ISSN: 1300-1582

T.C. Erciyes Üniversitesi

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi

Erciyes University
Journal of the Institute of Social Sciences

Yıl: 2005/2 Sayı: 19

A CONTRIBUTION TO PHENOMENOLOGY OF RELIGION: COMPREHENSIVE PHENOMENOLOGY

Mustafa ÜNAL, PhD.
Erciyes University Faculty of Theology (Turkey)

Özet

Günümüzde din fenomenolojisi, incelemiş olduğu herhangi bir fenomeni kendine has yöntemiyle sadece tasvir eder ve onun özünü anlamaya çalışır. Bunun için değişik din fenomenologları tarafından tasvirci, tipolojik, ilahiyat merkezli, tarihsel, hermenetik, felsefi ve yeni sitil fenomenolojiler gibi değişik adlardaki din fenomenolojisi akımları ortaya konulmuştur. Bunlar, fenomenleri tasvir edip anlamlandırdıktan sonra, söz konusu fenomenin bağlı bulunduğu toplumda bununla ilgili ortaya çıkmış olan sorunları çözmek gibi bir göreve ve işleve sahip olmamışlardır. Halbuki, toplumsal bir vakıa olan fenomenlerden kaynaklanan sorunları çözmek, din fenomenolojisinin de bir görevi ve işlevi olmalıdır. Bunun için, bu makalede, sorunları ortaya koyup onu anlamıyla birlikte kaynaştırarak ilgili sorunları çözmeye yarayacağı ileri sürülen ve *kapsayıcı fenomenoloji* adı verilen yeni yaklaşım tanıtılıp, uygulanabilirliği tartışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Din Fenomenolojisi, Evrensel Din, Resmi/Kitabi Din, Halk Dini, Farklılık, Kapsayıcılık, Comprehensive Phenomenology,

Summary

In the present time, the basic goal of the phenomenology of religion is to describe the essence of a phenomenon by using its own way, not to locate it. Today, for that aim, different phenomenological approaches which are named such as descriptive phenomenology, typological phenomenology, theological phenomenology, historical phenomenology, hermeneutical phenomenology, philosophical phenomenology and new style phenomenology were developed and applied to some phenomena from different religions. After description and finding out of phenomena, these approaches do not have any mission or function to solve some socio-religious questions appeared in certain societies. However, phenomenology of religion should have a problem solving mission and function of questions arose from any phenomenon. For that reason, in this present article a new approach called by the author as *comprehensive phenomenology* that adduces to help for finding out of phenomena, will be presented and its applicability will also be discussed.

Key Words: Phenomenology of Religion, Universal Religion, Official/Written Religion, Popular Religion, Differences (Exclusivism), Inclusivism, Comprehensive Phenomenology.

Introduction

If someone asks what phenomenology of religion is, the answer is so clear and concrete, indeed. Beginning with Edmund Husserl (1859-1938) who was the first to develop phenomenological method, many scholars (have) discussed the basic methodological problems of the phenomenology of religion whether it is a doctrine or a way. Some identified phenomenology as the manner of thinking, or finding of essence of phenomenon, understanding of meaning. So far all scholars belong to religious studies or social studies, defined their method as "description" rather than method of explanation. Of course, scientific method that now dominates academic approaches or thoughts, is useful for all kind of studies, but its results are varied depends on the milieu of the scholar's education and training. Therefore, explaining and commenting may, in preference, have been excluded at he beginning of study. In descriptive approach scholar only describes what s/he observes, in other words, transfers what s/he founded.

Certainly, every social phenomena could be understood by appliance of methods of the different humanistic sciences. For the phenomenological study, some basic attitudes, in time, have been developed in order to find out essence of phenomenon, such as description, reduction (or bracketing out), deductive or inductive manners. Meanings of religious phenomena, too, are manifested regarding to methods of Phenomenology of Religion. Today, there are different phenomenological approaches which are named such as descriptive phenomenology, typological phenomenology, theological phenomenology, historical phenomenology, hermeneutical phenomenology, philosophical phenomenology and new style phenomenology (Ünal 1999, 80-97; 98-146; Jurji 1963, Dhavamony 1973; Allen, 1971, 1987).[1] The first representative of Descriptive Phenomenology Pierre Danial Chantepie de la Saussaye (1848-1920) regards earlier methodological theories but claims that they cannot solve the problem of displaying essence of phenomena. Instead he asserts method of phenomenology between history and philosophy that classifies and describes different phenomena. He does not try to find out essence of facts, but only describes them in his *Manual* and *Handbook*.

