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**Abstract**

This paper examines Victor Turner's theory of Liminality, Religion and Society obtained from primary sources using the literature review method. The results of his study serve as a theoretical basis for discussing Victor Turner's Liminality and its relationship to religion and Society. This theory will help the writer dissect the customary ritual of washing the land in Soya Viktor Turner used this term in his research on symbols and rituals in the Ndembu people of Africa. Therefore, liminality has such rich characteristics that it provides its own perspective in the life of society and culture today. In addition to Liminality, the writer also examines the theory of religion and Society initiated by Emile Durkheim and Ernest Gellner. The results of the study show that these three theories have a very close and substantial relationship, in which of these three theories the meeting point is social equality with one another. This intersection exists as a result of Turner's theory of Liminality.
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**Intriduction**

Durkheim built a theory of religion based on the classical studies of Fustel de Coulanges[[1]](#footnote-1) and W. Robertson Smith[[2]](#footnote-2), which became the foundation and contribution to Durkheim in building his theory of religion. This theory is illustrated in the classic writings: The Elementary Forms oh the Religious Life. Here, Durkheim studies "the ever-present cause on which the most essential forms of religious thought and practice depend", and in doing so, he feels the need to study religion in its "most primitive and simplest form" and attempts to address its nature by studying its origins. This method was adopted so that it would be easier for Durkheim to examine the elementary elements and basic concepts of religion without being distracted by complex concepts, myths, and beliefs that were then added to the basic concepts by religious leaders. or other adherents of the religion concerned. Likewise, in a society that is still simple, there are usually no differences in beliefs between religious adherents, which causes religion to split into conflicting sects.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Relatedly, the religious system chosen by Durkheim for his main study is the religious systems of indigenous Australians such as the Waramunga tribe (upstream of the Finke River in Northern Australia), the Wombya people (Western Australia), the Arunta people, Luritja and Urabunna (in the Lake Eyre region of South Australia), and the Unmatjera, Kaitish, Tjingilli, Binbinga, Walpari, Gnanji, Mara and Anula peoples (area between the Mc Donell Mountains and Karpenter Bay in Northern Australia). Against these tribes, Durkheim did three things: 1) Analyse religion, which is known as a form of religion in the most primitive and simple society, with the intention of determining the elements and elementary ideas of religious life; 2) Examining the basic sources of these elements in simple religions; and 3) Making generalisations to other religions regarding the basic functions of religion in the general public.

From his study, Durkheim developed a definition of religion: "religion is a set of beliefs and practices related to something sacred, that is, something set aside and forbidden, beliefs and ceremonies that are oriented towards a single moral community where people give allegiance and submit to her".[[4]](#footnote-4) This understanding made Durkheim conclude that religion is basically something collective. It is different from magic. Magic[[5]](#footnote-5) is an individual effort, while religion cannot be separated from the idea of a community of worship or morals. This concept is different from Frazer, who said that religion and magic are likened to two people wearing the same clothes, both approaching one thing, but in a different way. Religion and magic both try to explain the workings of nature so that it can be controlled for the benefit of humans. Humans initially followed the path of magic, and when it failed, they turned to religion as a better form of thought than magic.[[6]](#footnote-6) For Durkheim, religion does not come to replace magic, which fails to explain the workings of nature because religion and magic have different concentrations.

Durkheim made a demarcation line between religion and magic to distinguish one from the other, namely, 1) religious beliefs or "religion" include always being adhered to by a clear group that declares and practices rites in accordance with these beliefs. This belief is not only individually accepted by all members of the group but also belongs to the group, and that belief unites them. Individuals who are part of a group feel together with other individuals with a shared belief. In the Christian environment, according to Durkheim, this community whose members are united is called the Church because they jointly imagine the sacred world and its relationship with the profane world and because it translates this general representation into identical practices. 2) Magical beliefs are completely different, including that they have never existed without a certain circulation and trend. They are often dispersed among broad strata of the population, and there are societies that have not the least active followers of magic, as have religions. However, those magical beliefs do not bind the humans who believe in them to each other and do not unite them in the same group, living the same life. There is no magical church. Between the magician and the individual who consults him, there are no durable ties that would bind him in a moral body, such as those that bind adherents of religious beliefs to a god or cause them to participate in cults. Magicians have subscriptions, and relationships with subscriptions are usually accidental and temporary. There are still many forms of differences described by Durkheim, especially regarding functional matters and their application in individual and collective life in society.

