Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 1998. 27:171–95
Copyright © 1998 by Annual Reviews. All rights reserved

WITTGENSTEIN AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Veena Das
Department of Anthropology, Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research, New York, New York 10003, and Department of Sociology, University of Delhi, Delhi 110007, India; e-mail cdedse@del2.vsnl.net.in

KEY WORDS: culture, language, rules, skepticism, everyday life

ABSTRACT

This essay explores the theme of Wittgenstein as a philosopher of culture. The primary text on which the essay is based is *Philosophical Investigations*; it treats Stanley Cavell's work as a major guide for the understanding and reception of Wittgenstein into anthropology. Some Wittgensteinian themes explored in the essay are the idea of culture as capability, horizontal and vertical limits to forms of life, concepts of everyday life in the face of skepticism, and the complexity of the inner in relation to questions of belief and pain. While an attempt has been made to relate these ideas to ethnographic descriptions, the emphasis in this essay is on the question of how anthropology may receive Wittgenstein.

INTRODUCTION

I wish to invite reflection in this paper on a certain kinship in the questions that Wittgenstein asks of his philosophy and the puzzles of anthropology. Consider his formulation—"A philosophical problem has the form: 'I don't know my way about'" (Wittgenstein 1953:para. 123). For Wittgenstein, then, philosophical problems have their beginnings in the feeling of being lost and in an unfamiliar place, and philosophical answers are in the nature of finding one's way back. This image of turning back, of finding not as moving forward as toward a goal but as being led back, is pervasive in the later writings of Wittgenstein. How can anthropology receive this way of philosophizing? Is there

0084-6570/98/1015-0171$08.00

something familiar in the feeling of being lost in anthropological experience? Wittgenstein's fear, "the seed I am likely to sow is a certain jargon" (Diamond 1976:293), is to be respected so that the translation of his ideas into anthropology should not be taken as the opportunity for merely a new set of terms. Instead of rendering a systematic account of any one aspect of his philosophy, I shall try to follow a few lines of thought that might interest anthropologists, hoping to convey the tones and sounds of Wittgenstein's words. My thought is not that this will help us reach new goals but that it might help us stop for a moment: to introduce a hesitancy in the way in which we habitually dwell among our concepts of culture, of everyday life, or of the inner. In this effort I am indebted to the work of Stanley Cavell, whose thoughts on several of these questions have acted like signposts in my own efforts to move within *Philosophical Investigations*.

THE PICTURE OF CULTURE

Definitions

In his recent, passionate work on the "anthropography" of violence, Daniel (1997) is moved to say, "Anthropology has had an answer to the question, What is a human being? An answer that has, on the whole, served us well, with or without borrowings from philosophers. The answer keeps returning to one form or another of the concept of culture: humans have it; other living beings do not" (p. 194). He goes on to discuss how Tylor's (1974) founding definition of culture helped to move it away from the "clutches of literature, philosophy, classical music, and the fine arts—in other words, from the conceit of the Humanities" (Daniel 1997:194). Let us consider for a moment the actual definition proposed by Tylor: "Culture or civilization taken in its widest ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (Tylor 1974:1). What is interesting in this definition is not only the all-inclusive nature of culture but also the reference to it as capability and habit acquired by man as a member of society. As Asad (1990) has noted, this notion of culture with its enumeration of capabilities and habits, as well as the focus on learning, gave way in time to the idea of culture as *text* "that is as something resembling an inscribed text" (p. 171). Within this dominant notion of culture as text, the process of learning came to be seen as shaping the individual body as a picture of this text, inscribing memory often through painful rituals so that the society and culture of which the individual is a member is made present, so to say, on the surface of the body (Clasteres 1974, Das 1995a, Durkheim 1976). The scene of instruction in Wittgenstein (1953) is entirely different.

Scenes of Instruction

Philosophical Investigations begins with an evocation of the words of Augustine in *Confessions*. This opening scene has been the object of varying interpretations. The passage reads as follows:

> When they (my elders) named some object, and accordingly moved towards something, I saw this and grasped that the thing they called was the sound they uttered when they meant to point it out. Their intention was shewn by their bodily movements, as it were the natural language of all peoples: the expression of the face, the play of the eyes, the movement of other parts of the body, and the tone of voice which expresses our state of mind in seeking, having, or avoiding something. Thus as I heard words repeatedly used in their proper places in various sentences, I gradually learnt to understand what objects they signified; and after I had trained my mouth to form these signs, I used them to express my own desires. (Wittgenstein 1953:para. 1)

Stanley Cavell (1982, 1990), who has given the most sustained reading of this passage, senses here the presence of the child who moves invisible among his or her elders and who must divine speech for himself or herself, training the mouth to form signs so that he or she may use these signs to express his or her own desires. Now contrast this scene of instruction with the famous builders' scene, which follows soon after in Wittgenstein (1953:para. 2):

> Let us imagine a language for which the description given by Augustine is right. The language is meant to serve for communication between a builder A and an assistant B. A is building with building stones: there are blocks, pillars, slabs, and beams. B has to pass the stones, and that in order in which A needs them. For this purpose they use a language consisting of the words "block", "pillar", "slab", "beam". A calls them out; B brings the stone which he has learnt to bring at such-and-such a call.—Conceive this as a complete primitive language.

If we transpose the scene of instruction in which the child moves among the adults with that of the builders, we might see that even if the child were to use only four words, these may be uttered with charm, curiosity, a sense of achievement. The child has a future in language. The builders' language is, in a way, closed. Wittgenstein wills us to conceive of this as a "complete primitive language." Yet as Cavell (1995) points out, there is no standing language game for imagining what Wittgenstein asks us to imagine here. It has been noted often enough that Wittgenstein does not call upon any of the natural languages from which he could have taken his examples: Thus his game in this section—whether with reference to the child or the dreamlike sequence by which one might arrive at an "understanding" of what the words five red apples mean or with reference to the builders' language—is in the nature of a fiction through which his thoughts may be maintained in the region of the primitive. But the "primitive" here is conceived as the builders' tribe, which seems bereft

of the possession of its culture or of an undoubted shared language—the language the tribe uses is invented language, not to be confused either with the natural languages found among people who maintain full forms of sociality or with the language of the child.

Wittgenstein's sense of the child who moves about in his or her culture unseen by the elders and who has to inherit his or her culture as if by theft appears to find resonance in the anthropological literature in the register of the mythological [for instance, in the bird nester myths analyzed by Lévi-Strauss (1969)]. Despite the studies on socialization, rarely has the question of how one comes to a sense of a shared culture as well as one's own voice in that culture in the context of everyday life been addressed anthropologically. If asked at all, this question has been formulated as a question of socialization as obedience to a set of normative rules and procedures. But juxtaposing the child with the builders seems to suggest that whatever else it may be, the inheritance of culture is not about inheriting a certain set of rules or a certain capacity to obey orders. As Wittgenstein (1953:para. 3) says, "Augustine does describe a system of communication: only not everything we call language is this system." And then, as if the surest route to understand this concept is to understand it through the eyes of the child, he points out that the words in a gamelike ring-a-ring-a-roses are to be understood as *both the words and the actions in which they are woven* (Wittgenstein 1953:para. 7).