Nathan Söderblom (1866-1931) applied different style of phenomenology called **typological phenomenology,** by trying to find out deep meaning of "spirit", "power" and "supreme being".

Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950) used theological phenomenology in his *Religion in Essence and Manifestation A Study in Phenomenology*. He followed Söderblom's, Otto's and his disciple F. Heiler's approaches that is why he is called *cosmopolitan*, but he developed in his own special way that I called **theological**

[1] These names were given by the author of the present article, with regard to the studies of the scholars who interested in phenomenology of religion. Some examples will be given below.

phenomenology, by using theological knowledge that he obtained during his education and experiences.

C. Jouco Bleeker used his own approach presented and used in his book Sacred Bridge that stars firstly with article entitled The Phenomenological Method published in 1963. He concentrated on Theoria, Logos and Entelecheia meaning respectively approving situation and views of religion, morphology of different religious traditions, and lastly understanding of periods of phenomena understood by manifestations.

In the late 1930's Joachim Wach (1898-1955) and his successors Joseph M. Kitagawa and Mircea Eliade developed and used intuitional or **hermeneutical phenomenology.** According to Wach, basic aim of the religious study is to understand "other" religions by using intuitional power. Therefore, hermeneutic differs from phenomenology, so needs a religious instinct. However, phenomenologist should keep his objectivity.

R. Pettazzoni G. Widengren, F. Heiler, W. Brede Kristensen, M. Dhavamony used different style phenomenology respectively historical phenomenology, descriptive historical phenomenology, phenomenology of philosophical hermeneutic and new style phenomenology.

As seen in the works of all phenomenologists hitherto, their goal is the same that to describe the meaning and essence of a phenomenon, not to "locate" it. In all phenomenological works, scholars point out only description and some meaning of related phenomena with regard to their own way. They do not present any solution about phenomena live in different forms or morphologies in different religions.

In fact, A. Scott Moreau, for instance, summarises phenomenological method in his article "Phenomenology of Religion", in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (revised edition. 2000) as follows: "*The phenomenological approach is not oriented towards problem solving, but towards empathetic description. It thus keeps the events themselves central. Further, the phenomenological method seeks to describe the phenomena from the perspective of the practitioner, known in anthropological circles as emic (or insider) description.*"

When one of these methods or approaches mentioned above is applied to any phenomenon from different religions, its adventure and meaning that it had experienced and referred during the history of the religion, have been only done regarding to its chronology and typology and morphology. This does not go further, rather than description of phenomena, and appliance of method in question does not utilise regarding to practical points of religious life. In addition, apologetic studies have created some impasses in the daily life of religion in question. Such as, scholars excluded some phenomena from the universal religions or written or official religion by giving them different meanings as superstition, wrong, pernicious innovation, false, "others", etc. This kind of difficulties could be solved

by appliance of ***comprehensive phenomenology*** which is believed that open the future road of phenomenology of religion. In order to include this kind of superstitions into certain universal religion, and to keep them alive, Comprehensive Phenomenology could be beneficial. Because, the phenomenology of religion which is one of the religious sciences that only describes and analyses religious life of certain society, should propose solutions for religious dilemmas seen among certain society. Here, for this aim, comprehensive phenomenology is to be offered as a problem solving approach for discussion of phenomenologists all over the world.

In this article ***Comprehensive Phenomenology*** which was developed by the author, will be described and applied to religious phenomena from different religions and cultures. This method can be applied to popular beliefs and practices by using general phenomenological methods (*eidetic vision* and *epoche*), and at the end new and extensive meanings could be found, and thus official or written religions includes "others" into their daily life.

