

CHAPTER 1

Montage and Time

Deleuze, Cinema, and a Buddhist Sorcery Rite

Bruce Kapferer

My broad aim in this chapter is to join cinema to ritual, to make the artistic explorations of a science/technology of the present-future, as Gilles Deleuze might have said, reflect on practices that are past or primordially oriented in an originary sense. What I will argue is that a cinematically informed analytical approach (in which, for example, concepts such as montage and its relation to time consciousness are found) enables new descriptive possibilities for grasping the significance of ritual practice. While not obviating symbolic and performance perspectives—usually developing from dramatic and theater metaphors—another and possibly more powerful approach to ritual and its existential effects is opened. Moreover, a perspective through cinema enables an expansion of how ritual achieves its pragmatic or reconstitutive effects. I will indicate that aside from the obvious differences of cinema and ritual there is an underlying unity. Indeed, I will suggest that ritual is already cinematic in dynamic, in terms of Deleuze's understanding, and has anticipated some of the potentials that cinema and its continuing innovations (in current digital technology, for example) is realizing through the artistic creators of film.

I start with a brief comment on Deleuze's two volumes on film (1986, 1989). Deleuze's work on cinema is effectively an ethnography that demonstrates central themes of his post-structuralist philosophy. In my opinion, it is a work as grand in conception as Claude Lévi-Strauss's magnificent structuralist work, *Mythologiques*. As Lévi-Strauss uncovers new visions of significance for a general understanding of human being through the myths, rituals, and other practices of Amazonian peoples, so Deleuze through the creative works of film uncovers innovative ways of describing existential processes and the place of human being within them. Through the technologies of the present constantly developing into the future, Deleuze opens new pathways for understanding human action and events. Lévi-Strauss attempts something similar, but through the imaginal creations of a destroyed or rapidly disappearing humanity that is quickly becoming a lost past. Both Deleuze and Lévi-Strauss attempt to overturn dominant and conventional understandings. However, the latter's stress on meaning (even if highly suppressed relative to interpretive Geertzian perspectives) and the paradigmatic and structural properties of myth, or narrative and story over the creative potentials of practice, would be challenged by Deleuze.¹

Here he would be joined by Victor Turner, who disagrees with Lévi-Strauss in a similar way. Contra to Lévi-Strauss, Turner values ritual over myth and, as with Deleuze, is influenced by Friedrich Nietzsche's stress on creativity and the con-

I start my discussion with an outline of some of the main themes in Deleuze's Cinema that I then take up through a discussion of a major Shinkai Buddhist anti-sorcery ritual known as the Sunyama. This ritual is fully described in Kapferer 1997, and other significant discussions are in 1983, 2005, 2012 [1988]. Sunyama materials is accessible to the reader. However, the major reason for presenting the material is one reason for its discussion here as more extensive available published which is one reason for its discussion here as more extensive available published Sunyama materials is that these were primarily influenced by a Husserlian-influenced phenomenological approach combined with a Tumorean symbolic/reflective orientation. Nevertheless, I note, that in the earlier work I did develop a critical approach to Edmund Husserl and attempted to expand beyond the limitations of his stress on intentionality. The Deleuzian perspective I apply here can be grasped as a further extensionality. The Deleuzian perspective I apply here can be grasped both our understanding of a particular rite and which I consider, may expand both our understanding of the Sunyama materials via a Deleuzian generally realized in the earlier analyses. The reconstruction of the Sunyama gives point to the philosophical arguments that Deleuze presents in Cinema and their relevance for forms of practice that may be conceived as outside their sphere of mereity about Cinema. Cinema is a phenomenon that enables Deleuze to pose major questions concerning the dynamics of creative/constructional human action and the grounds of existential experience, and accordingly develops a potentially valuable conceptual scheme of greater import than the understanding of cinema alone. While Deleuze's concepts are developed through a consideration of the technological problems of cinematic creation, they are intended to open the human realities in general. The discussion of ritual here through Deleuze's concept-horizons of understanding concerning the processes engaged in the creation of dual understandings of cinema in this larger Deleuzian spirit where an approach

trivial generation of the new. The influence of Nietzsche's discourse regarding the Apollonian/Dionysian tensions of Greek drama in *The Birth of Tragedy* is evident through much of Tummers' work. Tummers (1967, 1969) stress on process and reflexivity has resonance with certain directions in Deleuze's cinema works. This is apparent not merely in Deleuze's focus on creativity, but in the edition that can be made between Tummers' stress on process, symbol, and reflexivity, on the one hand, and Deleuze's concentration on time, image, and consciousness, on the other. The implication behind the argument to follow is that Deleuze's approach usesfully breaks from what might be referred to as the dominance of mean-ing in much anthropological analysis, especially of ritual, and which continues in Turners' work, a major influence on my own. Furthermore, I will suggest that De-leuze's development through cinema of a perspective on time and consciousnessness perhaps offer an opportunity to extend beyond Turner at least in the understand-ing of ritual. I comment also that with Deleuze in relation to the arts, Turner (1985) was concerned to marry the findings of science/technology to ritual analysis. He did so in a way that used science to confirm his ritual understandings. This, I think, is not the emphasis of Deleuze, which places art and science more in partnership than a course of enquiry in which neither has ultimate authority.

developed in the context of one kind of phenomenon can extend an understanding of another.

Deleuze's Cinema and a Generative Dynamics of Images

Deleuze concentrates his philosophical ethnography of the cinema on the nature of the image and a shift from the movement-image of classical cinema, and its sensory-motor schema, to the modern cinema and its development of the time-image, the image in itself. Here he comes to focus on what he calls the cinematic crystal image, an image that divides from within itself in an autopoetic dynamic generation. The crystal image is a point of origination par excellence and external to human being. The Cinema works as a whole express vital dimensions of a philosophy, highly influenced by Henri Bergson (1991, 1998), that takes radical issue with human-centered, constructivist, subjectivist, interpretational, reflexive positions—indeed, orientations that are powerful in the anthropology of ritual. Deleuze is critical of subject/object dualisms that are implicated in such positions, emphasizing instead a kind of material holism from which both are emergent. Thus consciousness is a refraction from reality, built from images and their light, the image being part of the matter of the real. Consciousness is already a dimension of the externally real before it becomes integral to subjective being and its reflexivity. Consciousness and its source—the image—is apart from humanity, originally external to human being. Contra to much phenomenology, consciousness is not born in intentional action. It does not start from the directional (intentional) orientation of human beings into the world whereby consciousness lights up reality bringing it into being as an act of consciousness (Schutz's 1967 concept of consciousness as a cone of light). Reality in its potentiality already exists independent of and prior to any individual human consciousness; human beings become conscious beings from within the motioning of the universe of the real that embraces them. The light of consciousness is the vibrational light of the image that is integral to the matter of the real. It is within this that human being comes to consciousness.

