"shaking lodge ritual" as follows: "[It] features a recurring stock of characters, variable to some degree among different operators and different performances by the same operator. Many characters possess individuating speech characteristics, familiar to the audience from hearsay and from other performances. . . . Today, most spirits speak in Cree, and others use English, French, Saulteaux, and Chipewyan, or unknown human languages" (p. 172). "During the course of the performance, they [the spirits] conversed among themselves, with the operator, and with members of the audience outside, responding to questions either in known languages or in unintelligible speech requiring translation by other spirits or by the operator" (p. 171).

stress that they are taking proper care of the devaru (or apologizing for not giving more or moaning about not being able to give more, etc.) and complain that the devaru, in turn, do not take care of them (or not enough or not as in previous years, etc.). The devaru stress how much they care for Nayaka and request better hospitality (more offerings, an earlier start for the event, more dancing, etc.). The Nayaka request cures from illnesses.

The ordinary round of everyday affairs continues during the two days of the pandalu. Domestic chores are

not marginalized on account of the occasion but constitute a significant part of its structure. Throughout the two days, Nayaka families go on with their domestic activities, frequently sharing with each other and, in some ways, with their devaru visitors, too. The devaru hut resembles ordinary Nayaka dwellings. Some men occasionally take naps there, sharing the hut with the devaru. In the morning, when people go to wash in the river and bring back water, they bow in the four directions, inviting local devaru to join them. Women on their way back sprinkle water from their vessels in the four directions, sharing the water with devaru around. In the course of conversation devaru request betel-nuts from their Nayaka interlocutor. One elderly Nayaka woman falls into a trance. She does not utter coherent words; in her frenzy she only sweeps the ground around the devaru hut and starts to undress (which bystanders stop her from doing). A joint meal of rice, cooked by Kungan's daughter and her husband, brings the event to a close. The food is shared equally among those present, and some food is spread in the four directions.

The pandalu makes known the Nayaka-devaru relatednesses and at the same time reproduces them. Objectified as kinship relationships, the relatednesses reconstitute all the participants as *sonta* and each of them as a person (Nayaka person, hill person, stone person, etc.). Furthermore, the pandalu constitutes (in the Gibsonian sense) "aids to perceiving" that "put the viewer into the scene" (Gibson 1979: 282, cited above). It "educates the attention" to perceive and specify the environment (while engaging with it) in a relational way. The pandalu "preserves information" (as effectively as books and even motion pictures); moreover, it encourages the learner to engage interactively with this information and so to experience it socially. The engagement with devaru characters "educates the attention" to notice devaru *as they interact with* oneself. It improves the skill of picking up information about the engagement itself, within its confines, from an engaged viewpoint.

If Nayaka only *subsisted* by hunting and gathering in their environment, they might perceive only its utilitarian affordances: an animal as something edible; a stone as something throwable; a rock as something one can shelter under. Within the practice of engaging with devaru characters in the pandalu they are educated to pursue individual interests within the confines of a relatedness—to negotiate for what they need while simultaneously taking care to reproduce the framing relatedness within which they do so. From year upon year of conversations, which in part repeat themselves and in part change, participants are increasingly sensitized to pick up information on the emergent, processive, historical, and reciprocal qualities of relatednesses. In sum, we can say that the pandalu involves "*making* [devaru] alive," that is, raising people's awareness of their existence in-the-world and, dialectically, producing and being produced by this, socializing with them.

Animism as Relational Epistemology

Within the objectivist paradigm informing previous attempts to resolve the "animism" problem, it is hard to make sense of people's "talking with" things, or singing, dancing, or socializing in other ways for which "talking" is used here as shorthand. According to this paradigm, learning involves acquiring knowledge *of* things through the separation of knower and known and often, furthermore, by breaking the known down into its parts in order to know it. To study, say, the tropical forest—the kind of forest in which Nayaka live and with which they "talk"—botanists of this persuasion cut down a strip of trees with machetes, sort out the fallen vegetation into kinds, place characteristic bits and pieces of each kind in small bags, and take them out of the forest to a herbarium for botanical classification (see Richards 1952). Compared with their method, "talking with" trees seems a ritual with no possible connection to the serious business of acquiring knowledge of trees.

If "cutting trees into parts" epitomizes the modernist epistemology, "talking with trees," I argue, epitomizes Nayaka animistic epistemology. "Talking" is shorthand for a two-way responsive relatedness with a tree—rather than "speaking" one-way to it, as if it could listen and understand. "Talking with" stands for attentiveness to variances and invariances in behavior and response of things in states of relatedness and for getting to know such things as they change through the vicissitudes over time of the engagement with them. To "talk with a tree"—rather than "cut it down"—is to