



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### The absence of the divine

**Citation for published version:**

Copeman, J & Hagström, J 2018, 'The absence of the divine', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, vol. 8, no. 1-2, pp. 87-91. <https://doi.org/10.1086/698410>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1086/698410](https://doi.org/10.1086/698410)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## THE ABSENCE OF THE DIVINE

JACOB COPEMAN & JOHN HAGSTROM

Willerslev and Suhr's text is a renewed warrant for the methodological recognition that anthropologists of religion often experience revelatory, transformative, and disruptive events during fieldwork. A catalogue of mystical encounters—resembling what Apter has recently dubbed the “ethnographic X-files” (2017, 297)—is provided: for instance, Evans-Pritchard's unidentified night-time lights, Bubandt's disconcerting rooftop dog, Willerslev's prophetic dream, and Suhr's whispering djinn. It would be easy to list further examples (e.g., Desjarlais 1992; Young and Goulet 1994; Jacobs 2002), and it is clear that a widespread phenomenon is receiving systematic attention here. As privileged drivers for novel anthropological insights, these experiences suffuse the scholarly core of the discipline with remarkable and perhaps unique generative force. The primary deficit of Willerslev and Suhr's otherwise excellent article, we will show, is their omission of examples that testify to the absence of the divine, felt by both interlocutors and anthropologists.

In certain respects, as the authors point out, their arguments are indebted to earlier calls for a dismantling of the disciplinary taboo against a methodological posture of radical participation, self-effacement, and existential transformation—frequently glossed as “going native” (e.g., Turner 1993; Ewing 1994; Fabian 2000). However, they seize on the significant fact that encounters with the divine are often doubt-ridden or even incomprehensible, echoing recent critics of the ontological turn (e.g., Graeber 2015), and new anthropological scholarship on doubt (e.g., Blanes & Oustinova-Stjepanovic 2015; Pelkmans 2013; Haynes forthcoming). In other words, the origin and meaning of disruptive experiences—whether in the form of prophetic dreams or manipulative whispers—are at times perceived by interlocutors as “inherently unknowable” (Graeber 2015, 28), foreclosing any recourse to the stable and coherent ontology implied by the problematic adage of the “native's point of view”. The inexplicable nature of such events, Willerslev and Suhr contend, is an index of absolute Kierkegaardian paradoxes, provoking questions that “understanding cannot answer,” and producing “a type of existential uncertainty that belongs neither to oneself nor to the ethnographic other, but subsumes them both.”

Graeber has suggested that the ethnographic record is probably just as ripe with skepticism as it is with revelation, even if it is a kind of doubt that rarely breaks the game: “the aura of at least potential disbelief,” as he puts it (2001, 243). Thus, specific hail charms and curers can be branded fraudulent, but such scrutiny tends to “leave the main belief in the prophetic and therapeutic powers of witch-doctors unimpaired” (Evans-Pritchard [1937] 1976, 107; see Lévi-Strauss 1963; Taussig [1998] 2016). Of course, there are also examples of more thoroughgoing disavowal and detachment (e.g., Radin 1927, 1953; Goody 1996). The skepticism that Graeber and others identify is, at least in part, tied to the potential for magical failure and ineptitude—as Bialecki puts it, the divine might exist “as much under erasure as it does as a presence ethnographically” (2014, 43). The analytical value of taking failure seriously is demonstrated by Oustinova-Stjepanovic's recent study of a Sufi order in Macedonia and the felt incapacity of its adherents, in spite of attempts at reflexive self-discipline, to experience spiritually charged rituals: “‘Why are we so inept?’ (Zashto nas ne biva?),” they ask themselves (2017, 338). There are many other examples of spiritual and

prophetic deficit (e.g., Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter 1956; Kendall 1996; Laderman 1996; Lewis 2000; Kravel-Tovi 2009). In line with Graeber's contention that the critical skepticism of interlocutors is often "simply left out of ethnographic accounts" (2015, 11), Oustinova-Stjepanovic charts the default conjectures of anthropological theory that engender an analytical predilection to "discount failure and ineptitude as an 'aberration'" (2017, 339).

