

RITUAL BETWEEN ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION

SNJEŽANA ZORIĆ

Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research, Zagreb

Ritual is a representative *topos* of both disciplines. We do not understand it as a text but a way of life in which the realization of Beauty and Good is leading to the Truthful. In this transformative process one experiences "being struck by the abyss", experience of giving to the Unknown, allowing being taken by it. In this "being-in" is the evidence of the ritual; "being-out" of it is the presumption of possibility to articulate it.

Talking "happens" always from the position of the one "standing out". Therefore, the ritual as a text appears to us as a "reading without the Other", con-versing without a collocutor. To converse without a collocutor is a mere sounding of the Unessential.

The momentariness of ritual encounter as the deepest dimension of "showing itself" is also a dimension of its disappearing. Attempt in catching it means its death. Only in the death of the ritual, anthropology and science of religion find their interest.

The life of the ritual, on the contrary, could be realized through the ritualization of everyday life, which enables the evidence of its sacrality, and through the aestheticization of everyday life, which is giving sense to its profaneness.

Confronted with the chaos of the thesis of what ritual is and what it is not, what it could be and what it could not, whether it should it be approached structurally or functionally, whether ritual is a symbolic or semantic

system, are all questions which as shown in theoretical papers are somewhat obsolete. However, they always reappear and are threaded through all possible modern, postmodern, constructivistic and deconstructivistic interpretations. All the disciplines which deal with the subject are more or less experiencing a crisis of re-examination of their own assumptions, and then endeavouring through addressing some other disciplines to find a way out of their own reductionisms, whether theoretical or methodical, or both. Creation of an object "that belongs to no one"¹ met with failure, while Panglossian nihilism² continues to permeate the subjects of each profession separately.

As a form of religious activity in what are the two referential disciplines for our work,³ ritual is interpreted from the social context

¹ "To do something interdisciplinary it's not enough to choose a 'subject' (a theme) and gather around it two or three sciences. Interdisciplinarity consists in creating a new object that belongs to no one" (Roland Barthes, *Jeunes Chercheurs*, read in James Clifford, "Introduction: Partial Truths", in: *Writing Culture* 1986:1).

² Panglossian nihilism is the term by which S.P. Reyna denotes the anti-scientific movement among anthropologists, pragmatically shown in the above mentioned book (*Writing Culture* 1986). The term seem to me to be an appropriate attribute for many trends in the current scientific situation, although its illustrative adoption on my part does not also mean acceptance of the contra-statements by which Reyna argues his "scientific" attitude, as opposed to the interpretative attitude of the anthropologists who write in *Writing Culture*. When it is being critical, Reyna's review appears witty, but it is relatively inflexible and limited in showing his own attitudes. The aspiration towards the mere formally logical demand for the scientific approach has already been abandoned by science itself, and it is in that light that one should also observe the positive side of what it being presented by the more recent anthropological examination found in *Writing Culture*. Nevertheless:

"Doctor Pangloss was the character in Voltaire's *Candide* who specialised in talking intellectually pretentious nonsense.

Literary anthropologists' demands for the repudiation of science, and for its replacement with a thick description innocent of validation, means that they hold a doctrine that allows them to know next to nothing" (Reyna 1994:576).

³ The selection of these two disciplines does not indicate an attempt at some new interdisciplinary state; rather it sees in them the possibility for mutual permeation in the sense that the theories and models of ritual in the context of cultural anthropology are based on the research of tribal religions and forms of religiosity in which there are usually no written sources for study of the rituals or sacred texts which would contain the worldview, while the science of religion is engaged precisely in texts, written tradition, more developed forms of religions and religiosity. In order to justify the introduction of hermeneutics into its method processes and, in some way, to detach itself from the seemingly positive manner of collection of data in the field and its description, the entire complex of ritual, and, finally, culture itself, is declared by anthropology to be a text which it interprets as it reads. We leave open the question of the extent to which a thesis about ritual or culture as a text can clear the way for a hermeneutic approach. In any case, in today's context of research of the ritual phenomenon we are no longer able to apply the approaches of the great names in anthropology known to us to date, and the offer deriving from anthropology itself also

