

the end but “through caregiving and mentoring, as a doctor, a husband, and a teacher.” To illustrate this, Kleinman offers the example of caregiving, which to him is the closest one gets to “an existential definition of what it means to be human.” It was thus in the act and process of taking care of his wife during her illness that Kleinman learned what caregiving is all about. Here one might think of Aristotelian virtue ethics as an obvious vantage point, but the philosopher Kleinman concentrates on William James as a discussion partner, who is well known for his pragmatism. Concerning the relation between philosophy and anthropology, Kleinman ends his essay by discussing James’ conception of the university as a “place where wisdom was at home.” According to Kleinman, however, the IT revolution has had a negative influence on the universities of our days. Meaning is replaced by information, which implies a turn away from research interests concerned with lived experience. What we might hope for is that philosophy and anthropology would learn from each other in order to “revivify quests for wisdom in the university and more broadly in public life.”

Ghassan Hage’s essay discusses Bourdieu’s relation to philosophy and provides an informative interpretation of the notion of *habitus*, coined as a principle of “homing and building.” As a self-styled, habitual eavesdropper, Hage takes his starting point in the experience of his loss – and eventual regaining – of hearing. He then uses this case study to point out some limitations in Bourdieu’s theoretical corpus, which is based on a modern ontology through and through, and as an alternative suggests a critical “anthropology of radical alterity.” Clara Han and Veena Das both discuss how Austin’s and Cavell’s theories of speech acts can prove fruitful for the understanding of – and, conversely, be enriched by – their respective fieldwork in poor urban neighborhoods in Chile (Han) and India (Das). João Biehl is concerned with the mutual influence of the anthropologist Pierre Clastres and the philosophers Deleuze and Guattari. He stresses that ethnography should not be conceived as proto-philosophy but as a genuine way of doing theory that admits for an emancipatory reflectivity. Bhrigupati Singh concentrates his efforts on discussing how non-dialectical philosophy (Nietzsche, Deleuze) can be helpful in the course of thinking about ethnographic fieldwork, while Michael M. J. Fischer delivers a tour de force through considerations on how philosophers like Benjamin, Derrida, and Arendt can relate to anthropological reflections about different circumstances and issues in Iran. Taking up an example of ritual thinking from early China, Michael Puett argues that philosophy and anthropology can both gain insights from indigenous visions in that they challenge the way in which we moderns categorize the world around us. On the basis of Bergson’s concept of duration, Steven C. Caton introduces a new way of thinking about the production and reliability of ethnographical work and suggests a form in which one strives to imagine what goes on in the mind of the other by focusing on the perception of duration that a certain subject might have in a given context. Vincent Crapanzano also discusses the question of other minds but in a line of reasoning that underscores the opac-

ity of the other. His essay does not draw conclusions, but rather sets the scene for rethinking the question of knowing the other’s mind as a question of which a part of the answer should call attention to the social conventions of a given people.

Now, what is the “ground between” anthropology and philosophy? This book does not address this question directly, but on the basis of the essays it is possible to point out some themes around which the two disciplines could be said to meet and, at the same time, differentiate themselves from each other. Just to mention some: life/lives, lived experience, subjectivity, the question of knowing the other’s mind, and the everyday / the ordinary. It is my contention that not only anthropologists – and maybe other social scientists – but also philosophers can profit from studying the inquiries presented in this book, in which most of the contributions, by the way, display a predilection for twentieth-century Continental philosophers. In the phenomenological and hermeneutical philosophy of the twentieth century, the concept of a “ground between” is sometimes utilized to denote the place where the familiar meets the strange – and this is the place where new understandings, for instance, between anthropologists and philosophers, might take their first steps.

Sune Liisberg

**Debaene, Vincent:** *Far Afield. French Anthropology between Science and Literature.* Transl. by Justin Izzo. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2014. 398 pp. ISBN 978-0-226-10706-6. Price: \$ 35.00

This work, originally published in French in 2010 under the rather different and more apt title of “*L’adieu au voyage*,” traces the relationship between anthropology and literature in France from the 1930s to the 1980s. The author explicitly contrasts his work here with “*Writing Culture*,” the famous volume edited in 1986 by James Clifford and George Marcus, which problematized the way ethnography is written and is seen as having contributed to a “crisis of representation” in anthropology generally. Debaene’s starting point, conversely, is a phenomenon that, if not unique to French anthropology, certainly lends it distinction, namely the quondam propensity of French fieldworkers to write not just a “scientific” ethnography based on their experiences, but a second work more literary in character: not works of fiction, but works more in the tradition of *belles lettres*, reflecting on the author’s fieldwork experience in a manner that may or may not be more philosophical, but is certainly not intended to be “scientific” or rigorously academic, and may often be intended for a wider readership than academic ethnographies per se. For a more international anthropological readership, the classic text is probably Claude Lévi-Strauss’s “*Tristes tropiques*” (published with that title in both English and French), while the archetypal author in this regard is surely the poet-ethnographer Michel Leiris, who in fact published “*L’Afrique fantôme*” before writing up his thesis on the *zar* possession cult in Ethiopia – but there are plenty of others, as Debaene makes clear. In his own words, therefore, unlike “*Writing Culture*,” “I focus