Method: This new approach, Comprehensive Phenomenology, too, regards classical phenomenological methods respectively description, typology, morphology, epoche or reduction and *eidetic vision*, in order to find out meanings and essences of phenomena gained throughout history of certain society and religion. This method is easily applied by a scholar from the same religion and so, becomes more useful. The phenomenologist fulfils these processes on one or more facts, as in general usage, without showing apologetic and emphatic behaviour – personally s/he is from the same milieu-, s/he could easily reach essence of phenomena. Its main aim is, differentiating from earlier approaches, to solve socio-psycho-religious problems occurs in a certain society, by utilising the results attained throughout the general phenomenological methods. In this regard, this could be more practical and useful, because this helps to keep alive the limited phenomena which are tried to exclude from official or written religions in question as superstitions, false or innovations. This, at the result, obtains the rule of "traditions increase by gathering" that is found in the general history of religion.

This approach must not be confused with hermeneutic which is regarded as a way that aims to give meaning and to interpret sacred or in general literary texts (Palmer, 2002, 39-62; 1973, 207-223). Because, the way that I called Comprehensive Phenomenology, is used for giving meanings to any phenomenon of whether universal or local indigenous theology, regarding to its historical process, geography, environment and milieu. For this, too, common phenomenological patterns of *epoche*, *intuition* and *empathy* are used throughout the study, as distinctive element apart from hermeneutic. Of itself, if some criticisms about impossibility or very difficulty of realisation of *epoche*, and about science could not be done with intuition (McCutcheon 2003, 92-100) are even directed toward this kind of phenomenology, from the point of that phenomenologist applies his method, this approach ought to be distinguished with

its peculiarities from other disciplines, even from the closest way, hermeneutic. In fact, C. Jouco Bleeker who is disciple of Gerardus van der Leeuw, as was mentioned above, began to discuss phenomenological hermeneutic in his *Sacred Bridge* published in 1963, but with the concepts he called *theoria* (proving of religious thought), *logos* (forms of different religious traditions) and *entelechia* (epoch of conception of religious facts), he is in the boundaries of general History of Religion and Phenomenology of Religion (Sharpe, 1992, s. 236-238; Sarıkçıoğlu 2002 (a)).

It is our opinion that "epoche" is an inevitable step for the Comprehensive Phenomenology, too, in order to find out "substance" of facts, as in general phenomenology (Moreau 2000). Because, while the substance of any fact is searched regarding to general phenomenological method, divine ordinance of related religion is not criticised in order not to be effected by preconceptions of the phenomenologist. However, on any fact, any decree of scholars or authority of the same religion seen in different places and milieu particularly related universal religions, could be excluded by the evaluation done after description, reduction (bracketing out) and eidetic vision. Because, different milieu accomplishes different beliefs and practices. This is seen in the researches of sociology of religion, history of religion, religious folk-lore, etc.

Before the appliance of epoche, truth or falseness of prejudge that researcher had, is not under discussion. The question is criterion of where, why and for what goal it was made. Criteria those are constructed for the related centre and goal, could wrongly be regarded by somebody else because of its unsuitability, and described as "truth", "wrong", "false" or "innovative". In such cases, the most suitable and utilised criterion that makes the phenomenologist distinguished and great, is his/her universal knowledge on the most distinguished "description of religion" acquired regarding to history of religion and phenomenology of religion.

At the same time, our approach of comprehensive phenomenology must not be identified with normativist approaches, that is with theological, jurisprudential and apologetically attitudes. Because, the comprehensive phenomenology, too, carries out general rules of phenomenology, it does not make a rule, but opens a new way, or solution.

1. An Outlook on the Concept of Religion

After this theoretical introduction, it is better to explain our notion about religion, for it is useful for understanding of appliance we will do below. Because, every discipline of religious studies defines the term of religion differently with regard to its own method and attitude.

First of all, it is necessary to know what the "religion" is, in order to understand phenomena studied by the phenomenology of religion. Because, whether theologian or scientist of religious studies, those who discuss the subject

of religion, show their understanding of "religion" differently in their studies. For this reason, one should know definitions of "religion" done by sciences of religion. Because it is related to our subject, we will define the term from the point of history of religion.

From the point of history of religion, it is shortly, "man's relation with sacred". We can easily see this kind of relation in all, whether national or universal religions. Into the sacred, whether physical or virtual beings and objects could be included. When somebody asks what these are, nobody answers this certainly counting one by one, because these are not definite, and so, can differ from environment to environment, from nation to nation, from time to time, from milieu to milieu (Eliade 1971, *passim*). Man's relation with sacred manifests in any form mostly indirect, as well as connected directly to main doctrines of religions. We call this "religious phenomenon". So, these manifestations could vary in forms among the different societies, even a small part of the same society while they belong to same religion. That is, religion is not only a particular body of beliefs, but also a vast web of practices, experiences and traditions. This second group mostly, as we pointed above, offers variations in forms, from environment to environment. Here, theologians and religious masters discuss on this issue from the point of different views.

