

THE RELIGION OF EVERYDAY LIFE:
AN ETHNOSCIENCE INVESTIGATION INTO THE CONCEPTS OF RELIGION AND MAGIC.

W. E. A. van Beek

1. THE PROBLEM

The empirical study of religion is haunted by a plethora of conceptions and presuppositions deriving not from the phenomena studied but from the chairborne division of theoreticians and theologians. Classification of religious phenomena still follows the lines set by students of religion in the nineteenth century; categories such as prayer, sacrifice, divination and magic are centuries old, deriving ultimately from the analysis of classical and Hebrew religion. Though their origin does not necessarily invalidate them, their general applicability still has to be proved. In this paper we shall try to clarify one pair of those concepts, i.e. the age-old distinction between religion and magic.

Prof. van Baal, among others, has applied himself to this problem in his inaugural lecture, "Magic as a Religious Phenomenon" (Van Baal 1960, 1963). In this lecture he demonstrated why the fields of magic and religion should be considered as one logically coherent phenomenon, giving ample proof of the fundamentally religious character of magical rites. In a later publication (Van Baal 1966), the term "private rites" has been used, but it has since been abandoned because of limited applicability. The awkward expression "magico-religious" indicates similarity between the two concepts but as it sheds no light on the internal division of the field, it is too easy a way out of the problem.

2. METHOD

Within the field of comparative religion Van Baal has always upheld

the banner of empirical research. With Van Baal I consider the unit of analysis and comparison to be a religion, instead of all kinds of concepts and classifications from western scholars with their inevitable ethnocentric bias.¹⁾ Religious concepts should be rooted in empirical study. Intensive field research is needed in order to arrive at valid religiographies embedded in the total cultural context of each particular religion. In any description of religion, the interpretation by the bearers of that particular culture should be taken into account. Though the analysis may be done by an outside investigator, the meaning and relevance of religious activities and concepts are to be discovered within the religion itself.

Therefore we shall analyse the conceptual system of a religion as a whole, with its own classification of religious activities, in order to discover, first whether the field of religion is subdivided in any way relevant to the problem of magic and religion and, second, what hypotheses this division implies about their relationship. For demarcation of the whole field we will use the definition of religion formulated by Van Baal: "all explicit and implicit notions, accepted as true, which relate to a reality which cannot be verified empirically" (Van Baal 1971: 3). This definition, though idealistic in the emphasis, leaves enough room for an analysis of ritual behavior, and, as Van Baal has shown, includes magical rites.

The approach best suited to this problem seems to be *ethnoscience*, or *formal semantic analysis*. In the confrontation of native classification with categorisations from outside, ethnoscience methods have the advantage of starting from those classifications relevant to the informants. It also has developed a rigorous method for internal validation of systems of classification. In ethnoscience terminology, our problem is one of contrasting the *emic* categories of religious activities in one particular religion with the *etic* categories of religion and magic.²⁾

Ethnoscience analysis depends heavily on language data, as it entails a formal semantic analysis of the organisation of the native terms; hence the major part of our analysis will be concerned with these native lexemes.

3. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE SEMANTIC DOMAIN.

We will analyse here the religious system of the Kapsiki and Higi in North Cameroon and Northeastern Nigeria.³⁾ In the Mandara mountains on the northern border of Nigeria and Cameroon, the Higi-Kapsiki

tribe consists of a loose conglomerate of highly autonomous villages, each of which is characterized by its territory and its own set of village-specific patrilines. Inside the village the virilocal polygynous nuclear family forms the basic unit of society. This family, *rhe*, is fully autonomous and privacy permeates Kapsiki culture. Constraints from other people, including the village chief, never exceed the level of advice, even if backed by respect for the office holder.

