to collaborative work (see: https://uywanya.com/estudio), unless the generic "we humans" is indicated.

2. While I sympathize with Viveiros de Castro's argument against treating "indigenous ideas" as concepts, in my

 https://doi.org/10.1086/719382

and theories used should not be applied or employed in order to "explain" Aymara people's relational practices or accounts; rather, they complement and reinforce each other for the sake of the general argument—concern about how we humans (might) contend with the challenges of living on a damaged earth. Anthropology then is not so much—or not only—about investigating other people's ways of life, but rather about leading (part of) our lives with them and opening ourselves to learning about how people cope with life in the one world we inhabit (Ingold 2018d). This article introduces several important concepts directly from Aymara cosmopractical experience and inserts them into a dialogue with contemporary discussions about the importance of a relational, affectional, and attentive attitude towards life. This intersecting dialogue allows me to evaluate the political and ethical relevance of what I call an "anthropology of life," an anthropology that studies more than just "human life" (as a society, as a worldview, etc.) and that aims at inquiring how humans (or human groups) learn to correspond with other lines of life on a troubled earth. Ethnographically, I approach these habilitating practices for a biosocial relationality from an extended ethnographic perspective that focuses on the "ontogenetic," on how we human beings (have to) become humans, over and over again, responding sensitively to other becomings and presences, human and other-than-human, who all share a world where elements such as the soil and the weather are crucial (Ingold 2015). My argument then has to do with the possibility of learning both from theoretical considerations (indigenous and nonindigenous) and from ethnographical participation in how Aymara families relate to their living surroundings, in order to better understand the biosocial challenges of our time.

2. Growing together in respect and affection: Aymara cosmopraxis

The Aymara *amawt'a* (sage) Beatriz Bautista, when asked about the pragmatic foundations of living as Aymara people or *jaqi*, says that they are all about living together in respect and actively cherishing affection for one another (*munaña*).[3] Respect, then, she states, is something you practice via a continuous and affective involvement with all the components of *pacha* (the all-encompassing space-time of life), relating carefully with other beings—humans, animals—as well as with the life-reproducing force of seeds or plants (*ispalla*) or with the "spirits" and energies (*ajayu*, *illa*) "presenced"[4] on land and in the atmosphere. It also implies, importantly, an involvement with *wak'a*s, *uywiri*s, *achachila*s—all honorific denominations for different kinds of presences, many of them considered to be "relatives," all treated as ancestors, situated perceptibly on earth, in a specific rock formation or hill, or in the higher snowcapped mountains—that grant us (all humans) life, teach and protect us, inspiring awe, some stricter, others gentler. For Bautista, this practice of respect—never given and always in the making—starts from the simplest daily action of relating in the human community as such, i.e. *aruntasiña*: greeting one another with courtesy, considered extremely important among Aymara people. Respect is "done" in many concrete ways, via everyday practices and those that could be described more as "ritual":[5] growing potatoes and accompanying them with care during the process; visiting the dead and the wak'as (Bartoletti 2019) and presenting them with food and other gifts, or climbing a guardian hill before dawn in order to learn from what (s)he might teach us. Doing things with respect and affection, says Bautista, is what guides us along the constant search for one's pathway (*thakhi*) in and with life (*thakhichaña* in Aymara means literally "to make oneself a way"), responding to the will of the extended community—human and beyond—observing carefully and taking into account what

approach I relate concepts with *practices* (not ideas) in a direct way and on an equal footing, in the manner of some indigenous thinkers and sages, as I show in Section 3. Viveiros de Castro's research focus is on many worlds (Viveiros de Castro 2013), while mine adopts the perspective of a one-world anthropology with a focus on ontogenesis (Ingold 2015, 2018d). See Section 4.

3. Personal communication, April 2020. See Section 5 for "*munaña*."

4. "To make or to become present." It is in this sense—transitive and intransitive—that I use "presence": the making of things or energies or their becoming present in fields of actions and events. See also Section 4 on the use of "presence" in the "middle voice."

5. The difference between everyday and ritual practices is not unequivocal. This is why in this article I speak of a continuum of attentional practices, where ordinary practices, such as planting seeds or having a conversation with elders, can be accompanied—or not—by simple "ritual" gestures (*ch'alla*/libation or sharing coca leaves). Some rituals can be carried out by the family itself, others require the intervention of a specialist. In Section 4 I describe an interesting example of a "family" ritual, known as *jatha katu*.

the weather and the soil, amongst others, can teach us. It is through this foundational attitude of respect and *cariño* (affection, love) that we engage ourselves in the world we inhabit, reciprocating with vigor (*qamasa*) and assuming our responsibilities when political authority—an important part of thakhi—is vested in us, by the grace of the "natural" protectors and on the basis of the respect that the community owes us in consideration of previously provided services.[6]

Simón Yampara, Aymara activist and sociologist, elaborated upon what he called an Andean economic theory in a series of conversations with French thinker and biologist Dominique Temple, who devoted most of his intellectual life to the elaboration of a vast theory of reciprocity (Temple 2003), starting with Karl Marx and Marcel Mauss but inspired strongly by Stéphane Lupasco's trivalent logic (the "logic of the included middle") and by how indigenous Andean people engage in reciprocity dynamics (including negative ones, such as vengeance).[7] In the first, Socratic, dialog of the pathbreaking[8] publication that resulted from this conversation (Yampara and Temple 2008), both men refer to the anthropological theorizations of Mauss and, later on, of Marshall Sahlins and Maurice Godelier. Yampara is very clear in concluding that not only they, but also Temple himself, do not really understand what *ayni*, the container concept in Aymara for different kinds of reciprocity practices, is about. Yampara stresses: "They have no understanding of ayni." Basically, he says this because, in his opinion, these authors touch upon "*prestaciones*"[9] merely between human beings, whereas countless examples can be found of ayni with other constituents of *pachamama* (mother of space-time), and with pachamama as a whole.[10] In an interesting image, Temple reads the opinion of his Aymara interlocutor as if the first circle of ayni performances were surrounded by a second and wider one. The ecological realm of ayni enfolds the economic (or cultural) and the two realms are inextricably intertwined. In his own writings, Yampara tries to cope with this lack of understanding by resorting to several Aymara concepts that he directly imports from what is done and experienced in Aymara families and communities, amidst what he calls, in Spanish, a generalized "*cosmo-(con)vivencia*" (living together—in conviviality—with the cosmos; Yampara 2011).

Both Bautista and Yampara grew up in rural indigenous communities in the seventies and eighties and learned these ways of respect and cosmo-conviviality throughout their youth, participating in communities of practices, in positions ranging from peripheral to prominent. So did most of the Aymara with whom I have worked since 1995 and who have lived for many decades in big cities, traveling regularly with their families back to their home communities for festive or agricultural reasons. Many of them still own some land on the Altiplano and maintain more or less intense relations of reciprocity with the community and with relatives who have stayed behind. Since the beginning of this ongoing, collaborative anthropological project,[11] the theoretical, epistemological, and methodological position adopted for the research has been firstly that of an anthropology of practices (Ortner 2006; Ingold 2018b). This is why I speak about cosmopraxis[12] as opposed to cosmovision or worldview, disregarding theoretical approaches which assume that what is primarily a set of ideas, symbols, and rules—a cosmovision—structures or even determines what people do. Focusing on practices

6. Both Carlos Yujra, an important Aymara amawt'a and ritual specialist, and the anthropologist Astvaldur Astvaldsson, in his study of the community of Sullqa Titi Titiri, have written about how jaqi are expected to lead their life passing through different thakhis while assuming successive responsibilities in the care for reciprocal relations among humans and between humans and their living environment. See Yujra 2005 and Astvaldsson 2002.

7. It is noteworthy that Temple's theories were very much welcomed by Aymara intellectuals and activists in the 1990s, because they recognized the similarity between his reflections on reciprocity and their own practices.

