
ON *BUDAYA* AND THE RE-SACRALIZATION OF INDONESIAN CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Ferry Hidayat
Pondok Modern Tazakka, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The Indonesian concept of *budaya* and its derivatives such as *budi*, *budidaya*, *kebudayaan*, *budiman*, *budi pekerti*, as well as *budayawan* were sacred concepts long ago. However, with the emergence of Cultural Anthropology by Indonesian anthropologists from the 1960s onwards, the concept of *budaya* became desacralized. Its desacralization started when *budaya* was construed as *culture* by Indonesian cultural anthropologists, and *Ilmu-Ilmu Budaya* was interpreted as the *Humanities*. This paper explores the sacred concept of *budaya* prior to the emergence of the Cultural Anthropology, then investigates the desacralization of the concept of *budaya* through the history of Indonesian Cultural Anthropology and finally attempts to offer a re-sacralization of the concept of *budaya* by revitalizing the concept through the Indonesian Hindu and Islamic metaphysical heritage. The re-sacralization of the Indonesian concept of *budaya* will provide a pathway to the emergence of a *Budaya* Anthropology which can correct some of the problems of the profanized Cultural Anthropology.

Keywords: *Budaya*, *Budi*, Culture, Cultural Anthropology, Re-sacralization.

The Original Ontological Conception of *Budaya*

Etymologically, the Indonesian word *budaya* is taken from the Sanskrit word *buddhayah*. Its Devanagari script is बुद्धयः. Its synonym is बुद्धि, transcribed as *buddhi*. In Hindu literature, *buddhayah* or *buddhi* has some meanings, all of which are metaphysical and supernatural.

First of all, *buddhayah* or *buddhi* means intellectual perception;¹ it is an internal faculty which is the source of the two other internal faculties called *ahankara* (self-consciousness) and *manas* (mind). *Buddhayah* or *Buddhi* is evolved from an original primordial ‘eternally existing essence’ which evolves or produces everything else called *prakriti*. *Prakriti* is a primal source of all productions in the universe;² it is “originary producer” of visible, material nature.³ *Buddhi* or *Buddhayah* is a reflection of *prakriti*.⁴ By analogy, in other words, *buddhi* is a red flower, while *prakriti* is a crystal. The crystal is often wrongly held to possess red color because it is near the flower. The red color of the crystal is in fact the reflection of the red color of the near flower.⁵ Human beings can activate their *buddhayah* or *buddhi* since they have *buddhi indriyâni* or “the organs of awareness”: the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and skin.⁶ With these *buddhi indriyâni*, human beings can grasp the presence of the *prakriti*.⁷

Secondly, *buddhi* or *buddhayah* means ‘the Universal Intellect’; it is one of manifestations of ‘the Divine Spirit’ or *Prajnâ*. *Prajnâ* has three modes of manifestation, each being a mystery in itself but descending to a lower outward manifestation. The three modes are ‘Universal Intellect’, ‘the Man-Logos’ (also called ‘Revelation’) who reveals in human languages, and ‘the Intellect’ in human beings.⁸ *Buddhi* or *Buddhayah*, as the first manifestation of *Prajnâ*, is *Prajnâ* in archangelic personifications in the macrocosm.

The second manifestation of *Prajnâ*, lower than *Buddhi*, is ‘the Man-Logos’, the archetypes of certain human beings; it is Khresna or Arjuna in his archetypal plane, or in his *Prajnâ* form.⁹ Lower than ‘the Man-Logos’ in the manifestation hierarchy of *Prajnâ* is ‘the Intellect’ within human beings’ soul in the microcosm.¹⁰ It is manifest in Hindu figures such as Ramanuja, Shankara, Sri Vivekananda, Ananda E.

Coomaraswamy, etc.

‘The Intellect’ within the human soul is also called *Buddhi* or *Buddhayah*; it is ‘the highest faculty of knowledge, distinct from *manas*, that is, mind or reason’. This *Buddhi* or *Buddhayah* is immanent in the heart of every human (Schuon 2008:246).¹¹ Although *buddhi* is inherent, it is still potential. To awaken it, a person must do *buddhi-yoga*, a spiritual exercise and training.¹²

This *buddhi* or *buddhayah*, when awakened, supplies good qualities to human beings such as higher judgement, instant understanding, discrimination between good and evil, intuition, love that has no bounds, and consequent universal forgiveness.¹³ The person whose awakened *buddhi* or *buddhayah* is called in Sanskrit, *buddhi-cintaka*, while a person who lost his *buddhi* is called *buddhi-cyuta*.¹⁴

Prajnâ, whose manifestation is *Buddhi* or *Buddhayah*, is itself the third or the lowest manifestation of the Highest Mystery. The Highest Mystery has three levels of mysteriousness in descending order: *Âtmâ* (‘the Pure Absolute’), *Being* (‘the manifested Pure Absolute’), and *Prajnâ* (‘the Divine Spirit’). *Âtmâ* (‘the Pure Absolute’) is the Highest Mystery in its purest state; indescribable, unqualifiable, unimaginable, unthinkable.¹⁵ Lower than it in the hierarchy of mysteriousness is *Being*. It is *Âtmâ* manifested, clothed in an outward lower manifestation. This is what is called *Vishnu*, *Shiva*, or *Brahma* in Hindu, who creates, reveals, and judges.¹⁶ Below it in the hierarchy of the Highest Mystery’s mysteriousness is *Prajnâ*.¹⁷

Lastly, *Buddhayah* or *Buddhi* means a ray from the cosmic principle *Alaya-mahat*.¹⁸ *Alaya-mahat* is the universal mind, of which *buddhi* or *buddhayah* is a temporary reflection.¹⁹

The ontological concept of *buddhayah* or *buddhi* as an internal faculty of human intellectual perception, as a manifestation of *Prajnâ* in the macrocosm and the microcosm, and as a ray of the universal mind (*Alaya-mahat*) as well, is adopted by Indonesian lexicography. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, ‘The Big Dictionary of Bahasa Indonesia’), for instance, still retains the

spiritual, metaphysical trace of this primordial, ontological concepts of *buddhayah* or *buddhi*.

The Bahasa word ‘*budi*’ is defined in *KBBI* as “alat batin yg merupakan paduan akal dan perasaan untuk menimbang baik dan buruk” (an internal faculty which combines reasoning and feeling for discerning the good and the evil), whereas ‘*budaya*’ is defined therein as a synonym of *budi*.²⁰ A person who activates his *budi* to discern good and evil—*buddhi-cintaka*—is called by *KBBI* as ‘*budiman*’.²¹

The Sanskrit word *buddhi indriyâni* is taken and spelled by *KBBI* as ‘*indra*’, or rather ‘*pancaindra*’— ‘alat perasa yg lima macam yaitu penglihat, pencium, pengecap, perasa tubuh, dan pendengar’ (the five human senses, which are sight, smelling, tasting, touch, and hearing).²² Javanese literature also inherits the original, ontological concept of *buddhi* or *buddhayah*. As an illustration, *Serat Centhini*, an old Javanese literary work written in 1903, mentions *budi* and construes it as an intermediary between *Being* (‘wujud tanpa kahanan’) and *Âtmâ* (‘kak sajati’):

Wujud tanpa kahanan puniki
Ing dalem kak sajati lantaran
Inggih budi lantarané
Sarupa wujud ing hu
Pan jumeneng Muhammad latip
Mustakik ing Hyang Suksma
Kenyatanipun
Budi wujud ing Hyang Suksma
Inggih budi inggih Hyang kang Mahasuci
*Budi tatabonira.*²³

(The Being without material existence
amidst the Pure Absolute
has an intermediary called Budi
which is a reflection of the Being
It is the Archetypal Muhammad

A reflection of the Divine Spirit
and its manifestation
Budi is a reflection of the Divine Spirit
Budi is the Holy Spirit
Budi is the Holy Spirit's castle.)