In this regard, religion in general explains the fact that the values that exist in all societies not only consist of a mixed set of values but also form a hierarchy. In this hierarchy, the highest score has implications for behavior. Therein lies one of Emile Durkheim's concerns that is different from other sociologists. He tries to reveal the nature of the interaction between social values and norms related to the daily implementation of social-moral obligations by most members of society. In addition, the most important according to Durkheim of all that is sacred is the ability to arouse feelings of awe and he has the power to force (in regulating) human behavior and the power to reinforce moral values for its adherents.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Durkheim's main analysis involves searching for sources of ideas about the sacred. In other words, what is in human experience that gives rise to the idea of a holy world. Because it is related to collectivity, there are several important elements that are always present in the phenomenon of community religion, namely, the belief system and the implementation of religious rites. Thus, the relationship between religion and society shows very close interdependence.

 **Method:**

In this writing, the type of research used is qualitative with the aim of understanding the multiple and interactive dimensions of social experience. As explained, this type of qualitative research includes constructivism which assumes that the study of Liminality, Religion and Nationality has an orientation towards preindustrial society, or it can be said that it is also a primitive society as an effort to exchange social experiences that can be defined through research results[[8]](#footnote-8).

**Result and Discussion**

**Background thought: Toteism, Sacred and The Profane**

**Totemism[[9]](#footnote-9)**

Observing Durkheim's thoughts as explained above leads us to enter one of the variants of elementary beliefs, namely, "Totemism". This is to make it easier for us to explore Durkheim's thoughts on the origin of religion. Emile Durkheim even said that it is impossible to understand something about religion if we do not first recognise the ideas that underlie it.[[10]](#footnote-10) The basic ideas include the belief in Totemism. This belief is something that is most important in Aboriginal society. Totemism not only has a religious aspect that gives birth to ceremonies and other forms of worship but is also related to the existence of clans, tribes and even communities.[[11]](#footnote-11) Therefore, the totem cannot be separated from the concept of tribal society with a structure and position in belief.

Durkheim further explained that each clan has a totem that is only specific to it. Therefore, two different clans of the same tribe cannot have the same totem. Basically, a clan becomes part of a tribe only because of the name it has. Therefore, every member bearing this name is part of the tribe with the same rights; however, wide the territory of the tribe, they have the same kinship relationship with one another.[[12]](#footnote-12) As a result, two groups that share a similar totem can only be two parts of a clan.

In most cases, the object that is used as a totem takes the form of an animal or plant that has a special organisational relationship with a particular community or clan. Inanimate objects are almost never used as totems.[[13]](#footnote-13) All of these are totems that can be said to be normal totems, but there are also totemisms that are abnormal. It is called abnormal totemism because sometimes the totem is not a complete object but only a part of it, but it is quite rare in Australian society[[14]](#footnote-14). Here, the totem is not an individual but a species or variety: the totem is not “this” or “that” Kangaroo or Crow, but the Kangaroo or Crow in general[[15]](#footnote-15). In addition, at the same time, the totem is also something concrete, which is a real picture of a clan; even the totem is also a symbol that represents the presence of god and at the same time symbolises the characteristics of a particular clan. Thus, totemism has a dual function in the life of a clan. He does not merely function as a figure that is worshiped or sacred by a certain clan. However, it is also a symbol or emblem of the group and a means of unifying the clan. By worshiping totems, the Arunta people actually worship groups. Because of that, the function of the totem is to integrate the social system of the Arunta people (integrate the separate parts together and make it a unit). This is what Durkheim called a social instrument.[[16]](#footnote-16)

In other words, what Durkheim wanted to identify about how totemism functions in the social system of the Arunta people is that religion in very primitive tribes is a very strong force of integration. The main goal of religion is to help people relate not to their God but to each other. Religious rituals help people develop a sense of community; for example, they take part in births, deaths, marriages and the harvest season. This is in line with the important role of values in the social system, namely, uniting groups by means of social solidarity.

 **"The Sacred" and "The Profane"**

The following variants will be studied to understand the most basic characteristics in every religious belief, namely, the matter of "The Sacred" and "The Profane". This characteristic does not lie in a supernatural concept or idea of divinity. To date, the concept of the supernatural has been seen by experts as a characteristic of everything that is religious. The concept of the supernatural is an order of things that is beyond our comprehension; the supernatural is the world of mystery, which cannot be known or which cannot be grasped and absorbed by the senses. Therefore, religion for Durkheim becomes a kind of speculation on everything that exists outside of science or common sense in general. The idea of this concept was conveyed by Spencer and Max Muller and was not approved by Durkheim. According to Durkheim, in any case, one thing is certain that this idea appeared very late in the history of religions. This idea is not only foreign to so-called primitive societies but also to societies that have not yet reached a certain level of intellectual culture.[[17]](#footnote-17)