Jean-Paul Sartre (2004) develops an argument in which the image or the imaginal appears in contexts divorced from the real—in effect, the image is a representation of the real. When reality reappears, the person about whom one has been thinking as real in the imaginary is displaced by the actually real. Deleuze, while extending on an implication already in Sartre, refuses the image/real disjunction. The image is real and what Sartre may conceive as its unreality is that dimension of it that exists as its potential, a notion that Deleuze's concept of the virtual captures (but which Deleuze asserts is no less real). There is no real/false image or subject/object duality—rather, something in between, neither subject nor object, a differentiating continuous emerging, merging, reemerging, or what Deleuze describes in relation to cinema as a gaseous process. Furthermore, the image is real in the sense that it is not merely an abstract concretization, a figment of the human imaginary, human through and through, beginning and ending with humanity as in Hegel's famous "night of the world," but, rather, and following Bergson, is the enduring and generative light of the world. Consciousness is not with human beings alone and is already everywhere a potentiality, immanent in all matter. The image, in Deleuze's usage extending from Bergson, is the primary material ground of consciousness from which meaning and symbolism are generated and molded. Moreover, and critically, the image (in cinema as elsewhere) is not purely visual

Rappaport 1999). The discourse on the image that Deleuze presents in the Cinema-trailist orientations or others—for instance, of a performative kind (Austin 1955; images materialize are not first and foremost of a linguistic character, as in structuralist orientation. The structural interpretations of the image are the relations in which the image is prior to language, which therefore cannot be the tool for its communication, for these come out of the movements and the intensities of the image. Deleuze does not privilege a language or lingual approach either as method or metaphor, for the image is prior to language and meaning are continually open.

Deleuze, further, interpretation and meaning are continually open. They depend upon the dynamics of the image through which such aspects are the cinema form. Questions of interpretation and meaning are not primary; rather, the plot is relatively simple, around which the complexities of the life of Deleuze, the shadings, etc., facilitate technology and techniques of cinematography. For between images, their assemblies, sets, framing, out of framing, angles, close-ups, a diversity of realizations impelled through divisions within images, the play between dynamics and intensity of the image, the image as virtual, which achieves a thread, opening out to new horizons of potential. Such potential is vital in the thread is formed an emergent complexity of experience that is in excess of its narrative is formed an emergent complexity of experience that is in excess of its narrative.

In Deleuze's analytic strategy, storyline or plot are secondary around which

of perspectives from within and outside human being.

Stantial with persons and things via the moving camera eye operating a multitude may be drawn into the action on the screen and become experienced consciously that can become anybody or thing. Through such process, the viewing individual that can deterritorialized nomad, a being of pure potential and becoming, a subject-gains, a deterritorialized nomad, a sense changing dimensions of a body without oriented individual, but in Deleuze's sense crossings of a singular self or embodiment across the screen. These are not multiple expressions of a body without object point whatever within the world, and in cinema the world is the play of images realities of the moving images. The eye is in the motioning of the cinematic object to itself, is distributed across the screen and appropriated into the cinematic subjectivity, which in the motion of the eye may quickly become an

critical property of what Deleuze examines as montage).

Quenly acts against it, shocking or subverting the habits of human perception (a relativized. Furthermore, the cinema, rather than extending natural perception, features a position before the world, as it were, is negated, made continuing subject is decended, and what was once thought of as natural perception conceived from a fixed and non-human. Perspective is multiple. The human viewing subject is decentred, and through the action of the camera played from any point across the screen. Subject positioning achieved via the anchored subject/individual seated in the cinema and moved as it were from the movement of the subject/individual seated in the cinema and positionality achieved via the movement of the camera. In this, subjectivity is reflected relations between the images on the screen and by the shifting subject different and continually shaped and reshaped both through the changing and different positions between the images on the screen and by the shifting subjectivity is reduced and consciousness produced both through the changing and varying intensities) that project from the screen have their consciousness territorial—on the screen produces consciousness. Those bathed in the light (and its in cinema, the light of consciousness through the play of images—images as matter is manifested in cinema in which the screen and its play of images for Deleuze becomes the brain, the plane of immanence for the emergence of consciousness. This is realized in cinema in which the screen and its play of images for Deleuze is, and does not wait for human being to produce it.

This is manifested in a plethora of other sensory dimensions.² Consciousness is not a product of the intentional orientation of human beings toward the world, but is thoroughly integral to the materialities of existence per se. Consciousness already but is manifested in a multitude of other sensory dimensions. Consciousness is not a product of the intentional orientation of human beings toward the world, but is

works—his discussion of various kinds of visual, sound, and other sense images such as affection-images—constitutes an attempt to develop a new phenomenology not just of the image in terms of the dynamics of the image, but of the forces involved in world creation and generation. He argues for an understanding of human being not only through human being but through a dynamics of going outside the human and from perspectives that are not necessarily those from the positionality of the human. This is the potential that cinema offers. For Deleuze, cinema is a manifestation of reality. If it is an imaginary of reality it is an extraction or subtraction from the potential that this reality already is.

Deleuze's approach to cinema is at variance with most approaches to ritual, which are thoroughly human-centric, even though much ritual, as I will suggest, in a manner similar to the cinematic, often attempts a grasping of human being from positions external to human being. All the major approaches to ritual assert its thoroughly human-centric character.³ Thus the stress in most anthropology on ritual is essentially symbolic, involving a primary emphasis on language and meaning. Victor Turner argues that symbols are the building blocks of rite integral to the reflexive processes by means of which ritual largely achieves its effects.⁴ A Deleuzian approach would challenge, if not completely, this position by arguing that the symbolic, language and meaning, and their constructions are emergent, a concentration on the dynamics of emergence perhaps being critical to the effects and force of rite. The point, while not rejecting symbolic perspectives, asserts that these must be secondary to a primary attention to the dynamics, structures, and processes of image production. That is, a symbolic construction for Deleuze, following Bergson, is not a reality in and for itself—real because it is constructed as real by human beings—but real in a thoroughly material sense independent of its human constructions or symbolic creative realizations. As such, the symbolic is rooted in the processes of the world and extracted or subtracted⁵ from it and always connected into material reality that exists independently of its construction. This is a vital aspect of how cinema works, symbolic constructions being integral to the play of images, which are continually the source of new symbolic potential that is in some part already a potential of the virtual of the image.