(conflicting situations, and dramatically fixed values, etc. are at the foundations of ritual) in the first, or it is reduced to existing textual models in the second.⁴ The need for clear methodical differentiation, which would ostensibly guarantee scientific authenticity, resulted in partial insights⁵ into the subject itself, in which all the parts together were still not capable of bringing the subject itself out into the light. Anthropology which tried to constitute itself as a positive science in fact excluded the very essence of the subject, because, of course, one cannot speak positively about essence; while the science of religion, in its panic-stricken need for differentiation

seems inadequate. Examination of one's own research, collection of material and interpretative work, reduced in modern ethnographies to the fact that the anthropologist is the one who writes, seems to me to be an insufficiently thought out and simplified concluding formulation of what is, above all, a subtle, complex and - for every authentic researcher - an essentially existential process.

⁴ The science of religion sees ritual as a form of religious life. Nonetheless, scholars of religion have not dealt directly with that life. The departure into unknown and foreign lands was considered "dangerous" because it could undermine one's own religious convictions and attitudes. The science of religion engaged with Christianity in direct encounter, while with other religions it mainly did so by serving with their texts and interpreting and comparing them. Only more recent reflections have given indication of a crisis, and there has been an opening up towards other religions in the form of tendencies towards an inter-religious dialogue which should be unfolding within the framework of conversations, understanding and mutual tolerance. Some researchers go even further, feeling the need for direct encounter with the living forms of the religiosities of Others which are best displayed in ritual:

"Erleben heißt: zugleich sehen, hören, riechen, fühlen und schmecken. Anstelle von ein paar exotischen Proben, aus der Ferne herbeigeschafft..., wird uns eine fremde Religion als lebendiges Ganzes umfassen. ... Was wir bislang nur teilweise und vom Rand her kannten, das erleben wir nun als Ganzes: wir sind mittendrin (Greschat 1988:74–75).

Man könnte das auch als methodische Regel fassen und Religionswissenschaftler bitten, sich eines Urteils über einen fremden Glauben so lange zu enthalten, bis sie ihn in seiner lebendigen Ganzheit erfahren konnten" (Greschat 1988:77).

Although not yet sufficiently thought out in the sense of anthropological method, which has been more deeply gone into in field work and the encounter with Others, these attempts are an indication of a possible dialogue and co-operation with the science of religion which is engaged in interpretations of sacred texts and comparisons of fundamental questions which are characteristic to all religions. What anthropology lacks is this very fact of study of the textual tradition of a specific religion. Probably because of what is self-understood in the research of rituals which belong to tribal religions, which do not possess textual tradition, when starting to study institutionalised religions and their pertaining rituals, anthropological research exhausts itself in its field work, forgetting the entire textual tradition which stands at the foundations of the religion in question, and which is present in all religious rituals as a self-evident part of worldview. I regard Sh. Oortner's *Sherpas Through Their Rituals*, Cambridge 1978, as an example of such an inadequate approach in the anthropological treatment of Buddhism.

⁵ Any scientific discipline moves within a defined contemplative frame which can be encompassed by defined methodology. Any scientific approach reduced to the frames of its methods results in partial insights.