less on the construction of ethnographic knowledge than on its distribution among places and publics and on the ways in which ethnographic texts have been conceived and characterized.” And further, unlike the case of “Writing Culture,” he thinks that “it does not suffice simply to uncover the rhetorical strategies or the tropes that ethnographers deploy. We must also situate their writings in a wider discursive space” (7) to understand the reception of these second books at particular historical moments. “Writing Culture” is also about how power relations have been concealed through rhetorical devices in anthropology, not about how literature can help us understand the human, as in the *Terre humaine* series, which published many of these second books. Although Dabaene certainly pays attention to how anthropology is written, it is rather the various tensions between academic anthropology and anthropologically informed literature in the period under discussion that is the main aim here. Another contrast Dabaene sees is with Malinowski’s infamous “Diary,” which Malinowski never intended to be published, let alone to reach a wider audience than his scientific works, which is accordingly not organized as a publishable text, and which records only unmediated reactions to his own momentary psychological conditions, not considered reflections on the fieldwork experience from either an epistemological or even a methodological standpoint, unlike the more literary books of authors like Leiris and Lévi-Strauss.

In describing the tensions between anthropology as science and anthropology as literature, Dabaene does not commit himself to any hard and fast dichotomy between the two, and indeed a major point of the text is the difficulty in framing the ways in which this dichotomy changes, is dissolved or made more concrete. Nonetheless he does work with the dichotomy heuristically. First, while science is seen as progressive, cumulatively acquiring knowledge which will supplant what we knew before, literature is fixed, literary texts acquiring a kind of sacredness prohibiting them from ever being challenged or otherwise interfered with. Secondly, while scientists are almost anonymous to the general public – and certainly we do not need to read their works to benefit from them – authors are public figures who can only be experienced through direct contact with their works. Finally, as modern science emerged in and after the 17th century, it progressively took over from literature the task of explaining the world and, through anthropology, of explaining humanity itself. Literature has therefore lost out to science, having to give ground in a domain it once had to itself – another source of tension between them (Montaigne is identified as the last writer in France to have sought to combine both strands of writing). But there are also more specific aspects related to the writings of these French anthropologists, such as the early influence of surrealism on many of them; the anti-aesthetic and anti-rhetorical stances of people like Leiris and Griaule, at least when they were being “scientific” (cf. the focus on facts unadulterated by theory that one finds so often among French fieldworkers); the importance of reconstructing the “atmosphere” of the culture being studied (we might

say “ethos,” though Dabaene denies that they are the same in his preface), as well as of Maussian holism in drawing the threads together (a counter to the alleged asociality of modern literature); and the importance of the body (or, as we might say, of embodiment) in the anthropologist actually experiencing the culture being studied, especially through participant observation and especially when writing in the more literary mode.

Then there is the sense of anxiety about being accepted in the field and truly penetrating another culture; the sense of disillusionment that pervades a work like “Tristes tropiques”; the irresolvable dilemma over the exotic becoming the ordinary as soon as one finds it (hence the “sadness” of the tropics); the search for pure alterity dissolving in the realization of a common humanity; and the concern to distance oneself from the traveller, let alone the tourist. These are very much materials for the anthropologist as *belle lettrist*, as well as providing an explanation for the more apt original French title of Dabaene’s work, which can be translated as “Goodbye to Travel” – a reference to this concern, as much as to Lévi-Strauss’s avowal of his personal distaste for travel as an experience with which he ends “Tristes tropiques.”

But the ultimate tension relates to how we understand the human – through experience leading to literature and/or to phenomenology, or through reason and analysis leading to science and the academy? The distinctiveness of Lévi-Strauss’s trajectory is that he went from the former to the latter, once he had experienced experience letting him down. Already in “Tristes tropiques,” as Dabaene makes clear, one finds that associationism which led to structuralism in its fully developed form, as well as to the famous debate with Jean-Paul Sartre. But as we also learned, structuralism progressively became anthropology with the people taken out, or at least deprived of all agency, and as a consequence Lévi-Strauss suffered a fate rather similar to Sir James Frazer’s, of seeing his work be condemned and become outmoded in his own lifetime. To this “Writing Culture” probably contributed more, internationally, than rather recondite debates over the relationship between anthropology and literature in France itself.

Dabaene treats his topic in great detail and with considerable sophistication, showing how these tensions have changed over time, and also, in Part 2, assessing the contributions of specific authors like Leiris and Lévi-Strauss to them – but also of others, such as Alfred Métraux and the ever-controversial Marcel Griaule. He also, in Part 3 of the work, deals with certain literary historians and critics who have commented on anthropology as both science and literature. Inevitably, given the scale of the topic, he can only aim to be representative, not comprehensive, in his treatment. Nonetheless, one other interesting figure for his thesis would have been Roger Bastide, who only appears fleetingly in this work, but who, as Stephanica Capone has shown, deliberately sought to combine scientific methods with literary approaches in his writings on *candomblé* in northeast Brazil, which he experienced, though not as a full initiate.

Robert Parkin