Concern with childhood in early anthropological literature has not been absent but has been expressed through the intricacies of age ranking, rites of passage, attitudes toward someone called "the average child," and the construction of "childhood" in a given society. Both Nieuwenhuys (1996) and Reynolds (1995) have recently shown how sparse the ethnographic descriptions of children and their agency have been. Reynolds's (1995) work on political activism of children and youth in the volatile and traumatic context of South Africa is special because she shows how tales of folk heroes might have provided a perspective to young people with which to view their defiance of the regime of apartheid even as they had to negotiate questions of obedience, authority, and kinship solidarity within the domains of family and kinship. I would also draw attention to the remarkable account by Gilsenan (1996) and to Das (1990b,c) and Chatterji & Mehta (1995) on the complicated question of what it is for children to inherit the obligation to exact vengeance, to settle for peace, or to bear witness in a feud or in the aftermath of a riot. Claims over inheritance are not straightforward in these contexts, but even in relatively stable societies, anthropological descriptions of culture as either shared or contested have excluded the voice of the child. As in Augustine's passage, the child seems to move about unseen by its elders.

Let me go on to the question that the figure of the child raises here: What is it to say that the child has a future in language?

There are several scenes of instruction in *Philosophical Investigations*—those pertaining to completing a mathematical series, those pertaining to reading, those pertaining to obeying an order. All raise the issue of what it is to be able to project a concept or a word or a procedure into new situations. "A" writes down a series of numbers; "B" watches him and tries to find a law for the sequence of numbers. If he succeeds, he exclaims, "Now I can go on." What has happened here?

One powerful way of understanding what gives a child the confidence to say "I can go on" is provided by Kripke (1982) with the example of what it is to follow a mathematical procedure or a rule. He points out that Wittgenstein shows convincingly that we cannot speak of an inner understanding having occurred; nor can we say that there are some basic rules that can tell us how to interpret the other rules. Here is how the problem appears to Kripke (1982:17):

> Here of course I am expounding Wittgenstein's well known remarks about a "rule for interpreting a rule". It is tempting to answer the skeptic from appealing from one rule to another more 'basic' rule. But the skeptical move can be repeated at the more basic level also. Eventually the process must stop—"justifications come to an end somewhere"—and I am left with a rule which is completely unreduced to any other. How can I justify my present application of such a rule, when a skeptic could easily interpret it so as to yield any of an indefinite number of other results? It seems my application of it is an unjustified stab in the dark. I apply the rule *blindly*.

Without going into this argument in any detail, I want to comment on one formulation that is proposed by Kripke (1982):, that our justification for saying that a child has learned how to follow a rule comes from the confidence that being a member of a community allows the individual person to act "unhesitatingly but blindly." Kripke (1982) gives the example of a small child learning addition and says that it is obvious that his teacher will not accept just any response from the child. So what does one mean when one says that the teacher judges that, for certain cases, the pupil must give the "right" answer? "I mean that the teacher judges that the child has given the same answer that he himself would have given. . . . I mean that he judges that the child is applying the same procedure he himself would have applied" (Kripke 1982:90).

For Kripke (1982) this appeal to community and to criteria of agreement is presented in Wittgenstein as a solution to the "skeptical paradox"—that if everything can be made out to be in accord with a rule, then it can also be made to conflict with it. But this skepticism with regard to justification, says Kripke (1982), applies to the isolated individual: It does not hold for one who can apply unhesitatingly but blindly a rule that the community *licenses* him or her to apply. As with application of a word in future contexts, there is no "inner state" called "understanding" that has occurred. Instead, as he says, there are language games in our lives that license under certain conditions assertions that

someone means such and such and that his present application accords with what was said in the past.

My discomfort with this description arises from the centrality that Kripke (1982) places on the notion of rule as well as from the processes he privileges for bringing the child in agreement with a particular form of life that would license such blind and unhesitating obedience to the rule.

If we take the teacher in Kripke (1982) to be the representative of the community within which the child is being initiated, then I am compelled to ask whether the "agreement" in a form of life that makes the community a community of consent can be purely a matter of making the child arrive at the same conclusion or the same procedure that the adult would have applied. Rather, it appears to me that as suggested by Cavell (1990), this agreement is a much more complicated affair in which there is an entanglement of rules, customs, habits, examples, and practices and that we cannot attach salvational importance to any one of these in questions pertaining to the inheritance of culture. Wittgenstein (1953) speaks about orders or commands in several ways: There is the gulf between the order and its execution or the translation of an order one time into a proposition and another time into a demonstration and still another time into action. I do not have the sense that the agreement in forms of life requires the child to produce the same response that the teacher does. To have a future in language, the child should have been enabled to say "and after I had trained my mouth to form these signs, I used them to express my own desires." There is of course the reference in Wittgenstein (1953:para. 219) to following a rule blindly.

> "All the steps are already taken" means: I no longer have any choice. The rule, once stamped with a particular meaning, traces the line along which it is to be followed through the whole of space,—But if something of this sort really were the case, how would it help?
>
> No; my description only made sense of it was to be understood symbolically.—I should have said: *This is how it strikes me* [emphasis in the original].
>
> When I obey a rule, I do not chose.
>
> I obey the rule *blindly* [emphasis in the original].

And then in paragraph 221, he explains, "My symbolical expression was really a mythological description of the rule." I cannot take up fully the question here of what it is to speak mythologically or symbolically, but from the aura that surrounds the discussion of these issues, speaking of obeying a rule blindly seems to be similar to the way one speaks of wishes, plans, suspicions, or expectations as, by definition, unsatisfied or the way one speaks of propositions as necessarily true or false, that is, that they are grammatical statements. When Wittgenstein (1953) talks about rules and agreement being cousins, the kinship between them seems more complicated than Kripke's (1982) rendering of either of these two concepts allows.

I want to take an ethnographic vignette now to show the entanglement of the ideas of rule, custom, habit, practice, and example in what might be seen as constituting agreement within a particular form of life. Gilsenan (1996) has given us a stunning ethnography of violence and narrative in Akkar, a northern province of Lebanon, in the 1970s. From the several narratives in this text, one can infer the rules by which issues of vengeance and honor are articulated in the exchange of violence. Indeed, if one reads Evans-Pritchard (1940) on the feud among the Nuer, it all seems like a matter of kinship obligations that can be stated in terms of clear genealogical principles through which feuds are organized. One could imagine that a male child being socialized into such a society could be taught his place in the community in terms of *rules* that he learns, much as Kripke's child learns to follow the same procedures as the adults who are initiating him if he is to learn how to add. But here are sketches from a story from Gilsenan (1996:165–66) of how a boy becomes a man even as he is being initiated into the rules of vengeance.

> **. . .** the chosen young man walked, alone and in broad daylight, up the steep hill separating the quarters of the fellahins and the aghas. . . . Everyone could see him, a fact much insisted upon in accounts. At the top of the hill, he approached the small ill provisioned shop owned by Ali Bashir who was standing at the entrance looking on to the saha (public space) before him . . . the boy simply said to him: "Do you want it here in the shop or outside?" Ali ran back inside, grabbed the gun, and was shot in the wrist, his weapon falling to the ground. The killer then emptied his revolver into Ali's chest. He died instantly.
>
> Turning his back on those fellahin who had witnessed his deed, the killer—and now hero—walked back down the hill. . . . All agreed that he presented his back to the enemies in a grand disregard for his own safety. No one dared retaliate.
>
> This archetypal *geste* of agnostic indifference filled every requirement of the heroic act. He was superb in exit as he had been on entry. The aesthetics of violence were in all respects harmoniously achieved.
>
> My informants all remembered that the senior of their number, a renowned hunter, companion of the lords, and also a paternal half-brother of the wounded man, hailed the young hero when he came down to the lower mosque at the entrance of the village exclaiming: "Ya `aish! Reja`it shabb!" (Long may you live! You have returned a man!). He saluted one who had gone up the hill a boy and come down a true, arms bearing young man.