For Deleuze, cinema works not because it is a suspension of reality or propels us into a reality that is imaginary—that is an escape from the real—but works because it indeed has (re)discovered dimensions of the processes of how human beings constitute and are constituted by the realities of which they are already part.⁶ Cinema is an instance of a technology by means of which the dynamics of the real are effectively broken into (art as science, science as art)—a real that has force apart from the human as it is integral to human constitution. Through cinema, discoveries are made concerning the way human beings construct their realities through a capacity to go outside the human and also to penetrate deeply within. Here, I think there is a close affinity between cinema and ritual.

Ritual, as with cinema, may be conceived as thoroughly built around the play of the real of the image and a concern with a symbolic extraction or subtraction of potentials that are integral to the virtual of the image. As with cinema, ritual too is often directed to a decentering of human perception and of human being. It goes outside the human and, as with cinema, may be enabled to reveal something of what underpins the creative and generative capacity of human being that may be otherwise obscured in thoroughly human-centered, subjectivist perspectives. Via the path of cinema, an insight may also be gained regarding some of the pragmatic effects of ritual performance that aim to intervene in the realities of human

A Suniyama is directed to cleanse sorcery victims of the effects of sorcery that attach to sand enter within the body and disrupt the whole being of the victim as an entity conditioned within time. Sorcery in this sense is a thoroughly radical event upsetting both the victim's life course through time and very constipation in time. From Martin Heidegger, but most especially from Bergson, and in the sense that Deluze builds time is behind and generative of Being, as it were, in the sense that Deluze builds as I will describe, are organized to deal with sorcery as a phenomenon that has obstacles and entanglements of the victim that have impeded and disrupted past performance of a Suniyama is different in its details insofar that it is set to the birth position, as astrologically determined, of the sorcery victim in Cosmic Time. Adjustments to specific performances will also be made to take the net advantages with most auspicious moment in Cosmic Time to make sure that the net operates with optimum efficacy. The key objective of the Suniyama is to reset the victim along his or her life trajectory, freed from the blockages, obstacles, and impediments that have accrued over the victim's life, and to also achieve a new beginning for the victim as a being emerging from Cosmic Time—Time as Being.

The Suniyama is a magificent night-long occasion involving splendid events of dance and tragic-comic drama. It gathers into its performance great Buddhist themes and embraes its participants—in the main, ordinary village folk—in their arguments to pragmatic effect. The net develops around a central building that may be conceived of as the key technical or technological apparatus of the net, a machine by means of which the forces of the cosmic entirety are brought into play.

At this point, I wish to turn to a consideration of some of my own ethnography on ritual performance. I address a Sinhala Buddhist anti-sorcery rite known as the Sri Suniyama. This is considered to be the master rite for a myriad of rituals in Sri Lanka that address a great diversity of illnesses mediated by various kinds of malignant spirits. Its central theme concerns the problem of time and consciousness and their relation to the order of society and the capacity of human beings to act

Time as Movement and Event: The Rite of the Suniyama

experience. However, an implication of what I present is that much ritual can be understood as anticipating what Deleuze uncovers in his work on cinema, and perhaps goes beyond it—the future in the past as the past is in the future.

and focused on the sorcery victim. Repotentiated within them, the sorcery victim is able to withstand the destruction of sorcery and is drawn back to consciousness and imbued with the capacity to act and to participate in the construction of his or her own life chances.

The ritual machine in which the sorcery victim will be situated is known as the Mahasammata Maligawa (Palace) or Suniyam Vidiya (a place of intersection of cosmic forces) and is constructed around the plan of the cosmic mandala of world origination. This central originating point of the mandala (*gaba*, literally a womb space) is inside the Palace and cannot be seen. Just after midnight, the patient will crawl through a small doorway into the Palace and sit at the central point—a place that in lay conceptualization is the bedroom of King Mahasammata, the first Cosmic ruler who institutes the order of human society and is an incarnation of the Buddha.⁷ The central chamber of the Palace is where Mahasammata is understood to be engaged in generative erotic play with his Queen Manikpala, the daughter of Lord Vishnu. Their erotic unity is indicative and sustaining of the harmony of Mahasammata's cosmic and social order.

The core myth of the rite, which provides the key storyline for the vital ritual events and which is intoned and sung at various stages of the ritual progress, recounts the occasion of the first act of sorcery of which Manikpala was the victim. The myth tells how Manikpala was raped by the great demon of sorcery, Vasavarti—the World Poisoner—who in various interpretations relating to Buddhist doctrinal texts is the great opponent of the Buddha, indeed his cousin. Vasavarti desires Manikpala and, disguising himself as Mahasammata, enters the cosmic bedchamber and rapes the Queen. The World Poisoner assumes the shape of a fire viper and penetrates to the Queen's womb. The Queen falls unconscious, her body is covered in sores, and the generative potency of Mahasammata's cosmic order is lost. Its harmony is shattered. All is decline and suffering. Mahasammata is distraught for his Queen Manikpala and no one can restore her to consciousness until Prince Odissa, himself a terrible sorcerer equipped with all magical knowledge and techniques, comes and invents the ritual—the Suniyama, in fact—by means of which the Queen is cured and the cosmic order regained.

The crucial events of the rite begin just before midnight and proceed through to almost midday the following day (a period during which the Sun begins and completes its ascent). The first major sequence of events (the *hat adiya*, or rite of the Seven Steps) involves the slow progress of some four hours in duration of the victim toward the Mahasammata Palace. This concludes with the victim crawling inside the Palace, which begins the second major sequence of events starting in the early hours of the morning and proceeding through to the conclusion of the rite at midday. These events involve the seating of the sorcery victim in an auspicious place (*ata mangala*), described among other things as the world mandala, where the victim is turned around to face back down the line of progress or path already taken. In this space, the victim is symbolically released from the coils of sorcery (ideally, 108 bonds of the sorcerer are cut).⁸ Thereby released, the victim then engages in a series of sacrificial acts (initially with the assistance of the ritual priests, but eventually as an independent sacrificer) that bring the rite to its conclusion. This is marked by the destruction of the Palace in a dramatic act where the great being of sorcery, Vasavarti Maraya (the Death-Bringing World Poisoner), cuts down the Palace, signifying his own destruction. In this act, the victim indeed appears to rise unscathed from the debris that falls all about. The event in fact

The governing images surmounting the edifice are those of the Sun and Moon, the temporal forces whose ascent and descent, waxing and waning, condition the temporal cycle, including those of life in all its forms and their death and regeneration. The timing of ritual events is in accordance with the particular intensities of cosmic forces that are dominant in the temporal flow of solar and lunar interconnection and tension (and too of the planets whose positioning affect the events of the facade is a painting of Sunyaya, the arch sacrificer and naturalist who invented the rite. This, as well as the distribution of images across the panels of the facade, indicates both the dynamic of differentiation in the cosmic unity (that the representation in montage in montage enables) and, indeed, of the rite which expresses a sacrificial dynamic of differentiating creative and regenerative action.