The domain of religion is composed of several parts in Kapsiki thought. The 4 relevant categories are (the labels are ours):

1. Lexemes indicating ritual action;
2. Lexemes indicating objects used in religious behaviour;
3. Lexemes indicating non-human individuals;
4. Lexemes indicating aspects of human beings.⁵⁾

Not all four semantic subdomains pertain to the problem posed. As our purpose here is an analysis of religious activities, we have to concentrate on the categories or subdomains 1 and 2. The lexemes under 3 and 4 either indicate general characteristics of people such as "misfortune", "soul", "taboo" (these are shorthand translations of course) or form an inventory of more or less supernatural beings, human or non-human.

In order to demonstrate the semantic dimensions we will analyse the ways in which the terms differ from each other. To facilitate reading, the terms have been given a translation label, but as translation forms one of the key problems in religiography (Evans Pritchard 1956: vi, vii), one should beware of attaching too much value to the labels. The semantic value of a term can only be seen in the ways it contrasts with other terms in the same semantic domain.

LEXEMES INDICATING RITUAL ACTION:

<i>geske</i>	(festival)
<i>vern</i>	(feast)
<i>ha</i>	("chasing Death")
<i>la</i>	(year festival)
<i>gwela</i>	(male initiation)
<i>makwa</i>	(first marriage of a girl)
<i>pele va</i>	(rain rite)
<i>Rhometlo</i>	(part of makwa)
<i>dzerhe mele</i>	(to sacrifice)

<i>mpisu</i>	(to spit on someone, in order to bless)
<i>bedla</i>	(to curse)

LEXEMES INDICATING OBJECTS USED IN RELIGIOUS BEHAVIOR

<i>rhwe</i>	(medicine - medical and medicinal)
<i>barwa</i>	(protective medicine)
<i>shafa</i>	(bundle of objects used in swearing oaths)
<i>maketlaketla</i>	(protective medicine)
<i>rheweredlea</i>	(protective medicine)
<i>sekwa</i>	(oath-binding medicine)
<i>mblaza</i>	(medicineholder for any kind of medicine)
<i>hwεβε</i>	(medicinal plant species)
<i>hangedle</i>	(medicinal plant species)
<i>kesiqe</i>	(harmful medicine)
<i>wasiri meqele</i>	(miracle objects)

The relevant divisions have to be explained and the separating dimensions have to be ascertained, by analysing the specific semantic content.

3.1 LEXEMES INDICATING RITUAL ACTION

The terms "geske" is a blanket term indicating any festival in which the whole village takes part. The range of "festivals" includes the main village communal rituals: *la*, *ba*, *Rhometla*. The *la*-ritual forms the final act of the Kapsiki year. In it, the initiation of boys (*gwela*) and the first marriage of girls (*makwa*) are concluded. The time is just before harvest, after the last rains. The whole village participates in a week of dancing and drinking and many "foreigners" (people from other villages) are present. The ritual part of it centers on the *gwela*, the feast on the newlyweds. The *gwela* initiation has started one month before the coming of the rains. The young initiandi of the village gather frequently and as a group pass through a series of rituals and symbolic tests. In all phases they are assisted by little boys from their clan or ward, and in most instances they serve in the rituals as a group. Though there is nothing secret about the *gwela*, normally few people besides the *gwela* and their helpers are present. The *makwa* festival, held the same time as the *gwela*, is much more public for the people in the village. The core of the festival is a

two day singing session of the newly wed girls, around which the whole village gathers. Foreigners are banned from it, for it is a strict intra-village happening. This is called *Rhometla* festival, after the mountain where it is held. In the *ba*-ritual, as in the initiation and *la*-rituals, the Kapsiki villages perform in a sequence each one waiting for its neighbours to finish. The purpose of the *ba*-ritual is to chase Death, who is thought of as a person, from the village. The women of the village gather in the early morning and perform the rite, assisted by the chief blacksmith. Usually no strangers are present at the rite, though the feast which may conclude it often attracts foreigners to the village. One rite that is very characteristic for the village of Mogodé is the "*peli va*", rainhunt. As by Mogodé's mythic charter no rainmakers should be consulted, rain making in Mogodé has a public character. Led by the hunting chief, all village youth gather in a ritual hunt following a traditional route. As rains are known to be capricious, all non-indigenous elements -- disturbing factors in any situation for the Kapsiki -- tend to be banned.