Some may argue that the scene of the instruction in Kripke (1982) bears little resemblance to the scene in which this young man is chosen by the elders as the appropriate instrument of revenge. (But then is the example of learning a procedure for solving a mathematical problem a good analogy for what it is to obey rules—a particularly clarifying one, as Kripke claims?) As for the young boy, it is his display of the aesthetics of violence that makes him a man. No one can say that he acted exactly as the elder would have acted in his place, for such

scenes are also marked by contingencies of all kinds in which one might end up not a hero but a buffoon. Yet it is through the entanglement of rule, custom, habit, and example that the child has not only been initiated in the community of men but has also found his own style of being a man. In fact, the aftermath of the story of this young hero converts him into a source of danger, always looking for some replication of the originating moment of his public biography, and who finally dies in a quarrel as if he were predestined to have such a death. A consideration of that event would take us into a different region of Wittgenstein's thought: the region of the dangers that the otherness of this hero posed for the rest of the community.

Anthropological accounts have suggested that attention to Wittgenstein's discussion on rules and especially the distinction between regulative rules and constitutive rules, as suggested by Searle (1969), may give new direction to questions of how to distinguish the nature of prescriptions in ritual actions and other kind of actions. Humphrey & Laidlaw (1994) have not only written a fascinating account of the Jain ritual of *puja* (worship), they have also argued that what is distinctive about ritual prescriptions in general is the constitutive nature of rules that go to define rituals.

> Constitutive rituals create a form of activity, by defining the actions of which it is composed. We pointed out that ritualized action is composed of discrete acts which are disconnected from agents' intentions and we said that this feature of ritualization depends upon stipulation. It is this stipulation, as distinct from mere regulation which is constitutive of ritual. Only ritual acts (like valid moves in chess) count as having happened, so the celebrant moves from act to act, completing each in turn and then moving on to the next. This is unaffected by delays, false moves, extraneous happenings, or mishaps. (Humphrey & Laidlaw 1994:117)

They use this distinction then to show the wide variation in the ways of performing the ritual act of *puja*, which are nevertheless considered right by the participants because they may be said to accord with the constitutive rules. The importance of this formulation is not only that it breaks away from the distinctions between instrumental action and expressive action, or from the overdetermined view of ritual as a form of communication, but also that it addresses some puzzling features of ritual observations that are often ironed out of final ethnographic texts. I refer to the kinds of mundane activities that may be carried on during a ritual but are nevertheless not seen as constitutive of the ritual and hence can be ignored in judgments about "rightness" of a ritual act.

There is an explicit analogy in Humphrey & Laidlaw's (1994) discussion of the constitutive rules of ritual and of chess. Wittgenstein's (1953) observations on chess may be pertinent here. He has talked not only about the *rules* that constitute the game but also *customs*—for example, the use of the king to decide by lots which player gets white in drawing lots (para. 563) or not stamping and

yelling while making the moves (para. 200). But Wittgenstein leads us to a different direction, one in which the entanglement of rules with customs, practices, and examples comes to the fore: "Where is the connection effected between the sense of the expression 'Lets play a game of chess' and all the rules of the game?—Well, in the list of rules of the game, in the teaching of it, in the day-to-day practice of playing" (para. 197). Wittgenstein used the analogy of a chess game to illuminate what it means for language to be governed by rules. In both language and chess there are rules that have no foundation, that is, the rules cannot be justified by reference to reality: They are autonomous, and they could be different. But there are limits to this analogy. The most important difference, as pointed out by Baker & Hacker (1980), is that the rules of chess are devised to cover every possible situation whereas our language cannot lay down the rules that will cover every conceivable circumstance. Hence there is always a gap between the rule and its execution. Could we say that the constitutive rules of ritual can cover every conceivable circumstance? I suggest that while this is sometimes the ambition of the theoreticians of ritual, as the *mimamsa* school of Indian philosophy claimed (see Das 1983), the embedding of ritual in the forms of life do not allow for this. In fact a situation of completeness would make ritual like the invented languages of Wittgenstein rather than the natural languages, which are never complete (Wittgenstein 1953:para. 18).

Baker & Hacker (1980) suggest that natural language games may be distinguished from invented ones by the fact that the former are mastered only in fragments while the latter are presented as complete languages. The feeling in reading about the builders' language is that they seemed particularly bereft of culture. I suggest it comes precisely from thinking of their language as if it were complete.

An anthropological text, we know, is marked by a certain kind of excess or a certain surplus. Call it thick ethnography, call it fascination with detail. Most ethnographies provide more than the theoretical scaffolding requires. It has been argued by some that this excess is embedded in the emplotment of ethnography as a performance (Clifford 1990). Others have spoken of the difficulty of portraying ways of life that are "experience distant" to their readers (Scheper-Hughes 1992). I suggest that this excess or this surplus expresses equally the distrust of formal rules and obligations as sources of social order or moral judgment. If culture is a matter of shared ways of life as well as of bequeathing and inheriting capabilities and habits as members of society, then clearly it is participation in forms of sociality (Wittgenstein's forms of life) that define simultaneously the inner and the outer, that allow a person to speak both within language and outside it. Agreement in forms of life, in Wittgenstein, is never a matter of shared opinions. It thus requires an excess of description to capture the entanglements of customs, habits, rules, and examples. It provides the context in which we could see how we are to trace words back to

their original homes when we do not know our way about: The anthropological quest takes us to the point at which Wittgenstein takes up his grammatical investigation. It seems a natural point to break here and inquire into what are "forms of life," "criteria," and "grammatical investigation" in Wittgenstein.

LANGUAGE AND SOCIALITY

Forms of Life

The idea of forms of life is what has often been taken to signal the availability of Wittgenstein's thought for sociology and anthropology. Wittgenstein takes language to be the mark of human sociality: Hence human forms of life are defined by the fact that they are forms created by and for those who are in possession of language. As it is commonly understood, Wittgenstein's notion of language is to see it in the context of a lived life, its use within human institutions rather than its systematic aspects. But is this enough? Cavell (1989) has expressed anguish at the conventional views of this text, which in his understanding eclipse its spiritual struggle.

> The idea [of forms of life] is, I believe, typically taken to emphasize the social nature of human language and conduct, as if Wittgenstein's mission is to rebuke philosophy for concentrating too much on isolated individuals, or for emphasizing the inner at the expense of the outer, in accounting for such matters as meaning, or states of consciousness, or following a rule etc. . . . A conventionalized sense of form of life will support a conventionalized, or contractual sense of agreement. But there is another sense of form of life that will contest this. (Cavell 1989:41)

What Cavell finds wanting in this conventional view of forms of life is that it is not able to convey the mutual absorption of the natural and the social—it emphasizes *form* but not *life*. A hasty reading of Cavell on this point may lead readers (especially anthropologists) to the conclusion that the idea of natural is taken as unproblematic in this interpretation. Let me dwell for a moment on this point. Cavell suggests a distinction between what he calls the ethnological or horizontal sense of form of life and its vertical or "biological" sense. The first captures the notion of human diversity—the fact that social institutions, such as marriage and property, vary across societies. The second refers to the distinctions captured in language itself between "so-called 'lower' or 'higher' forms of life, between say poking at your food, perhaps with a fork, and pawing at it or pecking at it" (Cavell 1989:42). It is the vertical sense of the form of life that he suggests marks the limit of what is considered human in a society and provides the conditions of the use of criteria as applied to others. Thus the criteria of pain does not apply to that which does not exhibit signs of being a form of life—we do not ask whether a tape recorder that can be turned on to play a shriek is feeling the pain. Cavell suggests that the forms of life have to

be accepted but that it is in the sensibility of *Investigations* to call not so much for change as for transfiguration. I am going to leave aside, for the moment, the relevance of this question for or against skepticism. Instead I want to point to a direction in which this distinction between the horizontal and the vertical may also show what happens at the limit of each. What is it that human societies can represent as the limit? Here I draw from some of my own work to show how such an idea may strike a chord on the keys of anthropological imagination.

