

Introduction

BACKGROUND OF THIS VOLUME

Ritual continues to be an important topic, if not a fashionable interest, in the contemporary study of religion and culture. Whether it is understood as a certain kind of symbolic action, a form of stylized behavior, a self-contained dramatic frame, or a distinctive sort of cultural practice, ritual is increasingly regarded as playing a salient role in the meaningful construction of personal and social worlds. Once upon a time, however, this way of acting and speaking was regarded as a relic of the past, attributable to superstition, magic, or simply weird, if not obsessive, behavior. Somehow this has all changed. Nowadays, it seems, ritual is everywhere and doing practically everything. It can be powerful, dramatic, transformative, good, and healthy. Ritual experiments and workshops abound that purport to offer intense, authentic experiences. Yet, we have also become more aware of ritual's capacity to abuse, to terrorize, to dominate, or to repress.

The veritable explosion of scholarly and popular literature on the topic of ritual has spawned new sets of questions about its role and nature in collective and personal life. Historians of religion, anthropologists, psychologists, theologians—to name only a few—have eagerly set themselves to the task of discussing, analyzing, and interpreting ritual processes in order to account more fully for their purpose and power. But whereas there is keen interest in various scholarly disciplines about what ritual is and does, there has been little conversation or discussion to determine whether we might be able to learn something from one another.¹ For if ritual is being studied and interpretations are being proposed from sometimes convergent and sometimes incompatible perspectives, why not bring together a group of people who are concerned, in their teaching and research, with advancing crit-

ical understanding of this particular phenomenon in order to see what might happen?

In the lively, imaginative, and challenging milieu of the Graduate Theological Union (GTU)² and the University of California, Berkeley (UCB), we often converse with one another on topics of mutual interest that are being explored across disciplinary boundaries. Someone says, for example, "You know, so-and-so is working on ritual. You should go and talk to her." One such conversation between the editors of this volume—one a teacher and researcher in the area of psychology and religion (DeMarinis), and the other a liturgical scholar with a wide range of interests (Aune)—prompted the idea of organizing and convening a workshop on the study of ritual that would include persons from a variety of disciplines. We had noticed that although there was a good deal of interest in this topic among our multi-denominational faculty colleagues, discussions of what ritual is and does (usually termed "liturgy" or "worship") were often limited or shaped by our respective institutional agendas or by the perceived normative interests of theology and doctrine. We also noticed that the scholarly investigation of ritual that was taking place "across the street" at UCB tended to be of the sort that eschewed what we at the GTU called the "committed study of religion." The preference in university disciplines was for description and analysis that we thought overmystified and even looked critically askance at certain modes of ritual behavior and sensibility.

Nonetheless, it seemed clear to us that if we at the GTU were to continue working toward a balance between the "committed study of religion" and the "critical disciplines and perspectives" of the university, a collaborative inquiry with ritual as a common focus might be a good way to explore together an issue that mattered on both sides of the street. Since our Dean, Judith A. Berling, and the Director of our Faculty Grants and Projects Office, Cheryl Tupper, were envisioning such collaborative inquiry on an intellectual theme or issue that would cut across the lines of GTU areas of doctoral study and also would include faculty members from UCB, we were able to propose such a workshop. At that time we wrote:

Religious ritual, both awesome and austere, provides members of a community of faith with an occasion and a set of symbols to either reinforce or to transform the ways in which they think and feel about themselves and the world in which they live. Study and reflection upon this "transaction of consequence," as ritual has been called in one recent discussion, are currently carried out in a wide variety of disciplines in

both the humanities and the social sciences. Once in a while interdisciplinary conversations occur on the topic of ritual, especially religious ritual, as the recent volume *Violent Origins* attests. Moreover, recent scholarship in such diverse fields as feminist psychology, transcultural psychology, medical anthropology, neo-analytic psychotherapy, and liturgical studies has recognized the vital importance of religious ritual and its constitutive role in offering answers to, or at least perspectives on, the fundamental question of what it means to be a human being, whole and healthy or diseased and distressed.