Unlike the foregoing lexemes, the remaining three are verbs. *Dzerhe mele* implies all behavior pertaining to sacrifice. In fact, it represents one of the core rituals in Kapsiki life, that of a private sacrifice performed on behalf of the *rhe*, the household group inhabiting one compound. Though the rites are not at all secret and include a social function (a drinking session of the old men of the ward), attendance at the sacrifice is strictly limited to the people concerned. Any other type of sacrifice, done on a jar belonging to a clan, ward, or village is indicated with *dzerhe mele* too. *Mpisiu*, "to spit", is an action possible in a great range of situations. It always implies some kind of a blessing given. The person performing spits a mouthful of red beer over the one receiving and gives a verbal blessing. In most instances the presence of other people is not intrusive at all and it sometimes adds to the ritual.

An opposite category is represented with *bedla*. The meaning "to curse" does not imply secrecy and privacy. Though a curse can be given in private, it must be divulged afterwards. If, for example, a mother's brother curses his sister's son, he can only do so if he has ample reason. Transgression on behavioral norms provokes *bedla*. Some people should be present to witness, but normally this is restricted to a few who know about the relations between the people concerned, if only by its timing (mostly during the night).

The word *verhe* is used most frequently in "*verhe makwa*", meaning the feast at which the clan of the bridegroom celebrates the arrival of a new bride. Characteristic of this important social function is the distribution of food and beer, which takes place on a larger scale than on other occasions. Meat especially, has to be abundant. The clan of one bridegroom feasts many visitors from their own village or neighboring ones, and they all gather in and around the compound for a day of conversation and consumption, in which a number of rites are performed.

Leaving aside the specific content of the rituals, the distinctive diacritical characteristics can be isolated. Relevant dimensions for this analysis seem to be:

- 1) collective action of the village as a whole; collective action in which an in-group within the village acts; individual action.
- 2) public versus private attendance. As Kapsiki life tends to be highly private in many respects (Van Beek 1975), one rightly expects this dimension to be relevant for the communal rituals, too. The continuum reads: public/non-public/private: In the first instance, anyone is welcome; the second one means that spectators normally do not show up, though they are not prohibited from coming as is the case with "private".

Paradigm I

ritual attendance:	public	non-public	"private"
ritual done by:			
collective: village	<i>la</i>	<i>ba</i>	<i>pele va</i>
collective: in-group	<i>verhe</i>	<i>makwa</i> (<i>Rhometla</i>)	<i>gwela</i>
individual:	<i>mpisu</i>	<i>bedla</i>	<i>dzerhe mela</i>

In this paradigm the criteria for the rows indicate the group of participants in ritual, while the audience for the performance is found in the column dimensions. The relevance of this division is indicated by the fact that other semantic components result in the same organisation of this field of lexemes. Thus, essential for any ritual to be

called *verhe* is the presence of food for everyone to eat.

In this respect it is the opposite of *la*, in which there is plenty of beer but practically no food whatsoever. The distinction village-rituals ingroup rituals corresponds with the opposition beer/food. So the paradigm can be read as follows:

Paradigm I^a

	consumption (male + female)	non-consumption (female)	indirect production (male)
liquid food	<i>la</i>	<i>ba</i>	<i>pele va</i>
solid food	<i>verhe</i>	<i>makwa</i> (<i>Rhometla</i>)	<i>gwela</i>
liquid + solid food	<i>mpisu</i>	<i>bedla</i>	<i>dzerhe mele</i>

These column dimensions should be explained. The consumptive side of *la* and *verhe* is clear. Both rituals are "feasts of plenty", in which it would be a terrible disgrace to lack beer or food. In the "*Rhometla*" festival, the accent is upon singing, not on eating or drinking. In fact, the girls only get a few calabashes with water and some colanuts during their singing days. The *ba*-ritual is a particular case in point. Abstention from drinking during and shortly after ritual is essential for its efficacy.