For some years now I have been engaged in trying to understand the relation between violence (especially sexual violence) in everyday domestic contexts and violence in the extraordinary context of riots during political events, such as the Partition of India or the violence against Sikhs following the assassination of then prime minister Indira Gandhi. In one of my recent papers (Das 1996) I have tried to conceptualize the violence that occurs within the weave of life as lived in the kinship universe, as having the sense of a *past continuous*, while the sudden and traumatic violence that was part of the Partition experience seems to have a quality of frozen time to it. In discussing the life of a woman, Manjit, who had been abducted and raped during the Partition and subsequently married to an elderly relative, I argued that while the violence she was submitted to by her husband was something sayable in her life, the other violence was not (could not be?) articulated. The horizontal and vertical limits seemed to me to be particularly important in formulating this difference.

> It is this notion of form of life, i.e. its vertical sense of testing the criteria of what it is to be human, that I think is implicated in the understanding of Manjit's relation to the non-narrative of her experience of abduction and rape. Men beat up their wives, commit sexual aggression, shame them in their own self creations of masculinity—but such aggression is still "sayable" in Punjabi life through various kinds of performative gestures and through story telling (I do not mean to say that it is therefore passively accepted—indeed the whole story of Manjit shows that it is deeply resented). Contrast this with the fantastic violence in which women were stripped and marched naked in the streets; or the magnitudes involved; or the fantasy of writing political slogans on the private parts of women. This production of bodies through a violence that was seen to tear apart the very fabric of life, was such that claims over culture through disputation became impossible. If words now appear, they are like broken shadows of the motion of everyday words. . . . Such words were indeed uttered and have been recorded by other researchers, but it was as if one's touch with these words and hence with life itself had been burnt or numbed. The hyperbolic in Manjit's narration of the Partition recalls Wittgenstein's sense of the conjunction of the hyperbolic with the groundless. (Das 1996:23)

I have taken this example in some detail because it suggests, through means of an ethnography, that while the range and scale of the human is tested and defined and extended in the disputations proper to everyday life, it may move through the unimaginable violence of the Partition (but similar examples are to

be found in many contemporary ethnographies of violence) into forms of life that are seen as not belonging to life proper. Was it a man or a machine that plunged a knife into the private parts of a woman after raping her? Were those men or animals who went around killing and collecting penises as signs of their prowess? There is a deep moral energy in the refusal to represent some violations of the human body, for these violations are seen as being against nature, as defining the limits of life itself. The precise range and scale of the human form of life is not knowable in advance, any more than the precise range of the meaning of a word is knowable in advance. But the intuition that some violations cannot be verbalized in everyday life is to recognize that work cannot be performed on these within the burned and numbed everyday. We reach through a different route the question of what it is to have a future in language. I believe that the limits of the forms of life—the limits at which the differences cease to be criterial differences—are encountered in the context of life as it is lived and not only in the philosopher's reflections on it. These are the times in which one may be so engulfed by doubts of the other's humanity that the whole world may appear to be lost.

In his work on violence, Daniel (1997) calls this point the counterpoint of culture: "The counterpoint I speak of is something that resists incorporation into the harmony of a still higher order of sound, sense, or society" (p. 202). Other accounts of violence similarly suggest that certain kinds of violence cannot be incorporated into the everyday (Langer 1991, 1997; Lawrence 1995): But then how is everyday life to be recovered?

Everyday Life and the Problem of Skepticism

In describing what he calls the counterpoint to culture, Daniel (1997) interviewed several young men in Sri Lanka who were members of various militant movements and who had killed with ropes, knives, pistols, automatic fire, and grenades. But it is clear from his powerful descriptions that what was traumatic for Daniel in hearing these accounts of killings was the manner in which the styles of killing and the wielding of words was interwoven. Here are some extracts.

> He was hiding in the temple when we got there. . . . This boy was hiding behind some god. We caught him. Pulled him out. . . The boy was in the middle of the road. We were all going round and round him. For a long time. No one said anything. Then someone flung at him with a sword. Blood started gushing out. . . . We thought he was finished. So they piled him on the tyre and then set it aflame. (Daniel 1997:209)

Daniel finds the shifting between the we and the they to be noteworthy, but what stuns him is the next thing that happened.

> This was the early days of my horror story collecting and I did not know what to say. So I asked him a question of absolute irrelevance to the issue at hand.

> Heaven knows why I asked it; I must have desperately wanted to change the subject or pretend that we had been talking about something else all along. "What is your goal in life?" I asked. The reply shot right back: "I want a video (VCR)." (Daniel 1997:209)

Wittgenstein's sense of exile of words is what comes to mind here. It is not that one cannot understand the utterance but that in this context when these words are spoken, they seem not to belong—they seem not to have a home. Daniel's (1997) turning away from this event is a desperate one. He lurches toward a hope (p. 211)—the rustle of a hope—wherever it may be found and whenever it may be found. And it is found in a scene of almost quiet domesticity. He recounts an event in the 1977 anti-Tamil riots in which a Sinhala woman is journeying on a train; she is in one part of the compartment, and on another seat is a retired Tamil schoolteacher. A mob began to drag out Tamils and to beat them. The Sinhala woman, recognizable easily as a Kandyan Sinhalese because of the way she wore her *sari,* moved over to his side and quietly held his hand. Some members of the mob entered the compartment, but the gesture of conjugal familiarity persuaded them that the gentleman was a Sinhala, so they proceeded elsewhere. Daniel (1997) thinks of the gesture of the woman as a sign, gravid with possibilities. But what are these possibilities? From a Wittgensteinian perspective, these seem to be only possibilities of recovery through a descent into the ordinariness of everyday life, of domesticity, through which alone the words that have been exiled may be brought back. This everydayness is then in the nature of a return—one that has been recovered in the face of madness.

The intuition of everydayness in Wittgenstein appears therefore quite different from, say, that of Schutz (1970), who emphasizes the attention to the "paramount reality" of the everyday and conceptualizes transcendence as momentary escapes from these attentions. It is also different from the many attempts made in recent years to capture the idea of the everyday as a site of resistance (Jeffery & Jeffery 1996; Scott 1985, 1990). My sense of these approaches is that there is a search in these attempts for what Hans Joas (1996) calls the creativity of social action. Rather than searching for agency in great and transgressive moments of history, it is in the everyday scripts of resistance that it is thought to be located. There is nothing wrong with this way of conceptualizing the everyday, for it has the advantage of showing society to be constantly made rather than given. The problem is that the notion of the everyday is too easily secured in these ethnographies because they hardly ever consider the temptations and threats of skepticism as part of the lived reality and hence do not tell us what is the stake in the everyday that they discovered.