The facade of Palace montage is far more than a mere expressive representation of Cosmic Time and its complexity. It is also a vital active constitutive force that demonstrates the potency of the image. The entire Mahasamanta building is made from different plant materials, including the images on the facade, and these contain the elements that relate to the life of all matter. The facade materials are expressedly filled with life and could be said to radiate it. Indeed, the facade is fees-

Montage and the Motivation of the Image

In the discussion to follow, I will concentrate on these critical events—primarily world from within Cosmic Time, thoroughly freed from the coils of sycophany. Is conceptualized as a rebirth, the victim effectively being repositioned into the the progress of the hat adiaya and the events of sacrifice inside the Palace—largely with reference to Deleuze's discussion of (a) the movement inside the Palace—largely time-image whereby Deleuze distinguishes classic cinema from modern cinema. While former continues into the modern (i.e., Post-World War II Cinema), the latter is the period for the development of the time-image or the expression of time in itself for which the mobile camera is no longer the critical technical instrument. Moreover, the development of the time-image in cinema supplants montage as the vital technique for the expression of the differentiation and intensity of time. It is beyond montage, even though montage is always implicated. Broadly, I will indicate that Deleuze's concept of the movement image is thoroughly underwriting of the events of the hat adiaya while his concept of the time-image is thoroughly of the events of the hat adiaya.

tooned with brightly colored lights and some ritualists say that it shines with the radiant energy of the Buddha and the cosmos. The Palace and the facade are alive as a differentiating and moving totality that gathers those who are focused upon it into the cosmic dynamic it represents.

The sorcery victim is ritually encouraged to participate in the life of the image, of the facade, and of the entire ritual structure. Through the participation in the image, the sorcery victim will be restored to consciousness and delivered from the paralyzing effect of sorcery. Deleuze argues that the cinema screen and the images playing across it shine with the quality of the vibrational light of consciousness that already is. Here, developing from a critical appreciation of Bergson, he indicates that cinema in a sense mimics reality. He contests a Husserlian phenomenology that stresses human beings as the source of consciousness and the commitment to intentional subjective consciousness—consciousness as emergent from the individual human subject's direction towards an object (some thing). In such an orientation, individual consciousness projects like a cone of light illuminating reality, subordinating as well as rendering it entirely relative to individual human construction and interpretation. Deleuze conceives such an orientation as thoroughly bound to the dualism of a subject/object dialectic, which obscures a major dimension of the cinematic effect as well as the nature of the forces engaged in human existential experience within reality, which the invention of cinema has recaptured, if unintentionally. Deleuze is critical of Bergson for his failure to realize this. Deleuze argues that the cinematic operates to subtract or extract from the vibrancy of reality (e.g., the close-up) rather than construct it. That is, the nature of reality is not entirely reducible to the individual subjective act, which is already within reality processes and drawing from them. Cinematic techniques express such a dynamic and, furthermore, are not constrained within the subjectifying/objectifying positioning of the human body. The cinematic, expanding on processes already experimented with in the history of the arts, facilitates the taking of positions ("any-point-whatever") that are not confined to the human body (or limited to assumptions of natural perception). Moreover, in cinema, perspectives on human beings or situations, for example, can be taken from positions thoroughly external to embodied human being. Thus the cinema screen is like a brain (a center of consciousness, the nerve center of connection) but without a body, cinema potentially and often effectively "reembodiment" the audience in the life and experience of the flow of images that it presents.

In cinema, human beings can be brought within a reality (within the real of the vibrant image) in which they come to participate in the multiplicities of the cinematic unfolding. As such, the audience is not an "anchored subject" immobilized and necessarily casting its gaze as an act of independent interpretative consciousness upon the screen. Rather, the audience is brought actively within the play of images across the screen and comes to participate from a multiplicity of positions within and among them. The screen and the light of its images shines upon the audience (rather than the light of the audience's consciousness upon them) and so captures, motivates, and motions the audience in accordance with its processes.

Cinema, and I suggest much ritual before it, creates a reality in which its audience becomes variously embodied, shares in the multiplicity of events, things, and their unfolding. This is so, potentially, through the action of "screen consciousness" upon the audience who may, despite a conscious resistance in themselves, become absorbed into the reality processes that envelop them. The potential of

The hat adiaya is regarded by ritualists as commencing the anti-sorcery work proper. Within its performance, the sorcery victim effectively becomes a movement-image in a slow progress, lasting some four hours, into the Palace. The force of this motion is understood to flow from the Palace into the victim, who is enjoined to focus on the montage of the ritualists, and not the subjective inner consciousness in the understanding of the ritualists, and not the subjective inner consciousness or intentional consciousness that in Husserl's phenomenology, for example, might otherwise be grasped as primary in the motioning (see Kapferer 1997). In the course of the journey toward and into the Palace, the victim is progressively cleaned of sorcery.¹⁰ The major instrument in this cleansing is the facade/Palace that gathers society. So is the facade/Palace. Victim and facade are in temporal synchrony, the former being brought into conjunction with the dynamic of the Cosmic Totality that is itself moving in time toward an increasingly ordered unity of its parts. The victim's progress toward the Palace indicates both the change that is occurring in the cosmic whole and simultaneously in the victim.

The Overcoming of Sorcery: The Hat Adiga as a Movement Image

Cinema is that the audience becomes far from being an anchored subject and made mobile within the motional reality of the screen.⁹ The montage of the Palace facade has an import similar to that Deleuze accords the screen-image—audience relation in cinema which the events of the heat adiya or Seven Steps exemplify.