8. "Pathbreaking" because it is intellectually interstitial, both authors recognizing that they are sustaining to some extent a dialog of the deaf, while trying to reduce the distance between their positions.

9. "*Prestaciones*," as Yampara uses the concept, are things one ought to do because one owes them to others.

10. "*Pachamama*" in fact is an all-encompassing, very much "lived" concept, that should not be translated as "Mother Nature" because, from the perspective of the Aymara cosmopraxis, nature is not experienced as a separate entity.

11. See www.uywanya.com.

12. De Munter and Note 2009. I coined the term "cosmopraxis" as the outcome of a discussion between philosophers and anthropologists about the notion of "worldview." I was not aware, at that time, that Viveiros de Castro had already used the concept from quite another epistemological standpoint and with a different aim, searching for a perspectivist theory of transspecific personhood (unicultural and multinatural) (Viveiros de Castro 2004).

also enables less identity-based approaches to how contemporary Aymara families relate with the earth-world. Second, experiences during fieldwork led us to orient the project towards what my collaborators and I have started to call an "anthropology of life" (de Munter 2017; de Munter, Trujillo, and Rocha 2019). Following Bautista, Yampara, and other Aymara mentors, the conviction behind such a study of life, rather than just an analysis of what Aymara society (family, economic system, etc.) might be, is that all beings and presences, other-than-human and human, including the deceased, share the one space-time they inhabit (*utjaña*, *qamaña*),[13] and, through their constantly relating dynamics, produce life-living (*jakaña*), past, present, and future (*nayrapacha*).[14] This is what the first part of the concept of cosmopraxis refers to: jaqi are brought up by actively accompanying things in pacha (cosmos) as they emerge, grow, mature, decline, and "humusify" (Haraway 2016; Ingold 2018c).

If, with Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, "we are committed to the idea that study is what you do with other people . . . talking and walking around with other people, working, dancing, suffering, some irreducible convergence of all three, held under the name of speculative practice" (Harney and Moten 2013: 110), the general aim of our study initially was to better understand how our Aymara collaborators, a majority of them living in urban contexts, learn to cope with life, generating what we might call their dynamic cultural tradition—i.e., Aymara and by extension Andean ways of ecological-social learning. From there on, walking, working, and reflecting with them on their ways of going about the world allowed us to study what Ingold (2016) would call "human correspondence"—the way people co-respond with other life-lines along the meshwork of life—or Donna Haraway (2016) a "sympoietic model for learning to stay with the trouble together."[15] Even though many of the younger Aymara, some of whom are members of the families involved in the project, are less attached to the *costumbres* (customs), having to struggle with sometimes precarious conditions or, more often, to engage in a more "Western," urban style of life, in general contemporary Aymara cosmopraxis still, obstinately, displays the "arts of living on a damaged planet" (Tsing et al. 2017).

The most recent phase of this exploration, on which this article is a reflection, aspires particularly to studying the everyday and more ritual practices ("attitudes," in the parlance of some mentors) that habilitate or "educate" the Aymara—starting from their family homes or *utanaka*—to attune to the relational dynamics of life, precisely by involving themselves in the intrinsic consonance of the two "circles" of reciprocity dynamics mentioned by Temple and Yampara. These dynamics can perhaps best be seen as spiraling, entwining lines of "giving" and "receiving" within and with the broader relationality of the earth "inhabited" by humans. Isabelle Stengers (2005), in a reflection on political ecology, aptly alluded to an "ecology of practices." In order to refer to this habilitating dynamic of relating and attuning, I speak metaphorically, as well as in very concrete terms, of "making family," mentioned by several Aymara collaborators as the central guarantee before being able to carry on living as Aymara people. "Making family" has to be seen as a field of "other-than-human" actions with ecological-cultural ayni at its heart—note that alpaca or llama herds usually are treated as relatives, as are, on another level, the "sacred" mountains or *achachilas* (literally "grandparents, ancestors"), among other elements in pacha. In Haraway's words, "the stretch and recomposition of kin are allowed by the fact that all earthlings are kin in the deepest sense" (2016: 103). From my own recent study experience, I propose to apprehend this "making kin" in its full biosocial reciprocating drive by means of the verb *uywaña*,[16] and the rich semantic field that flows around it. Teofilo Laime, Aymara sociolinguist and adviser to the current research project, notes that uywaña means "to nurture" and that it can refer to a person or an animal, which you "help or attend to so it can grow" (personal communication, November 2019). Uywaña, according to Laime, "does not distinguish whether it is an animal or a human, *what matters is that it grows*" (emphasis added). Adding the agentive suffix *-iri* results in *uywiri*, which means "(s)he who or that which raises." Generally it refers to persons, but it also has an important "ritual" sense, referring to "that which nurtures-and-protects": this can be a mountain, a

13. *Uta*: "house, family"; *utjaña*: "to exist, to dwell"; *qamaña*: "to dwell, to live."

14. *Nayrapacha* is an interesting cultural-political concept that interweaves past and future; see the works of Bolivian sociologist Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui (2010, 2015).

15. Haraway 2016: 96. "Sympoiesis" means "creating or making together, mutually" (in contrast to the concept of "autopoiesis" coined in Maturana and Varela 1972); the "trouble" is that caused by humans.

16. While several indigenous thinkers use the concept of uywaña to refer to biosocial raising practices, for the Argentine archaeologist Alejandro Haber (2007) it indicates a relational "episteme."

stone, a place, a house, "beings or places that have helped, that have seen everything that has grown" (Laime, personal communication, November 2019). In this "ritual" sense, uywiri is generally related to nature; here it refers rather to humans who are being raised by such uywiri, whom they visit and honor. But persons too can become uywiri in the "ritual" sense, once they are dead and have raised children and grandchildren—and in fact keep raising their relatives, thanks to the reciprocating commemorations of the dead (de Munter 2016; see Despret 2015). The verb uywaña then is about raising (someone or something), being raised or letting oneself be raised. As elaborated below (Section 5), when you insert the infix *-si*, the verb *uywasiña* means "to raise with *cariño*, with *cortesía*"—courtesy, that other central virtue resulting from Aymara cosmopraxis.

Such habilitating practices, which follow raising (uywaña), caring, and affective (uywasiña, uywiri) dimensions, can be understood within the broader scope of an anthropology of life, where "human life" evolves within and corresponds with what Ingold (2005) calls the "meshwork" of life (Karen Barad's [2007] "entanglement"), with lines emerging, growing, decaying, and disappearing, intertwining and attending to other lines of life along overlapping generations. Theoretically and methodologically, this study finds its primary inspiration in Ingold's recent work, but also, albeit in different ways, in the work of Anna Tsing ([2019] "ecology of attention"), Haraway ([2016] "symbiogenesis"), Vinciane Despret (2015), and María Puig de la Bellacasa (2017), even when these authors tend to align with Bruno Latour, as well as with Stengers. In spite of clear divergences—noticeably they mostly do not refer to Ingold's work—all share several matters of concern that are at the ethical-political heart of a biosocially oriented "anthropology of life." Think of the burning need to fuse what Haraway (2016: 93) calls the "colonial apparatuses of ecology and economics," or the fact that all these scholars recognize both the profound "messiness" we humans have worked ourselves into (during the current Chthulucene, or Anthropocene, era) and the concomitant urgency of making "alliances for livability with both humans and nonhumans" (Tsing 2019: 1:00:56). So, even when, from an anthropology-of-life perspective, I embrace as an honorable cause what Philippe Descola (2016) once rather deprecatingly called Ingold's "biolatry," we should not of course be naïve about such "love of life." In this regard, Stefan Helmreich, in his *Sounding the limits of life*, quotes critic W. J. T. Mitchell: "There is . . . a new kind of vitalism and animism in the air, a new interest in Nature with a capital N . . . The philosophy of life has returned with a vengeance in the age of biogenetic engineering and bioterrorism," but promptly recalls the ominous warning by artist Eduardo Kac and philosopher Avital Ronell: "the stability of life or of the living is thrown off course" (Helmreich 2016: 15–16).