Due to subject of this article is related to that how one should examine carefully, as we will make a break to return back this issue, let us count common and main peculiarities of universal religions which accomplish the base of discussion.

1- Universal religions are proselytists. In another words, they are spreading out not only among the native nations but also among different nations and races in different geographic regions.

2- They absorb and digest some beliefs and practices of nations who later converted, in their nature of university.

3- Unique "salvation religion" is itself actually; so, it is "perfect" in this context, it generally regards earlier beliefs seen in the same region as "falsified", and later beliefs "heretic". By re-forming some phenomena of earlier religious systems, it reconstitutes with regard to its own "salvation doctrine".

4- A universal religion interprets some phenomena in the context of its own historicism (Smart, 1989).

Those phenomena live together with or in universal religions are called popular beliefs and practices, therefore their system is called "popular" or "folk" religion. Folk religion can simply be described as beliefs and practices which are lived within a universal religion in a new form, understanding and interpretation. However, it is, from reverse point, with a certain and common meaning, a web of phenomena those are genius facts and live inside a universal religion encountered

in abroad. History of Religion, Sociology of Religion and Anthropology of Religion call it as Folk Religion or Common Religion (Vrijhof and Waardenburg 1979; Mensching 1994; Wach, 1990). We can practically say that folk religion is (and will be) found in all religions split in different sects.

In addition, there is concept of Official or Written Religion that is a whole system of doctrines of prophets or founders, and decisions of scholars on any phenomenon as judging "religious". While attitudes of official theologies to "religiousness" of any phenomenon is established in this way, History of Religion regards and fixes every kind of beliefs and practices related to sacred in daily life, without paying attention to boundary of normativity of religion in question, as "religious" (Bianchi 1999 5-8). From the Phenomenological point of view, too, all beliefs and practices that believers accepted "religious" in their intentions, whether reliable or not to their official religion's doctrine, are appreciated as "religious". To the sciences of religion, beliefs and practices are not judged such as "innovative", "superstition", "truth", "false", "wrong", "right", etc. regarding to researcher's prejudges; they are only described and found out (Ünal 1999, 83-85).

Perhaps, regarding to their results, this is the most important difference between the approaches of history of religion and sciences of theology to any religious phenomena. In fact, although there is no theoretically clash between Official/Written religion and Popular religion, this state is almost seen in every universal religions.

If one looks at biographies of researchers of comparative religion, throughout the world-wide, it is clearly seen that they are mostly "religious persons" and they did religio-centric, that is apologetical studies. This is not their own fault in fact, because they had "theology centric" training, and they naturally make comparison by showing their attitude by rejecting "others". Their basic shortcoming is the lack of phenomenological education. This disadvantageous case is not under discussion only to the historian of comparative religion who is believer of religion in question, but also could be referred to almost all.

We can briefly summarise thought of some distinguished researchers who are determined as religious persons, and make apologetically comparison in theology centric while they have very vast knowledge in scale, as below;

At the beginning, Christian polemical works against non-Christian religions appeared as early as in the period of Montanus or *Montanism* in the second century. In this period Church Fathers wrote earliest Apologies and defended Christianity against paganism, against state and Greek philosophy. *The Preaching of Peter* is assumed that the first Apology written by unknown author. The principle Apologists in this period are Aristides with his *Apology*, Justin Martyr with his *Apology: Dialogue with Trypho*, Athenagoras with his *Apology: Embassy for the Christians*, Tertullian with his principal apologies respectively against *Gnostics, Marcion, Valentinus, against Praxeas*; Tatian, Theophilus of

Antioch, Irenaeus and others. This understanding has systematically continued till and increased with the movements of Reform and Enlightenment. Christian theologians seen in the early centuries, such as Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-215) and Cyril of Alexandria (376-444) have defended their doctrines against Greek philosophy, and claimed its superiority. Moreover, they have discussed some theological issues between each other (Reese 1980, 95-96).