In an ecumenical and inter-religious setting such as the Graduate Theological Union, questions about ritual's cultural, theological, and psychosocial dimensions emerge with particular forcefulness and urgency. Yet discussions of these questions tend to be limited to our individual seminaries with their respective denominational agendas or to those areas which have certain methods and approaches for addressing the role and function of religious ritual in a pluralistic, ecumenical, and inter-religious context. Given the increasing interdisciplinary interest and ferment in discussions of certain fundamental issues in ritual theory and practice, however, it is certainly timely, if not urgent, that such discussions begin to occur among GTU and UCB faculty and some of our doctoral students.

Thus, in the fall of 1989 we received a grant to begin formal exploration under the rubric of "ritual as mediator of memory and meaning."

The scholars who were invited to participate represented divergent methodological interests and fields of study. There were those whose focus was on cross-cultural and historical themes and whose scholarship and teaching sought to advance critical understanding of interreligious, multicultural, and contextual religious experience. There were others whose field of study centered on the theological and pastoral examination of various traditions of Christian worship in relation to particular institutions and communities of faith. A third group of participants represented the interface between contemporary psychological disciplines and different religious traditions of pastoral care. In short, the members of our working group each had a discipline of reference—the comparative study of religion and religious experience (which included history and anthropology), liturgical studies, and religion and psychology.

In addition to this GTU and UCB faculty component of the project, two other features or dimensions need to be mentioned. First, there was also a doctoral seminar involving eleven GTU students who were working in a variety of areas including historical studies, systematic theology, religion and psychology, liturgical studies, and the history of Christian spirituality. The second feature was that we invited two speakers from outside the GTU/UCB communities. Ronald Grimes of Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, who is credited with the development of "ritual studies" as a distinct focus, presented a public lecture entitled "Ritualizing: Tradition and Culture, Meaning and Memory."³ Volney Gay of Vanderbilt University, an author and researcher in ritual studies in religion and psychology, presented a lecture with the title "The Role of the Despised" (revised for this volume under the title "Ritual and Psychotherapy: Some Similarities and Differences").

OUR THEME AND ITS CONTESTATIONS

Although we thought that our organizing theme, "Ritual as Mediator of Memory and Meaning," suggested a theory that we thought applicable to a wide range of ritual activities, we invited each participant, in preparation for our first meeting, to provide an initial working definition of ritual. Or, at least, some argued that certain matters needed to be taken into account when attempting to delimit the range of our inquiry. For example, one noted that ritual and religious ritual should be distinguished from the merely customary and habitual. Another observed that ritual has a social and normative context that assumes the seriousness of "performatory action." Almost all the participants emphasized that ritual is a particular kind of forceful or charged activity. We also asked the participants to suggest a reading list that could assist us in developing a common vocabulary for our conversations. As one might expect, the suggested readings covered a broad range of studies—*theoretical as well as ethnographic*. We were reminded of the contentious debates about the meaning and definition of ritual, as well as the continuing lack of agreement about how to define it. In spite of this definitional warfare, there was a general assumption—both in the scholarly literature and among the participants—that whatever ritual might be, it is the kind of activity in which certain things happen or signify complex realities in particular ways.

Once we had assembled the participants for this project, our initial task was to exegete the theme that the coeditors presented in the original grant proposal: "Religious Ritual as Mediator of Memory and

Meaning." Our primary purpose was not to assert a univocal viewpoint, but to surface issues of method, theory, and interpretation within a larger contemporary epistemological landscape. This was really the challenge of our interaction and engagement across disciplines and perspectives.

We spent a great deal of time trying to clarify and to explain the "memory and meaning" theme. For some, it seemed hopelessly decontextualized and already reflective of both methodological/conceptual commitments and a certain stance toward ritual theory. We were reminded, however, that the theme had emerged from a particular context, in this instance a psychotherapeutic one, and was simply being offered as an entree into a characteristic or dynamic of ritual—its capacity or special ability to create much-needed continuity in people's lives by linking the past to the present and the present to the future. This particular characteristic proved to be more evident in some of the rituals that we explored and, consequently, certain essays in this volume refer to that perspective.