The *gwela* have to cultivate more than ever during the rainy season of their initiation; as an integral part of their coming of age, they have to prove that they are independent cultivators. Any consumption during *gwela*-time should be kept private. The productive liquid aspect of the rain hunt needs no comment.

In the bottom row of the paradigm, the distinction between solid and liquid food is eliminated, and the relevance of the dimensions shows less clearly. In *mpisu* beer is essential, just as are beer and sorghum mush in *dzerhe mele*, and the ultimate purpose of *dzerhe mele* is production of food and protection of people. *Bedla* has no bearing on food.

The column dimensions in parentheses relate to the sexes dominant in the ritual action. *Pele va* and *gwela* are exclusively male-centered activities. *Dzerhe mele* within the compound is mostly performed by the

medicines are packed into an iron medicine holder, *m̄l̄wa*.

M̄k̄l̄l̄l̄l̄ protects against theft of crops. Knowledge of the exact process of fabrication is limited to one clan in the village. The same holds for *l̄l̄l̄l̄l̄*, a conical shell used by children for playing. One clan knows how to use it as a medicine against theft. If one is protected by these items a thief will be afflicted by an inflammation which will only heal if treated by the owner of the medicine.

l̄l̄l̄l̄ is a much stronger "medicine" which is known to everyone, and functions in case of debt. If debts are unsettled, the debtor risks loss of his entire family by some kind of epidemic death if the *sekwa* is put in his compound by the creditor. As it is deemed to work in any kind of debt relation, it traditionally functions as the central means for the enforcement of Kapsiki law.

In many instances in traditional law people swear on special objects, in order to validate their claims. These objects, *sewa* and *shafa*, are associated with death and are deemed very efficacious in case of false testimony. Both *sewa* and *shafa* are made from well-known materials that are not hard to find, the process of its fabrication is widely known, though the sheer power of the medicines makes it a tricky one.

hw̄e and *hw̄e* are both plant species (*Crinum* (Am) and *Cissus Quadrangulatus*) which cure specific illnesses. Each plant is applied for one illness only. Recognition of the application is very difficult and only possible for those working with that particular plant specimen.

Beshenu is a general term for a very harmful kind of *rhwe*, used only for killing. Accusations of possession and use of *beshenu* turn up frequently in village talks, hotly denied by the accused. People known to have it are forced to live on the outskirts of the village, if nothing else can be done about it.

The different kinds of *rh̄e* never are objects of public display, but only *beshenu* had a negative connotation. The word *rhwe* also is used to indicate a specific medicine for any kind of illness. So *rh̄e* (eyes) means the medicine against conjunctivitis (regardless of what medicine is used, indigenous or "white man's medicine").

Several very special objects are included under the term "*wushi m̄ne*" - neolithic remains, stones of a special shape, etc. Each serves its own specific purpose. When someone finds one of these, he must search for its way of application, mostly to secure an endless sorghum supply or well-being for his cattle. Other people may know

of the object, but normally do not, and anyway are not very interested as it can serve only the finder; it is of strictly private utility. Rituals for the *wushi menele* vary greatly. Eventually people can swear on them, which is considered as binding an oath as any.

In establishing the criteria for this semantic field, the first division seeming to be relevant is that between those medicines that work conditionally and those that do not. In the first case the relation between ego and alter or between ego and the object is relevant for its efficacy. *Shafa*, *sekwa*, *rhweredlea*, *maketlaketla* and *wushi menele* all work under specific conditions, and in most instances of social life are quite harmless, while *hwεβε*, *hangedle*, *banwa* and *beshenu* work whenever they are applied, for better for worse.