As for after emergence of Islam, some Christian philosophers and theologians such as S. Jean Damascene (675-750), Thedore Ebu Kurra (750-825), Timothe I (728-823) presented some polemic works against Islam.[2]

Methodically, the first apologists whose manner is the closest to theology centric approach about beliefs and religions are seen among the Muslim scholars. So, distinguished apologist and polemic, Abu Isa al-Varrak (d. 864) who was an Abbasid scholar, wrote more than twenty masterpieces but only four of them came into present time: (*Kitab al-İktisas Mezahib Ashab al-İsneyn ve'r-Red Aleyhim*; *Er'Red 'ala al-Mecus*; *Ar'Red ala al-Yehud*; *Kitabu'l-Makalat* (or *Er'Red 'ala el-Nasara*). In his books, after his description Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity, Manichaeism and pre-Islamic Arabian paganism or Ignorance beliefs and practices, he compares them with Islam regarding to theological centric approach, and rejects them (Ünal 1999, 33-4).

Beside Varrak, again the Muslim scholars followed and progressed this tradition in further centuries. The tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries became golden period of the Muslim scholars, in terms of apologetic study, which only defends Islam, and polemical study which only presents negative side of "others". In these centuries, scholars produced in the categories of "firak" that is "sects", and "milel and nihal" that is respectively "true religion" and "false beliefs". Makdisi (d. 950), Bagdadi (d. 1038), Esferani (d. 1078), Bakıllani (d. 1013), Ibn Hazm (d. 1064), Sehristani (d. 1183), each of these was a star of this field (Tümer and Küçük, 1993 18-19; Sarıkçıoğlu 2002 (b), pp. 2-3).

By the effect of the Enlightenment emerged in the Medieval Europe, this research school started to loose its favourite in Islamic world, and was replaced by theological centric studies of the Christians, which have been seen successfully since eighteenth century.

One of the first researchers about Comparative History of Religion in the West, James C. Moffat, who was professor of Theology Faculty of Princeton University used the Christian theology centric method, that is very often criticised by the historians of religions, in his books particularly in *A Comparative History of Religions* published in 1875 in New York. As his criterion, although he strongly defines and takes the descriptive approach of history of religion, even he evaluates different religions objectively, when he searches Christianity that he adheres, he

[2] For more authors see Harman, 1993, pp. 95-110.

often excludes and blames other beliefs or believers by using expressions of subjectivity such as "others", "infidel", "unbeliever", "idolatry".

James Freeman Clarke, too, shows similar attitude in his book *Ten Great Religions An Essay in Comparative Religion* published in 1899 in Boston and New York. When he comments on beliefs of China, India, Iran and Middle Eastern religions, he strongly desires what he makes is reliable to the Holy Bible's teaching. He wrongly states that he would compares religions regarding to false or truth sides. However, this approach is not the way of historian of religions, that is not to use prejudicial terms as blaming or praising other beliefs and practices.

In addition we can give more examples from studies of western theologians, but it is beyond the scope of our discussion.

Shortly, these scholars excluded some phenomena borrowed from "others" or "native cultures" as determining "pernicious", "superstitions", etc.

Such scholars who have very deep knowledge, at least about their own religion, in our opinion, should learn and apply only "comprehensive phenomenology" to remove his own shortcomings mentioned above, in order to be able to "understand and give basic meanings" of phenomena in both his and "other" (for him) religions. If mentioned scholars who did theology centric comparative studies have evaluated phenomena with regard to comprehensive phenomenology, they could have contributed to enriching of their universal religions in question, from the point of phenomena borrowed. Up to present time, it was observed that widening of religion in question about numbers of phenomena, have naturally broadened with characters of nations' "tolerance". However, in some periods when the "written religions" those politically dominated over "others", related religion was restricted by ignoring its nature of universality. Religious culture in the Medieval Europe that restricted by the well-known endeavours of cleaning of remnants of paganism, Osiris and Mitraism from Christianity, started tolerance to other cultures and beliefs only after the developed European countries have colonised undeveloped countries, and assimilated "other" cultures, and borrowed some elements from sub-cultures (Weiggall 2002; Van Den Broek 1979, 11-54; Huisman 1979, 55-70; Frijhoff 1979).