So is the idea of divinity, which is also used to define religion. Starting from the opinion of M. Reville, who defines "religion is the determining force of human life, namely, a bond that expresses the human mind with mysterious thoughts that control the world and self that he is aware of, and with things that give rise to peace when bound by it".[[18]](#footnote-18) Durkheim stated that "the fact that will occur when "divinity" is understood in a narrow sense, then this definition will exclude so many religious facts. The spirits of people who have died and spirits of all kinds and levels, which roam in the religious imagination of humans on this Earth, have always been objects of rites and sometimes also objects of worship. It is clear, however, thatspirits and spirits are not gods.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Based on this thought, Durkheim did not want to define religion specifically from a supernatural point of view and rejected the definition of religion put forward by Tylor that "religion is a belief in spiritual being". The example taken is Buddhism. According to him, Buddhism is a religion, but it "does not have the idea of God and spirit", and some sects within Buddhism also "deny the existence of God" and gods. In addition, there are also several types of group rituals that have absolutely nothing to do with God or spirits. By this example, for Durkheim, religion is nothing more than "the idea of God and spirit". Consequently, religion cannot be defined solely in terms of these two things[[20]](#footnote-20) The explanations above show that Durkheim disagreed with scholars who approached their understanding of religion from supernatural or divinity concepts. Referring to the observations made on the Aborigines, as well as the best method he used, Durkheim then found that the most basic characteristic of every religious belief lies in the concept of "The Sacred" (Sacred) and "The Profane", as has been mentioned in on. For him, all religious beliefs, both simple and complex, show one common characteristic, namely, the separation between "The Sacred" and "The Profane" (profane), not what has thus far been known as "natural" and "supernatural.[[21]](#footnote-21)”

Durkheim then defines "religion as a belief system with behaviors that are intact and always associated with the sacred, that is, things that are set aside and forbidden - beliefs and practices that unite all people who adhere to and believe in these things into one moral community called the Church, to which all are subject[[22]](#footnote-22).” According to Durkheim's definition, the keywords are "community" and "church". Therefore, "the sacred" (the sacred) has a broad influence, determining the welfare and interests of all members of society. Durkheim understood religion in a strict sense, that religion is a fundamental and permanent aspect of humanity. Ancient theories about religion are a natural human instinct a sich. Every cultural society has its own belief system design as a logical action to "understand the world" and respond to natural phenomena that are found. This view is constructed by the theory of religious development, namely, the theory of naturalism Max Mueller[[23]](#footnote-23) and the theory of Animism E. Taylor.[[24]](#footnote-24) According to Durkheim, if you want to look at religion scientifically, it is not enough to trace its past history but also to look at religion in the present and the effects that religion itself has on the development of society. Every religion must return to the social aspects of the community of its adherents, and there is no connection between religious rules and "everything that exists outside the world", the creation of the world, the existence of God or the problems of life after death. According to Durkheim, the main goal of religion is not rational but social. Religion functions as a generator of social feelings, providing symbols and rituals that allow people to express their feelings and always be bound by their community. As long as religion still carries out its function, it will always be in the right position, protecting the soul of society.[[25]](#footnote-25) In this case, the nature of the sacred (sacred) manifests itself in reality and is surrounded by provisions, religious ordinances, and prohibitions that impose a radical separation from the worldly (profane).

According to Durkheim, all have a center of worship, although they vary in form. The concept of a "church" as a center of worship, as used by Durkheim, relates to the regular organisation of ceremonies in relation to religious adherents. Durkheim arrived at his view of religion as a system of beliefs and practices that are unified (solidaire) and related to the sacred, beliefs and practices that are united by a single moral community, namely, the "church." At this point, society is called the sacred (society as sacred) because belief encourages people to have collective consciousness (conscience collective), and the idea of society is the soul/spirit of religion (the idea of society is the soul of religion), which is Durkheim's thesis.

In principle, the study of religion and society puts forward several things. First, the sociology of religion should analyse the development of religion starting from the simplest "beliefs" ever known to humans, for example, the Totemism of the Australian Aborigines. This is intended to look for the most elementary forms of religious activity in certain belief traditions, where the structural forms become the basis, values and basis of humans in driving the development of society. Second, the goal of Durkheim's social philosophy is to place the origins of the creation of fundamental concepts or categories as forms of collective representation that are social, such as "our way of thinking" and "our way of living". Third, the analysis of totemism as the most primitive religion is intended to form a "generalisation of the nature of universal functions" of religion itself in every form of social relationship.[[26]](#footnote-26)