The motion of the *hat adiya*, if not the same, bears some similarity. That is, it is not constructed from a series of poses (or what Deleuze [1986:4] discusses as "transcendental elements" that might describe the building of the dances of the gods in the Suniyama presented before the performance of the *hat adiya*; see Kapferer 1997¹¹), but more from what Deleuze describes as sections or "immanent material elements." Here I note a connection between what I referred to previously concerning the motion of the victim as effecting or being related to a change in the whole, the Cosmic Totality of the dynamic of the rite.

In this regard, the *hat adiya* and cinematic motion bear a relation to Bergson's concept of duration (*duree*) or real time as elaborated in *Matter and Memory*, which Bergson otherwise opposes to cinematic time or movement, for which Deleuze criticizes him (see especially 1986: 8–11). Thus, contra to Bergson, Deleuze argues that the movement-image (and time-image) in cinema (and the moves in the *hat adiya*) are mobile sections, elements of a continuing process. Further, each movement constitutes a qualitative change in the Whole, in both cinema and the Suniyama, and thus approach what Bergson describes as real time or *duree* (see especially Deleuze 1986: 10–11).

The victim in the *hat adiya* starts the journey to the Palace from a position seated among the spectators (frequently numbering over two hundred and drawn from extended kin, neighbors, and friends) to the event who are gathered at the edge of the performance area (symbolically at the perimeter of Mahasammata's City). The body of a snake (the fire viper of sorcery, *gini polanga*) is drawn on the ground between where the victim is positioned and the small entrance into the Palace.¹² The body of the snake is also conceived as the line of the *susumna* or channel that runs along the spine of the body that carries the life force (*prana*) that the ritualists understand as traveling from the Palace into the victim, effectively restoring the ensorcelled once more to mobility, to a capacity to act that sorcery has blocked and prevented. The ritualists demand that victims focus on the facade and the Palace as a whole. In this way, the ritualists say that the energies emanating from these can flow into the victim, effectively bringing about the motioning of the victims and moving them into the Palace.

Seven points are located along the body of the snake that the victim will traverse. These are conceived as seven *cakra* or lotus points through which cosmic forces from the Palace will enter the victim's body. The lotuses also mark out the stages of the victim's movement and ultimately to a liberation from the constraining bonds of sorcery. Each of the seven points is also understood to be a barrier thrown up by sorcery that the victim crosses over after the clearing, negating action of anti-sorcery rites that invoke the potencies of forces in the Cosmic Totality, principally that of the Buddha and the Sinhala Guardian deities. After each crossing, that segment of the snake's body traversed is cleared away along with the ritual objects employed at each stage.¹³

Several observations can be made on the material presented. The seven *cakra* points, as well as energy vortices, can be conceived as sections of movement/*duree*/time in Deleuzian/Bergsonian terms. Effectively, they are sections of movement in the cinematic sense discussed by Deleuze: specifically sections, I suggest, in a singular flow of movement in time of the sequence past becoming present moving to a future. One aspect of this is the tracing, or perhaps a retracing, of the time past of the ensorcelled victim. By means of this, the ritualists (and the victim) enter via the technology of rite within this time past so as to systematically remove the hindrances and obstacles that have prevented movement and action as well as

The final events of the Sunyama, following the hat adiya, begin with the victim crawling through a small doorway at the base of the Palace facade. The victim is turned around facing back in the direction just traveled and seated in the middle of the Cosmic Mandala. Here the victim is bound with the coils or crepe of sorcery, which are then cut, indicating the victim's liberation. Sorcery victims often

Into the Crystal of Time: Beyond Montage

the ata mangala or auspicious site, the place where the potencies of Brahma, Siva and the Buddha are concentrated.

the Seer (see below) for it is the Cosmic Mandala (a center of cosmic communion, will come to sit which, indeed, as Deleuze writes of the time-image is the place of which all duration and its materializations are emergent. This is where the victim turns of the time image that lies behind it, the generative locus of time itself from one hand, time as succession (the hat adiya) and, the other hand, the inner sanctum of the Sun and Moon. In other words, the facade is a line of radical transition between, on the etc.), and their motion chronologically timed in terms of the movement of the Sun rising and juxtapositioning of several levels of duration (planetary demons, gods, image that lies behind. This is intimated in the facade itself—which is both a coextensive that separates time as succession, as movement image, from the time-non-chronological order" (2000: xi).¹⁵ The Palace facade/montage is a partition, a screen that single event can belong to several levels; the sheets of past-co-exist in duration, a present-future. It is, for example, a coexistence of distinct durations, or of levels of that the time-image goes "beyond the purely empirical succession of time—past-having to do with what he calls the time-image. Following Bergson, he asserts from movement. Deleuze, with regard to cinema, conceives of time in itself as within which all is potential. Time in itself is beyond montage and not derivative life's complexities.

The hat adiya is a motioning within time—but not time in itself, rather time birthing and creative moment to begin life anew—to trace a new pathway through life, during which they can be conceived as being restituted in their own lifetime, during which they can be conceived as being restituted in their own is the dynamic of the victims, own forward and backward motion through their Manikapala). The vastness of this movement is one which also encompasses mata and of the harmony exemplified in the erotic interplay of Mahasamanta with that generative instant of Time (symbolized in the creative action of Mahasam-Cosmos (or, rather, a ritual repetition or replication of it)—a movement toward Palace is also a movement back to the originating moment of existence in the usually a motioning forward and backward in Time.¹⁶ The movement toward the vastness of the cosmic journey that the victim is undertaking. It is simultaneous center of creative emergence. In this way, the slowness of the hat adiya expresses machinic ritual replication of the vortex of Time or the Buddhist Void (sunya), the destination of the victim to go within the Palace is, as I will explain, an entry into a process of Cosmic Time in which the victim is motioning. Moreover, the ultimate in its passing duree. I also note that the slowness indicates the vastness of the of montage to similar effect) as a cinematic technique indicating the speed of time bears on this.

Thus the slowness is akin to the slow motion of film (and also the engagement a clinging from the victim's body of sorcery, as these have entered

shake and tremble as they crawl through the entrance into the Palace. This I think is a bodily expression that intimates the extraordinary significance that this event condenses. One obvious understanding is that it is an involuntary physical expression of the release of tensions following the removal of the poisons of sorcery. But it can also be grasped as an involuntary physical awe-provoked anticipation of the approach to or entry within the zone of the Open, in Deleuze's conception, a place of indeterminate reoriginating intensity of pure potential—a virtual that is yet to be actualized (see Kapferer 1997, 2005).