With regard to the Islamic history, the circumstance includes not all periods, but certain times. In these related periods, very different "official Islams" have appeared because of political struggles among the varied groups. Therefore, they excluded each other, and they made it their own self, in other words they localised their own "official Islam". Turkish peoples those who adhered Islam, too, made their own self some Islamic phenomena by taking refuge with universality of Islam.

2. Applicability of Comprehensive Phenomenology

In this section an analysis of the applicability of the hypothesis of comprehensive phenomenology on the individual types of popular religion will be shown by indicating some significant subjects in Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

Judaism first experienced schism of the adherents on the daily life of that Jewish Cult and the Law, particularly among the Pharisees and Essenes, soon after the beginning of second temple period. Today, too, Judaism lives a very big dilemma on the compulsory observances because of its universality, having very large milieu and very huge but scattered population all over the world called Diaspora. They perform their religious practices differently from each other but unified by the sake of its universality. Sectarianism in the Judaism up to the present time, shows soteriological exclusivism. Each sect or group says only our groups will be saved in the world to come, or will be vindicated in the final war between good and evil. Pharisees and Sadducees and also the Jews in the Diaspora in the past and now, are opposite to each other in most observances in general on festivals, sacrifices and offerings, charity, family law, purity, food, Shabbat observance, etc. Innovations of each group are different from each other has (Sanders 1990, 185f.; Doeve 1979, 325-339).

As is seen, exclusivism is clear in the Jewish sects. This problem can only be solved by the application of comprehensive phenomenology in order to make the religion an inclusivist and redeemer religion for all adherents.

Christianity has also the same problem by clashing with pagan and Greek beliefs and practices, appeared in the second half of the second century, as is shown by a famous passage in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (Smyrna, 156) and in the second half of the fourth century, mentioned in the *Confessions* written by Saint Augustine (354-430) (Musurillo 1972, 17ff). Cult of martyrs including commemoration on the third day, comes from or is a Christian variant of, pagan cult of the heroes, *parentalia*, or arose out of the Jewish cult of the saints. The ancient magical arts or oracles continued to be practised more powerfully by using Christian names such as Jesus for the amulets or apotropaic magic (Rees, 1948, 1950). Ancient oracles, amulets, soothsaying, astrology and a fatalistic attitudes, after a short period of decline, had regained much of their former impact on public and personal life, as remains of paganism. Church fathers opposed astrology and fatalism by saying while both are mentioned in the Holy Bible, and reckoned by the early Christian community (*Galatians* 4:10; Cumont 1960, passim.). Church fathers wrote many apologies against the superstitious observances and beliefs, however, people thought that there is no need to go away from showing their own earlier beliefs and practices, while they keep on Christianity.

Popular observances never had a direct reference to basic creeds of the Christian religion. The ecclesiastical leaders mostly rejected beliefs and practices originated in pagan milieu, but some of them regarded them in terms of

admissibility of some popular beliefs and practices commonly seen among the believers who had in relationship with their pagan contemporaries. It is from the fourth century onward that we see Christianised popular or common observances performed by the Christians, but originally pagan. Christian Fathers, saints, popes or other priests have no major religious schism in the daily life of people, while they are denominated ongoing times into different theological schools or sects. Because they mainly solved problem of beliefs and practices related to pagan period, such as Easter Duties, Christmas observances, customs related to dead, fertility rites and rituals, purification rites for the polluted places by synthesizing in the melting pot of universality of the Christianity. These have often a pre-Christian pagan character. However, today, too, ecclesiastical leaders all over the world condemned popular beliefs and practices not seen in the holy books, alleging that they were intolerable excesses from pagan cult, though they were Christianised by replacement or enrichment of some Christian motifs and figures, or by penetration of official religion as descending elements of culture into the remnants of heathen observances, vice versa. They want to 'dematerialise' the faith totally, especially by removing all concrete objects of devotion (Huisman 1979, 55-70; Bouritius 1979, 117-165).

In Islam, too, there are very different interpretations of varried beliefs and practices not seen in official Islam, but in popular daily life all over the Muslim World. Normative Islam which have been developed during the centuries by '*ulema*, or scholars of Islam, excluded some popular experiences by determining as "superstition", "innovation" or "false" separating from the compulsory beliefs and practices. However, this question should be solved with regard to the universality of Islam, by including them into vigorous daily life of Muslim communities all over the world, for Islam is, as was pointed out above, a universal religion spread among different nations and cultures in different geographies. Naturally, it is common to be performed of some observances in different.