Over the long haul of the project, however, the organizing theme was variously employed, modified, criticized, re-defined, and even discarded. What seems to have emerged early on in our discussions was the necessity of probing further the nature of ritual activities themselves as we recognized the pluralism embedded in the study of ritual, both methodologically and religiously. Moreover, most participants understood both their respective study and the common work to have meaning while, at the same time, raising more questions than answers.

In our work together, we also realized the necessity of paying close attention to the very acts we were purporting to describe and to interpret. We needed to articulate our own respective awarenesses and multiple judgments regarding the rituals under study. For the question that was continually provoking and challenging us was this: "Whose meaning are we constructing when rituals are interpreted: our informants' or our own?"⁴

The unity of our group was in attending to and contesting the assumptions and "truth claims" as they are operative in our disciplines, as well as in acknowledging that our own experiences of ritual were at work as we went about our tasks of description and interpretation. Our sense was and is that if we did not include such matters we would be guilty of exemplifying the sort of thing recently commented upon by Stephen A. Tyler in his book, *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World*:

The ethnographer suppresses the experience of ritual, its fits and starts, movements from center to periphery, its plurivocality, and substitutes for it the smooth, uninterrupted flow of a univocal narrative in which the sequentialized action builds logically to its climax and moves unfalteringly to its conclusion. Both ethnographer and reader suppress their experience of ritual and know it only as literature, as a text of a ritual which can be understood only by comparing it to texts of other rituals, seeing it finally as part of the ultimate "how to" book of magic, or as a preliminary, though hesitant, step on the road to science.⁵

Among the lively questions to emerge from this portion of our work was whether any privileged or articulated role of the influence of the personal experience of the respective workshop participants (or perhaps lack thereof) needed to be acknowledged. We realized that this was the case these days in certain forms of cultural and social analysis where the notion of the "positioned subject" is invoked or when it is argued that the role of subjectivity in ritual studies must be expanded.⁶ One of our colleagues stated this issue well:

When it is the ritual of "my" tradition [there is] familiar pattern with subtle variations which express the cycles of the sacred year and/or personal or communal experience; a sense of belonging; best when multivalent (when [it] contains layers and levels of meaning); breaks the race of profane time to a different rhythm and thus helps to stimulate a certain level of reflection/prayer/contemplation/focus. . . .

When it is "their" rituals: the pattern is both powerful and communicative even though I am not "within" the community; [there is] a sense of connectedness to others; [there is] the power of the dramatic structure (rituals have a plot); roles and relationships are defined; conveys more deeply than any other mode (except perhaps art) the vitality of the tradition.⁷

We were very aware that to describe such vitality and veracity as "meaning" or "meaning-making" might ensnare us in the nasty debate over whether ritual "means" anything or whether instead it should be regarded as "pure activity without meaning or goal."⁸ With the demise of referential theories of meaning at least since the time of Gottlob Frege, however, there has been a corresponding broadening and deepening of "meaning" as involving much more than "signifying

to the intellect."⁹ While ritual may not or need not have *intellectual content*, this is not at all to say or to suggest that it is meaningless. Rather, as has been observed and argued recently,

Meaning is meaning, in the vague and wonderful sense we use the word when we talk to each other. . . . We have to learn that when we ask "What does ritual mean?", we must immediately qualify our query: "To whom?", "When?", "Why?", and, importantly, "How?"¹⁰

Moreover, ritual, in the final analysis, is

a matter of human culture, enacted by men and women, sometimes alone, more often in community. It is therefore a question of subjective experience. As we describe it, soberly, and as objectively as we can, we are describing the real experience of a real person or group of people.¹¹

Thus, the essays collected here have sought to describe ritual experiences of a real person or groups of persons.