Presumably, this Hindu ontological concept penetrated into Javanese metaphysical horizon and had inspired the founders of a Javanese intellectuals association in 1908 so as to call their association '*Budi Utomo*' or 'the Eminent Budi'. The famous members of the association such as Wahidin Soedirohoesodo, Soetomo, M. Soeradji, Radjiman Wedyodiningrat, and Supomo, among others, practice a kind of mysticism that displays the Hindu spiritualism and primitive Javanese religiosity,²⁴ emphasize in their speeches the Hindu tradition of Java, hold discussions on topics of the continuous Hindu influence of ancient Java as well as stimulate a new interest to revitalize and reconstruct their Hindu-Javanese past in their Javanese movement, *Budi Utomo*.²⁵

The Javanese people's traditional association of their religion as '*agama Budi*' is also indicative of this Hindu spiritual heritage.²⁶ Even the foundation of *Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan* (Indonesia's Ministry of Education and Kebudayaan), side-by-side with *Kementerian Agama* (Indonesia's Ministry of Religious Affairs), is presumed to aim at the retainment of this Hindu metaphysics of *buddhayah* within Indonesian people's national ideology of education.²⁷

The Profanization of *Budaya*

The Indonesian metaphysical, sacred concept of *budi* and *budaya*, taken from the Hindu ontology of *buddhi* or *buddhayah*, had in turn been desacralized and profanized. The profanization was mainly promoted by Indonesian modernist thinkers such as Tan Malaka (1894-1949), Sutan Sjahrir (1909-1966), Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana (1908-1994), and the Indonesian Literature Movement of the 1945.²⁸

Tan Malaka, for instance, in his book *Massa Actie* (1926) criticized *Budi Utomo* and its roots in Hindu metaphysics and opposed the Hindu concept of *budaya* and claimed it as the concept of the slaves which must be eradicated:

...dari dulu sampai sekarang kaum B.U. menghabiskan waktu dengan pekerjaan memanggil-manggil arwah yang telah lama meninggal dunia. Borobudur yang kolot, wayang dan gamelan yang merana, semuanya buah 'kebudayaan perbudakan', ditambah dan digembar-gemborkan mereka siang dan malam. Di dalam 'lingkungan sendiri' kerap kali dukun-dukun politik itu menyuruh Hayam Wuruk—raja Hindu atau setengah Hindu itu—dengan laskarnya yang kuat berbaris di muka mereka. Tetapi di luar kumpulan gaib itu seboleh-bolehnya dibicarakan soal-soal yang tak berbahaya. Di dalam kongres B.U. berkali-kali (sampai menjemukan) kebudayaan dan seni Jawa (?) dibicarakan. Soal penting yaitu yang mengenai penghidupan rakyat di Jawa—jangan dikata lagi di seluruh Indonesia, tak pernah disentuh, jangankan diperbincangkan mereka.²⁹

[... since a long time ago B.U. members have been spending their time by conjuring up the spirits of their ancestors. The ancient Borobudur Temple, puppet performance and gamelan, all of which are fruits of 'the kebudayaan of the slaves', are more and more widespread by them nights and days. In their own 'circle' these political shamans conjure up Hayam Wuruk—the Hindu or the half-Hindu king—with his powerful troops to march before their presence. Out of their esoteric circle, however, trivial political issues are discussed. In B.U. congresses Javanese kebudayaan and art (?) are explained on and on (so boringly), while a key issue that concerns with Javanese people's prosperity—let alone with all Indonesian people's prosperity is never dealt with, nor talked over.]

Sutan Sjahrir, in his memoir of his political exile dated 20 June 1935, criticized the *budaya* metaphysics as the feudal, aristocratic metaphysics resembling the Middle-Age Western metaphysics that must be destroyed. He called instead for the adoption of a Modern Western scientific way of thinking:

Di sini sejak berabad-abad tidak ada kehidupan rohani, tidak ada kehidupan budaya, tidak ada sama sekali kemajuan. Memang ada pengungkapan seni Timur yang banyak dipuji-puji, akan tetapi apakah itu semua tiada lain dari perkembangan yang tidak sempurna dari kebudayaan feodal, yang tidak mungkin menjadi tempat berpegang bagi kita, orang-orang abad kedua puluh? Apa bisanya wayang dengan segala lambang-lambangnyanya yang sahaja dan mistik itu—yang sejajar dengan cerita-cerita kiasan (allegori) dan ilmu batin abad menengah di Eropa—yang menyumbangkan sesuatu yang bersifat intelektual dan kultural secara umum kepada kita? Kebutuhan rohani kita adalah kebutuhan abad kedua puluh, masalah-masalah kita, pandangan kita adalah dari abad kedua puluh. Selera kita bukan menuju kepada mistik, tetapi kepada kenyataan, kejelasan dan kelugasan (realiteit, helderheid, zekelyheid)... kebutuhan rohani kita, kita tergantung dari Barat, bukan secara ilmiah saja, melainkan juga secara budaya umumnya...³⁰

[Since a long time ago there has been no spiritual dynamism here, there has been no dynamism of budaya here, there has been no progress at all. It is true that there are Eastern art expressions which are much praised here, yet aren't they only imperfect development of kebudayaan of the feudal society, which are impossible to be withheld by us, the people of the twentieth century? What can the puppet performance and all its mystical symbolism—which are similar to allegorical stories and to the mysticism of the Medieval Age Europe—generally contribute to our intellectual growth and our cultural progress? Our spiritual aspiration is the

twentieth century aspiration, and our problems as well as our perspective are the twentieth century ones. Mysticism is not to our taste; ours are reality, clarity, and explicitness (realiteit, helderheid, zekelyheid)... the West doesn't only fulfil generally our spiritual aspirations but also fulfils our scientific as well as cultural aspirations...]

Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana criticized the *budaya* spiritualism as a cause of the colonialism by the Dutch in Indonesia and promoted the Western materialism, egoism, individualism, and capitalism to be adopted and applied by Indonesian people:

Kalau kita *analyseeren* masyarakat kita dan sebab-sebabnya kalah bangsa kita dengan perlombaan bangsa-bangsa di dunia, maka nyatalah kepada kita bahwa menjadi *statisch*nya, menjadi matinya, tiada berjiwanya masyarakat bangsa kita ialah karena berabad-abad itu kurang memakai otaknya, kurang egoisme (yang saya maksud bahagiannya yang sehat), kurang materialisme... Otak Indonesia harus diasah menyamai otak Barat! Individu harus dihidupkan sehidup-hidupnya! Keinsyafan akan kepentingan diri harus disadarkan sesadar-sadarnya! Bangsa Indonesia harus dianjurkan mengumpulkan harta dunia sebanyak-banyak mungkin!³¹

[If we analyze our society and the causes of our nation's failure in the competition among all nations on earth, it is clear that our society have become *statisch*, and have become dead, and have become unmotivated for centuries due to the fact that our society use their brains less, and they lack of egoism (I mean, the positive part of it), and they lack of materialism... The brain of Indonesians must be reeled over and over so as to be similar to the brains of Westerners! Individuality must be shown over and over! The self-interest realization must be encouraged on and on! The nation of Indonesia must be encouraged to get as abundant worldly possession as possible!]

In line with Sutan Takdir's criticism of *budaya*, the Indonesian Literature Movement of the 1945 (whose members are the famous literati like Chairil Anwar, Asrul Sani, Rivai Apin, Akbar Djuhana, H.B. Jassin, and Sitor Situmorang) criticized the *budaya* metaphysics believing that it should be cast away in a revolutionary manner on their art manifesto called known as *Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang*:

...Kami tidak akan memberikan suatu kata ikatan untuk kebudayaan Indonesia. Kalau kami berbicara tentang kebudayaan Indonesia, kami tidak ingat kepada melap-lap hasil kebudayaan lama sampai berkilat dan untuk dibanggakan,... Revolusi bagi kami ialah penempatan nilai-nilai baru atas nilai-nilai usang yang harus dihancurkan....³²

[... We will never tie ourselves with the kebudayaan of Indonesia. If we discuss about it, it does not mean that we polish achievement of the old kebudayaan over and over so that it shines out and it can be praised up,... The meaning of revolution to us is to replace new values over obsolete values and to destroy them...]