These excluded phenomena from the official creed of Islam by the *'ulema*, may be analysed regarding to the comprehensive phenomenology aiming at enriching and enlivening religious cultural life of the certain community by not imposing religious patterns of certain nation, but freeing them in native milieu.

From this point of view, some phenomena still discussed can be accounted as below; initiation ceremonies for the birth, marriage, and Islamic orders, some para-religious rites and rituals such as musical celebrations and festivals, *mevlid* or birthday festival of the Prophet Muhammad, some magical actions; rites pertaining to nature; death and funeral rites and beliefs; sacrifices, salvation, religiosity of the Muslim people, etc.

Conclusion

Any community or its social-religious system could be found out by search of values wholly. Community is formed with people those who are unified by social relationships. These relationships are divided into two kinds; one is "physical" that requires individual "benefit", but the other is "spiritual" or moral values which are characterised with unity of rites and rituals, that is norm-role definition. The latter distinguishes one society or community from others, even, sometimes, from the adherents of the same religion (Brown 1972, 72-83). The basic reason of differences between certain societies is to be clear of religious and ritual manifestations with different symbols and images as "sacred" or "profane" (Geertz 1972, 167-180). On the plane of appliance of sacred and profane, it shows some differences with regard to sources of religious daily life of the people. In this context, as a result of religious anthropologic, ethnological, sociological and cultural researches, concepts of "official" and "popular" religion include some differences among the communities those who believer of the same religion, but in different regions or milieu. This situation can be observed in every country. Different observances seen in Christian Spain, Ireland, America that are Catholic countries. Other universal religions, too, have the same characteristics in different geographies among the different nations. We should seek the reasons of these variances in the cultures of certain societies. Because, the concept of "sacred" in the mind of peoples in certain region, manifests itself in any form. In fact, there is mutual relationship between these two concepts; culture plays a great role in the process of religion's formation, and religion in the process of culture's formation (Yinger 1970, 203-223).

Earlier beliefs and practices never disappear, but they are seen in different forms by changing its form in "compatible" character with "new" religion. This comes true in two ways: The first is "tolerance" anticipated for the spread of certain written religion among certain people. The second is renewal and (re)interpretation of beliefs in and quality of earlier god(s) with new one's or *vice versa* by combining each other.

However, all universal religions exclude this kind of observances from official or written religion as determining innovative, superstition or false, etc. This makes a gap between the society and culture, and causes monotony of religion among only homogeneous groups.

As a result, in order to keep the differences alive, in its process during the history of religion, and culture, the phenomenologists can our apply comprehensive phenomenology on varied phenomena. So, this synthesises, amalgamates, unifies, etc. oncoming cultural and religious values. Because, differences in unity are richness …

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Douglas (1987), "Phenomenology of Religion", *Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 11, New York Macmillan Publishing Company, London Collier Macmillan Publishers, ed. M. Eliade, s. 272-285.

Bianchi, Ugo (1999), *The History of Religion* (*Dinler Tarihi Araştırma Yöntemleri*, çev. M. Ünal, Geçit Yayınları, Kayseri.

Cumont, F. (1960), *Astrology and Religion Among the Greek and Romans*, New Haven: Yale University Press, New York.

de la Saussaye, P. D. (1891), Chantepie, *Manual of the Science of Religion*, Longmans, London.

Dhavamony, Mariasusai (1973), *Phenomenology of Religion*, Gregorian University Press, Rome.

Doeve, J. W. (1979), "Official and Popular Religion in Judaism", in *Official and Popular Religion Analysis of a Theme for Religious Studies* (eds. P. H. Vrijhof and J. Waardenburg), Mouton Publisher New York, pp.325-339.

Eliade, M. (1971) *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, Sheed and Ward, London (Türkçesi, *Dinler Tarihi İnançlar ve İbadetlerin Morfolojisi,* çev. Mustafa Ünal, Serhat Yayınları, Konya 2005).