In Cavell's (1984, 1988, 1990) rendering of Wittgenstein's appeal to the everyday, it is found to be a pervasive scene of illusion and trance and artificiality of need. This, to my understanding and experience, is because both the temptations and threats of skepticism are taken out from the study of the phi-

losopher and reformulated as questions about what it is to live in the face of the unknowability of the world (for my purposes especially the social world). Let me depart for the moment from the kinds of scenes of violence that have been described by Das (1990b, 1995a,b, 1997), Daniel (1997), Langer (1991, 1997), Lawrence (1995), and many others. These scenes may appear exceptional to many. Instead, I ask, is the sense of the unknowability of the social world also encountered in other contexts, in the context of normal suffering, so to speak? Some scholars suggest that this unknowability of the social world has been made more acute by the processes of modernity or globalization (see Appadurai 1996:158–78), whereas my sense is that uncertainty of relations is part of human sociality as it is embedded within certain weaves of social life (Das & Bajwa 1994). But let me take my example from an anthropological classic.

Evans-Pritchard's (1937) account of witchcraft among the Azande has often been seen as that society's way of dealing with misfortune rather than with the essential unknowability of other minds. For instance, Taussig (1992) has written,

> To cite the common phraseology, science like medical science, can explain the "how" and not the "why" of disease; it can point to chains of physical cause and effect, but as to why I am struck down now rather than at some other time, or as to why it is me rather than someone else, medical science can only respond with some variety of probability theory which is unsatisfactory to the mind which is searching for certainty and for significance. In Azande practice, the issue of "how" and "why" are folded into one another; etiology is simultaneously physical, social, and moral. . . . My disease is a social relation, and therapy has to address that synthesis of moral, social, and physical presentation. (p. 85)

It is true that Evans-Pritchard (1937) veered in several directions in accounting for the Azande beliefs in witchcraft, including questions about the rationality of the Azande. If we pay some attention to the descriptions that he provides, however, we find not so much a search for certainty and significance, but rather a shadow of skepticism regarding other minds (Chaturvedi 1998). Moreover, this skepticism seems to have something to do with the manner in which language is deployed.

Evans-Pritchard (1937) reports that those who speak in a roundabout manner and are not straightforward in their conversation are suspected of witchcraft: "Azande are very sensitive and usually in the lookout for unpleasant allusions to themselves in apparently harmless conversation" (p. 111). Very often they find double meaning in a conversation (p. 116) and assume that harm would be done to them, as in the following instance recounted by Evans-Pritchard shows:

> An old friend of mine, Badobo of the Akowe clan, remarked to his companions who were cleaning up the government road around the settlement that he

> had a found a stump of wood over which Tupoi had stumbled and cut himself a few days previously when he had been returning late at night from a beer feast. Badobo added to his friends that they must clear the road well, as it would never do for so important a man as Tupoi to stumble and fall if they could help it. One of Tupoi's friends heard this remark and repeated it to his father who professed to see a double meaning in it and to find a sarcastic nuance in Badobo's whole behaviour. (pp. 115–16)

A pervasive uncertainty of relations is indicated by many factors: the Azande aphorism "One cannot see into a man as into an open woven basket"; the Azande belief that one cannot be certain that anyone is free from witchcraft; and the care that a Zande man takes not to anger his wives gratuitously because one of them may be a witch and by offending her he may bring misfortune on his head. And although a Zande would not state that he is a witch, Evans-Pritchard (1937) reports that one may know nothing about the fact of one's own witchcraft (p. 123). Uncertainty about other minds here is linked to a certain alienation from the language that one speaks, as if the language always revealed either more or less than the words spoken. Indeed it is the intimate knowledge of how Azande converse and interpret one another's meanings that Evans-Pritchard (1937) considers important to an understanding of how attributions of witchcraft are made: "Once a person has been dubbed a witch anything he says may be twisted to yield a secret meaning. Even when there is no question of witchcraft Azande are always on the look-out for double meaning in their conversations" (p. 131). Here we have the intuition of the humans as if one of the aspects under which they could be seen is as victims of language that could reveal things about them of which they were themselves unaware.

This idea touches upon the Wittgensteinian theme of language as experience (and not simply as message). He takes examples of punning, or of a feel for spelling: If you did not experience the meaning of words (as distinct from only using them), then how could you laugh at a pun? The sense is of being controlled by the words one speaks or hears or sees rather than of controlling them. There is some similarity to Austin's (1975) concerns with performatives especially with perlocutionary force.

A context that I consider decisive for understanding these themes is that of panic rumor. I shall take the example of anthropological studies of rumor to show how the theme of the unknowability of the social world and the theme of humans becoming victims to words come to be connected. Although rumor is not an example that figures in Wittgenstein, I propose that one may find connections in the way in which there is a withdrawal of trust from words and a special vulnerability to the signifier in the working of rumor and the exile of words under skepticism.

Several historians and anthropologists have emphasized the role of rumor in mobilizing crowds (Rudé 1959, 1964; Thompson 1971). Historians of the

subaltern school have seen it as a special form of subaltern communication, "a necessary instrument of rebel transmission" (Guha 1983:256). Other characteristics of rumor identified by Guha (1983) are the anonymity of the source of rumor, its capacity to build solidarity, and the overwhelming urge it prompts in listeners to pass it on to others. The excessive emphasis on communication, however, obscures the particular feature of language that is often brought to the fore when we consider the susceptibility to rumor during times of collective violence (Das 1990a,b, 1998; Tambiah 1996). Bhabha (1995) has posed the question in an incisive manner: What is special to rumor as distinct from other forms of communication? He goes on to isolate two of its aspects. The first is rumor's enunciative aspect, and the second its performative aspect. "The indeterminacy of rumour," he says, "constitutes its importance as a social discourse. Its intersubjective, communal adhesiveness lies in its enunciative aspect. Its performative power of circulation results in its contiguous spreading, an almost uncontrollable impulse to pass it on to another person" (p. 201). He concludes that psychic affect and social fantasy are potent forms of potential identification and agency for guerrilla warfare and hence rumors play a major role in mobilization for such warfare.

Other views of rumor, especially those derived from mass psychology, have emphasized the emotional, capricious, temperamental, and flighty nature of crowds (Le Bon 1960). Something common in these situations is an essential grammatical feature (in Wittgenstein's sense) of what we call rumor: that it is conceived to spread. Thus while images of contagion and infection are used to represent rumor in elite discourse, the use of these images is not simply a matter of the elite's noncomprehension of subaltern forms of communication. It also speaks to the transformation of language; namely, that instead of being a medium of communication, language becomes communicable, infectious, causing things to happen almost as if they had occurred by nature. In my own work on rumor in a situation of mounting panic of communal riots, I have identified the presence of an incomplete or interrupted social story that comes back in the form of rumor and an altered modality of communication (Das 1998). The most striking feature of what I identify as panic rumors (in which it is difficult to locate any innocent bystanders) is that suddenly the access to context seems to disappear. In addition, there is an absence of signature in panic rumors so that rumor works to destroy both the source of speech and the trustworthiness of convention. (This characteristic seems to distinguish perlocutionary force from illocutionary force. In the latter, trust in convention and law allows promises to be made and marriages to be contracted.) Cavell (1982) has invoked *Othello* as the working out of a skeptical problematic. The mounting panic in which the medium of rumor leads to the dismantling of relations of trust at times of communal riots seems to share the tempo of skepticism. Once a thought of a certain vulnerability is lost, as Cavell shows (1982, 1994), the world is engulfed without limit.