Ingold, from the relational and praxeological standpoint of an *anthropology* of life, has always claimed that human history should never be distinguished from that of nonhumans, both comprising processes of making and growing. Although "only the former involves the reproduction of power relations in the production of Society," what matters is "that the production of life involves the unfolding of a field of relations that *crosscuts* [original emphasis] the boundary between human and nonhuman." And these are relations of power: "the infliction of pain and suffering is not limited to relations among humans." Therefore, an anthropology of life as a cause will always be intrinsically political, starting with any basic claim made about nature and society and the lack of a subsequent fusion between the two—think of the current debates and activism concerning the "commons." Ingold's "politics of dwelling" resides in the apparent incompatibility of the protection provided by a place to live in ("to dwell in," intransitive and open-ended) and the protection of nature, and in the struggles that this incompatibility entails (2005: 4).

Such disenchanted but committed visions about "life" (or the biosocial) and how we humans participate in it, as expressed by artists (like Hamish Fulton or Ana Mendieta) and scientists alike, sustain our conviction that it is essential for an anthropology of life to adopt the kind of generous, self-exposing, and critical inquiry advocated by Ingold (2018b). Indeed, while fully acknowledging anthropology's colonial debt and methodological conceit (Ingold 2014), it still is the vehicle par excellence that allows humanity to recognize and relate with other ways or habits that might orient us towards getting things on a less grim course. It is a field of inquiry that permits us to work towards Erin Manning's (2016) better "alignments" with time (or space-time, as the Aymara would have it), when she explores the relational potentialities of the "minor gesture(s)" in her discussion of what people might learn from nonneurotypical[17] and artistic ways of coping with a rowdy and challenging world. This is

17. "The neurotypical is the very backbone of a concept of individuality that is absolutely divorced from the idea that relation is actually what our worlds are made of" (Manning 2016: 6).

why an anthropology-of-life posture will always have to carefully pay attention to what an education leading to more favorable "alignments" might mean, inspired by as many practices as can be found out there. In the collaborative part of the research, we tackle this question by accompanying contemporary Aymara families—but extending the anthropological reflection to all humanity—in their relations with other-than-human lines of life, throughout the space-time of the one earth inhabited by humans. "Let us summon up a field of study that would take upon itself to learn from as wide a range of approaches as it can; one that would seek to bring to bear, on this problem of how to live, the wisdom and experience of all the world's inhabitants, whatever their backgrounds, livelihoods, circumstances and places of abode" (Ingold 2018b: 2). More than comparative, then, this study endorses a complementary approach, where education—learning—works in a double sense: as anthropologists we open ourselves to *learning* about how people of the world—in this case the Aymara, corresponding with their fellow beings, becomings, and presences—*learn* to handle life in ways that allow them to cope with and improvise on its vicissitudes and opportunities. This article moves "in between" (I borrow the preposition from Ingold 2015: 147) these two educational dimensions and has a sideways interest in evaluating the political nature of such a project as an anthropology of life. It is striking to see how, in a recent publication (*Dwelling in political landscapes*, edited by Lounela, Berglund, and Kallinen [2019]), the Finnish editors, notwithstanding their evident respect for Ingold's contribution to the discipline in general and to the theorizing of ecological-cultural relations in particular, state, when evaluating the politico-critical reach of his oeuvre, that "Ingold's broadly phenomenological contribution feels insufficient and risks appearing apolitical" (p. 9). Despite the cautious formulation this is a harsh critique that fails to appreciate the inherently political thrust of his project, much more than "merely" phenomenological. Ingold himself suggested (2005) that "dwelling," already very present in *The perception of the environment* (2000), might sound Heideggerianly cozy and harmonious, asking: "If dwelling implies an openness to the world, how can it accommodate struggle, defeat and closure?" And, rather rhetorically, "can dwelling be the foundation for a genuinely political ecology?" (Ingold 2005: 3). In this reflection I argue that in recent publications Ingold has deepened and specified the political reach of his work by insisting on the praxis of "e-ducation" (in its etymological sense from ex-*ducere* or "to lead out")[18] and of attentionality as central aspects of (human) correspondence (and of anthropology itself) (Ingold 2015, 2018a, 2021). Maybe his "dwelling" metaphor was imperfect, but the current combination of an anthropology of life, with a firm emphasis on education, agencement, and attentionality at its core, can make a convincing case for the political relevance of this approach.

3. On "indigenous peoples," ontogenesis, and education

> *Human beings . . . like all living beings . . . undergo a process of ontogenesis. They grow themselves and, since their growth is conditioned by the presence and actions of others, they grow one another.*
> —Ingold 2015: 120

In his essay "What is human?" (2018c) Ingold refers to the fashionable discussion about the Anthropocene and the so-called posthuman era. The "posthuman" label could mean several things: on the one hand, that the concept of humanity "has run its course, eventually brought down by the weight of its internal contradictions, and by mounting inequalities between those who lay claim to universal humanity as of right, and those—above all, the world's so-called 'indigenous peoples'—for whom the forcible imposition of these claims has meant loss of land, livelihood, and sometimes even life." On the other hand, claims to "humanity" and "civilization," as made by the formerly victorious colonial powers, are gradually falling apart and the groups in power are having—albeit unwillingly—to give in to what is, in the view of many, common sense: "Post-humanity, here, signals *a return to the soil, to the humus, and a renegotiation of our relations with the earth on a foundation of neither conquest nor exclusive possession but of custodianship and care*. The postcolonial world, in this sense, is *necessarily* not only post-human but also other-than-human" (ibid., emphasis added). This return to the soil with care, custodianship—the latter concept may be too one-sided, given

18. Masschelein 2010. Ingold, following Masschelein (see Section 4), uses "education" in this way, in order to make clear that it is not about instilling knowledge in someone's head, but rather about letting them be "led out," exposing themselves and responding to what the world confronts them with.

that uywiri mountains are deemed to protect Aymara people—and a sense of an "other-than-human" commonality across the life/not-life divide (Alberti 2016) is of course not limited to indigenous peoples, but their still very alive relational attitudes and practices can guide and inspire in significant ways.