Frijhoff, W. and Th. M. (1979), "Official and Popular Religion in Christianity, The Late Middle-Ages and Early Modern Times (13^{th}- 18^{th} Centuries)", in *Official and Popular Religion Analysis of a Theme for Religious Studies* (eds. P. H. Vrijhof and J. Waardenburg), Mouton Publisher New York, pp. 71-116.

G. J. F. Bouritius (1979), "Popular and Official Religion in Christianity: Three Cases in 19^{th} Century Europe", in *Official and Popular Religion Analysis of a Theme for Religious Studies* (eds. P. H. Vrijhof and J. Waardenburg) Mouton Publisher New York, pp. 117-165.

Geertz, Clifford (1972), "Religion as a Cultural System", *Reader in Comparative Religion*, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, London, 1972 pp. 167-180.

Harman, Ö. Faruk (1993), "Hıristiyanların İslam'a Bakışı", *Asrımızda Hıristiyan-Müslüman Münasebetleri*, İslami İlimler Araştırma Vakfı Tartışmalı İlmi Toplantılar Dizisi: 16, İlmi Neşriyat, İstanbul.

Huisman, J. A. (1979), "Christianity and Germanic Religion", in *Official and Popular Religion Analysis of a Theme for Religious Studies* (eds. P. H. Vrijhof and J. Waardenburg) Mouton Publisher New York, pp. 55-70.

Jurji, Edward J. (1963), *The Phenomenology of Religion*, The Westminster Press Philadelphia.

McCutcheon, Russel T. (2003), *Manufacturing Religion, The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the Politics of Nostalgia*, Oxford University Press Oxford, New York.

Mensching, Gustav (1994), *Dini Sosyoloji* (çev. Mehmet Aydın) Tekin Kitabevi Konya.

Moreau,A. Scoot (2000), "Phenomenology of Religion", *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*.

Musurillo, H. (1972), The Acts of the Christian Martyrs, Oxford University Press Oxford.

Palmer, Richard E. (1973/1), "Phenomenology as Foundation for a Post-Modern Philosophy of Literary Interpretation", *Cultural Hermeneutics*, SCM Press, s. 207-223.

Palmer, Richard E. (2002), *Hermenötik*, çev. İbrahim Görener, Anka Yay. İstanbul.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1972), "Taboo", *Reader in Comparative Religion*, *An Anthropological Approach*, eds. W. A. Lessa, E. Z. Vogt, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, pp. 72-83.

Rees, B. R. (1948), "Popular Religion in Graeco-Roman Egypt, I. The Pagan Period", *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 34, pp. 82-97.

Rees, B. R. (1950), "Popular Religion in Graeco-Roman Egypt II. The Transition to Christianity", *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 36, pp. 86-100.

Reese, William L. (1980), *Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion, Eastern and Western Thought*. Humanities Press. Atlantic Highlands.

Sanders, E. P. (1990), *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, SCM Press, Philadelphia.

Sarıkçıoğlu, Ekrem, (2002/a)*Din Fenomenolojisi*, SDÜ Yayınları, Isparta.

Sarıkçıoğlu, Ekrem (2002/b), *Başlangıçtan Günümüze Dinler Tarihi*, Fakülte Kitabevi, Isparta.

Sharpe, Eric J. (1992), *Comparative Religion A History*, Duckworth, London.

Smart, N., (1989), *The World's Religions Old Traditions and Modern Transformations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tümer, Günay -Abdurrahman Küçük (1993), *Dinler Tarihi*, Ocak Yayınları, Ankara.

Ünal, Mustafa (1999), *Din Fenomenolojisi Tarihçe Yöntem Uygulama*, Geçit Yayınları, Kayseri.

Van Den Broek, R., "Popular Religious Practices and Ecclesiastical Policies in the Early Church", in *Official and Popular Religion*, Mouton Publisher New York, s. 11-54.

Vrijhof, P. H. and J. Waardenburg (eds.) (1979), *Official and Popular Religion Analysis of a Theme for Religious Studies*, Mouton Publisher New York New York.

Wach, Joachim (1990), *Din Sosyolojisi* (çev. Ünver Günay), Erciyes Üni Yayınları, Kayseri.

Weigall, Arthur (2002), *Hristiyanlığımızdaki Putperestlik*, Ozan Yayıncılık, İstanbul.

Yinger, J. Milton (1970), *The Scientific Study of Religion*, Macmillan Publishing New York, London.