Unlike Cavell, Williams (1996) considers skeptical doubts to be unnatural doubts. He holds that the experience that we know nothing about the real world has to arise from a particularly striking experience of error. Yet no experience of error, he argues, can give us a feel of a total loss of the world. The threat of skepticism for Cavell lies in our feeling that our sensations may not be of this world: But for Williams this threat arises in the philosophizing of Cavell because he has internalized a contentious theoretical view. Cavell, on the other hand, suggests in all his work that skeptical doubt arises in the experience of living. Skepticism is for him a site on which we abdicate our responsibility toward words—unleashing them from our criteria. Hence his theme of disappointment with language as a human institution (Cavell 1994). The site of panic rumor suggests similarly a subjection to voice (comparable to Schreber's subjection to the voices he heard). There seems a transformation from social exchange to communal trance, and if this trance is to be resisted, one has to lead works back to the everyday, much as one might lead a horse gone suddenly wild to its stables.

COMPLEXITY OF THE INNER

It might be tempting to suppose that the unknowability of the social world essentially relates to the unknowability of the other. But the question of skepticism in Wittgenstein does not posit an essential asymmetry between what I know about myself and what I know about the other. His famous arguments against the possibility of a private language is not that we need shared experience of language to be communicable to one another but that without such a sharing I will become incommunicable to myself. The inner for Wittgenstein is thus not an externalized outer—there is no such thing as a private inner object to which a private language may be found to give expression. This view is not to be construed as Wittgenstein's denial of the inner but rather that inner states are, as he says, in need of outward criteria (Johnston 1993, Schulte 1993). Thus what appear often in our language as intrinsic differences between different kinds of inner states are basically grammatical differences in disguise. Part II of *Philosophical Investigations* begins with the following:

> One can imagine an animal angry, frightened, unhappy, happy, startled, but hopeful? And why not?
>
> A dog believes his master is at the door. But can he also believe his master will come day after to-morrow? And *what* can he not do here?—How do I do it?—How am I supposed to answer this?
>
> Can only those hope who can talk? Only those who have mastered the use of a language? That is to say, the phenomena of hope are modes of this complicated form of life. (Wittgenstein 1953:174)

The reference to language here is obviously not to suggest that those who have mastered the use of a language have acquired the logical skills necessary to express hope but rather that grammar tells us what kinds of objects hope and grief are. Thus the inner states are not distinguished by some reference to content but by the way we imagine something like an inner state for creatures complicated enough to possess language (and hence culture). I would like to illustrate this idea with reference to the discussion of belief and then follow the illustration with a discussion on pain.

Belief

The question of belief in *Philosophical Investigations* appears as the asymmetry between the use of first-person indicative and third-person indicative. Two observations in the second part of this text are crucial. The first is "If there were a verb meaning to believe falsely it would not have a first person indicative" (Wittgenstein 1953:190). The second, closely related to that observation, is "I say of someone else 'He seems to believe. . . .' And other people say it of me. Now, why do I never say it of myself, not even when others *rightly* say it of me?—Do I not myself see or hear myself, then?" (Wittgenstein 1953:191).

Wittgenstein is asking, What does a belief look like from the inside? When he says that it is possible to misinterpret one's own sense impressions but not one's beliefs, he is not referring to the content of an inner experience but rather to the grammatical impossibility of inferring one's belief (or one's pain) introspectively. That is why he says that if there were a verb that meant "to believe falsely," it would lack a first-person present indicative. Wittgenstein is not stating a metaphysical truth about belief here, but a grammatical one. Even when it is possible to make such statements as "It is raining and I do not believe it," the grammar of the term belief does not allow us to make these statements, for we cannot imagine a context for such statements—they violate the picture of the inner in the grammar of the word belief.

Anthropologists have wrestled with the problem of belief in the context of translation of cultures. The problem has been persistent: When anthropologists attribute belief statements to members of other cultures (i.e. non-Western cultures), are they making a presumption that a common psychological category of most Western languages and cultures is to be treated as a common human capacity that can be ascribed to all men and women? Such questions have been asked of several categories of emotion (see Lutz & Abu- Lughod 1990, Lutz & White 1986), but the case of belief is special because it has been anchored to questions of universal human rationality on the one hand (Gellner 1970, Lukes 1977) and common human condition of corporeality on the other (Needham 1972).

As far as the side of universal rationality is concerned, the puzzle for many scholars seems to be to account for the apparent irrationality of beliefs like that

of witchcraft or of other scandalous statements: for example, that the Nuer believe that twins are birds (Evans-Pritchard 1956). In his polemic against the anthropological tendency to find coherence in such statements, Gellner (1970) states that only through an excessive charity of translation can such beliefs be rendered intelligible. He seems to suggest that they are either to be taken as evidence of prelogical thought or as ideological devices to hide the power exercised by privileged classes in society (the latter point is made with regard to the category of *barak* among Moroccan Berbers). Gellner warns that "[t]o make sense of the concept is to make non-sense of the society" (1970:42). Asad (1990) has given a devastating critique of Gellner's method, especially of the manner in which in his haste to pronounce on the irrationality of such concepts he actually manages to evade all questions on their use in everyday life of the society under consideration. Wittgenstein's general view seems to be that there are many empirical assertions that we affirm without specially testing them and that their role is to establish the frame within which genuine empirical questions can be raised and answered (Cavell 1969, Williams 1996). If this scaffolding is questioned, then we are not in the realm of mere differences of opinion. Thus to someone who is offering an explanation of the French Revolution I will probably not ask whether she has any proof that the world is not an illusion. If such a question is asked, we shall have to say that our differences are noncriterial differences that cannot be resolved by adducing more evidence.

Thus, for the Azande there are genuine empirical questions about how one is to know whether one's illness is to be attributed to the witchcraft of a neighbor or a wife. The final empirical proof of the cause is provided by the postmortem of a body to show whether witchcraft substance is found in the body. Obviously if one shifts this kind of question to the kind of question in which we ask a Zande if he or she believes witches to exist, one is shifting the frame completely. In this revised frame (in which we are certain that witches do not exist), one can ask questions only about witchcraft beliefs, or witchcraft craze, but not about superiority of one kind of witchcraft medicine over another or whether unknowing to oneself one may be a witch—a source of danger to one's neighbors and friends. What does this mean for the practice of ethnography? One strategy is that adopted by Fevret-Saada (1977), who felt that to open her mouth on issues of witchcraft in Bocage was to become implicated in utterances that constitute the practices of witchcraft. Thus her ethnography becomes an account of the complicated relation that the ethnographer comes to have with the "bewitched" and the "unwitchers." It does not raise questions about the rationality or truth of witchcraft beliefs because there is no way in which such questions may be asked from within the language games of the Bocage. The other strategy is to think of ethnography as a persuasive fiction (Strathern 1988). I shall return to the question of translation. For the moment

let me say only that the disappointment in the indeterminate place of anthropological knowledge is perhaps like the disappointment with language itself, as somehow natural to the human. This disappointment is a great Wittgensteinian theme and should perhaps lead us to think that the reason why so-called contradictions in belief do not paralyze one in any society is that one's relation to the world is not on the whole that which would be based on knowing (Cavell 1969, 1982, 1994, 1995).