The Modernist thinkers' hatred of the old *budaya* metaphysics and spiritualism is followed by the secularization of and the desacralization of *budaya* by Indonesian cultural anthropologists in the 1960s onwards. Cultural anthropologists like Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, Sidi Gazalba (a Sutan Takdir's disciple), Koentjaraningrat, Dick Hartoko, etc., began to connect the ontological concept of *budaya* with the Western Modern profanized, desacralized concept of *culture*. As an illustration, Sutan Takdir's book was translated into English by Benedict R. Anderson and entitled *Indonesia in the Modern World* (1961), in which Anderson translated *kebudayaan*—the most primary key word in Sutan Takdir's anthropological discourse—into the English word *culture* throughout all pages of the book.³³ This translation later influenced all Indonesian cultural anthropologists' construction of *budaya*. Sidi Gazalba, a Sutan Takdir's

pupil, closely identified *budaya* with *culture* in his book *Sistematika Filsafat* (1973):

Definisi kebudayaan. Suatu kebudayaan ialah cara berpikir dan cara merasa, yang menyatakan diri dalam seluruh segi kehidupan sekelompok manusia, yang membentuk kesatuan sosial dalam suatu ruang dan suatu waktu. Cara berpikir dan cara merasa itu menyatakan diri dalam cara berlaku dan cara berbuat. Dengan demikian definisi itu dapat diperpendek: cara berlaku-berbuat dalam kehidupan. Kependekan ini dapat diperpendek lagi: cara hidup (way of life, kata ungkapan Inggris).

Jadi kebudayaan meliputi seluruh kehidupan manusia. Kehidupan begitu luas, sehingga menjadi kabur pengertiannya. Untuk lebih jelas dapat memperpegangi apa apa itu kehidupan, ia dapat kita bagi dalam sejumlah segi atau faset. Segi kehidupan yang kita maksud identis dengan apa yang diistilahkan oleh antropologi dengan *cultural universal*, atau pola kebudayaan sejangat, yaitu segi-segi kebudayaan yang universal ditemukan dalam tiap kebudayaan....³⁴

[Definition of kebudayaan. A kebudayaan is the way of thinking and the way of feeling self-expressing in all aspects of life of a group of people, which establish a social unity in a space and at a time. Both the way of thinking and the way of feeling are manifest in the way of behaving and the way of acting. To put it short, it is the way of behaving and the way of acting in life. Even shorter, it is the way of life (an English expression).

Accordingly, kebudayaan deals with whole life of human beings. Since life is so vast, its definition could be vague. To clarify what is meant by life herein, we identify some of its aspects or facets. The facets of life which we mean herein are identical to those called by anthropology as

cultural universal, or universal pattern of kebudayaan, or aspects of kebudayaan which are found universally in each kebudayaan.]

Koentjaraningrat, a cultural anthropologist who graduated from the Yale University under the tutelage of Professor George P. Murdock—and who contributed much to *Cross-Cultural Survey* initiated by Murdock—wrote a book titled *Kebudayaan, Mentalitet dan Pembangunan* (1974), in which he emphasized the juxtaposition of *budaya* with the Western Modern secularized definition of *culture*:

Kata “kebudayaan” berasal dari kata Sanskerta *buddhayah*, ialah bentuk jamak dari *buddhi* yang berarti “budi” atau “akal”... kebudayaan menurut hemat saya antara lain berarti: *keseluruhan gagasan dan karya manusia, yang harus dibiasakannya dengan belajar, beserta keseluruhan dari hasil budi dan karyanya itu*, maka istilah “kebudayaan” memang suatu istilah yang amat cocok. Adapun istilah Inggrisnya berasal dari kata Latin *colere*, yang berarti “mengolah, mengerjakan”, terutama mengolah tanah atau bertani. Dari arti ini berkembang arti *culture*, sebagai segala daya dan usaha manusia untuk merubah alam.³⁵

[The word “kebudayaan” originates from a Sanskrit word *buddhayah*, a plural form of *buddhi*, which means “budi” or “akal”... to me kebudayaan means: *an aggregate of human thoughts and human actions which must be made accustomed through learning as well as an aggregate of results of the human thoughts and human actions*, hence the term “kebudayaan” is a very suitable term. Its English synonym originates from Latin word *colere*, which means “to cultivate, to act”, which particularly signifies land cultivation or farming. Out of this significance develops the meaning of *culture* as all human endeavors and human efforts to alter the nature.]

In 1976, Dick Hartoko translated a book by the Dutch cultural

anthropologist Cornelis Anthonie van Peursen entitled *Strategie van de Cultuur* (1970) into Bahasa, where Hartoko juxtaposed the Dutch *cultuur* with *budaya* and simultaneously construed *budaya* as something to be engineered, to be manipulated, and to be shamelessly exploited in the best interests of a powerful political elite.³⁶ Such a translation demonstrates this process of desacralization of *budaya*.

Furthermore, Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, in his English writings in 1988, equated the Bahasa *budaya* with the English word *culture*, German *kultur* and the the tendencies of Western Modern developmentalism, further desacralizing the old ontological concept of *budaya*:

The appearance of man in the course of evolution has brought a great change in the total process of life on our planet. While the animal lives on the basis of its drives and instincts, in man through his upright position a change took place in the form and structure of his brain, which enabled the emergence of new capacities and potentialities in his psychological make-up which in the English language are called *mind* and *spirit*. While the animal lives in nature as a part of nature, man transcends his natural surrounding and creates new entities in which he lives his life, and which we call *culture*. In the German language the combination of mind and spirit is called *Geist* so that in the German language the *Geisteswissenschaften* run parallel with the *Kulturwissenschaften*. In the Indonesian language we have used for the concept of *Geist*, that is the combination of *mind* and *spirit*, the word *budi* which characterized man as the enlightened animal. It is thus especially in the Indonesian language that the relation between the psychological make-up of man and his culture is the most clearly expressed since from *budi* derives directly *budidaya* or *kebudayaan* which means the power or result of the *budi*. It is in the great process of change created by *budi* and *budidaya* that the concept of development...has its broadest basis....³⁷

The profanization of the *budaya* ontology by Indonesian cultural anthropologists is followed later by the desecration of the metaphysical concept of *budaya* by Indonesian linguists and lexicographers. For example, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (KBBI) records the idiom ‘*bermain budi*’, which means ‘*bermain otak untuk menipu*’ (to deceive by beating someone’s brains out).³⁸ Also, there is a verb ‘*memperbudikan*’, which means ‘*menipu*’ (to deceive).³⁹ The phrase ‘*budi pekerti*’, taken from two metaphysical words ‘*buddhi*’ and ‘*prakriti*’, has been desacralized so that it is only construed as ‘*tingkah laku, perangai, akhlak*’ (behavior, character, habitual act).⁴⁰ This has aligned its meaning with Western psychological behaviorism. The word ‘*kebudayaan*’, unfortunately, suffers from the worst form of desacralization. *KBBI* defines it ‘*hasil kegiatan dan penciptaan batin manusia spt kepercayaan, kesenian, dan adat istiadat*’ (result produced out of human mind activity and creation such as belief, art, and customs).⁴¹ To state that religious belief is created through ordinary human thinking is to reduce it to humanism. This profane significance of *kebudayaan* leads to the production of other profanized words such as ‘*budaya politik*’, ‘*pembudayaan*’, ‘*budayawan*’, ‘*budi daya*’, and ‘*kebudayaan rakyat*’.⁴² It can be reasonably presumed that the juxtaposition of *Ilmu Budaya* and *the Humanities* is a result of such a tendency.

Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana’s linguistic interpretations in his writing in a book on the politics of language continues this process of desacralization.