Our descriptive and interpretive efforts, while trying to avoid the contentious and often nasty discussions of how to define the term *ritual*, nonetheless have been influenced by implicit or explicit definitions. For example, some of us found the recent shift from the concern with formal definition to an approach in terms of "qualities of ritual" or "ritualization" to be useful, if not more advantageous.¹² This shift allowed exploration of certain dimensions of the experience of ritual such as cognition and emotion that, say, more theological investigations would not consider or be willing to consider at all. For example, in liturgical studies, a primary concern has been with "official" and "normative" meaning—"the things the experts say that a rite means" and "the structure of signification that ritual affixes upon the non-ritualized world that the ritual participants re-enter when the rite has been concluded."¹³

Yet other essayists, particularly those writing from comparativist or clinical points of view, found it necessary to be more definitionally specific. As Volney Gay has observed, "The way in which one defines the term 'ritual' directly influences the development of one's subsequent analysis of the phenomenon."¹⁴ But it also needs to be noted that the theoretical debate in the study of ritual has yet to produce a precise way of specifying what this sort of human activity is. It just might be that precise definitions are neither possible nor are they necessary. In

fact, most definitions, as Don Handelman has pointed out, are “unremarkable, noncommittal, and innocuous. . . .”¹⁵ Moreover,

they really tell us almost nothing, apart from some vague sort of instruction, perhaps akin to: PAY ATTENTION—SOMETHING SPECIAL GOING ON HERE AND NOW.¹⁶

THEORETICAL INTERESTS AND CONCERNS

Paying attention to something important going on here and now (or, then and there) does involve, however, an awareness of or responsiveness to theoretical interests and concerns. “Theory,” of course, has many meanings, but here we need be concerned only with its meanings in the context of the study of ritual. By “ritual theory” we mean the debate over the nature and function of this sort of activity. The focus is on the problematic of how to understand or explain appropriately just what is being done and said. Throughout our discussions and in the essays in this volume, we strove to be as clear and forthright as we could about what were our operative theoretical interests and concerns. Yet a crucial question that surfaced, particularly during the writing of the essays, was whether we were using theory applicatively or critically.

For example, it is rather easy to think of theory in the applicative sense. That is, we bring to our inquiry a systematic statement of rules or principles to be followed. For the study of ritual, this usually means that there is a thing that can be generally labelled “ritual” and that it exhibits certain distinctive features. In the early work of our project, it was clear that most of us operated with this notion of theory. We assumed, often without testing, that there is some sort of universal construct—i.e., “ritual”—and the task is to figure out how it works and why. So, we would employ our favorite theorists—Ron Grimes, Victor Turner, Theodore Jennings, Catherine Bell, Evan Zuesse, Mircea Eliade, Clifford Geertz, Stanley Tambiah, Arnold van Gennep—because we thought they best helped us to illuminate a particular ritual or ritualizing situation.

What is fascinating is that even though we began to find the formulation “ritual as mediator of memory and meaning” to be problematic because it did not work as a satisfying explanation for some of the expressions we were exploring,¹⁷ we found it difficult to proceed to the realization that our inquiry into particular ritual instances could challenge and reformulate the theorists’ positions. This may have been due to a naive understanding of how theory and practice are related—that is, we think that theory is applied to a ritual expression rather than for-

mulated from it. But once some of us interrogated theoretical positions from the perspective of our examples and cases, theory began to emerge as having a great deal to do with the very basic questions that any serious student of ritual must face. These include: How did they do that? How did they make sense of that ritual? Where are they coming from? Why does ritual still have the power to do what it does? This can be, of course, very unsettling, because assumptions are questioned and more problems are created.

Often, for example, it is assumed that ritual has to do with order, structure, unity, identity, transformation—to name just a few characteristics and dynamics that a dominant theoretical discourse might claim. But is it always the case that such activity is about or actually doing these things? Some of our colleagues discovered otherwise. In their research and writing, they found very different characteristics and dynamics. Resistance, subversion, as well as redefinitions of power and performativity, began to surface. Others of us became uncomfortable with notions of “meaning” because they overshadowed or displaced “knowing” or did not account for “embodiment,” which were emerging as salient features of the rituals under investigation. What these discoveries indicated is that ritual and ritualizing are “inherently historical”¹⁸ or radically contextualized with “context” requiring as much interpretation as the ritual activities themselves. Any theoretical insights needed to emerge from the specificity of the activity being explored.