In recent decades, the anthropological study of the immense variety of indigenous groups, who never really left "the soil" behind and maintained a mutual relationship with other beings and presences, has often been addressed from different ontologically oriented theoretical perspectives. Well known is, to mention just this one, the collaboration between Martin Holbraad, Morten Axel Pedersen, and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (2014). These "ontological" avenues, heterogeneous in their premises and scopes, are all politically pertinent. Their objectives and epistemological options, however, are quite different from what characterizes an anthropology of life. They show the contrast between a fairly well-established emphasis on semiosis—human groups coping with the world through their logocentric/symbolic capacities and specific worldviews—on the one hand, and a rather disruptive focus on processes of mutual becoming and learning through responsiveness, improvisation, attentionality, and abduction on the other. They tend to deal with indigenous traditions in terms of socially and ecologically—mostly in this order—constructed ontologies (even with "subjects" like jaguars or forests, for example) as *distinct* ways of thinking, knowing, and representing the world (on this conceptualizing bias, see Strathern 2012)[19]—all of which allows Benjamin Alberti and Tamara Bray (2009) to speak of "alternative ontologies" and Arturo Escobar (2014) to elaborate on "relational ontologies," in the plural. Such approaches are valid but aim at another sort of political commitment, more directly preoccupied with identity-based politics, epistemic racism, decoloniality, and (inter)cultural differences. Within an anthropology-of-life perspective, however, one that focuses on biosocial becomings, I am not that interested in a multiplication of the ontological (Alberti 2016) nor in the representational and intentional—people living up to their views about the world. What does concern me primordially, in a more general way, is how certain fields of practice bring about—"produce"—human correspondence with other beings and presences, amidst a messy world. Of course there is an ongoing, rich Aymara tradition whose distinctive experiences and rights have to be reclaimed. For this, activists and scientists have access to concepts like tradition, culture, (political) ontology (Blaser 2009; Burman 2017), or even the one I prefer to use, cosmopraxis. However, when studying the social-ecological foundations and practices that allow the Aymara to live "well"—*suma*—within pacha, we (members of the research project) are not interested in contrasting one "ontology"[20] or cosmopraxis with another. Rather, we are concerned with opening ourselves to what can be learned from how the Aymara are habilitated to correspond with the other lines of life with which their own becomings are intricately entwined. They learn this in the first place by making family and kin, in the more-than human-sense, by nurturing and by letting themselves be nurtured (see PRATEC 2006), rather than by internalizing—and only afterwards externalizing—more abstract principles of ayni or, more generally, by enacting a cosmovision. Such habilitating dynamics for relationality occur in communities of practices (Lave and Wenger 1991) with people developing skills in simultaneously "passive" (things happening to them and moving them) and "active" (involving themselves) ways, "learning-in-doing." Studying these dynamics invites the exploration of ethically and axiologically rich ways of conceiving agency, more relational and less human-centered. The political-"educational" relevance of studying such practices, where Levinasian ethical relations with the other become fully biosocial, can hardly be overestimated. People everywhere have to cope with changing life conditions, being born, growing, dwelling, caring, suffering and creating, aging, dying, and giving birth. The ways this is done are of course heterogeneous, which allows the appreciation of other accentuations of what are undoubtedly universal human potentialities. People everywhere might be guided by an interest in how ontogenesis—as a universal—results from the jaqi's engagement with a

19. Marilyn Strathern's oeuvre tackles ontological multiplicity and interdependence, within a world—or societies—made up of many interdependent partialities. Her work is very sensitive to relationality, more focused on how people do things and less on meaning and conceptualizations.

20. For anthropologist Zoe Todd, an indigenous thinker and activist, there still is an ambiguity in the use of the concept: indigenous ontology is not only *made up* of relational ways of knowing and landscapes; it is also a political, material, economic, and legal *project* of *actively constituting* the world (Todd 2014).

sentient ecology[21] and, from there, in the "e-ducational" practices that accompany their anthropogenesis in the Andes.

4. Visiting, attentionality, and the middle voice

> *Its creativity is that of "doing undergoing," of agencement, in which beings continually forge themselves and one another in the crucible of social life, their humanity not a foregone conclusion but an ongoing relational achievement.*
> —Ingold 2018a: 31

In Aymara cosmopraxis, pragmatic and affective enskillment—in which "teachers" can perfectly well be nonhuman—for biosocial aligning is brought about across a continuum of everyday and ritual practices. The kind of generalized attitude or sensitivity towards relationality as the central condition for life and the learning or habilitating processes that sustain/afford this disposition permeate ordinary as well as more ceremonial occasions of honoring and visiting (de Munter 2016, 2018). One way of characterizing this "attitude" is Bautista's and Laime's allusions to the continuous enactment of cortesía as a bonding principle in Aymara conviviality (Bautista and Qhana Pukara 2017; Laime Ajacopa 2017), inherent to the greeting and visiting of relatives (including the dead), of "sacred" places and presences (uywiris, ajayus, to mention just two), and of other beings (e.g., the herds' *floreo*, or "flower ceremony": Mamani 1996, 2006). Visiting (*tumpaña*) among the Aymara automatically implies a gesture of *apthapi*, related to the verb *apaña*: you carry things with you, in order to share them "politely," with your deceased relatives, with your guardian mountain, with the aunt living near lake Titicaca who is taking care of your land, etc. Haraway, reflecting on how humans share lives with companion species, recalls Despret's "virtue of politeness" as a "particular epistemological position" (Haraway 2016: 127).

> In every sense, Despret's *cultivation of politeness is a curious practice. She trains her whole being, not just her imagination, in Arendt's words, "to go visiting."* Visiting is not an easy practice; it demands *the ability to find others actively interesting*, even or especially others most people already claim to know all too completely, to ask questions that one's interlocutors truly find interesting, to cultivate the wild virtue of curiosity, to retune one's ability to sense and respond—and to do all this politely! (ibid.: 127, emphasis added)

So rather than an "epistemological position," Haraway sees the cultivation of politeness as a practice that should be trained, which she describes, along with Hannah Arendt, as "visiting." Significant here is "*the ability to find others actively interesting*," a grammatically somehow ambiguous expression in the "middle voice"[22] and a direct invitation to reflect on exactly how the adverb "actively" should be understood from a "human correspondence" standpoint. This is precisely what Ingold has been working on, insistently, since *Making*, the first volume of his recent "trilogy" (2013, 2015, 2018a), with a particular reading of agencement and of education.[23] He has come to conceive of anthropology as a sort of educational craft, with anthropologists, just like everyone else—albeit maybe in a more focused way—submitting themselves actively to what is happening in the world they are moving through.[24] Immersed exposure comes first, careful

21. Sentient ecology refers to "knowledge not of a formal, authorised kind, transmissible in contexts outside those of its practical application. On the contrary, *it is based in feeling, consisting in the skills, sensitivities and orientations that have developed through long experience of conducting one's life in a particular environment*" (Ingold 2000: 25, emphasis added). Ingold uses "anthropogenesis" as a contraction of "anthropo-ontogenesis." It indicates a specific kind of ontogenesis (being as growth and becoming), but one in which the being whose generation is in question happens to be human, distinct from ontogenesis in general, because of the way human lives extend between imagination and perception.

22. "In the middle voice, . . . the doer is *inside* the process of his doing, inside the verb. In a doing to which agency is thus subservient, writes [linguist Émile] Benveniste, the doer 'achieves something which is being achieved in him'" (Ingold 2015: 145).

23. For agencement, see Ingold 2018a: 45: "By contrast to the agency of the volitional subject, I take '*agencement*' to refer to the way in which the 'I' of habit is continually engendered in the wake of action, more as question than assertion."

24. Consider Manning, who defines agencement as "the sense of directionality occasioned by movement rather than a subject-based intentionality" (2016: 190).