Suasana kebudayaan modern yang berbeda benar dari suasana kebudayaan daerah yang belum modern jelas mengenai suasana hukum dan administrasi kenegaraan dan terutama mengenai segala sesuatu yang menjelmakan unsur progresif kebudayaan modern, yaitu ilmu, teknologi, dan ekonomi yang melingkungi universitas, bank, dan pabrik. Pada umumnya kita dapat berkata bahwa dalam kebudayaan modern itu berkuasa rasio, inisiatif, dan perhitungan yang nyata. Sebaliknya, suasana bahasa daerah sebagai suasana lanjutan kebudayaan yang lama. Perbedaan suasana ini

makin lama akan makin besar sehingga pada suatu ketika tentang konsep-konsep dan kata-katanya bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa modern akan lebih dekat kepada bahasa Inggris, bahasa Jerman, bahasa Belanda, dan lain-lain, karena sama-sama menjelmakan kebudayaan modern....⁴³

[The difference between the state of modern kebudayaan and the state of not-yet modern kebudayaan of the regions are clearly seen in terms of law, state administration, and especially in terms of all progressive aspects which represent the modern kebudayaan, such as science, technology, and economy surrounding university, bank, and factory. We can posit generally that in the modern kebudayaan reason, initiative, and real calculation assume power. On the other hand, the state of regional languages is the continuing state of the ancient kebudayaan. The difference of both states of kebudayaan will turn so radical that someday concepts and words in Indonesian language will be closer to English, German, Dutch languages, etc. since they together represent the modern kebudayaan....]

Resacralization

The re-sacralization of the present Cultural Anthropology can only be carried out as well by re-discovering the Islamic metaphysical concepts which resemble the concept of *Buddhayah* ('the Universal Intellect'). It can be found, for instance, in the work of Al-Fârâbi (870-950) who is famous for his concept of *al-'Aql* (the Intellect).

Al-Fârâbi theorized that Allah (God) created *al-'Aql* as an intermediary so as to create the material macrocosm and microcosm. First, Allah created *al-'Aql al-Awwal* (the First Intellect). It is a manifested image of Allah. It has full capacity for intellection, so through its intellection it gives rise to *al-'Aql al-Tsânî* (the Second Intellect) and the first material sphere within the macrocosm, called 'the First Sphere'. *Al-'Aql al-Tsânî* also has full capacity for intellection, and through its intellectual activity it gives rise to *al-'Aql al-Tsâlits* (the Third Intellect) and the second material sphere, "the Sphere of the Fixed Stars." Likewise, through its intellection,

al-‘Aql al-Tsâlits gives rise to *al-‘Aql al-Râbi* (the Fourth Intellect) called “the Sphere of Planets.” The *al-‘Aql al-Râbi* employs its full capacity for intellection and gives rise to *al-‘Aql al-Khâmis* (the Fifth Intellect) called ‘the Sphere of Jupiter.’ The *al-‘Aql al-Khâmis* is followed by *al-‘Aql al-Sâdis* (the Sixth Intellect), *al-‘Aql al-Sâbi* (the Seventh Intellect), *al-‘Aql al-Tsâmin* (the Eighth Intellect), and *al-‘Aql al-Tâsi* (the Ninth Intellect), with the corresponding spheres of Mars, the Sun, Venus and Mercury, respectively. The chain of the intellects terminates with *al-‘Aql al-Âsyir* (the Tenth Intellect) which, intellectualizing on itself, emanates the last material sphere called ‘the Sphere of the Moon.’ The *al-‘Aql al-Âsyir*, due to its intense activeness in transmitting Allah’s message, bestowing Allah’s knowledge as well as granting Allah’s wisdom inside human beings’ intellects, is also known as *al-‘Aql al-Fa’âl* (the Active Intellect).⁴⁴ Allah also creates *al-‘aql* in the microcosm—the internal faculty in human beings that functions to receive the transmitted message, the bestowed knowledge and the granted wisdom of Allah, and to get connected with the macrocosmic *al-‘Aql al-Fa’âl* or the Archangel.⁴⁵ The person whose *al-‘aql* gets connected with the *al-‘Aql al-Fa’âl* is called to have *al-‘Aql al-Mustafâd* (the acquired intellect).⁴⁶

Al-Fârâbi’s conception of *Al-‘Aql* is adopted by al-Kindî,⁴⁷ by Avicenna,⁴⁸ by Al-Ghazâlî,⁴⁹ and by Shihâbuddîn Yahyâ al-Suhrâwardî,⁵⁰ among others, which means that it was very influential among Muslim metaphysicians. Al-Fârâbi’s notion of *Al-‘Aql* is revived nowadays by an eminent Malaysian metaphysician, Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, particularly in his work, *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islâm*.⁵¹

Another Islamic conception which closely resembles the *Buddhayah* as a ray of *Alaya-mahat* is the notion of *al-Nûr* (‘the Light’). Al-Suhrâwardî theorizes that Allah is the Light of lights (*Nûru’l-Anwâr*) or *al-Nûr al-Awwal* (‘the First Light’).⁵² He creates a Light which enlightens “... material things to make their existences higher.”⁵³ The Light has two kinds: an incorporeal light (*al-nûr al-mujarrad*) and an accidental light (*al-nûr al-‘aradhî*). If the Light illuminates a being through its *al-nûr al-mujarrad* and *al-nûr al-‘aradhî*, it becomes a soul or a spirit. Conversely,

if a being is not illuminated by the Light, a *ghasaq* (obscurity) or a *hai'ah* (form) falls on it and it becomes matter.⁵⁴

The Angels (*al-Malâikah*) are the pure lights which gain enlightenment from *al-Nûr al-Awwal*. They are totally spiritual, incorporeal and immaterial since *al-nûr al-mujarrad* totally illuminates them and no *ghasaq* and no *hai'ah* (form) falls on it. The purest of the pure lights is called *Bahman* or *al-Nûr al-Aqrab* ('the Nearest Light'). *Al-Nûr al-Aqrab* illuminates other pure lights through its *al-nûr al-mujarrad* and *al-nûr al-'aradhî*. The other pure lights in turn illuminate beings around them so that the souls of the stars exist. If the souls of the stars get *ghasaq* or a *hai'ah*, the souls turn into matters, creating the material fixed stars and other heavenly bodies in the universe.⁵⁵

One of the pure lights, called *al-Nûr al-Muhammadî*, becomes the archetype of human microcosm.⁵⁶ *Al-Nûr al-Muhammadî* illuminates the souls of human beings and creates material human beings.⁵⁷ Within each human being there is a light enlightening his mind, his self, and his body. If the light falls on his mind, it becomes the light of intelligence.⁵⁸ When a human being loves material things more than spiritual things, his light will diminish. *Kâfirs* (unbelievers) are in fact those who have the 'gloomy light.'⁵⁹ Conversely, if a human being loves spiritual things more than material things, his light will luminously radiate and reach *al-Nûr al-Awwal*.⁶⁰

The resembling metaphysical conception of *al-Nûr* is also formulated by other metaphysicians among others like al-Ghazâlî⁶¹ and Ibn 'Arabî.⁶² The ontological notion of *al-Nûr* is revived by a contemporary metaphysician, Gibril Fouad Haddad.⁶³

Remnants of this Islamic sacred conception of *al-'aql* and *al-nûr* are found in the Bahasa lexicography. The *KBBI* enlists '*akal*',⁶⁴ '*akal budi*',⁶⁵ '*nur*',⁶⁶ '*nurani*',⁶⁷ as well as '*nuriah*',⁶⁸ and The *Tesaurus Bahasa Indonesia* clarifies that '*berbudi*' is synonymous with '*berakal*'.⁶⁹

The Islamic concepts of *al-'Aql* and *al-Nûr*, as exposed above, can re-sacralize and de-profane the key anthropological concept of the Cultural Anthropology.

The Revolutionary Implications

If the Hindu *buddhayah* or *buddhi* is identical with the Islamic ‘*aql* or *nûr*, some revolutionary anthropological implications for the Bahasa *budaya* or *budi* will arise.