It seems only reasonable to expect that many anthropologists will share the trials and shortcomings of their informants. Stoller once proposed that anthropologists of shamanism are especially liable to "experience something so extraordinary that they find no reasonable explanation" (1984, 93), but it took one anthropologist-turned-practitioner eighteen years of San Pedro-fueled ceremonies to finally share the visions of her fellow adherents (Glass-Coffin 2010). Bialecki's insightful remarks are again helpful here: "There is a problematic aspect to any encounter with divinity; even a theist can acknowledge that contact with the divine is in no way guaranteed" (2017, 205).

In fact, there is now a modest body of confessional texts by anthropologists describing their own spiritual failures. Morton reflects on "two instances of [his] secular-rationalist embarrassment in the presence of divine revelation" (2013, 235): the first occurred during a lecture when a Cook Islander student had a vision of Morton being transformed into a venerable Aboriginal elder, and the second event took place during his fieldwork in New South Wales, when he was chased from a forbidden sacred site by an unseen creature (242). He found himself incapable of sharing the sense of mystical depth and revelation expressed by his student and informants, citing his "anthropological lack of grace" (245). Kahn, in a similar tone, describes himself as a "poster boy for modern secular selfhood," and reports feeling a visceral unease when his interlocutors detail personal incidents of telepathy, healing powers, rebirth, or palm-reading—phenomena that he calls "radically other to secular experience" (2011, 78). Blanes, reflecting on his fieldwork in Pentecostal churches in Lisbon and Madrid as "someone who was unwilling either to 'go native' or, on the other hand, conceal his atheism" (2006, 225), also describes feelings of anxiety and embarrassment when participating in intensive rituals (231). He writes: "In order to 'live in Christ' I had to be 'touched by God'—something that is felt in a bodily manner and not rationalised but . . . I had felt nothing so far. I hadn't been anointed by God's grace" (229). In Papua New Guinea, when an Urapmin informant suggested that Robbins was "starting to 'receive' the Holy Spirit," he strongly protested (2015, 124).

In contrast, Suhr describes an example of djinn possession in Denmark, and he reports hearing manipulative whispers. Oustinova-Stjepanovic, in a not too dissimilar case, was herself diagnosed with possession by a male Sufi dervish in Macedonia, which involved "being subjected to manhandling and physical scrutiny during the search for a djinn or spots where evil forces could have hit" (2015, 127). Her physical and emotional discomfort during the exorcism left little room for Willerslev and Suhr's appeal to "accept the impossibility of understanding the power of God in healing." Reflecting on her experience, she arrives at the crucial insight that what is at stake for many atheist anthropologists is not methodological atheism, a strategy she rejects (2015, 115–16). Instead, "dispositional atheism," deeply felt sensory aptitudes or sensibilities, sets the limits of her participation (129). This is a helpful way of thinking about the experiences reported by many atheist anthropologists, such as

Kahn, Morton, and Blanes—and all of them write against Berger’s (1967) version of methodological atheism: for Kahn, it is a violent “ethnocentric exercise” (2011, 82); for Blanes, it is inimical to the recognition of spirits (Blanes and Espírito Santo 2014); Bialecki, who describes himself as “in effect an atheist,” re-works it to frame God as an agent in the world (2014, 33); Morton (2013) favors the cross-pollination of anthropology and theology, and, perhaps surprisingly, reads Durkheim as theology; and the list goes on (see Apter 2017). These accounts give a far more accurate picture of how the anthropology of religion looks today compared to what Fortes once wrote about objectivity and reason (1980, vii). Willerslev and Suhr argue that Berger’s variant of methodological atheism still occupies the position of a guarded doctrine, but it is obvious that there are considerable limits to that claim.