This specificity includes the “frame” in which the ritual occurs, its cultural history, and its universe of morphological significance (i.e., relating to form, structure, pattern).¹⁹ To accomplish this, at least the following sets of issues need to be addressed:

- meanings and meaningfulness
- time, place, and the participant’s perceptions
- recent *and* older history of the ritual and of its interpretations
- role of pattern, indigenous structure, particularity
- relation between “interpreter” and “interpreted”

Theoretically, we believe that it is our attention to these sets of issues that has made our collaborative endeavor both significant and worthy of further discussion.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

The provision of “case studies” across a wide range of cultures and historical instances is exactly what has been suggested by recent ritual

studies.²⁰ More important, each of our contributors has sought to incorporate his or her historical, methodological, and autobiographical situations in responsible and graceful ways.

The volume is divided into three parts: comparative explorations, liturgical explorations, and clinical explorations. Our choice of "explorations," both for the title of the volume and for its three parts, is deliberate. As noted earlier, this project began as an "exploration" of the topic of religious ritual and its relation to memory and meaning-making. During our process of discussion and exchange, this relation was explored, criticized, modified, and utilized in a variety of ways—some more explicit than others. In particular, the presentations of Ronald L. Grimes and Volney Gay challenged us to reconsider the commonly accepted views of ritual as "traditional," "collective," and "meaningful."

The "exploratory" nature of these essays means that they can be also "hypothesis generating." That is, they raise critical questions for further cooperative exploration *beyond* the liturgical, comparative, and clinical areas. And, finally, the essays can be considered "explorations" in the sense of undertaking the theoretical and methodological challenges present in the study of ritual in the 1990s.²¹

Each part of the volume has its own introductory essay, which provides a point of entry to and thematic overview of the essays. The three-part structure of the volume is intentional. The comparative, liturgical, and clinical explorations reflect the three broad disciplines of the scholars involved in our project. Our placement of the comparative explorations first grew out of the realization that the rituals we were investigating seemed to proceed from those embedded in particular religious or belief structures to those which were located within certain ecclesial communities to those which emphasized ritual and the individual. The progression, of course, is not terribly neat or tidy since there are overlaps as well as tensions between and among the comparative, liturgical, and clinical. But, in terms of matters of emphasis, our triadic structure reflects, we think, the push-and-pull that exists between belief systems, institutions, and individuals.

Also, the placement of the comparative explorations first is reflective of a historical progression in the study of ritual. Comparative studies have been the most traditional and have tended to be the dominant mode of explanation. Liturgical and clinical studies have only recently begun to utilize and to take advantage of the breaching of scholarly boundaries. What we wanted to know about particular instances of ritualizing—whether in church or in the clinic—was being restructured by interpretive paradigms that one might think belong more to the

comparative enterprise. Yet we also think that our triadic organization of this volume testifies to how the disciplinary can give way to the interdisciplinary because changes in interpretive approaches actually ensue in changes in what can be seen and then thought about with respect to the rituals being explored. We began to realize that formulations of the question also change—and this is what has happened in this book.

Finally, our triple focus represents a movement in the relation between “interpreter” and “interpreted.” That is, those writing in the comparative section are outsiders to the rituals they investigated. The question which their “outsider” position raises is whether we can really understand a culture other than our own. Such a question has been at the forefront of so-called postmodernist culture writing and theorizing.²² The essayists in the liturgical section of this volume are insiders. They stand within the particular traditions they explore. Such a vantage point allows for exploration of ritual activity, experience, and impact at both the individual participant and group levels. Although this vantage point permits discussion and analysis of normative claims as well as descriptive matters of empowerment and identification, it may also blind the essayists to certain issues, such as the private or the political. The clinical essayists write as professionals concerned with articulating and exploring the consequences of ritual experience and ritual memory at the following levels of meaning-making: cognitive, behavioral, and symbolic.

The interpreter—interpreted relationship thus raises the larger issue of “integrity”: how to be present in the face of radical difference. Anthropologist Bruce Kapferer’s observation is useful here. He has written, “For the worlds of others to realize their critical force, their schemes of thought and practice must be explored systematically and, further, must be given equivalent ontological and epistemological status.”²³ A brief glance at our triple focus will begin to make this concern with integrity clearer.