A second criterion is whether its application and actual use are known to a larger circle than the users or makers themselves. The application of both criteria results in the following paradigm:

Paradigm II

Conditionality: Fabrication and possession:	conditional function (non-secret non-public)	non-conditional function (private)
Generally Known	<i>sekwa</i> <i>shafa</i>	<i>hwεβε</i> <i>hangedle</i>
known by in-group	<i>rhweredlea</i> <i>maketlaketla</i>	<i>banwa (+ mblaza)</i>
known privately	<i>wushi menele</i>	<i>beshenu</i>

As the dimensions in parentheses show, the *rhwe* in the column "conditional" are those the use of which is non-secret and even somewhat public. In any case the fact of application of those *rhwe* should be divulged.

The use of the non-conditional column has to be very private, even secret; in the case of *hwεβε*, the economic importance of knowing exactly what plant to use is too great to spread the word around.

Both *banwa* and *beshetu* are secret, but in the first case the lineage knows about its existence and has access to its use, while the existence of *beshetu* is known only by its user, though suspected by outsiders.

As we are here concerned about the major divisions of this semantic field, there is no need for going into much detail as to the further sub-divisions of the cells. In the first row a distinction "strong" "weak" could be made, the upper lexemes indicating the stronger *rhwe*. The cell "conditional"/"known privately" can also contain the many unnamed *rhwe* which, though found to be efficacious by single individuals, have never gained wider acceptance. It should be recalled that *beshetu* is a general name too; each individual has his own type. Any systematic comparison was of course out of the question. Our informants knew only about other people who had it!

4. INTERPRETATION

What is the relation between the dimensions of paradigms I and II? In the latter the lexemes indicate primarily objects, while action sequences are meant in no. I. For our purposes the semantic analysis the context is of dominant importance, so we have concentrated on the use and application of the *rhwe* more than on their material components.

Paradigm I

attendance

Paradigm II

Information about application

	public	non-public	private	non-private	private	
collectivity village		<i>ba</i>	<i>pele va</i>	<i>sekwa shafa</i>	<i>hweβe</i>	general
in-group	<i>verhe</i>	<i>Rhometla (makwa)</i>	<i>gwela</i>	<i>rhweredlea</i>	<i>banwa</i>	in-group
individual	<i>mpisu</i>	<i>bedla</i>	<i>dzerhe mele</i>	<i>wushi mejele</i>	<i>beshetu</i>	individual

ritual participants

information on fabrication

As the column dimensions of paradigm II show, the semantic values used in paradigm II are transpositions of those used in paradigm I. Going from left to right, there is a general shift from collective to individual, from group to person. The *rhwe* are means to individual ends, while the paradigm I items are means for collective ends, though the collectivities may not be larger than one nuclear family.

With regard to timing in social life, the *geske* have to be done at the right time, in the right season, in the right way. Exactly how is as important as precisely when. Therefore all religious activities in paradigm I have to be preceded by divination; how they should be performed is known by any socialised person, but details and time of the ritual depend on other factors. This is not the case with *rhwe*. A Kapsiki decides for himself whether and when to use or threaten with *sekwa*, plant a stick with *maketlaketla* in his sweet potato field, or search for and eventually use *beshegu*. In this he is guided by the exigencies of everyday life, his knowledge of the medicines and his relations with his fellow-Kapsiki. There is no need to go to a blacksmith-diviner for that.