responsiveness next. To conceive of learning processes—for anthropology, for Aymara cosmopraxis—in terms of "submission leads, mastery follows" implies a critical revision of the usual ways of conceiving of agency as associated with notions of intentionality and volition and, I would add, with human-centeredness (see also Manning 2016). In *The life of lines*, Ingold specifically elaborates on this recalibration in a chapter entitled "Doing, undergoing," disputing "the assumed passivity of undergoing" (2015: 127). One argument, coinciding with his critique of hylomorphism, as well as with the present one of cosmovision, is that if people mainly "executed" designs and structures underlying actions, there would be no real creation, in which an intrinsic combination of relationality, improvisation, and imagination is at play. So when doing is placed within undergoing it is in an active sense: "it is the way, as Marx and Engels would have put it, in which human beings are not just the executors but the *producers* of their lives" (ibid.: 127). At this point Ingold too, like Haraway, turns to Hannah Arendt's political philosophy, and her account of the human condition, where she hints at the semantic distinction that existed in classical Greek and Latin for the verbs "to act," *archein* and *prattein* in Greek; *agere* and *gerere* in Latin. The first of each pair "originally carried the sense of initiation or commencement, of setting things in motion, while the latter (*prattein*, *gerere*) meant to take hold of them, to bear with them and to finish them off" (ibid: 127). However, Arendt shows—Ingold approvingly recalls—how these meanings altered with time and took on a stubborn bias: "For the one who would set things in motion became exclusively a *leader*, whose function was to issue commands, while those who would bear with them became *subjects*, whose sole duty was to put these commands into practice, to execute them. Thus the idea arose that the leader is the prime doer, and that it is the fate of subjects to undergo whatever their master decrees" (ibid.: 127). However, there is no such thing as the leader's mastery, "for he too is necessarily a participant in social life, and his strength and stature come not from him alone but from what others have lent him, and without which he could achieve nothing . . . Or in Arendt's terms, it is not for some to act and others to suffer; rather, both action and suffering always go together—they are two sides of the same coin" (ibid.: 127–28). Haraway was precisely hinting at a very similar idea to Arendt's in her discussion of the crucial importance of training one's whole being "to go visiting," in relation to an ability "to find others actively interesting": a skill to be cultivated through submitting and accompanying, not by imposing one's will—or interpretation—onto the people one visits. With regard to visiting as a way of "doing-undergoing" par excellence, it is pertinent to keep in mind Renato Rosaldo's seminal essay "Ilongot visiting" (1993), where he reflects upon how qualities of openness, improvisation, indetermination, and variability, characteristic of Ilongot visiting—and hosting—practices, lead to what he calls "social grace." "To go visiting" can then be seen as a central skill for the production of social life: social life that, along the lines of my study of the Aymara families, should be read in its full biosocial sense, as the dynamics of learning to correspond with all presences and becomings with which all humans share life. Within Aymara cosmopraxis, this is what happens, for instance, when people visit and commemorate the dead (de Munter 2016, 2018), when visiting an uywiri mountain that will guide apprentices to become community healers and sages, or, simply, by visiting, tilling, and cherishing the soil and the fields that allow potatoes to grow: these are all habilitating practices for relational "aligning."

Before elaborating briefly on some of these moments in the continuous flow of Aymara visiting practices, I need to introduce the concept of attentionality, crucial to better grasp the political thrust of an anthropology of life. Indeed, the "visiting" attitude, intrinsically entangled with affective politeness and the ability to respond, accords with how Ingold conceptualizes this notion (2018a). When Ingold strives to replace—as does Manning, in a similar vein—the classical intentionality–volition–agency triad by attentionality–habit–agencement ("habit" in a particular Deweyan reading),[25] attentionality can be seen as the driving force of human correspondence. The notion has its origin in the rich polysemy of the verb "to attend," which etymologically means "to stretch toward," starting from the body itself, or, in Ingold's words: "the stretch of life that I am after" (2018a: 20). It can also mean "*caring* for people or for things, in a way that is both practical and dutiful; *waiting* [cf. French *attendre*], in the expectation of a call or summons; *being present*, or coming into presence, as on an occasion; *going along* with others"; and finally, longing, as the temporal and affective "stretch of life" (ibid.: 21, emphasis in the original). "Attentionality" is an attitude,

25. "With the principle of habit, however, this opposition [between doing as active and undergoing as passive] is dissolved. Here, undergoing is what one does, and doing what one undergoes. Active undergoing continually digests the ends of doing, and extrudes them into pure beginning. In Dewey's terms, the digestion is a 'taking in,' the extrusion a 'going out'" (Ingold 2018a: 22).

a way of being-with, of people who, through their attentive correspondence with the world, form what John Dewey—intensely revisited by Ingold—called "habits": habits that, at the same time, allow them to "in-habit [*sic*] the world. It becomes a home and the home is part of our every experience" (ibid.). "To attend" relates to practices which allow humans to expose themselves, physically and affectionately, to the world and to presence it—middle-voicely—on the move through fields of agencement. Ingold notes that this, too, is what the philosopher of education Jan Masschelein contends to be the aim of e-ducation: "Its purpose is not to instil a consciousness or awareness *of* the world around us. It is rather to draw us into a correspondence *with* this world. Or in a word, it is about *attending* to it" (2018a: 30, emphasis in the original). (This is the process that Ingold, inspired by Ramón Llull, will eventually refer to as "to human"—as a verb.)

Studying Aymara cosmopraxis allows the appreciation of how jaqi, via various visiting and attending practices—true "minor gestures" in Manning's sense[26]—develop intricate relations with pacha. They do so with, among other things, the soil and its "spirits": the soil (ground, earth) that shelters their dead, the soil they till when growing potatoes, the soil they tread on attentively, when they climb the uywiri mountains during their "e-ducation" as amawt'as. All along the continuum[27] of such ritual and ordinary actions, that relate them with the earth-soil (*uraq-pacha*), Aymara families, ever-extending collectivities that emerge through visiting-and-corresponding, attend in undergoing but active ways to that which is enfolding and sustaining them—that which has seen them grow (uywiri)—and thus is educating them, in multiple ways. Every year, most families commemorate their forebears in intense ways at the beginning of November (coincidentally also the Catholic festival of All Souls),[28] when the first generous rainfall is expected, vital for the seedlings on the Altiplano. The Aymara commemorate their dead relatives first at home in a generally relaxed atmosphere of visiting and conviviality (preparing meals, setting up a commemorative ritual "table" decorated with cloths and gifts of food and lots of *t'antawawa*, the anthro- and zoomorph breads the families make for the occasion), with more solemn moments (*q'uwachaña*) and music-making to bind it all together.[29] They are waiting for the ajayus of their beloved dead to come by; sometimes they even go to collect their ajayus at the cemetery and bring them home for the day. All day long, people share meals, and receive and return gifts, prayers, and anecdotes for the deceased—uywiri in their own right because they watched them grow up. On the second day—the commemorations last several days—they take everything (food, other components of the ritual table, musical instruments) to the cemetery, where commensality and reciprocity—sometimes also dancing—continue, amongst the graves and surrounding fields and hills, with chatting, meditating, and sharing food, all in close proximity to the earth, to the tombs. At a certain moment in the afternoon, in an almost frenetic enactment of reciprocity, people start to give away all that they brought to the cemetery, and in return receive many other gifts (de Munter 2016). In Aymara, the totality of these commemorations of the dead is called *apxata*, from the verb *apaña*. In general, one might say that, during these celebrating and memorializing practices, young and old come together in order to presence—as doing-in-undergoing—the ajayu energy-spirit of the dead, reciprocating with them in awe and with the land where the cemetery is situated and the ancestors are buried.[30] These ancestor spirits are traditionally believed to reside in the high mountains, which themselves are considered achachilas, while the dead are important mediators with those achachilas and, through them, with the earth.

26. Inspired by, among others, Deleuze, Guattari, and Alfred North Whitehead, Manning (2016) conceives of minor gestures as alternative actualizations of doing and being in (and with) the world, previous to its conceptualization, driven by nonhegemonic, sensitive perception and collective agencement.

27. I understand "continuum" in two complementary ways: first, attentional and visiting practices take place throughout the year. In the second place (see footnote 5), I see a continuum on the "scale" between familiar or ordinary ritual practices (such as the *jatha katu*, described in this section) and more ritually elaborated practices (ceremonies directed by specialists).

28. "Coincidentally" because these celebrations of the dead and of the first rainfall were already being held long before the arrival of the Spaniards.

29. On the all-relating force of music-making in the Andes, see Stobart and Howard 2002.

30. The word for "human" may derive from the practice of burial: of the possible etymologies, Ingold writes: "No-one knows exactly where the old word comes from. Giambattista Vico, in his *New science* of 1725, thought that its source lay in the Latin word for burying, *humando*, itself derived from humus" (2018c).