First, the juxtaposition of *budaya* with *culture* which has been established by the profanized Indonesian cultural anthropologists is totally fallacious. *Budaya* is not identical to *culture* at all. *Budaya* is both metaphysical and ontological, whereas *culture* is very humanistic and secular. *Budaya* is very godly and divine, while *culture* is very human and humane. *Budaya* is eternal, unhistorical and stationary, whereas *culture* is changing, evolutionary, historical, and progressive. *Culture* founds a secular and irreligious civilization, but this is not the case with *budaya*. *Budaya* establishes a religious and sacred civilization. It follows that the English *culture* is identical with the Bahasa *kultur*, not at all to *budaya*.⁷⁰

Secondly, cultural anthropologists or cultural philosophers deal with *culture*, while *budayawan* or metaphysicians or spiritualists or sufis or *muta'allihûn* deal with *budaya*.

Thirdly, ‘cultural’ products are produced by human beings through their rational, empirical, scientific capabilities to dominate and manipulate Nature. While *budaya* products are produced by human beings under the ontological guidance of *al-'Aql al-Fa'âl* (‘the Active Intellect’) and *al-Nûr al-Muhammadi* (‘the Muhammadan Light’).

Fourthly, *culture* manifests itself in the form of arts, sciences, technologies, distinct from religion or metaphysics, while *budaya* manifests itself in arts, sciences, technologies, in connection with religion or metaphysics. *Culture* considers religions as its something merely functional and useful, whereas *budaya* considers religion as its center and source of understanding.

Fifthly, *culture* is considered progressive where human beings highly develop scientifically or materialistically, while *budaya* is considered progressive when human beings highly achieve spiritual, religious, metaphysical, and sufistic civilization.

Sixthly, cultural anthropologists utilize natural sciences, statistics, socio-metrics, scientific logics and methodology to discern cultural phenomena, while *budayawans* or metaphysicians of *buddhayah*, *buddhi*, *al-‘aql* or spiritualists of *al-nûr* utilize metaphysics, spiritualism, religion, sufism, symbolism, sacred sciences, *scientia sacra* to discern *budaya* phenomena.

Finally and conclusively, *budaya* highly holds to religious principles and totally submit to God, while *culture* is sometimes an affront to God and disrespectful of religion. *Culture* and *budaya* are in many ways diametrically opposed. Cultural Anthropology is, hence, identical with ‘Antropologi Kultural’, but not at all to ‘Antropologi Budaya’. The idea ‘Antropologi Budaya’; is a oxymoron. The Humanities cannot, be translated ‘Ilmu Budaya’ since this to would be a violation of the sacred conception of *budaya*.

Budaya Anthropology

The following is a rough comparison between how ‘Antropologi Kultural’ and ‘Antropologi Budaya’ carries out research; between how a cultural anthropologist studies the culture of an ethnic group and how a *budaya* anthropologist does so. To make it clearer, an anthropological textbook entitled *Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures* (1970) is taken as an illustration.

‘Antropologi Kultural’ is represented herein by three anthropologists, while ‘Antropologi Budaya’ by the author alone. The cultural anthropologists are Homer G. Barnett, Robert K. Dentan, and C.W.M. Hart. Barnett reported on a tribe in the Palau Islands, Oceania; Dentan anthropologized the Semai people, a tribe in Malaysia; and lastly, Hart studied the Tiwi tribespeople in North Australia.

To begin with, Barnett conducted an anthropological study of the cultural practices of a local tribe of the Palau Islands. He first met a local tribesman who could speak English and Palauan language. With his assistance, Barnett met some Palauans, did an ethnographic sketch, and interpreted everything he discovered out of his encounter.⁷¹ He attended

some dinners, observing how the Palauans dined.⁷² He joined Protestant church prayer services, met some Protestant preachers, studying on how the Palauans understood the Biblical message.⁷³ He watched the local dance performances (*ngloik*), observing how the Palauans dance.⁷⁴ He found a clubhouse decorated with the Palauan motif, studying the motif and its symbolical meaning.⁷⁵ He attended some district court sessions, studying on how they judged and treated the offenders.⁷⁶ He lived in a Palauan's house, observing some customs practiced by the host and the social taboos which he strictly avoided.⁷⁷ He attended some Palauan religious ceremonies and was instructed on local mythologies, and he interpreted how these mythologies function in society (kinship system).⁷⁸ Out of the data gathered during the research visit, Barnett finally abstracted, induced, concluded, and reported in the form of a book, *Palauan Society: A Study of Contemporary Native Life in the Palau Islands* (1949).⁷⁹

Both Dentan and Hart conducted the similar procedures; Dentan when investigating the culture of the Semais, and Hart when scrutinizing the life of the Tiwis. They both found informants so as to gain access to the language of the tribes, observed various local customs (passage rite, communal ceremonies, marriage and kinship systems), learned local religious practices and shamanism and related them to their social functions, learned how the Christian churches educated and civilized the tribespeople, watched their artistic performances and artistic products and interpreted them in the framework of social patterns they adhered to, and finally wrote study reports in books; Dentan wrote *The Semai* (1968), while Hart authored *The Tiwi of North Australia* (1960).⁸⁰

This is also what had been carried out by George Peter Murdock (1897-1985), a professor of social and cultural anthropology at Yale University,⁸¹ and his Indonesian disciples such as Koentjaraningrat,⁸² Abdurrauf Tarimana, and a cohort of cultural anthropologists they created at Universitas Indonesia, Universitas Sumatra Utara, Universitas Andalas, Universitas Padjadjaran, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Universitas Udayana, Universitas Hasanudin, Universitas Sam Ratulangi,⁸³ and Universitas Haluoleo (Tarimana 1993:10-11).⁸⁴

All the above-mentioned cultural anthropologists follow the very-long tradition of anthropological study of the cultures of the tribespeople forerun by the famous cultural anthropologists such as Margaret Mead (1901-1978),⁸⁵ E.E. Evans-Pritchard (1902-1973),⁸⁶ and Franz Boas (1858-1942),⁸⁷ among others, mainly characterized by religious indifference and metaphysical ignorance, whose working principles are, in the words of Evans-Pritchard:

The beliefs are for him sociological facts, not theological facts, and his sole concern is with their relation to each other and to other social facts. His problems are scientific, not metaphysical or ontological. The method he employs is that now often called the phenomenological one—a comparative study of beliefs and rites, such as god, sacrament, and sacrifice, to determine their meaning and social significance... The validity of the belief lies in the domain of what may broadly be designated the philosophy of religion.⁸⁸

On the other hand, a *budaya* anthropologist validates ‘*the belief... in the domain of... the philosophy of religion*’ and takes this as the core of his research methodology.⁸⁹

In the first place, a *budaya* anthropologist approaches the culture of the Palauan people or the Semais or the Tiwis by first seeking the holy books or sacred scriptures which enlightening the hearts of people of the three cultures since the books and scriptures are from *al-‘Aql al-Awwal* descending from archangelic plane (*al-‘Aql al-Fa’âl*) to human sphere (*al-‘aql*). Then, he studies contents of the sacred books, inwardly and outwardly, literally and spiritually, including the study of their inherent symbolisms, parables, metaphors, idioms, etc. and gains a perfect understanding of them to awaken ‘the Acquired Intellect’ (*al-‘Aql al-Mustafâd*) within his soul.

Secondly, he discovers the spiritual or metaphysical texts written by the shamans or witches or the sages and the saints of the Tiwi or the Semai or the Palau which he observes to complete his understanding of the holy books and sacred scriptures for it is only in them that *al-Nûr al-Muhammadi*—that is *Buddhayah* manifested within human souls—is fully actualized, realized, and fully awakened.