from theology, also ignored, and in the end extinguished, the life of that with which it deals. The hermeneutic approach as a guarantee of being knowledgeable about the constantly alternating trends in science showed itself as ideal for interpretation of religious and ritual texts, while the encounter "in the flesh" with some of the rituals showed itself to be incompatible with the idea of academic dignity. Field work as the fundamental condition precedent of all culturo-anthropological study, and its methods which have been questioned in many ways do not find their place in scholarly works about religion. On the contrary, they evoke a feeling of horror in direct confrontation with a foreign culture, or deal, on their part, with such forms of religiosity and ritual which cannot be found in the field. It would be really inappropriate to search for the mysteries of Orpheus in the territory of modern Greece! Endeavours to deal with the fundamental questions of the sense of the science of religion are nearer to philosophical thought about Others than to direct encounters with them. One of the negative attempts at parallel examination of possible cultural responses to this basic question is shown in the work of Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, *Der leidende Gerechte in der Religionsgeschichte, Ein Beitrag zur problemorientierten "Religionsphänomenologie"*. Establishing the universal nature of the phenomenon of the Righteous Person who suffers unjustly, Klimkeit looks for his image in diverse cultures and religions. Counting them diligently, it remains an open question what, at all, the entire undertaking was meant to reveal.

That is why we see the meeting-point of anthropology and the science of religion in a synthesis of field research work preceded by excellent knowledge of textual tradition, and a broadening of the interpretative universe which would no longer rest only on the categories of social sciences, but would take a step further and also deal with the categories of spiritual sciences which admitted the concept of the Sacred⁶ into the referential frame of their conceptual categories. In order to deepen its analyses and interpretations, anthropology has to turn to something speculative, while the science of religion has to be turned away from arbitrary speculation with living forms of religious life in direct field work. The study of ritual would bring us nearer to compliance with such a demand. For ritual is such a religious topos comprising both textual traditions and their performance, while in some cases what is actually in question is a transformation of texts in ritual, or the opposite, a ritualisation of texts.

⁶ The concept of the Sacred derives from what Rudolf Otto treated in his work *Das Heilige* (Otto 1917), and meant a certain turning point in the reception and interpretation of religious and ritual phenomena.

Preoccupation with ritual in a possible dialogue of both disciplines could lead to consideration of that which is crucial for ritual - its transformatory essence, on the one hand, and its active participants on the other. Rehabilitation of the importance of the subject in the ritual act seems to us to be decisive for further ritual research. For that purpose, it was essential also to question one's own conceptual assumptions, thereby clearing the way for an approach to philosophical thought in anthropology and the science of religion.

However, an unexpected problem arises here. In recent decades, the philosophy of religion has been an almost nonexistent discipline, and the vacuum which can be divined subsequent to its classic theorists can no longer be filled on the basis of old approaches and speculations. The enclosed state within the chrysalis of its own cultural frames, and the lack of openness towards everything Other and Foreign, can be penetrated only by an intercultural encounter which would then result in the corresponding philosophical interculturality.

"Die Begegnung der verschiedenen Philosophien, Kulturen und Religionen bedarf einer intensiven und fachwissenschaftlichen Erörterung seitens der Beteiligten. Studien zur Interkulturellen Philosophie sind jenseits aller Zentrismen, ob europäisch, asiatisch, afrikanisch oder lateinamerikanisch. Darüber hinaus dient sie dem Ziel der intra- und interkulturellen Verständigung auf dem Wege einer Philosophie, die sowohl ein Denkweg als auch ein Lebensweg sein will.

(...) Die Andersheit des Anderen ist so erreichbar, ohne sie reduktiv zu traktieren zu vernachlässigen.

(...) Zur Aufgabe der interkulturellen Philosophie gehört wesentlich das theoretische und praktische Kultivieren der Einsicht in die erkenntnistheoretische, methodologische, metaphysische, ethnisch-moralische und auch religionswissenschaftliche Bescheidenheit des je eigenen Zugangs zum regulativen Einen mit vielen Namen" (*Philosophische Grundlagen...* 1993: Vorwort).

Bringing into question the objectivity of their own subjects, both cultural anthropology and the science of religion no longer give support to the topical nature of their profession as such, but to the theme understood as a subject in which an attempt is then made to give that very same subject a chance to be a collocutor, listening to what it itself has to say. The tendency to deconstruction of the subject matter remains, however, often further concealed by the rhetoric of the method within the discipline. It often happens that no communication or discussion is achieved, not to mention any encounter. To encounter the Other means in fact to supersede Oneself and the Other in such a way that neither one nor the

other remains the same, but, due precisely to the fascinating nature of the encounter, for both to manage to exist authentically.