Belief and Corporeality

Needham's (1972) enquiry on the status of belief statements and the problem of translation is on entirely different lines. He states,

> If they [beliefs] are assertions about the inner states of individuals, as by common usage they would normally be taken to be, then, so far as my acquaintance with the literature goes, no evidence of such states, as distinct from the collective representations that are thus recorded, is ever presented. In this case we have no empirical occasion to accept such belief-statements as exact and substantiated reports about other people. (p. 5)

Needham goes on to address this problem through Wittgenstein's idea of grammatical investigation and particularly that an inner process stands in need of outward criteria. However, his notion of grammatical does not appear to be that of Wittgenstein's—it is hasty and confuses philosophical grammar with the notion of grammar in linguistics (perhaps it is comparable to a case of surface grammar in Wittgenstein, but I am not on sure ground here). The burden of Needham's argument is that even when we are convinced that a person genuinely believes what he says he believes, our conviction is not based on objective evidence of a distinct inner state: "We can thus be masters, as we are, of the practical grammar of belief statements yet remain wholly unconvinced that these rest on an objective foundation of psychic experience" (Needham 1972:126).

Now if I am correct that the inner is not like a distinct state that can be projected to the outer world through language in Wittgenstein but rather like something that lines the outer, then language and the world (including the inner world) are learned simultaneously. Neeedham is right in suspecting that a grammar of belief in the English language and in forms of life in which beliefs are held, confessed, defended, solicited, guarded, and watched over may be different from the way in which similar concepts through which the world and the word are connected in the woof and weft of some other society's life. However, the solution Needham (1972) offers to the problem of translation—that some inner states are accompanied by bodily expressions (such as body resemblance, natural posture, gesture, facial expression) whereas other inner states (such as belief) have no specific behavioral physiognomy—is to misread

grammatical differences as intrinsic differences in the content of experience. Wittgenstein's way of describing this idea was to say that the body is a picture of the soul or that the soul stands next to the body as meaning stands next to the word.

We are thus not going to get out of the problem of translation by an appeal to certain human capacities that are real and universal, as contrasted with others that are artificial constructs of various cultural traditions, as proposed by Needham (1972). That is not to say that we do not *read* the body but rather that we depend on grammar to tell us what kind of an object something is. Inserting the centrality of the body in human society is important not in inferring internal states of mind but in the intuition of language as a bodying forth, as in Wittgenstein saying, "Sometimes a cry is wrenched out of me." Let us now consider this question with regard to pain.

Pain and Private Objects

Wittgenstein on pain is a major philosophical and anthropological issue, yet there is no highway of thought available to traverse. It would have to be from the side roads and the meandering in uncharted territories that one would find the relation between Wittgenstein's thoughts on pain and the anthropological task of studying forms of sociality. Consider Cavell (1997), who says,

> *Philosophical Investigations* is the great work of philosophy of this century whose central topic may be said to be pain, and one of its principal discoveries is that we will never become clear about the relation of attributions of the concept of pain, nor about any of the concepts of consciousness, nor of any unconsciousness—neither of my attribution of pain to myself nor of my attribution of pain to others—without bringing into question the endless pictures we have in store that prejudicially distinguish what is internal or private to creatures (especially ones with language, humans) from what is external or public to them. (p. 95)

In some of the most creative anthropological writing on this issue, we find the disappointment with language to somehow be integral to the experience of pain (Good et al 1992). Wittgenstein emphatically denies the possibility of a private language in this case, as in other cases, that refers to what is internal or private to creatures. But what this means is that for Wittgenstein the statement "I am in pain" is not (or not only) a statement of fact but is also an expression of that fact (Cavell 1997). The internal, as I have stated, is not an internalized picture of the outer—nor is the external only a projection of the internal. In this context, what is unique about pain is the absence of any standing languages either in society or in the social sciences that could communicate pain, yet it would be a mistake to think of pain as essentially incommunicable (Das 1997). At stake here is not the asymmetry between the first person ("I am never in doubt about my pain") and the third person ("you can never be certain about

another person's pain"), but rather that to locate pain I have to take the absence of standing languages as part of the grammar of pain. To say "I am in pain" is to ask for acknowledgment from the other, just as denial of another's pain is not an intellectual failure but a spiritual failure, one that puts our future at stake: "One might even say that my acknowledgement is my presentation, or handling of pain. You are accordingly not at liberty to believe or disbelieve what it says—that is the one who says it—our future is at stake" (Cavell 1997:94). Some passages from *The Blue and Brown Books* (Wittgenstein 1958) are remarkable in the notion of language as embodied or bodying forth.

> In order to see that it is conceivable that one person should have pain in another person's body, one must examine what sorts of facts we call criterial for a pain being in a certain place. . . . Suppose I feel that a pain which on the evidence of the pain alone, e.g. with closed eyes, I should call a pain in my left hand. Someone asks me to touch the painful spot with my right hand. I do so and looking around perceive that I am touching my neighbour's hand. . . . This would be pain felt in another's body. (p. 49)

I have interpreted this passage (see Das 1995a,b, 1997) to propose that Wittgenstein's fantasy of *my pain* being located in *your body* suggests either the intuition that the representation of shared pain exists in imagination but is not experienced, in which case I would say that language is hooked rather inadequately to the world of pain or that the experience of pain cries out for this response to the possibility that my pain could reside in your body and that the philosophical grammar of pain is about allowing this to happen. As in the case of belief, I cannot locate your pain in the same way as I locate mine. The best I can do is to let it happen to me. Now it seems to me that anthropological knowledge is precisely about letting the knowledge of the other happen to me. This is how we see Evans-Pritchard finding out about himself that he was "thinking black" or "feeling black" though he resisted the tendency to slip into idioms of witchcraft. In the Introduction to this paper, I talked of Wittgenstein's idea of a philosophical problem as having the form "I do not know my way about." In his remarks on pain, to find my way is similar to letting the pain of the other happen to me. My own fantasy of anthropology as a body of writing is that which is able to receive this pain. Thus while I may never claim the pain of the other, nor appropriate it for some other purpose (nation building, revolution, scientific experiment), that I can lend my body (of writing) to this pain is what a grammatical investigation reveals.

THE DARKNESS OF THIS TIME

In the preface to *Philosophical Investigations*, Wittgenstein (1953) wrote, "It is not impossible that it should fall to the lot of this work, in its poverty and darkness of this time, to bring light into one brain or another—but, of course, it

is not likely" (p. vi). Bearn (1998) writes that the destructive moment of the *Investigations* threatens the fabric of our daily lives, so it is more destructive than textbook skepticism of the philosopher or the café skeptic. If in life, said Wittgenstein, we are surrounded by death, so too in the health of our understanding we are surrounded by madness (Wittgenstein 1980:44). Rather than forcefully excluding this voice of madness, Wittgenstein (1953) returns us to the everyday by a gesture of waiting. "If I have exhausted the justifications, I have reached bedrock, and my spade is turned. Then I am inclined to say: 'This is simply what I do (handle)' " (para. 217). In this picture of the turned spade, we have the picture of what the act of writing may be in the darkness of this time. The love of anthropology may yet turn out to be an affair in which when I reach bedrock I do not break through the resistance of the other. But in this gesture of waiting, I allow the knowledge of the other to mark me. Wittgenstein is thus a philosopher of both culture and the counterpoint of culture.

Visit the *Annual Reviews home page* at http://www.AnnualReviews.org.