Then, just in case the *budaya* anthropologist does not find any sacred scripture and any metaphysical text of the sages within the cultures due to its lack of writing tradition, the *budaya* anthropologist attempts to discover the culture’s divine and intellectual revelations in the form of their mythology of origins, the traditional legends which they hand over from generation to generation, the cosmogonic/cosmological songs, dances and sacred music, their dress their architectural forms. He or she investigates all forms of sacred art, since all of these are also *al-Nûr* and *al-‘Aql* expressed in a manner outside of the conventional, philosophical, legal, theological modes of expression. “*Metaphysical doctrines do not of necessity find their expression only in verbal forms but can be expressed visually and ritually.*”⁹⁰ Being another expression of ‘the Light’ and ‘the Intellect’, the sacred art of the cultures researched must be fully understood by the *budaya* anthropologist as ‘*a sacred text*’ whose symbolism, parables, metaphors, exegesis, idioms, etc. are understood according to its own terms since “*every sacred art is... founded on a science of forms, or in other words, on the symbolism inherent in forms. It must be borne in mind that a sacred symbol is not merely a conventional sign; it manifests its archetype by virtue of a certain ontological law.*”⁹¹

In the last place, the *budaya* anthropologist works on a ‘thick description’, inducing, describing, discovering all manifestations of the internal *buddhayah* or internal faculty of *al-nûr* or *al-‘aql* in the tribes’ material products which he observes, and finally gaining an appreciation of a culture based upon its metaphysical religious, spiritual and ontological foundations. Because as Schuon writes, “*it is the spiritual, not the temporal, which culturally, socially and politically is the criterion of all other values.*”⁹²

All in all, the real Antropologi Budaya (and not at all Antropologi Kultural!) bases its research on metaphysics first, then proceeds with its metaphysical reflections on the tribe's outmost material civilization inasmuch as the ontology of *al-nûr* and *al-'aql*, and of *budi* and *budaya* as well is a mirror; and all kinds of immanent manifestations of the tribe are only its outmost beautiful, handsome reflections of the primeval *Buddhi*.⁹³

ENDNOTES

¹ Monier Williams, *Indian Wisdom: Examples of the Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Doctrines of the Hindus*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 93

² Ibid., 90-93

³ Douglas L. Berger, *Encounters of Mind: Luminosity and Personhood in Indian and Chinese Thought*, (Albany: SUNY Press, 2015), 60

⁴ Karl H. Potter (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Volume III*, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1998), 20

⁵ Ibid., 86

⁶ Douglas L. Berger, *Encounters of Mind: Luminosity and Personhood in Indian and Chinese Thought*, (Albany: SUNY Press, 2015), 60

⁷ Karl H. Potter (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Volume III*, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1998), 241

⁸ Frithjof Schuon, *Form and Substance in the Religions*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2002), 95

⁹ Frithjof Schuon, *Autumn Leaves & The Ring: Poems by Frithjof Schuon*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2010), 15

¹⁰ Frithjof Schuon, *Spiritual Perspectives & Human Facts: A New Translation with Selected Letters*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2007), 130

¹¹ Frithjof Schuon, *Christianity/Islam: Perspectives on Esoteric Ecumenism*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2008), 246

¹² "buddhi-yoga", *MW Sanskrit Digital Dictionary VI.4*.

¹³ "Buddhi", in G. de Purucker (ed.), *Encyclopedic Theosophical Glossary: A Resource on Theosophy*, Electronic Version of Current Manuscript, (California: Mario Lampic, 2009), 151

¹⁴ "buddhi-cintaka" & "buddhi-cyuta", *MW Sanskrit Digital Dictionary VI.4*.

¹⁵ Kautsar Azhari Noer, *Tasawuf Perennial: Kearifan Kritis Kaum Sufi*, (Jakarta: Serambi Ilmu, 2002), 201

¹⁶Frithjof Schuon, *Form and Substance in the Religions*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2002), 95

¹⁷Frithjof Schuon, *Logic and Transcendence: A New Translation with Selected Letters*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2009), 148

¹⁸“Buddhi”, in G. de Purucker (ed.), *Encyclopedic Theosophical Glossary: A Resource on Theosophy*, Electronic Version of Current Manuscript, (California: Mario Lampic, 2009), 151

¹⁹“Alaya-mahat”, *ibid.*, 36

²⁰“budi” & “budaya”, *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

²¹“budiman”, *ibid.*

²²“indra”, *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

²³P.J. Zoetmulder, *Pantheïsme en Monisme in de Javaansche Soeloek-Litteratuur*, translated into Bahasa by Dick Hartoko, (Jakarta: Penerbit Gramedia, 1998), 3rd edition, 249-253

²⁴Martin Ramstedt (ed.), *Hinduism in Modern Indonesia*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), 2-3

²⁵*Ibid.*, 3

²⁶Bani Sudardi, *Sastra Sufistik: Internalisasi Ajaran-Ajaran Sufi dalam Sastra Indonesia*, (Solo: Tiga Serangkai, 2003), 12; A legendary Javanese figure, Ki Sabda Palon Naya Genggong, as told in *Serat Dharmogandul* by Prawirataruna, claimed his and all Javanese people’s religion as ‘Agama Budi’, see Andjar Any, *Rahasia Ramalan Jayabaya, Ranggawarsita & Sabda Palon*, (Semarang: CV. Aneka, 1979), 105-109.

²⁷Martin Ramstedt (ed.), *Hinduism in Modern Indonesia*, (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004), 6

²⁸Ferry Hidayat, *Antropologi Sakral: Revitalisasi Tradisi Metafisik Masyarakat Indigenous Indonesia*, (Ciputat: IPS Press, 2010), 31-38

²⁹Tan Malaka, *Massa Actie (Aksi Massa)*, (Jakarta: CEDI Aliansi Press, 2000), 144-145

³⁰Quoted in Subagio Sastrowardoyo, “Sikap Budaya Takdir dalam Polemik Kebudayaan serta Pengaruhnya”, in S. Abdul Karim Mashad (ed.), *Sang Pujangga: 70 Tahun Polemik Kebudayaan, Menyongsong Satu Abad S. Takdir Alisjahbana*, (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2006), 353-354

³¹Ignas Kleden et.al. (eds.), *Kebudayaan sebagai Perjuangan: Perkenalan dengan Pemikiran S. Takdir Alisjahbana*, (Jakarta: Dian Rakyat, 1988), 17-21

³²Abdul Hadi W.M., “Mengenang Asrul Sani (1927-2004): Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang dan Masalah-Masalah Kesusastraan Kita”, in *Magazine of Literature HORIZON*, March 2004, 22

³³Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, *Indonesia in the Modern World*, translated into English by Benedict R. Anderson, (New Delhi: Prabhakar Padhye, 1961).

³⁴ Sidi Gazalba, *Sistematika Filsafat Buku I*, (Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1985), 4th printing, 59-60

³⁵ Koentjaraningrat, *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia*, (Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan, 1995), 15th printing, 19

³⁶ C.A. van Peursen, *Strategie van de Cultuur*, translated into Bahasa by Dick Hartoko, (Jakarta & Yogyakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia & Kanisius, 1979), 1-15

³⁷ Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, "Socio-Cultural Development in Global and National Perspective and Its Impact", in *Monthly Magazine Ilmu dan Budaya*, Year X, No. 10/July 1988, (Jakarta: Universitas Nasional, 1988), 721-722

³⁸ "bermain budi", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

³⁹ "memperbudikan", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁴⁰ "budi pekerti", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁴¹ "kebudayaan", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁴² "budaya politik" & "pembudayaan" & "kebudayaan rakyat" & "budayawan" & "budi daya", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁴³ Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, "Politik Bahasa Nasional dan Pembinaan Bahasa Indonesia", in Amran Halim, *Politik Bahasa Nasional 1: Kumpulan Kertas Kerja Praseminar*, (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1980), 39-54.

