

In response to the reviewers' comments, we have done the following revisions:

- We have changed the title to "The anthropology of romance and the romance of anthropology. Notes on ethnography, reflexivity, militancy and subversion"
- We have worked on a more explicit formulation of the concept of romanticism in the introduction, in order to avoid confusion on the correlations between romance and romanticism and highlight the *coincidencia oppositorum* (subversion) approach.
- We have attempted for a clearer explanation of why we connect love and romance with a romanticist ideology.
- We have complexified some of the debates and examples invoked throughout the text, in order to make our points clearer and also to avoid the idea of excessively quoting *en passant* and in an obscurantist manner. Namely, two sections: Victor Turner's engagement with an anthropology of experience; and Georges Balandier's personal trajectory and engagement with a militant anthropology.
- We have sent the piece to a copy-editor, who has checked the English and addressed several convoluted, obscure or unclear sections.
- We have tackled the following specific queries:

Reviewer A

- 1) He/she questioned our use of the idea of a 'mainstream anthropology', asking if such a thing exists. We have stressed that our understanding of anthropology is plural (see e.g. footnote 6).
- 2) There was also an observation concerning the possibly excessive use of bibliographic references in this article. We have eliminated unnecessary or accessory references; however, others have been added. We acknowledge that the amount of references may make it feel like a 'annual review' article. But we feel that this is inherent to the nature and argument of the article.
- 3) Finally, concerning the reference to the ultimate relevance of this article, we respond that our goal was to perform an 'intellectual history' of anthropology, but we have also stressed in our conclusions why we believe this is still a relevant issue for contemporary anthropology.

Reviewer B

- 1) He/she pointed out similar concerns as Reviewer A, concerning our working definition of 'romanticism' and our 'bibliographical strategy', addressed above.

2) A critical observation was made concerning our configuration of 'the romantic', asking: what is non-romantic? We tackle this in the conclusion.

Reviewer C

1) He/she suggests that we discuss in more depth Turner's engagement with an anthropology of experience (see above).

2) There was also an observation asking us to be more explicit in how we interconnect love and a non-utilitarian stance. We have addressed this in the introduction and in the section "On bullshit".

3) A language and style revision was also requested. We have addressed this throughout the text.