The concept of the Open is appropriate to Deleuze's transcendental empiricism, which argues for a non-Kantian transcendence that is thoroughly grounded in and oriented to the empirically real.¹⁶ It is also relevant to the practical concerns of the Suniyama, whose machinic and highly pragmatic intent is to restore the victim to action but with a capacity to actualize that which is imagined or yet to be imagined. I underline a major point. It is the ritual as a technology over and above any exhortations of an idealist religious kind that it may engage that is crucial. Religious ideals, morals, and values within the rite are techniques for the achievement of practical results and, furthermore, gather their potency not so much in themselves as through the apparatuses and procedures of the rite. The belief—or not—of the victim is secondary to the images of cosmic force, whose vibrant potency are the key instruments in the technology of ritual practice.¹⁷

Vital to the Suniyama's technology is its machinic capacity to separate that which Deleuze distinguishes as the movement-image from the time-image, a distinction that some critics question (Bogue 2003; Rancière 2006). The practice of the Suniyama is organized in terms of a separation to which Deleuze's distinction is relevant. Deleuze's description of the time or crystal image (time in itself) and the progress toward it, even despite Deleuze's grounding it in the history of cinema, is remarkable in its similarity to the events within the Palace and the efficacy that ritualists attach to them. What he says has bearing especially on major events of comedy and sacrifice as acts of differentiation that are associated with the victim's repositioning within the Palace.

Deleuze discusses the pure time-image of the cinema as a crystal image, an image that divides within itself (and as I discuss below are features of the differentiating and internally refracting dynamic of both comedy and sacrifice). In his discussion, the crystal time-image is a virtualizing of the actual. What is real or imaginary is indistinct. The time-image is set apart from action and the sensory-motor scheme of the movement-image of cinema in which there is an interval and an oscillation between what is real and what is imaginary. The crystal time-image for Deleuze is not associated with an agent or actant, rather with the seer (see Deleuze 2000: 272). Moreover, crystal images do not extend from action situations, but constitute (again for cinema) what he refers to as pure sound and optical situations apart from extensions into reality. The virtual of the crystal image becomes the dynamic source for the creation of a new reality. In Deleuze's formulation, the movement-image proceeds toward the crystal image, time in itself, from within which new movement in time extending into new potential of action is generated.

Deleuze argues that the time or crystal image is constituted and achieves its efficacy by means of a delinking from the movement image, time as succession in space. Such a delinking in the Suniyama is done in the acts of the obliteration of the timeline of the *hat adiya* and the resituating of victims within the *atamagala*, their turning around to face back the way they have come and their immobiliza-

Upon the completion of the comedy, the ritualists and the victim engage in a series of sacrificial acts. I comment here that the juxtaposition of comedy with the events of sacrifice that follow metonymically indicates a similarity and a difference. They are both acts of intense differentiation and share in what Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss (1956) describe as the key sacrificial dynamic of creation through destruction. Their distinction is that, in this context, the comedy is a discourse of destruction. Their distinction is that, in this context, the comedy is a discourse of destruction.

Upon the completion of the comedy, it is its direct presentation (Deleuze 1989: 275).

Moreover, the rhythm and speed of the comedy is to invoke a sense of constant becoming, an almost inexhaustible emergence and momentary actualization of time that in Deleuze's analysis is also the "seed" of origination or reorigination, an idea appropriate to ritualist cultural understandings of some of the potency of the atamagala.¹⁹ What we see in the crystal is no longer the empirical progression of time as succession of presents, nor its indirect representation as interval or as the atamagala.²⁰ This, in a very different register, expresses a dynamic of the crystal potential. This, in a sense, is to invoke a sense of the crystal potential, the potentiality, in a sense, to be something more than what it might otherwise be conceived as falsifying. In a sense, comedy can be understood as both a dynamic of montage and montage beyond. Moreover, the breaking down in fact of the whole that the victim has now passed beyond, a breaking down in fact of the truth and falsehood in fragmentation into that which it might otherwise be conceived as falsifying. In a sense, comedy of the Vadiiga Patuna sets up one "truth" after another to be smashed or dissolved and the imaginary broken, but also those between truth and falsity. The discourse and the imaginary link to time as progression. The comedy has many of the features that might describe the inner machine of the atamagala as a direct signaling the process within the atamagala as one which has gone beyond reason between succession, causation, and reason (the link between successions of events, often uprootously so, into the potentialities of the dissolving of their actualities, often uprootously so, into the reasons of everyday life, and mins); see Kapferer 1997) is a destruction of the Vadiiga Patuna (A Comedy of Brah-

Among the many features of this event, the Vadiiga Patuna (A Comedy of Brahma) is a destruction of this event, the Vadiiga Patuna (A Comedy of Brahma) before the Palace.

In this situation, there is a thorough break, for the victim, with the actual. This involves a further or more intensive move into the virtual that is not yet actual and most importantly a direct rather than indirect, representation of the conditions with time in itself. Within the space of the atamagala, many of the conditions are met for that production of the crystal time that Deleuze (see 1989: 274-75) describes through reference to cinematic practice in which there is the creation of an image, a crystal image, of time as progression. The comedy refuses the logic of succession, causation, and reason (the link between successions of events, often uprootously so, into the reasons of the dissolving of their actualities, often uprootously so, into the reasons of everyday life, and mins); see Kapferer 1997) is a destruction of the Vadiiga Patuna (A Comedy of Brahma) before the Palace.

In this situation, there is a thorough break, for the victim, with the actual. This involves a further or more intensive move into the virtual that is not yet actual and most importantly a direct rather than indirect, representation of the conditions with time in itself. Within the space of the atamagala, many of the conditions are met for that production of the crystal time that Deleuze (see 1989: 274-75) describes through reference to cinema practice in which there is the creation of an image, a crystal image, of time as progression. The comedy refuses the logic of succession, causation, and reason (the link between successions of events, often uprootously so, into the reasons of the dissolving of their actualities, often uprootously so, into the reasons of everyday life, and mins); see Kapferer 1997) is a destruction of the Vadiiga Patuna (A Comedy of Brahma) before the Palace.

ing on a note of destruction, whereas sacrifice is a reversal of such a process—a destruction that ends on a note of creation or reorigination.