THE ESSAYS

The essays in Part I are “comparative explorations” of a wide range of ritual behavior—Aboriginal, Javanese, Shingon Buddhist and Shaker (Martin, Fischer, Payne, and Stortz). These authors have isolated key issues and themes such as bodies, knowing, power, authority, gender, person, and status and, at the same time, have historicized and contextualized them. In so doing, they reflect the multiple ways complex cultures require decoding, recognizing how

treacherous is the terrain of comparison whether across time or geographical boundary.

What these diverse essays offer, even generate, is an enhanced understanding of the multiple levels of ritual experience and function. In some cultural and meaning-making contexts, these levels work to personally or communally transform. Investigations of other contexts, however, challenge traditional theories of ritual that emphasize the conservative or transformative function of this way of acting and speaking. Sometimes, what is found instead is an understanding and experience of ritual that embraces chaos and resistance or confronts various kinds of power and authority.

In every case, however, the dimensions of social identification and social consequence of each ritual expression are undertaken. The essays also raise insights and questions regarding recognition and appreciation of the category of space, both internal and external, in ritual experience and analysis.

The essays in Part II are primarily "liturgical explorations" of certain rituals or ritualizing activities in several Christian traditions (Aune and Slough). They are "liturgical" in the disciplinary sense of the authors' training in the investigation of church or synagogue activity enshrined principally in texts but now expanded to go beyond them in order to discover the ways that liturgy might actually be said to work in particular communities. The activities investigated in these essays include a Communion service and hymn singing. The essayists have in common the "insider" position of participant-observer. They each stand within the particular traditions which they explore, using a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches, especially those where ritual is regarded as a distinctive kind of strategic action that embraces social and (inter)subjective dynamics of knowing and feeling.

The essays in Part III involve "clinical explorations" of the nature and function of ritual (Gay, DeMarinis, Driskill, and Noonan). There is a consideration of the similarities and differences between ritual and psychotherapy, followed by two case presentations of the therapeutic efficacy of religious ritual in clinical settings, and an exploration of the commonalities of the experience of surgery with the phenomena usually associated with rites of passage.

The interactions are investigated from different clinical vantage points. Yet, each does so with attention to intrapersonal and interpersonal consequences. Each author employs an approach to ritual activity and experience by way of phenomenological and functional categories. These essays are located within the broad field of the psy-

chology of religion, with special emphasis on psychotherapeutic contexts.

In this part of the volume, the focus shifts from an analysis of religious or social rituals within particular cultures or ecclesial traditions to the use and application of ritual categories in various clinical contexts. This shift is significant, for it necessitates experimenting and a broadening of understandings of ritual. The essays in this section deal the most explicitly with the interactions among ritual, memory, and meaning. Hypotheses concerning these interactions are generated for the clinical arena and beyond. First, the essayists emphasize both the positive and negative dimensions and consequences of the power of ritual experience. Second, ritual experience affects behavioral, cognitive, and symbolic levels of development. It generates ritual memory, which is itself of an order and magnitude that requires carefully constructed containment systems. Third, the memory of ritual makes a conscious and unconscious impact in ways that other experiences do not. It cannot be restricted to cognition because what occurs is both bodily and affective. The involvement of the body in ritual understanding and reconstruction in the therapeutic context is essential.

TOWARD FURTHER DISCUSSION

These explorations of ritual expression and experience raise further questions concerning the kind of *work* ritual does. Is it "transformative"? That is, are there reorganizations or reinterpretations of cultural and personal experience that produce newly meaningful wholes—one being or state has become another being or state? Or is the work of ritual less tidy and less dramatic, achieving not so much a shift in consciousness or status but rather a reinvigorating and sustaining of an already existing awareness of the way things are, have been, and will be? Is ritual "humanizing" in its use of shared symbols and communal affirmations? Have some of us "romanced ritual" or mystified it into a central socio-cultural process that is source and shaper of values and beliefs? Or is it something else altogether?