Potatoes, too, have ajayu. The process of their growth and harvest—something simultaneously ordinary and vitally central in Andean life—is attentively accompanied and cared for, in several ways. It is in particular the women who are—as part of their thakhi—in charge of selecting the seed potatoes, the ones that will be kept carefully for planting the next year. These, as Bautista relates (personal communication, April 2020), are called *yuxch'a*, literally "daughter-in-law." These yuxch'as, when planting time arrives, in October or earlier, are carefully collected and sometimes (a habit that is in the process of being recovered) exchanged with other communities. The planting and growing process at community level is guided by a married couple who not only organize the more collective ritual moments but also ensure that every member duly completes their agricultural tasks throughout the complete "agricultural" cycle. These couples are called *kamani*s or "custodians" (Patzi 2017); they are specifically charged by the community with this task for the duration of a year. Mostly, the communities where this habit still exists have three kinds of kamanis, for potatoes, quinoa, and barley, three essential crops/products, each with its own ajayu. During the principal ceremonies (*ch'amacha*) that mark the different phases of the crop cycle, the kamanis' children or grandchildren participate fully in the libations, dressed in the same striped ponchos as the adults, sadly greeting the sacrificial llamas, attending the offerings. Celebrating with the elders, they come to sense the solemnity of such occasions of biosocial "togethering," part of their becoming jaqi. In our research, amawt'as and others explain that what kamanis do is to connect very concretely the ajayus of the earth-soil with those of the seeds and plants, which implies also engaging in dialog—sometimes defying, then fighting or reconciliating—with the elements:[31] wind, rain, hail and so on, each with their own ajayu (Patzi 2017). The classic book edited by Denise Arnold and Juan de Dios Yapita (1996) describes living with "*Ispalla Tayka*," literally "Twin Mother," a ritual denomination for the potato, where "twin" points to the prodigious, rhizomatic multiplication that occurs over and over again, thanks to an intricate agencement among the ajayus of humans, soil, air, and plants. An impressive entanglement of attentional practices takes place in between culturally-socially required actions and the accompaniment of natural growing processes. The ajayus, human and other-than-human, are clearly the connecting force—more verb-like, moving constantly in between sky, earth, and soil, uniting the "natural" and the "social." Or as that other amawt'a, the late Carlos Yujra, put it, in line with the biosocial reciprocity that Yampara and Temple elaborated on, "There are many ajayus in the sky. They exist so that we, living beings, can live with their spiritual strength in all places. The bodies of living beings are related to pachamama's ajayus. These ajayus are connected to our lungs, bones, nerves, blood, skin, marrow, brain, eyes, ears, mouth, tongue, and nose so that we can live, express ourselves, speak, and walk through this world" (Yujra 2005: 7, my translation).

I mention here, in order to show how cosmopraxis is equally fostered via quite "ordinary" ritual actions, the *jatha katu*,[32] literally the picking (also "fertilization") of the (first) seeds. This really is a family ritual: at sunrise, around Carnival (*Anata*), family members gather in the fields and the women carefully pick some of the earliest potatoes. Simultaneously, they adorn themselves, and some of the crops, with streamers and make a little hole in the earth near the roots of the harvested plant, filling it with fruit and coca leaves, and offering a ch'alla of wine. In this way they gratefully restore the gift of the soil and express their hope for a plentiful harvest (Bautista, personal communication, April 2020). It is interesting, for a good understanding of the multirelating force of these cosmopractical dynamics, to note that this familiar way of visiting-receiving-and-giving will be echoed at other times in the year—generally in the colder months, before the new sowing season—when people visit a major uywiri like Pachjiri (in Umasuyus): here, usually accompanied by a ritual specialist, they make offerings to a pair of wak'as, called "*Ispal Achachila*s" (literally "Twin Grandparents"), two rocks situated on the top of this "sacred" mountain, and ask for a prosperous harvest (Bautista, personal communication, April 2020; see Burman 2011).

As a last example in the continuum of attentional practices, I share an important testimony by Bautista, about an experience of "doing-undergoing" during the initial phase of what is usually called "*el camino del amawt'a*." This is the path that an apprentice must follow in order to become, gradually, a sage or "philosopher," a specialist not only in thinking about relationships but in

31. See Ingold 2015 on "weather-wising" (chapter 14, "Weather-world").

32. Though rarely described in the literature, some interesting testimonies can be found on the internet. I here describe the jatha katu for potatoes, but it is also done, albeit less frequently, for other crops or fruits. "*Katu*" is related to the verb "*katuña*": "to catch, to fertilize."

very concretely connecting and perceiving things and presences whose dynamic relations make possible—or impede—life in the world. One of the recurrent experiences a master amawt'a invites her or his apprentices to undergo is climbing an uywiri mountain at night, in the dark, guided only from afar. The familiar surroundings and views are replaced by a sense of insecurity, sensations of danger, sometimes of fear and awe.

> Already when I was small, with my grandfather who was an amawt'a, I had learned to go up those mountains, to have patience with them and little by little get to know them. But that was during the day. However, at the time when I was taking seriously my own training as an amawt'a, most of the climbs of the uywiri mountains, we had to undertake them at night . . . At night, because one needs to have/sense this relation more of touch and contact. In daytime, you can look, almost admire: "ah, over here there is a stone, some other thing, a shrub, over there is the track . . ." but during the night you have to learn to develop that part that, in usual academic work, people tend to forget. The instinctive part, the subjective part, the forgotten and disregarded part. An ability to attune to different existing ajayus . . . With time I came to understand that . . . all stones, all mountains in fact are our uywiri. (Bautista, personal communication, April 2020)

This reflects perfectly how e-ducation by attention works for Masschelein—and for Ingold with him: drawing humans into a correspondence with this world and attending to all its constituents. Ingold recalls how he met Masschelein on one of the latter's "pedagogical" walks. "Once on the trail we submit to it—we are even commanded by it—and in that sense the walk is an experience we undergo. Yet this is not, Masschelein relates, a 'passive undergoing.' It is active, 'a kind of cutting the road through.' So what is this road, and what does it cut? The road, of course, is that of attention, along which the world opens up and is made present to us, so that we ourselves may be exposed to this presence and be transformed" (Ingold 2018a: 30).

5. *Uywasiña*: Affectionality and/in power

Habilitating practices for a relational attitude, like the ones mentioned above—commemorating the deceased, growing "Twin-Mother" potatoes, becoming an amawt'a—are brought to the fore in attentionality. They allow people to be transformed by the world through which they make a journey, transforming it in their turn. This attitude of finding the world "actively interesting" (with "interest" deriving from the Latin "*inter-esse*," "to be between"; the sense here is "to be in-between with concern and sympathy") is characterized by attending to others (human and other-than-human) and by longing actively for things to happen. And longing "makes it possible to align care and attention, which depend on bringing things into presence, with the temporal stretch of life" (Ingold 2018a: 29). Bautista insists that the engagement of amawt'as with the people who call on them for assistance is in fact very similar to climbing uywiris in the dark (personal communication, April 2020): attending to what is offered to us by the soil and the road that we have gone through, not so much in order to get an overview of the complete panorama from the top but in order to work ourselves—walking, listening, sensing, looking—*into* that relational field, in order to be able, once we become practitioners, to "intervene" responsively, amidst the complexly interconnected world we are part of. Amawt'as, and in fact every participant in the communities of learning that still continue in Aymara tradition, learn to care for the relation between beings and things by participating in the (continuum of) habilitating practices I have invoked here. "As co-responsive beings, the responsibility of care is something that *falls* to us. . . . To care for others, then, we must allow them into our presence so that we, in turn, can be present to them. In an important sense, we must let them be, so that they can speak to us" (Ingold 2018a: 27, emphasis in the original). This implies that the work of the amawt'a (moving in between uywiris and humans, accompanying a myriad of ajayus), of the women selecting and cherishing the seedlings, or of the participants attending the apxata is fundamentally a question of affecting and being affected. Affectionality and attentionality are inextricably united in what people do, immersed in the spiraling dynamics of biosocial reciprocity that Temple and Yampara discussed. To return to the earlier double "metaphor" of uywaña/uywasiña: as explained above, the infix *-si* is used to express what is done affectively (with politeness and cariño) and interestingly also indicates the reflexive and reciprocal mode. In the same vein, urantasiña is to greet one another with courtesy and love—the basic attitude of respect and responsiveness highlighted as the foundation of Aymara conviviality. So it is with *amtaña*/*amtasiña*: "to remember," the latter "to remember with cariño," meaning also "to miss someone" and, consequently, "to visit" (Layme et al. 1992). To remember, as practiced during the apxata visiting, is a way of caring and attending in between past, present, joy, lakes, grief, mountains, hope, wind, rain, sun, ancestors, and future,