What might Willerslev and Suhr’s article tell us about the “return of theology” in anthropology? Engelke’s exposition of Philip Blond’s theology is instructive here, not least given the fact that Blond was trained by Milbank, the lead advocate for Radical Orthodoxy and the author of that lauded title *Theology and Social Theory* (Milbank 1990), which Robbins (2006) introduced as an exemplar to showcase the productive potential of theology. “There is no such thing as a secular realm,” writes Blond (1999, 235), “a part of the world that can be elevated above God and explained and investigated apart from Him.” For all their qualms about the analytical cul-de-sac of humanist models of univocal sameness, post-secular theorists are often just as predictable: secularity is reimagined as a fraudulent Christian masquerade, reason is faith (or faith’s end, or faith’s origin—dealer’s choice), and the notion of a nontheological reality is considered just as preposterous as a nonpolitical one (Engelke 2015, 136–37). Once the “secular episteme” is unmasked as “post-Christian paganism” (Milbank 1990, 280), a project of radical remaking is warranted: “The very language of politics, as well as that of culture— and thus the very terms of the secular in which they operate—have to be reconfigured at the ontological level” (Engelke 2010). This project is mirrored in Fountain’s (2013) call for a remodeled anthropology, or “anthro-theology.” But if, as we have shown, secularity is not reducible to intellectual precepts that are ostensibly indebted to Christian antecedents, but exists also in the form of dispositions and sensibilities, then the “return of theology” demands more than a reconfiguration of theoretical languages—it calls for the reconfiguration of selves, or what Willerslev and Suhr call a “personal commitment to existential transformation of the self.” The undertaking of such a project is unlikely to ameliorate the absence of the divine.

## References

- Apter, Andrew. 2017. “Ethnographic X-Files and Holbraad’s Double-Bind: Reflections on an Ontological Turn of Events.” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7 (1): 287–302.
- Berger, Peter. 1967. *The Social Reality of Religion*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Bialecki, Jon. 2014. “Does God Exist in Methodological Atheism? On Tanya Luhrmann’s *When God Talks Back* and Bruno Latour.” *Anthropology of Consciousness* 25 (1): 32– 52.

- . 2017. *A Diagram for Fire: Miracles and Variation in an American Charismatic Movement*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Blanes, Ruy L. 2006. "The Atheist Anthropologist: Believers and Non-Believers in Anthropological Fieldwork." *Social Anthropology* 14 (2): 223–34.
- Blanes, Ruy L., and Diana Espírito Santo, eds. 2014. *The Social Life of Spirits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blanes, Ruy L., and Galina Oustinova-Stjepanovic. 2015. "Godless People, Doubt, and Atheism." *Social Analysis* 59 (2): 1– 19.
- Blond, Philip. 1999. "Perception: From Modern Painting to the Vision in Christ." In *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology*, edited by John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock, and Graham Ward, 220–42. London: Routledge.
- Desjarlais, Robert R. 1992. *Body and Emotion: The Aesthetics of Illness and Healing in the Nepal Himalayas*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Engelke, Matthew. 2010. "Radical Orthodoxy's New Home?" *The Immanent Frame*, <https://tif.ssrc.org/2010/03/18/radical-orthodoxys-new-home/>.
- . 2015. "On Atheism and Non-Religion: An After- word." *Social Analysis* 59 (2): 135–45.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1937) 1976. *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic among the Azande*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ewing, Katherine P. 1994. "Dreams from a Saint: Anthropological Atheism and the Temptation to Believe." *American Anthropologist* 96 (3): 571–83.
- Fabian, Johannes. 2000. *Out of Our Minds: Reason and Madness in the Exploration of Central Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Festinger, Leon, Henry W. Riecken, and Stanley Schachter. 1956. *When Prophecy Fails*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fortes, Meyer. 1980. "Anthropologists and Theologians: Common Interests and Divergent Approaches." In *Sacrifice*, edited by M. F. C. Bourdillon and Meyer Fortes, v–xix. New York: Academic Press for the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Fountain, Philip. 2013. "Toward a Post-Secular Anthropology." *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 24 (3): 310–28.
- Glass-Coffin, Bonnie. 2010. "Anthropology, Shamanism, and Alternate Ways of Knowing-Being in the World: One Anthropologist's Journey of Discovery and Transformation." *Anthropology and Humanism* 35 (2): 204–17.