⁴⁴ Abû Nashr Al-Fârâbî, *Kitâb Ârâu Ahli 'l-Madînat al-Fâdhilah*, (Beirut: Dâr al-Mashriq, 1982), 37-124

⁴⁵ Majid Fakhry, *Al-Fârâbî Founder of Islamic Neoplatonism: His Life, Works and Influence*, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2002), 82-91

⁴⁶ Abû Nashr Al-Fârâbî, *Kitâb Ârâu Ahli 'l-Madînat al-Fâdhilah*, (Beirut: Dâr al-Mashriq, 1982), 124

⁴⁷ Al-Kindî, "Risâlat al-Kindî fi'l-'Aql", in Muhammad 'Abdul Hadi Abu Ridah (ed.), *Rasâilu 'l-Kindî al-Falsafiyah*, (Egypt: Mathba'ah al-I'timâd, 1950), 312-358

⁴⁸ Avicenna, *at-Ta'liqât*, ed. Abdurrahman Badawi, (Beirut: al-Dâr al-Islâmiyyah, 1972), 48, 114, 175

⁴⁹ Al-Ghazâlî, *Ma'âriju 'l-Qudsi fî Madârij Ma'rifati 'l-Nafsi*, (Beirut: Dâru'l-Âfâq al-Jadîdah, 1975), 55-56 & 123-127

⁵⁰ Shihâbuddîn Yahyâ al-Suhrâwardî, *The Shape of Light, Hayakal al-Nûr*, translated into English by Tosun Bayrak, (Louisville: Fons Vitae, 1998), 37-39

⁵¹ Syed Muhammad Naquib al-Attas, *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islâm: An Exposition of the Fundamental Elements of the Worldview of Islâm*, (Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 1995), pp. 143-176

⁵² Shihâbuddîn Yahyâ al-Suhrâwardî, *The Shape of Light, Hayakal al-Nûr*, translated into English by Tosun Bayrak, (Louisville: Fons Vitae, 1998), 36

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *Three Muslim Sages: Avicenna, Suhrawardî, Ibn 'Arabî*, (New York: Caravan Books, 1997), 3rd printing, 69-70

⁵⁵ Ibid., 71-73

⁵⁶ Ibid., 73

⁵⁷ Shihâbuddîn Yahyâ al-Suhrâwardî, *The Shape of Light, Hayakal al-Nûr*, translated into English by Tosun Bayrak, (Louisville: Fons Vitae, 1998), 39

⁵⁸ Ibid., 53

⁵⁹ Ibid., 47

⁶⁰ Ibid., 80

⁶¹ Al-Ghazâlî, *Mishkâtu'l-Anwâr wa Mişfatu'l-Asrâr*, ed. Al-Syaikh 'Abdul Azîz 'Izzuddîn al-Sirwân, (Beirut: 'Âlamu'l-Kutub, 1982), 161-182

⁶² Muhammad Dâwûd Qaysharî, *Syarhu Fuşûşî'l-Hikâm li-Ibni'l-'Arabî*, ed. Seyyed Jalâluddîn Ashtiyânî, (Teheran: Shirkat Intishârât 'Ilmî, 1375 H), 127-131

⁶³ Gibril Fouad Haddad, *The Muhammadan Light in the Qur'an, Sunna, and Companion-Reports*, (Fenton & London: ISCA, 2012), 103-137

⁶⁴ "akal", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁶⁵ "akal budi", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁶⁶ "nur", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁶⁷ "nurani", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁶⁸ "nurah", *KBBI Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*

⁶⁹ "berakal", in Dendy Sugono (ed.), *Tesaurus Bahasa Indonesia Pusat Bahasa*, (Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional RI, 2008), 10

⁷⁰ All readers can surely discover that the concept of *culture* in the entire production of the Western sciences (including Cultural Anthropology) is based not on any kind of religion or spiritualism or metaphysics at all, in an enlightening book surveying all the uses of the nomenclature *culture* produced in all fields of science, ranging from the 18th century to the 20th century, by A.L. Kroeber & Clyde Kluckhohn entitled *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, (Cambridge: The Harvard University Printing Office, 1952). E.E. Evans-Pritchard, an anthropologist of the University of Oxford, revealed emphatically that all anthropological researches done since the time of E.B. Tylor, Durkheim, Levi-Bruhl, until of Freud were obviously based on their critical stance towards theism, "...implicit in their thinking were the optimistic convictions of the eighteenth-century rationalist philosophers that people are stupid and bad only because they have bad institutions, and they have bad institutions only because they are ignorant and superstitious, and they are ignorant and superstitious because they have been exploited in the name of religion by cunning and avaricious priests and the unscrupulous classes which have supported them. We should, I think, realize what was the intention of many of these scholars if we are to understand their theoretical constructions. They sought, and found, in primitive religions a weapon which could, they thought, be used with deadly effect against Christianity. If primitive religion could be explained away as an intellectual aberration, as a mirage induced by emotional stress, or by its social function, it was implied that the higher religions could

be discredited and disposed of in the same way... the impassioned rationalism of the time has coloured their assessment of primitive religions and has given their writings, as we read them today, a flavour of smugness which one may find either irritating or risible... Religious belief was to these anthropologists absurd, and it is so to most anthropologists of yesterday and today..."(p.15). Evans-Pritchard even emphasizes that "...What I have said does not imply that the anthropologist has to have a religion of his own, and I think we should be clear on this point at the outset. He is not concerned, qua anthropologist, with the truth or falsity of religious thought. As I understand the matter, there is no possibility of his knowing whether the spiritual beings of primitive religions or of any others have any existence or not, and since that is the case he cannot take the question into consideration. The beliefs are for him sociological facts, not theological facts, and his sole concern is with their relation to each other and to other social facts. His problems are scientific, not metaphysical or ontological. The method he employs is that now often called the phenomenological one— a comparative study of beliefs and rites, such as god, sacrament, and sacrifice, to determine their meaning and social significance..." (p.17). See E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religion*, (Oxford: OUP, 1965).

⁷¹ George D. Spindler (ed.), *Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970), 4-6

⁷² Ibid., 6-12

⁷³ Ibid., 12

⁷⁴ Ibid., 13

⁷⁵ Ibid., 16

⁷⁶ Ibid., 18

⁷⁷ Ibid., 23-24

⁷⁸ Ibid., 25-26

⁷⁹ Ibid., 28

⁸⁰ Ibid., 90-111 & 145-163

⁸¹ His book, among others, is *Social Structure* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949). He is the professor that taught and guided Koentjaraningrat when writing his final thesis at Yale University. Murdock's strictly statistical and sociometrical approach inspired Koentjaraningrat's works.

⁸² His role in widespreading 'the Yale mafia' of socio-cultural anthropologists in all over Indonesian state universities is pivotal. He gave scholarships to junior anthropologists in order to continue their post-graduate study in the USA and Australia. See Koentjaraningrat, "Commemorative Lecture", a speech when receiving the Fukuoka Asian Cultural Prizes, http://www.asianmonth.com/prize/english/lecture/pdf/06_01.pdf, retrieved on 2 November 2020.

⁸³ Koentjaraningrat, *Pengantar Antropologi I*, (Jakarta, Rineka Cipta, 2005), 3rd printing, 38

⁸⁴ Abdurrauf Tarimana, *Kebudayaan Tolaki*, (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1993), 2nd printing, 10-11

⁸⁵ She is famous for her magnum opii: *Growing up in New Guinea: A Comparative Study of Primitive Education* (New York: Blue Ribbons Books, Inc., 1930) & *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation* (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1928).

⁸⁶ His anthropological fieldwork report, among others, is *The Nuer: A Description of The Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People* (Oxford: Oxford at Clarendon House, 1940).

⁸⁷ His cultural anthropological work includes *The Mind of Primitive Man* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938).