Existing insights and interpretation of ritual are not brought into question, but that which is beyond them; in an attempt to obtain a different view of the Ritual we try to bring into the open more of its neglected possibilities.

Declaring ritual to be text, anthropology can legitimately draw it into its hermeneutic aura, depriving it, quite paradoxically, of its possibility to speak for itself. The dialogue nature of the hermeneutic approach is a pure metaphor for what are in fact two internal and parallel monologues of the researcher him- or herself and his or her imagined collocutor. If the dialogue is fictitious, as experimental anthropologists claim for their work, the literal nature of the fictionality of the science of religion, under which we understand the arbitrariness in choice of source or even the process of interpretation, far supersedes them.

Wolfgang Gantke opposes such an approach in his problem-oriented phenomenology of religion:

"Muessen wir also in unserem Vorverständnis wie in einem geschlossenen Käfig gefangen bleiben, können wir das Fremde wirklich nur "von außen" wahrnehmen?"

Aber auch wenn ein völlig vorverständnisfreies Verständnis des Fremden nicht möglich sein sollte, kann sich die problemlernorientierte Religionsphänomenologie dennoch um eine möglichst vorurteilsfreie, dialogische Auseinandersetzung mit fremden Positionen bemühen. Es gibt hier Zwischenmöglichkeiten, die durch die einfache, aber falsche Alternative Subjektivität versus Objektivität ausgeblendet werden. Noch einmal: Der Dialog der Religionen ist deshalb möglich, weil es beim Fremdverstehen Grade der Annäherung gibt. Ein naives Allesverstehenkönnen darf nicht sofort gegen ein resignatives Nichtsverstehenkönnen ausgespielt werden. Daß die Kunst des Fremdverstehens unter den einzelnen Forschern unterschiedlich stark entwickelt ist, hängt ohne Zweifel auch mit den subjektiven Voraussetzungen des Verstehens zusammen" (Gantke 1994).

As a logical step out of hermeneutics, ritual is shown as a direct step into the hermetic.⁷ We leave the existing theories of ritual to the side. The assumption is that they are known to those engaged in the profession, and those to whom they are not will be no obstacle to openness to other forms of reception, accustomisation or understanding.⁸

⁷ I am grateful to the German philosopher Heinrich Rombach for the inspiration for opening up to the hermetic.

⁸ Namely, if Geertz's thesis stands that all anthropologists are "university types" who write for one another, then it is superfluous to refer to theories which are already known. For those who are not scientifically but rather existentially interested in the

Our attitude can be condensed into a number of theses:

1. Originally, ritual is not text. One is either in it or is not.
2. If one is in it, the essence of ritual is transformatory, if one is not in it, then ritual is repetitive, mechanical behaviour.
3. The process of research and re-thinking of ritual takes part on two planes - "to be outside" or "to be inside" the ritual act itself.⁹
4. The description of the Essential is impossible. Such a description resides in watching; only accidental qualities are described.

* * *

Rejecting the possibility of the existence of divine might and power in the world in favour of the scientific approach, both mentioned disciplines understand and explain ritual from "this here". Our interest is in that part of ritual which links Man with the part of the Cosmos marked by the attribute - Sacred. We want to restore legitimacy to the transcendental allowing it to be seriously taken into consideration, without bringing into question the truth or falsehood of divine and spiritual beings with whom the participant in the ritual comes into contact; we are interested in a possible meeting of the worlds, even if they are polarised to the extremes of *the other side* and *this side*. Ritual is an event "between", the co-bearing event (Greek: *syμβαλεῖν*) of the ritualist together with the ritual act in that which is neither ritual, nor its symbols, nor the participant him- or herself.