The sacrificial action in which the victim now participates is consistent with the crystalline dynamic of the time image that the victim is effectively within. The sacrifices perhaps are more accurately described as dynamic acts of division, rather than acts of destruction. That is, whole objects (especially ash pumpkin, or coconuts in the instance of the Suniyama and other healing rites), that in themselves express a totality, are cut by the victim or, in other words, divided. As such, the sacrifice is an initial act of differentiation from within the crucible of time in itself. In Deleuze's terms a crystalline differentiating act of emergence, a process of reactualization from out of the space of the virtual where all is potential (in contrast to the deactualization of the real that is a major process of the preceding comedy) is occasioned through the sacrifice.

The act of cutting is also explicitly a cutting away of the agencies and effects of sorcery—a final or finishing (*tindui*) cutting away of the past so that the erstwhile victim of sorcery is able to actualize or reoriginate anew. This receives its most complete and intense expression in the final dramatic acts of the Suniyama, when a ritual performer appears in the totalizing form of sorcery, in the guise of the Death-Bringing World Poisoner (Vasavarti Maraya), and destroys the Palace in an act both of self-destruction and of sorcery's effects (see Kapferer 1997). In this sense, the Suniyama is an effect of sorcery and the destruction of the Palace signifies the end of its effect. A powerful feature of this concluding event is the breaking free of the victim from the dimension of time in itself. As the debris falls all around in this most spectacular of the ritual events, the victim appears to rise out of the chrysalis of time itself. It is a supreme event of actualization from out of the realm of the virtual and the start of a new path through the complexities of social reality.

Sorcery is an ordinary expectation in the Sinhalese context that explicitly acknowledges the complexity of social existence (and its cosmic conditionality) to be rooted in the fact that all beings are singular points of origination and trace a multiplicity of different life courses. These, in the Sinhala Buddhist karmic universe, crisscross and intermesh having both negative and positive effects for the beings so engaged. The idea of sorcery captures and expresses such notions and the Suniyama ritual situates much of its efficacy by disentangling victims from the disastrous and ill effects of what could be described as life's collisions or events where a person's course through life is blocked or otherwise adversely affected by its intermeshing with that of others (human and extra human). The machinic process of the Suniyama achieves this by taking victims outside the lived karmic actualities of causation and of interconnection. In other words, the matter of time (in the sense of problematic and in the Bergson/Deleuzian usage of the materiality of the image) is central to the Suniyama both in its intimate connection with the issue of causation and in the necessity essentially to reset the ensorceled in time, to establish a new point of singularity whereby victims can trace a path through the complexities of existence.

Time, Cinema, and Ritual

Cinema is an ethnographic phenomenon that in the history of its practice opens a window on many of the crucial questions that have consumed philosophy and

not the same as an emphasis on practice to which the idea of process has been given, to intervene within time and its passage, as it were. The stress on production, to both repudiate this and to enter into the dynamics of its production, is of much ritual to time and movement (transformation) in ritual practice and the objectivity of time and birth that cinema addresses. The stress on process in Van Gennep and Turner is a fundamental recognition of the centrality of ritual and movement that cinema addresses. I want to expand from members the kinds of problematic that cinema addresses. And extentional renewal in Arnold van Gennep's sense that Victor Turner so brilliantly describes that are radically processual (rites of birth and death, of cosmic duality of nites that are ritual—those such as the Sunyama and, I think, a huge ritual, or at least some ritual—the Sunyama and, I think, a huge

standing of questions confronting human being as a whole.

They may be joined as a function of their practice in contributing to an understanding of ritual problems and serendipitously arrives at similar solutions. More profoundly key problematics and pragmatics technology if radically distinct from the cinematic, interests in certain pragmatic technologies that cinema addresses such as that of cinema may extend an understanding of ritual practice. This is because the latter, no less a traditionist trajectory of the common kind (art emerges from life, or science replaces literature), an attention to modern technological practice such as that of cinema may they are mutually informative. Without being committed to a dubious linear evolution and science/technology. Or if there are clear and obvious contrasts, as there are, what I am suggesting is that there is no necessary opposition between ritual and metaphysics presents for enquiry into the nature of existence.

be said science or technology liberates art and overcomes the barriers that ritual union of the creative insights of art with scientific practice. Alternatively, it might arts and looks forward to what the technological modern can achieve through a discussion, is more fully concretized in cinema. In other words, ritual is like the more strongly. Much ritual can be grasped as anticipating that which, in Deleuze's through cinema. This is the tenor of my argument here, although I would put it that Deleuze can easily be interpreted as indicating that what he refers to as Antiquity (this discussion of dance being of relevance to me) intimates what is realized in the context of demonstrating the new potential of cinema.²⁰ However, I note Deleuze himself says as much with reference to ancient cosmologies of time and from what might be described as the technological modern. In his Cinema work, metaphysics in much conventional opinion, including that of Deleuze, distances it ritual, in the multipleities of its practice, is obviously distinct from cinema—its science, a theme expressed in Deleuze and Guattari's *What is Philosophy?* (1994).

port and to advance an understanding. In cinema, there is a conjunction of art and potential, lead it to break into questions of larger philosophical and existential implications. This is despite or because of the pragmatic concerns of cinema practice. Numerous others are in Deleuze's investigation integral to the artistic problems provoked by Unintentionally, as it were, the pragmatism of cinema, the problems provoked by cinema, for example, in the efforts to represent events and their unfolding in intention. This is so despite or because of the pragmatic concerns of cinema practice. Significance (or in his terms of molar import) relevant to the generative situation of human beings in existence. The questions of time and consciousness among explored through the multipleities of its processes, but addressing issues of larger ethnographic in an anthropological sense. It builds a particular phenomenon, and organic with the cinematic phenomenon that he addresses. His approach is cinematic, as in the concepts that he develops, are in many ways emergent from involved in its artistic creative use. The questions that Deleuze pursues through the final driven in the narrative and representational demands of problematics of those the arts and sciences. This is so through the evolution of its technological potential

reduced. Ritual and cinema are practices that are mutually informative perhaps as much, if not more so, than the relatively common understanding of ritual through the metaphors and practices of drama and theater.

The connection between ritual and cinema, or at least highly significant approaches to these phenomena, indicates that a work such as that of Deleuze is of considerable relevance to the understanding of rite. This is what I mean when I say that ritual anticipates cinema, indicating that the ideas that Deleuze develops may have some relevance in understanding the ritual process and vice versa. There is no doubt that Deleuze's argument expands my understanding of the Suniyama and perhaps this rite clarifies some of the importance of Deleuze's own position.