of entwining all these elements. "Longing brings together the activities of remembering and imagining. Both are ways of presencing: remembering presences the past; imagining the future" (Ingold 2018a: 28).[33] Attentional practices occur along a continuum of uywasiña: affectively accompanying potato growth, sharing coca leaves for a propitious conversation, undergoing patiently and engagedly an uywiri's teaching, etc. In her intriguing work, Manning celebrates, in tune with Ingold, the fragility and persistence of the minor gesture, "perceiving in it more potential than in the self-directed 'I' that stands outside experience and speaks the major languages of the brands of individualism and humanism that frame neurotypicality as the center of being" (2016: 7). From my research, I contend that such minor gestures are present in Aymara cosmopraxis in quite continuous and distributed ways, and therefore may be "easier" to find and to study than in the examples Manning resorts to—autistic experiences of space-time and collective artistic practices. With regard to the political urgency of working for better alignments and what she calls "a collectivity in the making"[34] Manning—following Félix Guattari—stresses the need for "modes of encounter not simply with the human but in the wider ecology of worlds in their unfolding" (ibid.: 173). Seen from the perspective of an anthropology of practices and of the "being-alive," I maintain that the continuum of attentional practices among Aymara families guarantees an on-going production of skills that enable such biosocial modes of encounter and, in general, an affectional force of "becoming-together": a force that thrives on affectionality. In this regard, Manning remembers, with Gilles Deleuze, how the early Friedrich Nietzsche considered "the capacity for being affected . . . not necessarily a passivity but an affectivity . . ." and conceived of the "will" to power "as the *feeling* of power" (ibid.: 207, emphasis in the original), in combination with an affirmative acceptance of an often arduous life-in-communion: power not as something connected to the subject and its volition and agency but as "a matter of feeling and sensibility." The Aymara verb *munaña*[35] means "to love (things or persons), to feel affection," and also "to want or desire something strongly." As a noun, it means "(strong) will." As an affectional and affirmative force, munaña is an important component of what Bautista calls the "rite of patience." The patience taught to her by her grandfather amawt'a and by the uywiri they climbed was, with time, transformed into a kind of ritual in its own right, a first phase of concentration before becoming actions of healing or of another kind. More than a separate ritual, it is a state of body and mind in between the passive and the active, an attitude that allows you to open and connect, that enables you to reinvigorate relations in the world that you are part of, that allows, in Ingold's terms (2018a: 34), for "a correspondence of . . . *agencement*s."

The tension between the call for more-than-human collectivities in the making à la Manning and a strong ideological emphasis on individualism and human-centeredness is emblematic of these times. Attentionality, as "enacted" broadly in Aymara cosmopraxis, offers firm guidelines for what, many years ago, Ivan Illich, in his radical, utopian critique of modern society (1973), advocated as the "gratuitous" (nonpurposeful but affectionate) enablement of conviviality, a necessary "tool" for recovering bottom-up control of central human activities such as healthcare, education, and agriculture, all interdependent. Ingold's "contention . . . is that only an education that admits of variations in the minor key . . . an education that leads out, through exposure rather than indoctrination . . . can afford a freedom that is real rather than illusory, and lead us out of structures of authority that are manifestly unsustainable. It is not that such education condemns us to the darkness of an unlit cave so much as that it alone enables us to carry on, to keep life going, and to offer new beginnings for generations to come" (2018a: 37). Basically, says Bautista, "going back to respectfully visit (*tumpthapi*) the uywiris reminds us about our place in the world and teaches us the value of carefully relating with all beings present, past and future."

33. Or as the often-quoted saying in Aymara goes: *Qhip nayra uñtasa nayraqatar saraña*, (looking forward and backward, let's walk towards the future/past) (*nayra*, meaning "eye," looking to the past and the future, in a direct political allusion to the precolonial past that guides the struggle of this indigenous group).

34. "For the collective as a mode of existence in its own right is not the multiplication of individuals. It is the way the force of a becoming attunes to a transindividuation that is more-than" (Manning 2016: 173).

Acknowledgments

The research that inspired this article is funded by Proyecto Fondecyt Regular 1190279 (ANID, National Agency for Research

35. There is an interesting parallel with the Quechua concept of *munayniyuq* (from *muna* = "will, desire, love"). See de la Cadena 2015, story 7: "*Munayniyuq*. The owner of the will (and how to control that will)."

and Development, Chile). I would like to thank all the Aymara families which have allowed me to pursue my anthropological studies over the years.

References

Alberti, Benjamin. 2016. "Archaeologies of ontology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 45: 163–79.

Alberti, Benjamin, and Tamara L. Bray. 2009. "Animating archaeology: Of subjects, objects and alternative ontologies: Introduction." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19 (3): 337–43.

Arnold, Denise, and Juan de Dios Yapita, eds. 1996. *Madre melliza y sus crías. Ispall Mama Wawampi: antología de la papa*. La Paz: Hisbol-ILCA.

Astvaldsson, Astvaldur. 2002. "Coming to power: Knowledge, learning and historic pathways to authority in a Bolivian community." In *Knowledge and learning in the Andes: ethnographic perspectives*, edited by Henry Stobart and Rosaleen Howard, 109–26. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Barad, Karen 2007. *Meeting the universe halfway. Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bartoletti, Tomás. 2019. "Greek divination from an Amerindian perspective: Reconsidering 'nature' in *mantike*." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 9 (2): 334–58.

Bautista, Beatriz, and Qhana Pukara. 2017. "*Suma qamaña* y la justicia indígena. Un testimonio." In *Ecología y reciprocidad: "(con)vivir bien," desde contextos andinos*, edited by Koen de Munter, Jacqueline Michaux, and Gilberto Pauwels, 125–29. La Paz: Plural-CEPA-Tari.

Blaser, Mario. 2009. "Political ontology: Cultural studies without 'cultures'?" *Cultural Studies* 23 (5–6): 873–96.

Burman, Anders. 2011. *Descolonización aymara. Ritualidad y política*. Plural, La Paz.

———. 2017. "The political ontology of climate change: Moral meteorology, climate justice, and the coloniality of reality in the Bolivian Andes." *Journal of Political Ecology* 24 (1): 921–38.

de la Cadena, Marisol. 2015. *Earth beings: Ecologies of practice across Andean worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

de Munter, Koen. 2016. "Ontología relacional y cosmopraxis, desde los Andes. Visitar y conmemorar entre familias Aymara." *Chungará (Arica)* 48 (4): 629–44.

———. 2017. "'Educar (mediante) la atención' en la cosmopraxis aymara. Re-pensar el 'vivir bien' desde una antropología de la vida." In *Ecología y reciprocidad: "(con)vivir bien," desde contextos andinos*, edited by Koen de Munter, Jacqueline Michaux, and Gilberto Pauwels, 129–54. La Paz: Plural-CEPA-Tari.