"For philosophy from the outset 'authentically to be' means to exist in thinking, and not that which thinks this or that subject matter, but which itself and within itself uncovers the very truth of the being - the being itself. But being always reveals itself differently to each philosopher... Because, the truth is one - this intuition is possessed by each human spirit which sets out on the search for the essence of being, the search for that which authentically is.

For individual existence, authentically to be means to be in analogy with the metaphysical basis of being, which is proclaimed in the language of philosophy as being itself, and is heralded in the language of faith as God" (Cipra 1995:585).

Mutatis mutandis "ritually to be" in our context means "authentically to be" and that in a way that one is inside with one's heart, and not with one's thought.

Ritual is the way and the vital way, at that, which in its ritualisation leads to the aesthetisation of life. Ritual transformation of both the ritualist

possible leap into ritual praxis itself, in addition to understanding, precognition about what rituals are is also unessential.

⁹ I have already written about this in my paper called *Orient in Orient - Reception of Indian Spirituality in Korea* (Zorić 1994).

and his world, as for those for whom the ritual is intended e.g. the souls of ancestors, and for their worlds on *the other side*, is a transformation through the Good and the Beautiful towards the Truth.¹⁰ Ritual as a way, is a way according to instruction which in the identity of content and form, and consistent performance, attain their perfection, and, thereby, their efficacy. A ritual is always a purposefully defined act - in order that the disturbed cosmic order be re-established, the souls of ancestors taken into paradise, or as an individual meeting with the primordial of everything that is.¹¹

In ritual the proximity of the Sacred, the extremely dangerous Abyss (*mysterium tremendum*) is experienced. This is also the source of the connection of ritual knowledge with secret societies, particular ways of transmission, and every gaining of knowledge which was possible after the ritual of initiation which, too, was not performed in public. Taking the concept of the Sacred as an analytical unit of its hermeneutic process, the science of religion tries to supersede the profanity with which its research is increasingly confronted. In its need to provide some deeper sense to the interpretation of religious phenomena and thus, of the ritual itself, the science of religion no longer adheres strictly to demands made for a scientific approach, but, without determining it in advance, remains open to possible encounters with the Sacred. It does not possess one semantic identity provided in advance, which would be somehow fixed and contextually unchanged, but is, to the contrary, always open again to new interpretations (*religio una in rituum varietate*).

In its openness, religious phenomenology obtains no insight of the fact that experience of the Sacred in ritual is always the experience of one integral world. This is the experience of suddenly being attuned, similar to the events of enlightenment described by Buddhist and Christian mystics. In the unexpectedness of the encounter with the Abysmal, Man opens up

¹⁰ Music, song and dance are crucial in the performance of ritual. Sound is in a special relationship with divine forces; mantras, for example, have the power to liberate exceptional spiritual forces, the body in dance transcends by movement everything thinkable and unthinkable and reaches that which cannot be attained by thought.

Transformation through Good means a preparation period to which the ritualist is subjected before the commencement of performance of the ritual; just as external preparations and affirmation of the sacred time and place are necessary in the ritual context, so are internal purification of both the physical and the mental in Man, in order to achieve the efficacy of the ritual act being undertaken.

Beauty is a factor of the Music and Dance in the ritual act which is usually understood as a sacrifice to the Numinous being addressed by the participants in the ritual.

¹¹ In the Indian Veda, Man is denoted as a sacrificial being by whose sacrifice not only maintains the cosmic order but also, by performance of his own cosmically prescribed duty, places him on the way to drawing near to the very source, on the other side of existential being (transcending the *saṃsāre*).