Literature Cited

Appadurai A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, pp. 48–66, 158–78. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press

Asad T. 1990. The concept of cultural translation in British social anthropology. In *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*, pp. 171–200. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press

Austin JL. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Baker JP, Hacker PMS. 1980. *Wittgenstein: Meaning and Understanding,* Vol. 1. Oxford: Blackwell

Bearn GCF. 1977. *Waking to Wonder: Wittgenstein's Existential Investigations.* New York: State Univ. NY Press

Bhabha HK. 1995. By bread alone: signs of violence in the mid-nineteenth century. In *Location of Culture*, pp. 198–212. London: Routledge

Cavell S. 1969. *Must We Mean What We Say?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

Cavell S. 1982. *The Claim of Reason*: *Wittgenstein, Skepticism, Morality, and Tragedy.* Oxford: Clarendon

Cavell S. 1984. Existentialism and analytical philosophy. In *Themes Out of School: Effects and Causes,* pp. 195–234. San Francisco: North Point

Cavell S. 1988. The uncanniness of the ordinary. In *In Quest of the Ordinary: Lines of Skepticism and Romanticism*, pp. 153–78. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Cavell S. 1989. Declining decline: Wittgenstein as a philosopher of culture. In *This New Yet Unapproachable America: Lectures After Emerson After Wittgenstein*, pp. 29–77. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Cavell S. 1990. The argument of the ordinary: scenes of instruction in Wittgenstein and in Kripke. In *Conditions Handsome and Unhandsome: The Constitution of Emersonian Perfectionism*, pp. 64–101. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Cavell S. 1994. A *Pitch of Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press

Cavell S. 1995. Notes and afterthoughts on the opening of Wittgenstein's *Investigations*. In *Philosophical Passages: Wittgenstein, Emerson, Austin, Derrida,* pp. 125–87. Oxford: Blackwell

Cavell S. 1997. Comments on Veena Das's essay "Language and body: transactions in the construction of pain." See Kleinman et al 1997, pp. 93–99

Chatterji R, Mehta D. 1995. A case study of a communal riot in Dharavi, Bombay. *Relig. Soc.* 42(4):5–26
Chaturvedi R. 1998. *Witchcraft and other minds*. M.Phil. diss. Univ. Delhi, Delhi, India. 120 pp.
Clasteres P. 1974. *Société contre l'état.* Paris: Les Editions Minuit
Clifford J. 1990. On ethnographic allegory. In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography,* ed. J Clifford, GE Marcus, pp. 98–122. Delhi, India: Oxford Univ. Press
Daniel EV. 1997. *Charred Lullabies: Chapters in an Anthropography of Violence.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press
Das V. 1983. The language of sacrifice. *Man* 18:445–62
Das V, ed. 1990a. *Mirrors of Violence: Communities, Riots and Survivors in South Asia*. Delhi, India: Oxford Univ. Press
Das V. 1990b. Our work to cry: your work to listen. See Das 1990a, pp. 345–99
Das V. 1990c. Voices of children. *Daedalus.* Special issue on *Another India,* pp. 48–65
Das V. 1995a. *Critical Events: An Anthropological Perspective on Contemporary India*, pp. 175–97. Delhi, India: Oxford Univ. Press
Das V. 1995b. Voice as birth of culture. *Ethnos* 60(3–4):159–81
Das V. 1996. *Violence and the work of time.* Presented at Plenary Sess. Violence. Univ. Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland
Das V. 1997. Language and body: transactions in the construction of pain. See Kleinman et al 1997, pp. 67–93
Das V. 1998. Official narratives, rumour, and the social production of hate. *Soc. Ident.* 4(1):1–23
Das V, Bajwa RS. 1994. Community and violence in contemporary Punjab. In *Purushartha* (Special issue on *Violences et Non-Violences en Inde)*, ed. D Vidal, G Tarabout, E Mayer, 16:245–59
Diamond C, ed. 1976. *Wittgenstein's Lectures on the Foundations of Mathematics, Cambridge 1939*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
Durkheim E. 1976. (1915). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.* London: Allen & Unwin
Evans-Pritchard EE. 1937. *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic Among the Azande.* Oxford: Clarendon
Evans-Pritchard EE. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Clarendon
Evans-Pritchard EE. 1956. *Nuer Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon
Fevret-Saada J. 1977. *Les mots, la mort, les sorts.* Paris: Gallimard
Gellner E. 1970. Concepts and society. In *Rationality*, ed. BR Wilson, pp. 18–49. Oxford: Blackwell
Gilsenan M. 1996. *Lords of the Lebanese Marches*: *Violence and Narrative in an Arab Society.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Good MJD, Brodwin PE, Good B, Kleinman A, eds. 1992. *Pain as Human Experience: An Anthropological Perspective.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Guha R. 1983. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Delhi, India: Oxford Univ. Press
Humphrey C, Laidlaw J. 1994. *The Archetypal Actions of Ritual. A Theory of Ritual Illustrated by the Jain Act of Worship.* Oxford: Clarendon
Jeffery P, Jeffery R. 1996. *Don't Marry Me to a Plowman! Women's Everyday Lives in Rural North India*. Boulder/Oxford: Westview
Joas H. 1996. *The Creativity of Action.* Transl. J Gaines, P Keast. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Johnston P. 1993. *Wittgenstein: Rethinking the Inner.* London/New York: Routledge
Kleinman A, Das V, Lock M, eds. 1997. *Social Suffering*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Kripke S. 1982. *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language.* London: Oxford Univ. Press
Langer L. 1991. *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory.* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
Langer L. 1997. The alarmed vision: social suffering and holocaust atrocity. See Kleinman et al 1997, pp. 47–67
Lawrence P. 1995. *Work of oracles: overcoming political silences in Mattakalapu.* Presented at Srilankan Conf., 5th, Indiana
Le Bon G. 1960. (1895). *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. New York: Viking
Lévi-Strauss C. 1969. (1964). *The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology,* Vol. 1. New York: Harper & Row
Lukes S. 1977. Some problems about rationality. In *Essays in Social Theory*, pp. 122–74. London: Macmillan
Lutz C, White GM. 1986. The anthropology of emotions. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 15: 405–36
Lutz CA, Abu-Lughod L, eds. 1990. *Language and the Politics of Emotion,* pp. 1–24. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Needham R. 1972. *Belief Language and Experience*. Oxford: Blackwell
Nieuwenhuys O. 1996. The paradox of child labor and anthropology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 25:237–51

Reynolds P. 1995. 'Not known because not looked for': ethnographers listening to the young in Southern Africa. *Ethnos* 60(3–4): 159–81
Rudé G. 1959. *The Crowd in the French Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon
Rudé G. 1964. *The Crowd in History, 1730–1848*. New York: Wiley
Scheper-Hughes N. 1992. *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Schulte J. 1993. *Experience and Expression: Wittgenstein's Philosophy of Psychology.* Oxford: Clarendon
Schutz A. 1970. *On Phenomenology and Social Relations: Selected Writings*, ed. HR Wagner. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Scott JC. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
Scott JC. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts.* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
Searle JR. 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Strathern M. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and the Problems with Societies in Melanesia.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Tambiah SJ. 1996. *Leveling Crowds: Ethnonationalist Conflicts and Collective Violence in South Asia.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Taussig M. 1992. Reification and the consciousness of the patient. In *The Nervous System*, pp. 83–111. New York: Routledge
Thompson EP. 1971. The moral economy of the English crowd in the eighteenth century. *Past Present* 50:76–126
Tylor EB. 1974. (1878). *Primitive Culture*. New York: Gordon
Williams M. 1996. *Unnatural Doubts*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press
Wittgenstein L. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. New York: Macmillan
Wittgenstein L. 1958. *The Blue and Brown Books*. Oxford: Blackwell
Wittgenstein L. 1980. *Culture and Value*, ed. GH von Wright. Transl. P Winch. Oxford: Blackwell