Along with raising these questions, the essays also suggest directions for further explorations of the nature and function of ritual. These directions include analysis of the special power in ritual acts; the influence of ritual upon behavioral, cognitive, and symbolic levels of development; the role that structure and history play in conserving or resisting hegemonic order; and the impact upon conscious and unconscious levels of meaning-making. It is clear that ritual experience cannot be restricted to cognitive categories alone but involves the

body as well as the mind. Continued inquiry into ritual practice is, perhaps, not so much for the sake of presenting a new or grand theory of how it works and why. Rather, these essays point to a kind of attentiveness and engagement with those activities that just might leave us with more complicated and more unsettling questions. We have noted some of them—performance, sense-making, cultural location, and power. As these questions are posed, so the horizon enlarges, habits of simplification and reduction are challenged, and more conversation with a plurality of voices is invited.

NOTES

1. Exceptions might be the papers and conversations collected in *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, René Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation*, ed. Robert G. Hamerton-Kelly with an Introduction by Burton Mack and a Commentary by Renato Rosaldo (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987) and *Understanding Rituals*, ed. Daniel de Coppet (London and New York: Routledge, 1992). The issue of *Journal of Ritual Studies* 4/2 (Summer 1990) devoted to the topic of "Ritual and Power" and the ongoing "Ritual Studies" group of the American Academy of Religion should also be mentioned.

2. The Graduate Theological Union, located in Berkeley, California, is a consortium of nine seminaries representing various Roman Catholic orders, Protestant denominations, and faculty in Jewish, Orthodox, and Buddhist studies.

3. This essay was subsequently published as "Reinventing Ritual" in *Soundings* 75/1 (Spring 1992), pp. 21–41.

4. James L. Watson, "The Structure of Chinese Funerary Rites: Elementary Forms, Ritual Sequence, and the Primacy of Performance," *Death Ritual in Late Imperial and Modern China*, ed. James L. Watson and Evelyn S. Rawski (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), p. 5.

5. (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), pp. 93–94.

6. See Renato Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989); S. Michael Price, "Ritual, Meaning, and Subjectivity: Studying Ritual as Human Religious Expression," *Epoche: UCLA Journal for the History of Religions* 16 (1988), pp. 11–32.

7. Judith A. Berling, discussion paper prepared for the GTU Interdisciplinary Project on Religious Ritual as Mediator of Memory and Meaning, March 22, 1990, p. 2.

8. Frits Staal, *Rules Without Meaning: Ritual, Mantras and the Human Sciences*, Toronto Studies in Religion, vol. 4, (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), p. 131.

9. S. Michael Price, "Ritual, Meaning, and Subjectivity," p. 23.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

12. E.g., Ronald L. Grimes, *Ritual Criticism: Case Studies in Its Practice, Essays on Its Theory* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1990), p. 13ff; Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 7–8, 73–74, 88–89, 140–41, 205, 209, 218.

13. Lawrence A. Hoffman, "How Ritual Means: Ritual Circumcision in Rabbinic Culture and Today," *Studia Liturgica* 23 (1993), pp. 80, 82.

14. *Freud on Ritual: Reconstruction and Critique*. (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), p. 40.

15. *Models and Mirrors: Towards an Anthropology of Public Events* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 11.

16. *Ibid.*

17. See, for example, the essays by Fischer, Payne, Stortz, Aune and Slough in this volume.

18. John D. Kelly and Martha Kaplan, "History, Structure, and Ritual," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990), pp. 119–150; *Modernity and Its Malcontents: Ritual and Power in Postcolonial Africa*, ed. Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

19. What follows is based on Fred W. Clothey, "Toward a Comprehensive Interpretation of Ritual," *Journal of Ritual Studies* 2/2 (1988), pp. 147–161.

20. E.g., Grimes, *Ritual Criticism*, and Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.

21. See the challenges raised by ritual studies as a field as well as the study of ritual in general: for example, Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*; Grimes, *Ritual Criticism*; and *Violent Origins: Walter Burkert, René Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation*.

22. See, for example, James Clifford's introductory essay, "Partial Truths," in Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The*

Poetics and Politics of Ethnography (Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press, 1986), pp. 1–26.

23. Bruce Kapferer, "The Anthropologist as Hero: Three Exponents of Post-Modernist Anthropology," *Critique of Anthropology* 8/2 (1988), p. 95.