———. 2018. "'Leren door aandacht': Doden bezoeken en gedenken bij de Aymara en in de Lage Landen." *Volkskunde* 1: 25–45.

de Munter, Koen, and Nicole Note. 2009. "Cosmopraxis and contextualizing among the contemporary Aymara." In *Worldviews and cultures:Philosophical reflections from an intercultural perspective*, edited by Nicole Note, Raúl Fornet-Betancourt, Josef Estermann, and Diederik Aerts, 87–102. Heidelberg: Springer.

de Munter, Koen, Felipe Trujillo, and Ruth Carol Rocha Grimaldi. 2019. "Atencionalidad y líneas de vida en la malla Poopó-Uru-Qotzuñi ('gente del agua')." *Antípoda, Revista de Antropología y Arqueología* 34: 19–40.

Descola, Philippe. 2016. "Biolatry: A surrender of understanding (Response to Ingold's 'A naturalist abroad in the museum of ontology')." *Anthropological Forum* 26 (3): 321–28

Despret, Vinciane. 2015. *Au bonheur des morts: Récits de ceux qui restent*. Paris: La Découverte.

Escobar, Arturo. 2014. *Sentipensar con la tierra: Nuevas lecturas sobre desarrollo, territorio y diferencia*. Medellín: UNAULA.

Haber, Alejandro. 2007. "Arqueología de *uywaña*: Un ensayo rizomático." In *Producción y circulación prehispánicas de bienes en el sur andino*, edited by Axel E. Nielsen, M. Clara Rivolta, Verónica Seldes, Maria Magdalena Vázquez, and Pablo H. Mercolli, 13–34. Córdoba: Brujas.

Haraway, Donna. 2016. *Staying with the trouble. Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. 2013. *The undercommons: Fugitive planning and black study*. Wivenhoe: Minor Compositions.

Helmreich, Stefan. 2016. *Sounding the limits of life: Essays in the anthropology of biology and beyond*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Holbraad, Martin, Morten Axel Pedersen, and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro. 2014. "The politics of ontology: anthropological positions." *Fieldsights*, January 13, 2014. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/the-politics-of-ontology-anthropological-positions, last accessed May 9, 2021.

Illich, Ivan. 1973. *Tools for conviviality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.

———. 2005. "Epilogue: Towards a politics of dwelling." *Conservation and Society* 3 (2): 501–8.

———. 2013. *Making: Anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture*. London: Routledge.

———. 2014. "That's enough about ethnography!" *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4 (1): 383–95.

———. 2015. *The life of lines*. London: Routledge.

———. 2016. "On human correspondence." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 23 (1): 9–27.

———. 2018a. *Anthropology and/as education*. London: Routledge.

———. 2018b. *Anthropology: Wy it matters*. Cambridge: Polity.

———. 2018c. "What is human?" Unpublished ms.

———. 2018d. "One-world anthropology." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 8 (1/2): 158–71.

———2021. *Correspondences*. Cambridge: Polity.

Laime Ajacopa, Teofilo. 2017. "La vida en Layqa Qala, la zona oculta del ayllu Sullkatiti." In *Ecología y reciprocidad: (con)vivir bien, desde contextos andinos*, edited by Koen de Munter, Jacqueline Michaux, and Gilberto Pauwels, 273–83. La Paz: Plural.

Lave, Jean, and Étienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Layme Pairumani, Félix, Teófilo Laime, Damián Apaza, and Primitiva López. 1992. *Diccionario castellano–aimara*. La Paz: Presencia.

Lounela, Anu, Eeva Berglund, and Timo Kallinen, eds. 2019. *Dwelling in political landscapes: Contemporary anthropological perspectives*. Helsinki: Studia Fennica.

Mamani, Manuel. 1996. "El simbolismo, la reproducción y la música en el ritual. Marca y floreo de ganado en el altiplano chileno." In *Cosmología y música en los Andes*, edited by Max Baumann, 221–46. Frankfurt/Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana.

———. 2006. "Tierra, producción y música en el área agrícola de Parinacota: El caso del rito de Pachallampi." In *Kay Pacha: Cultivating earth and water in the Andes*, edited by Penny Dransart, 39–46. Oxford: BAR Publishing.

Manning, Erin. 2016. *The minor gesture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Masschelein, Jan. 2010. "E-ducating the gaze: The idea of a poor pedagogy." *Ethics and Education* 5 (1): 43–53.

Maturana, Humberto, and Francisco Varela. 1972. *Autopoiesis and cognition: The realization of the living*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Ortner, Sherry B. 2006. *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Patzi, Jannet. 2017. "El cargo del *kamani*, su papel cultural en la comunidad y su función en el ciclo agrario aymara." Tesis de licenciatura, Universidad Mayor de san Andrés, La Paz. https://repositorio.umsa.bo/handle/123456789/12499.

Puig de la Bellacasa, María. 2017. *Matters of care: Speculative ethics in more than human worlds*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

PRATEC (Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas). 2006. *Culturas educativas andinas: Aproximaciones quechuas y aymaras*. Lima: PRATEC.

Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. 2010. *Ch'ixinakax Utxiwa. Una reflexión sobre prácticas y discursos descolonizadores*. Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón.

———. 2015. *Sociología de la imagen. Miradas ch'ixi desde la historia andina*. Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1993. "Ilongot visiting: Social grace and the rhythms of everyday life." In *Creativity/Anthropology*, edited by Smadar Lavie, Kirin Narayan, and Renato Rosaldo, 253–69. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Stengers, Isabelle. 2005. "Introductory notes on an ecology of practices." *Cultural Studies Review* 11 (1): 183–96.

Stobart, Henry, and Rosaleen Howard, eds. 2002. *Knowledge and learning in the Andes: Ethnographic perspectives*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Strathern, Marilyn. 2012. "Response: A comment on 'the ontological turn' in Japanese anthropology." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2 (2): 402–405.

Temple, Dominique. 2003. *Teoría de la reciprocidad*, edited by Javier Medina and Jacqueline Michaux (3 vols.). La Paz: PADEP-GTZ.

Todd, Zoe, 2014. "Fish pluralities: Human–animal relations and sites of engagement in Paulatuuq, Arctic Canada." *Étude/Inuit/Studies* 38 (1–2): 217–38.

Tsing, Anna. 2019. Dialog "L'Écologie de l'attention," Chasselas, France, May 29. https://lamanufacturedidees.org

/2019/03/29/lecologie-de-lattention/, last accessed May 9, 2021.

Tsing, Anna, Heather Swanson, Elaine Gan, and Nils Bubandt, eds. 2017. *Arts of living on a damaged planet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2004. "Perspectival anthropology and the method of controlled equivocation." *Tipití* 2 (1): 3–22.

———. 2013. "The relative native." *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 3 (3): 469–71.

Yampara Huarachi, Simón. 2011. "Cosmovivencia Andina. Vivir y convivir en armonía integral—*suma qamaña*." *Bolivian Studies Journal* 18: 2–22.

Yampara, Simón, and Dominique Temple. 2008. *Matrices de civilización: sobre la teoría económica de los pueblos andinos*. La Paz: Ediciones Qamañ Pacha.

Yujra, Carlos. 2005. *Laq'a achachilanakan jach'a tayka amuyt'äwinakapa/Los grandes pensamientos de nuestros antepasados*. La Paz: C y C Editores.

Koen de Munter studied cultural anthropology in Belgium and has been doing fieldwork with Aymara families in Bolivia since 1995. He worked in anthropology departments at Ghent University (Belgium), Universidad de Tarapacá (Northern Chile), and is currently an Associated Professor at the Departamento de Antropología of Universidad Alberto Hurtado (Santiago de Chile). His main research interests are indigenous traditions in the Andes, anthropology of education, ecological anthropology, decolonial praxis, anthropology of life. At the present time he is coordinating, as Principal Investigator, the research project Fondecyt Regular 1190279 (Cosmopraxis Aymara y mundo relacional: "hacer familia" con vivos, muertos y wak'as, 2019–2023). A project website may be viewed at: www.uywanya.com.

Koen de Munter
koendemunter@ymail.com