Goody, Jack. 1996. "A Kernel of Doubt." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.)* 2 (4): 667–81.

Graeber, David. 2001. *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value: The False Coin of Our Own Dreams*. New York: Palgrave.

———. 2015. "Radical Alterity Is Just Another Way of Saying 'Reality': A Reply to Eduardo Viveiros de Castro." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5 (2): 1–41.

Haynes, Naomi. Forthcoming. "The Benefit of the Doubt: On the Relationship between Doubt and Power." *Anthropological Quarterly*.

Jacobs, Janet. 2002. "Transitional Identities: Self, Other, and the Ethnographic Process." In *Personal Knowledge and Beyond: Reshaping the Ethnography of Religion*, edited by James V. Spickard, J. Shawn Landres, and Meredith B. McGuire, 88–99. New York: New York University Press.

Kahn, Joel. 2011. "Understanding: Between Belief and Unbelief." *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 22 (1): 76–88.

Kendall, Laurel. 1996. "Initiating Performance: The Story of Chini, a Korean Shaman." In *The Performance of Healing*, edited by Carol Laderman and Marina Roseman, 17–58. New York: Routledge.

Kravel-Tovi, Michal. 2009. "To See the Invisible Messiah: Messianic Socialization in the Wake of a Failed Prophecy in Chabad." *Religion* 39 (3): 248–60.

Laderman, Carol. 1996. "The Poetics of Healing in Malay Shamanistic Performances." In *The Performance of Healing*, edited by Carol Laderman and Marina Roseman, 115–42. New York: Routledge.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. "The Sorcerer and His Magic." In *Structural Anthropology*, 167–85. New York: Basic Books.

Lewis, Gilbert. 2000. *A Failure of Treatment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milbank, John. 1990. *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Morton, John. 2013. "Durkheim, Freud and I in Aboriginal Australia, or Should Anthropology Contain Theology?" *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 24 (3): 235–49.

Oustinova-Stjepanovic, Galina. 2015. "Confessional Anthropology." *Social Analysis* 59 (2): 114–34.

———. 2017. "A Catalogue of Vice: A Sense of Failure and Incapacity to Act among Roma Muslims in Macedonia." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.)* 23 (2): 338–55.

Pelkmans, Mathijs, ed. 2013. *Ethnographies of Doubt: Faith and Uncertainty in Contemporary Societies*. New York: I. B. Tauris.

Radin, Paul. 1927. "Skepticism and Critique." In *Primitive Man as Philosopher*, 375–84. London: D. Appleton and Company.

———. 1953. "Psychological Types: The Religious and the Non-Religious Man." In *The World of Primitive Man*, 68–104. New York: Henry Schuman.

Robbins, Joel. 2006. "Anthropology and Theology: An Awkward Relationship?" *Anthropological Quarterly* 79 (2): 285–94.

———. 2015. "Engaged Disbelief: Communities of Detachment in Christianity and in the Anthropology of Christianity." In *Detachment: Essays on the Limits of Relational Thinking*, edited by Matei Candea, Joanna Cook, Catherine Trundle, and Thomas Yarrow, 115–27. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stoller, Paul. 1984. "Eye, Mind and Word in Anthropology." *L'Homme* 24 (3/4): 91–114.

Taussig, Michael. (1998) 2016. "Viscerality, Faith, and Skepticism: Another Theory of Magic." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6 (3): 453–83.

Turner, Edith. 1993. "The Reality of Spirits: A Tabooed or Permitted Field of Study?" *Anthropology of Consciousness* 4 (1): 9–12.

Young, David E., and Jean-Guy Goulet, eds. 1994. *Being Changed: The Anthropology of Extraordinary Experience*. Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.