But in the case of paradigm I, even if the starting date of the festival is fixed by a stable sequence of festivals held throughout the Kapsiki territory as is the case with *la* and *ba*, the leading persons of the village or clan have to consult the diviner in order to ascertain the last details of the ritual. In all cases of paradigm I versus paradigm II this distinction is relevant: "surplus information needed"/"no further information needed". While this distinction conforms somewhat to a generally used distinction between religion and magic ("supplication to the will of higher beings"/"automatic result following action"), the latter formulation does not suit the type of transformation from the dimensions of paradigm I to those of paradigm II. Automatism is not present. Moreover in each and every case there is a way out, and always an alternative interpretation to give: e.g., the ulcers thought to result from theft of property protected by *rhweredlea* can also be caused by drinking from a specific part of the beer of the *rhweredlea* owner. Information remains highly ambiguous; nevertheless there is no divination. The relevant distinction lies in the frequency of the situations calling for religious action; in the cases of paradigm II this frequency is much higher than in the first instances. The Kapsiki uses *rhwe* in those problem situations deemed normal, which

he encounters often, perhaps daily. He expects his fellow men to steal his crops, forget their debts and he is always aware of the danger of fighting, carrying his *baḡwa* always on his body. Divination is reserved for those occasions in which his everyday experience is not sufficient -- viz. for those problems not encountered daily: All cyclical rites call for divination and cluster under the *geske*. The problems to be solved here are of a much more latent character than those attacked by *rhwε*: worries over women, children, crops and general health are long-range problems to which the *geske* address themselves. As many rites in both domains are private, done by a small in-group, the distinction between communal rites and private rites which is not relevant, should be replaced by "religion for special situations"/"religion for normal situations" or "religion for short-range manifest problems"/"religion for long range latent problems". *Rhwε* is everyday religion, the common-place religion embodying a highly pragmatic aspect that is an integral part of any living religion. This problem-solving aspect is underlined by the fact that the range of *rhwε* is wider than the traditional view of magic: *rhwε* incorporates medicinal applications as well as "supernatural" ones, many items for the settlement of debts and protection against the infringements on "sacred privacy": i.e., those situations which, though occurring frequently, are considered as real problems in Kapsiki society.

5. CONCLUSION

We have analysed the ritual activities in Kapsiki religion which fall into two categories. Both were "emic" units and the internal organisation of the two groups of action-terms showed considerable resemblances. The first group consisted of those rituals forming the core of most descriptions of religion: cyclical rites, "rites de passage", etc. The second group roughly corresponds to the usual conception of magical rites. However, an activity such as cursing, not classed under magical terms, can be considered as more or less "magical" in content; in Goode's summary of characteristics of magic (1951: 53-54) it fits in quite easily, having a specific goal, individual ends and a situation wherein the performer decides when and whether to carry out the ritual.⁴⁾ Returning to the general problem posed under 1 and 2, we have to evaluate what this ethnoscientific analysis has taught us about the concepts of religion and magic.

The lexical subdomains divide the semantic field of religion in a slightly different way from what the concept of magic would have done. But this difference can be accounted for. Under certain conditions, one can hold that the concept of magic has emic properties, i.e. the division made by the concept of magic is a relevant one, if some fields normally excluded from religion are seen as a part of the same semantic field, i.e. medicinal and legal processes. However, the specific content and interpretation of magic are a different point. The formal analysis has yielded some hypotheses about the specific content of Kapsiki magic, which can be tested in other cultural settings. Our analysis showed that magic and religion not only belong to the same semantic domain but that "magic" presents an immediate, pragmatic religious response to normal problem situations. Whereas "religion" in its narrower sense only pertains to specific situations with a much more latent problem content. Generalising from the analysis one can state: Magic is commonplace religion, "the religion of the dirty hands", "religion of Monday". One significant distinction between the two fields of action is the use of divination. Divination tends to be turned to in latent low-frequency problems, viz. in those situations defined by the society as potential problems. "Magical" rites solve the everyday problems, anticipating and reacting on those behavioral responses of ones fellow men considered as normal.

One of the bias factors in the study of religion has been the insistence on extraordinary behavior, and -- in magic -- a focus on quite extreme cases. In a way this has been a survival of the old "curiosa" heritage of anthropology. Students of religion have tended to neglect the study of everyday phenomena in human life.