to the new and the unknown, this path to knowledge is such that in giving ourselves up to the Unknown, we allow ourselves to be led by it. To this extent, we necessarily betray our scientific Creed¹² which always moves along the horizon of the known, and interprets everything by drawing on certain existing theses, hypotheses, theories, minor auxiliary theories and similar scientific 'myths'. To this extent also, to understand ritual as a custom or reduction of its nature to all the possible formal aspects means, in fact, to miss out on this utterance quality of the World which is irreversibly elevated and then forgotten each time in ritual, and it is in that very oblivion that it provides the chance for its repetition. And this is not because the sense is lost and the ritual becomes mere mechanical repetition, but just because the experience of the sense is momentary, is grasped in collision of the worlds and directly disappears. Rituals differ by their (mostly structured) exteriors; they can be differentiated by their function and satisfy many of them, but they are not comprised of all that, that is not the essence of ritual. Getting to know the external procedé of a ritual still does not mean understanding it. Constructing a thick description of a ritual still does not mean explaining it, neither from my, nor from the executor's point of view. And it is not even crucial whether we understand the ritual or not. The evidence of the ritual is the feeling which comes about when we allow it to speak for itself, without assumptions, but nonetheless in a self-explanatory manner. It is in that self-explanatory sphere that ritual happenings are found and exist. Only after that are rendition, explanation, and interpretation possible; only then (after "being within") when we have emerged once again. To hermeneutise means to speak from the position of one who stands outside, seeing the ritual as a text is like reading it without the Other, a conversation without a collocutor. A conversation without a collocutor is the sounding of the Unessential.

It has already been mentioned that the ritual encounter of the worlds is experienced but cannot be retained. "To be outside" and "to be within" are the two poles of the existential event which belong to one another in a circular way, both on the hermeneutic and the hermetic plane. The process of external acquaintance with what is ritual, this "being outside" foregoes every "being inside"; "being outside" is necessary when we want to reduce to words this "being inside" of ritual occurrences. It is necessary to speak

¹² "Das Heilige ist möglicherweise 'ganz anders', als wir es uns wünschen, vorstellen und denken. Es ist nicht auszuschließen, daß es sich dem kontrollwissenschaftlichen Zugriff zu entziehen vermag. Vielleicht setzt das wirkliche Begreifenkönnen des Heiligen immer schon das Ergriffenwerden vom Heiligen voraus. Die Nicht-Objektivierbarkeit des Heiligen bedeutet indes noch nicht, daß es das Heilige nicht gibt" (17 theses in: Gantke 1994).

about the ritual encounter if we want to make the attained insights communicable. The objectivity of this "being outside" is really not possible.¹³ It always already comprises a certain "being inside", a certain precognition of *what* and *how* with this openness towards the encounter with what is Ritual. Those who remain only *outside* do not grasp it, those who stay *inside* lose it. The momentary nature of the ritual encounter as its most profound dimension as a phenomenon, is also a manifestation of its disappearance. The encounter is grasped but not retained. Within the attempt to retain lies the death of what is Ritual. Repetition without reaching the target. And it is only in that place that both anthropology and the science of religion tie in. Only the death of what is Ritual is capable of evincing the interest of anthropologists or scientists of religion. They will try to imbue it with a new, illusory life.

We aim for the very life of what is Ritual

The ritual happening comprises transformation. It is separated from, and closed towards the external world by a separate space, a separate time, a separate atmosphere, by separate preparations of the participants. Everything takes on a dimension which is not present in everyday life; through the ritualisation of everyday life the evidence of its sacred nature is emphasised. By aesthetisation of everyday life, its profanity is imbued with meaning. Ritual as the co-bearing happening is a transformation of reality, but also the path towards it. Through it, the Abysmal becomes attainable, and man touched by it is no longer exposed to doubts about his own existential meaninglessness.

Although it occurs as a repetitive phenomenon, ritual is not circular but "a single unrepeatable encounter", as Japanese aesthetics would say. Or the circularity of the ritual event is a single new encounter every time. An ascent. And a fall.