In the beginning of this chapter, I equated Deleuze's Cinema works with Lévi-Strauss' magnificent *Mythologiques*. Both scholars bring together an enormous array of creative materials in the pursuit of opening new pathways into uncovering the nature of the human project within its circumstances of existence. Lévi-Strauss is dominantly concerned with meaning and in large part develops a linguistic or language-based approach. Deleuze generally challenges such an orientation as well as others common in anthropology, such as symbolic and certain phenomenological orientations. He offers a new point of direction perhaps out of the impasse that some of these have encountered and a certain repetition in argument as well as an amassing of more and more empirical evidence without breaking the barriers or the circle of understanding that a commitment to such approaches may effect. A key feature of the Cinema works, one of which some complain, is that Deleuze is not concerned with the plot or narrative of film but rather with the technical dynamics such narratives provoke. His approach opens a particular corridor to understanding that stresses the importance of practice, something with which Turner is concerned—and of course Lévi-Strauss despite the negative comments to this view of Lévi-Strauss passed by Turner and others—but in a direction that opens to new potential.

Notes

1. Lévi-Strauss famously concentrates on myth in preference to ritual, which he sees as largely "noise" and fractionalizing of meaning. I (1983) discussed this orientation critically giving preference to a Turnerian orientation. My main point was to oppose the separation of myth and ritual and to see in ritual the dynamics upon which myth comes to mean. While I take a poststructural Deleuzian approach here, the position should be seen as an extension of this earlier orientation of mine.
2. Here there is much congruence with Turner's approach to ritual to which Deleuze gives important reference in his other relevant work. I think the stress that Deleuze places on the image over the symbol extends the import of Turner's perspective. It should be noted that Deleuze is conscious of Turner's ritual materials and gives due acknowledgement of the relevance to his thought.
3. The exception might be ethological and socio-biological approaches. However, these tend to extend to non-human beings human characteristics and forms of display that are recognized as being ritual because they appear to be like what human beings do. I note that, in many rites performed by human beings and well documented in the ethnographic literature, human beings attempt to imitate animals and by doing so actually strive to leave a human-centric position.
4. Although Turner is concerned mainly with meaning and the dynamics of reflexivity, he can also be read as in many ways anticipating aspects of a Deleuzian approach. As with Deleuze, he is strongly influenced by Nietzsche (especially *The Birth of Tragedy*) and

15. In my opinion, one of the most brilliant cinematic workings through of this idea are the final events in Stanley Kubrick's *2001* involving the descent into Jupiter and the scenes in the hotel room. In many ways, Kubrick's great film is a thorough explication of many of Deleuze's insights. I explore this fully in an essay discussing this film in the context of a discussion of the Suniyam rite (Kapferer [in press]).
16. Kant's concept of the sublime has bearing, as Deleuze recognizes, both on Deleuze's concept of transcendental empiricism and especially his concept of the virtual. See also Kapferer 2007.
17. I suggest that belief arises in ritual practice. It is in rite that belief is affirmed and renewed.
18. "By raising themselves to the indiscernability of the real and the imaginary, the signs of the crystal go beyond all psychology of the recollection or dream, and all physics of action. What we see in the crystal is no longer the empirical progression of time as succession of presents, nor its indirect representation as interval or whole; it is its direct presentation, its constitutive dividing in two into a present which is passing and a past which is preserved, the strict contemporaneity of the present with the past that it will be, of the past with the present that it has been" (Deleuze 2000: 274).
19. Clearly, there are many other aspects to the comedy. In Kapferer 1997, for example, I have discussed it as the objectification of consciousness through the breaking of language rules. But in the context of sorcery, it can be conceived as an explosion of reason in itself or of events as bound in a chain of causation—a dimension of sorcery as karma or as implicit in the comedy sorcery as the absurd paradox of karma.
20. I cite Deleuze (1986: 4) at length in this regard: "For antiquity, movement refers to intelligible elements, Forms or Idea which are themselves eternal or immobile. Of course, in order to reconstitute movement, these forms will be grasped as close as possible to their actualization in matter-flux. These are potentialities which can only be acted out by being embodied in matter. But, conversely, movement merely expresses a 'dialectic' of forms, an ideal synthesis which gives it order and measure. Movement, conceived in this way, will thus be the regulated transition from one form to another, that is, an order of poses or privileged instants, as in dance."

This might be seen to apply to the events of dance preliminary to the *hat adiya* where the major forces of commanding gods of the Cosmic Totality are presented (see Kapferer 1997). The dancers adopt poses that then progressively flow into the motion of dance. But these poses could equally be regarded in the same way that Deleuze conceives of the figures in cartoon film as not static poses but sections through movement in process. This, as I have described, is the idea that is more thoroughly realized in the events of the *hat adiya*.

References

- Austin, J. L. 1955. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford Paperbacks.
- Bergson, Henri. 1998. *Creative Evolution*. New York: Dover.
- . 1991. *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone Books.
- Bogue, Ronald. 2000. *Deleuze on Cinema*. New York: Routledge.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1986. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. London: Continuum.
- . 1989. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. London, Athlone Press.
- . 1994. *What Is Philosophy?* trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kapferer, Bruce. 1976. *Transaction and meaning: directions in the anthropology of exchange and symbolic behavior*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- . 1983. *A Celebration of Demons*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- . 1997. The Feast of the Sorecer. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

—. 2004. "Virtual Dynamics and Virtual Practice: Beyond Representation and Meaning." *Social Analysis* 48(2): 33–54.

—. 2007. "Anthropology and the Dialectic of Enlightenment: A Discourse on the Definition and Ideals of a Threatedened Discipline." *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 18(1): 72–94.

—. In press. *Aubrck and the Cosmology of 2001*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Huber, Henry, and Marcel Mauss. 1964. *Sacrednec: Its Nature and Function*. London: Routledge Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2003. *The Birth of Tragedy*. London: Penguin.

Rancière, Jacques. 2006. *Film Fables*. Oxford: Berg.

Rappaport, Roy. 1999. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 2004. *The Imagination: A Phenomenological Psychology of the Imagination*. London: Routledge.

Schutz, Alfred. 1967. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Turner, Victor W. 1967. *The Forest of Symbols*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

—. 1969. *The Ritual Process*. London: Routledge.

—. 1985. On the Edge of the Bush: Anthropology as Experience. Tucson: Arizona University Press.