Though the view of religion and magic as a continuum has been a step forward (Goode 1951: 53, Norbeck 1961: 35) it still is misleading as it holds magic to be a marginal case of religion, while in social life it is one of the central phenomena. After all, man has to live every day, so commonplace behavior is not trivial at all for a science of man.

NOTES

1. The tendency to isolate the scholar's classification as units of research is most marked in the worked of the phenomenologists. The table of contents of van der Leeuw's "Phaenomenologie der Religion" makes this clear: "Heiliges Wasser und Feuer; Die heilige Oberwelt; Die heilige Mitwelt; Die Tiere; Wille und Gestalt; Die Gestalt der Mutter" (van der Leeuw 1933 cited in van Baal 1971: 90).
2. The concepts of "emic" and "etic" have been developed by Pike (Pike 1954). It is coined from the terms phonemic and phonetic. Emic properties are intrinsic to the system as a system, diacritically functioning as specifiers of the internally valid distinctions within the system. These properties are results of the analysis and cannot be observed directly. "Etic" properties are observable for any outsider, and are not system specific. Thus phonetic elements (sound patterns) can be heard, taped and reproduced, while phonemes function only in separating lexemes with different semantic values. They have no semantic value of their own, but merely serve to separate words. This function is called *diacritical*.
Apart from the directly observable behavior, concepts and classifications that do not derive from the system under study are called "etic" too.
3. Research on the Kapsiki and Higi has been carried out from February 1972 through August 1973, and has been made possible by a grant from the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (W 52-91). The name Kapsiki will be used for both parts of the tribe. The notation of Kapsiki terms follows the orthography set up by the joint alphabetisation programs in the Kapsiki area.
4. The demarcation of the four major subdomains as presented has been made by a special field technique. One of my informants, Sini Kwada Heru, has performed a card sorting test on the relevant lexemes, after first helping establish the total field of lexemes associated with religion. Dubious categorisation has been checked with other informants, but this type of terminology presented few problems in classification, and agreement was easily reached. This type of field technique is an example of the general tendency in ethnoscience to involve the informants in the analysis of the data.
5. The absence of Kapsiki blanket terms for the subdomains presents no problem as to their emic status. Analyses of folk taxonomies have shown that a taxonomy can contain many non-labelled taxa, especially non-terminal taxa, i.e. in the higher levels of abstraction (Berlin, Breedlove, & Raven 1968).
6. Goode's 11 characteristics of magical rites can be summarized in four major aspects (Goode 1951):
 - Goal: concrete, individual and eventually anti-social.
 - Attitude: manipulative, unemotional.
 - Roles: professional decides where, when and whether to carry out the ritual.
 - Action: privately, with a major concern for the technical side (in case of failure another technique is tried).

REFERENCES

- Baal, J. van
1960 "Magie als Godsdienstig Verschijnsel", inaugural lecture 17-10-1960, Amsterdam 1960. Citations are from the english version "Magic as a Religious Phenomenon" in *Higher Education and Research in the Netherlands* VII, 3/4, 1963, p. 10-21.
- Baal, J. van
1966 *Dema. Description and analysis of Marind-Anim culture (South New Guinea)*. The Hague 1966.
- Baal, J. van
1971 *Symbols for communication. An introduction to the anthropological study of religion*. Assen 1971.
- Beek, W.E.A. van
1975 "Les Kapsiki", *Contributions anthropologiques à l'histoire du Cameroun*, Annales du Centre National des Recherches Scientifiques, Paris 1975 (in press).
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E.
1956 *Nuer Religion*, Oxford University Press 1956.
- Berlin, B. Breedlove, N, & Raven, K.
1968 "Covert Categories and Folk Taxonomies" *American Anthropologist* 70: 290-299.
- Goode, W.
1951 *Religion among the primitives*. Glencoe, Free Press 1951.
- Pike, N.L.
1954 *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*, SIL 1954.
- Norbeck, E.
1961 *Religion in primitive society*, Harper & Brothers, New York.