Consequently, no detailed description, no analysis of all possible parts, order, function within society, surmounting of conflicts, role exchange, no mental structure of binary logic, but rather an experience of something fundamental which is articulated through ritual and which it is only possible "to see" in a ritual fashion represents the authenticity of "ritually to be". The utterances are many, the structures are peculiar in their cultural diversity, the functions polyvalently dependent on world

¹³ Testimony of that is provided in Malinowski's *Diary* whose appearance shook confidence in scientific objectivity and disengaged observation in the participant/observation process.

view; however, that which is unique, is that one and only encountered in the ritual.

To this extent, the ritual happening precedes any discussion of ritual. Speech rests on memory, on the memory of participant and observer. On the whole, the participant does not remember,¹⁴ while the observer i.e. the researcher, did not even see what was decisive, what was crucial. Nonetheless, both try to reveal something out of all this, to retain something in some understanding or some interpretation. And that is why diverse anthropological reports are possible about one and the same phenomenon. Retention of the event, writing down the event, text as the most sacred product of anthropological efforts in surmounting the field material is, at the same time, also a betrayal of the Sacred. Just because phenomena lend themselves to interpretation from outside one's own horizons, sciences are possible; they show life, but they do not live it. In that way they supply us with partial insights, partial theories, partial truths... The one who interprets is always in the dimension of showing and representing. And the crisis of representation was recognised earlier by anthropologists. To come to a phenomenon without prejudice means to bring about a transformation of one's own self, means to bring about a transformation in the methodical and theoretical assumptions of the profession we are engaged in, mean to bring about a transformation in the fore-structure of the *Dasein* of the research.

Ritual is not a mental category, it is not a mode of behavior, understanding of it is not obtained in one conceptual or observational process; only through an existential leap into what is Ritual itself are its representation and its interpretation possible.

The uniqueness and unrepeatable nature of ritual experience are crucial for both the philosophical, and for the anthropological and scientific religious dealing with ritual. Although there are many unique factors, they do not offer an opportunity to scientific comparison. All else which the *in* and *on* of ritual show, is comparable.

To that extent, I appeal for an openness in approach which would keep clearly in mind the multiple meanings and multilayered nature of religious phenomena, and particularly of ritual. This does not have anything in common with arbitrariness and obstinacy, which can, in any case, be easily repudiated with solid empirical work. What is in question is the simple willingness to experience and understand possible strata and meanings of phenomena, which does not also mean the uncritical

¹⁴ It is very difficult to speak of that experience of encounter and existential attunement; shamans, for example, do not remember their ecstatic journeys, or speak of them in the forms of existing culture clichés.

acceptance of all possible field and interpretative *spiritualia* offered. Whether the Sacred in the ritual encounter is a reality independent of consciousness, whether it is some anthropological constant or a culturally conditioned interpretational construct, is something we can leave open at this level of our insight.

REFERENCES CITED

- Cipra, Marijan. 1955. "Autentično biti" [Authentically to Be]. *Filozofska istraživanja* 15/3:585–590.
- Gantke, Wolfgang. 1994. *Zu einer problemorientierten Religionsphänomenologie*. Manuscript of his habilitation paper. Bonn.
- Gantke, Wolfgang. 1994. *Das Heilige - ein umstrittener Begriff*. Würzburg.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1993. *Die künstlichen Wilden. Der Anthropologe als Schriftsteller*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Greschat, Hans-Jürgen. 1988. *Was ist Religionswissenschaft?* Berlin.
- Ortner, Sherry. 1978. *Sherpas through Their Rituals*. Cambridge.
- Otto, Rudolf. 1917. *Das Heilige*. Breslau.
- Philosophische Grundlagen der Interkulturalität*. 1993. R. A. Mall & D. Lohmar, eds. Amsterdam.
- Reyna, S. P. 1994. "Literary Anthropology and the Case against Science". *MAN - The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 29/3:555–581.
- Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. 1986. J. Clifford & G. E. Marcus, eds. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zorić, Snježana. 1994. "Orient in Orient - Reception of Indian Spirituality in Korea". *Journal of Social & Natural Sciences* XXVII.

(Translated by Nina H. Antoljak)