For Durkheim, every society needs a religion that can bind them together. Religion is a unified system and practice related to something sacred, something alienated and forbidden to believe and practice and unite in a moral community, namely, the church, and all people submit to Him.[[27]](#footnote-27) Durkheim referred to the term "social solidarity" (social solidaire) as a form of achieving human social life and the existence of social order in society.[[28]](#footnote-28) Social solidarity is divided into two forms: mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity.[[29]](#footnote-29) Mechanical solidarity is the main foundation for social cohesion so that collective consciousness "completely embodies" individual consciousness by assuming identity among individuals. Meanwhile, organic solidarity is an awareness that presupposes differences among individuals in terms of their beliefs and actions but does not presume their identity.[[30]](#footnote-30)

According to Durkheim, religion can only be understood by looking at the social role it plays to unite communities under a single unitary ritual and common belief. [[31]](#footnote-31) Religion can be identified with "something" that divides the world into sacred and profane. The social consequence of religious practices that are directed to the sacred area is a form of creation or reproduction of collective consciousness, a social unit that binds all its members into homogeneous units. Religion has been characterised as unifying most sublime human aspirations as a source of morality in social order, individual inner peace and civilising human beings. Religious institutions basically have an important understanding regarding the problems of human life in the transcendence of something sacred; in fact, these institutions are the most likely form of association to survive in the social-community order.[[32]](#footnote-32)

According to Durkheim, the idea of society is the spirit of religion (the idea of society is the soul of religion) because religion is social. Even though individuals have life choices, their choices remain in the social framework as something that is "given" to us from birth. In terms of methods and approaches, Durkheim emphasised scientific science and refused to make comparisons between because it would reduce the building of society itself. Beliefs and religious practices are social facts, their existence is individual, and they influence the way of thinking and behaving of an individual. Individual subjective religious practices and actions will have a significant social impact that forms collectivity and creates a strong emotional condition (collective effervescence), as well as enabling the remapping of the order of relations in the social system. Therefore, religion is an expression of something that is basic, real, and intimate.

There is no wrong religion, all religions are right in their own way—all the answers, although in various ways, are given to deal with every condition of human existence[[33]](#footnote-33) Durkheim saw that the real and objective phenomena behind religious symbols were not God but society itself. First, Durkheim opens the discourse between beliefs and religious practices because the subjective awareness of individuals of explicit religious symbols and God is basically not the actual object of these symbols but of society and the individuals themselves. Second, in a religious practice, there is collective participation, and even a consensus on religious beliefs has created the necessary conditions for social integration[[34]](#footnote-34)

**Conclusion**

From the explanation of the theoretical concepts of Liminality, religion and nationality, in the end, the writer arrives at the following conclusions:

1. The experience of human liminality not only occurs in religious ceremonies or rites but is also found in everyday life. Within this liminality, there is the experience of "community", which is a fundamental experience for humans. By Viktor Turner's experience, Community is seen as a social form of Liminality and that is a relationship that is concrete, direct and anti-structural. In the experience of the human community, they experience equality and have social relations, but these relations do not cause differences.

2. Human relations with rituals or religious ceremonies are related to crises in social life in society. Victor Turner understands that humans are not static but evolve. In this development, humans are also seen as beings who move from one stage to the next. Humans are also understood as a process, so it does not happen all at once. Therefore, the rites that are carried out encourage people to do and obey certain social orders. For Victor Turner, rites have a role in society, including eliminating conflict and building social solidarity in society.

3. The basic thoughts of Durkheim's sociology about religion when assessing society as a reality, namely, that the goal of religion is not to help humans relate to God but to help individuals relate to each other. The same goes for religious rituals helping people develop a sense of community; for example, they take part in ceremonies of marriage, birth, and death, which unite the group by way of religious contraction.

4. Religion is an essential factor for social identity and integration, so religion places more emphasis on social elements that produce social solidarity. Religion is a system of collective self-interpretation, a system of symbols by which society can become self-aware. Religion is a projection of society itself on human consciousness; as long as society continues, religion will continue, and society will continue to produce symbols of its collective self-understanding, thereby creating religion.

5. Potential nationalism or nationality is due to shared cultural values as an agrarian cultural heritage with the hope of building a homogeneous community entity. These community entities are expected to be equal to be able to live together in a bond in the midst of the nation and state. Rousseau introduces a type called civil religion, which he interprets as a loyalty of citizens who are bound by a social contract that they build themselves to achieve together their general will, namely, justice. and common welfare. If the general will is well understood and has transcendental value, then it is the duty of every citizen to carry out his duties properly so that they are useful to others.

6. The substantial value as the meeting point of the three theories above, "liminality, religion and nationality", is social "equality", which needs to be studied more deeply.
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