⁸⁸ E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Theories of Primitive Religion*, (Oxford: OUP, 1965), 17

⁸⁹ On how a Muslim budaya anthropologist does his fieldwork had been as a matter of fact sketched out in my published proceeding entitled “Towards Islamic Anthropology in an Indonesian Context: A Perennialist Epistemological Perspective” at the 2nd International Conference on Thoughts on Human Sciences in Islam (IC-THUSI), Jakarta, 18-19 November 2015, at https://www.academia.edu/19041027/Towards_Islamic_Anthropology_in_an_Indonesian_Context_A_Perennialist_Epistemological_Perspective

⁹⁰ Harry Oldmeadow, “Melodies from The Beyond: Australian Aboriginal Religion in Schuonian Perspective”, in Arvind Sharma, *Fragments of Infinity: Essays in Religion and Philosophy*, (Prism, 1991), 10

⁹¹ William Stoddard, *The Essential Titus Burckhardt: Reflections on Sacred Art, Faiths, and Civilizations*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, Inc., 2005), 88

⁹² Frithjof Schuon, *The Transfiguration of Man*, (Bloomington: World Wisdom, 1995), 28

⁹³ Ironically enough that Akbar S. Ahmed’s *Toward Islamic Anthropology: Definition, Dogma and Directions* (Ann Arbor: New Era Publications, 1986), despite Islamness of his book title, never adopts or even employs this metaphysical approach he suggestes as kind of Islamic Anthropology. Any sciences based not on ontology and metaphysics are flawed sciences.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Akbar S. *Toward Islamic Anthropology: Definition, Dogma and Directions*. Ann Arbor: New Era Publications, 1986.
- Al-Attas, Syed Muhammad Naquib. *Prolegomena to the Metaphysics of Islâm: An Exposition of the Fundamental Elements of the Worldview of Islâm*. Kuala Lumpur: ISTAC, 1995.
- Al-Farabi, Abu Nashr. *Kitâb Ârâu Ahli 'l-Madînat al-Fâdhilah*. Beirut: Dâr al-Mashriq, 1982.
- Al-Ghazali, *Ma 'âriju 'l-Qudsi fi Madârij Ma 'rifati 'l-Nafsi*. Beirut: Dâru'l-Âfâq al-Jadîdah, 1975.
- Al-Ghazali, *Mishkâtu 'l-Anwâr wa Mişfatu 'l-Asrâr*, ed. Al-Syaikh 'Abdul Azîz 'Izzuddîn al-Sirwân. Beirut: 'Âlamu'l-Kutub, 1982.
- Alisjahbana, Sutan Takdir. *Indonesia in the Modern World*. trans. Benedict R. Anderson. New Delhi: Prabhakar Padhye, 1961.
- Alisjahbana, Sutan Takdir. "Socio-Cultural Development in Global and National Perspective and Its Impact", in *Majalah Bulanan Ilmu dan Budaya*, Year X, No. 10/July 1988. Jakarta: Universitas Nasional, 1988.
- Al-Kindi, "Risâlat al-Kindî fi 'l-'Aql", in Al-Kindi, *Rasâilu 'l-Kindî al-Falsafiyah*. Egypt: Mathba'ah al-I'timâd, 1950.
- Al-Suhrawardi, Shihabuddin Yahya. *The Shape of Light, Hayakal al-Nûr*, interpreted by Tosun Bayrak. Louisville: Fons Vitae, 1998.
- Avicenna, *at-Ta'liqât*, ed. Abdurrahman Badawi. Beirut: al-Dâr al-Islâmiyyah, 1972.
- Berger, Douglas L. *Encounters of Mind: Luminosity and Personhood in Indian and Chinese Thought*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2015.
- Boas, Franz. *The Mind of Primitive Man*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938.

- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. *The Nuer: A Description of The Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Oxford at Clarendon House, 1940.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. *Theories of Primitive Religion*. Oxford: OUP, 1965.
- Fakhry, Majid. *Al-Fârâbi Founder of Islamic Neoplatonism: His Life, Works and Influence*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2002.
- Gazalba, Sidi. *Sistematika Filsafat Buku I*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1985. 4th printing.
- Haddad, Gibril Fouad. *The Muhammadan Light in the Qur'an, Sunna, and Companion-Reports*. Fenton & London: ISCA, 2012.
- Hadi W.M., Abdul. "Mengenang Asrul Sani (1927-2004): Surat Kepercayaan Gelanggang dan Masalah-Masalah Kesusastraan Kita", in *Majalah Sastra HORISON*, March 2004.
- Halim, Amran. *Politik Bahasa Nasional 1: Kumpulan Kertas Kerja Praseminar*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1980.
- Hidayat, Ferry. *Antropologi Sakral: Revitalisasi Tradisi Metafisik Masyarakat Indigenous Indonesia*. Ciputat: IPS Press, 2010.
- Hidayat, Ferry. "Towards Islamic Anthropology in an Indonesian Context: A Perennialist Epistemological Perspective" at the *2nd International Conference on Thoughts on Human Sciences in Islam (IC-THUSI)*, Jakarta, 18-19 November 2015, at https://www.academia.edu/19041027/Towards_Islamic_Anthropology_in_an_Indonesian_Context_A_Perennialist_Epistemological_Perspective
- KBBI Offline Digital Dictionary version 1.5.1*
- Kleden, Ignas. et.al. (eds.), *Kebudayaan sebagai Perjuangan: Perkenalan dengan Pemikiran S. Takdir Alisjahbana*. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat, 1988.
- Koentjaraningrat, *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan, 1995. 15th printing.

- Koentjaraningrat, *Pengantar Antropologi I*. Jakarta, Rineka Cipta, 2005.
3rd printing.
- Koentjaraningrat, “Commemorative Lecture”, a speech when receiving the Fukuoka Asian Cultural Prizes, http://www.asianmonth.com/prize/english/lecture/pdf/06_01.pdf, retrieved on 2 November 2020.
- Kroeber, A.L. & Kluckhohn, Clyde. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge: The Harvard University Printing Office, 1952.
- Malaka, Tan. *Massa Actie (Aksi Massa)*. Jakarta: CEDI Aliansi Press, 2000.
- Mashad, S. Abdul Karim. (ed.), *Sang Pujangga: 70 Tahun Polemik Kebudayaan, Menyongsong Satu Abad S. Takdir Alisjahbana*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2006.
- Mead, Margaret. *Growing up in New Guinea: A Comparative Study of Primitive Education*. New York: Blue Ribbons Books, Inc., 1930.
- Mead, Margaret. *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation*. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1928.
- Murdock, George Peter. *Social Structure*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.
- MW Sanskrit Digital Dictionary VI.4.*
- Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Three Muslim Sages: Avicenna, Suhrawardî, Ibn ‘Arabî*. New York: Caravan Books, 1997. 3rd printing.
- Noer, Kautsar Azhari. *Tasawuf Perennial: Kearifan Kritis Kaum Sufi*. Jakarta: Serambi Ilmu, 2002.
- Peursen, C.A. van. *Strategie van de Cultuur*, trans. by Dick Hartoko. Jakarta & Yogyakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia & Kanisius, 1979.
- Potter, Karl H. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Volume III*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1998.

- Purucker, G. de. (ed.), *Encyclopedic Theosophical Glossary: A Resource on Theosophy*, Electronic Version of Current Manuscript. California: Mario Lampic, 2009.
- Qayshari, Muhammad Dawud. *Syarhu Fuṣūṣi 'l-Hikâm li-Ibni 'l-'Arabî*, ed. Seyyed Jalâluddîn Ashtiyânî. Teheran: Shirkat Intishârat 'Ilmî, 1375 H.
- Ramstedt, Martin. (ed.), *Hinduism in Modern Indonesia*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.
- Schuon, Frithjof. *The Transfiguration of Man*. Bloomington: World Wisdom, 1995.
- Schuon, Frithjof. *Spiritual Perspectives & Human Facts: A New Translation with Selected Letters*. Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2007.
- Schuon, Frithjof. *Christianity/Islam: Perspectives on Esoteric Ecumenism*. Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2008.
- Schuon, Frithjof. *Logic and Transcendence: A New Translation with Selected Letters*. Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2009.
- Schuon, Frithjof. *Autumn Leaves & The Ring: Poems by Frithjof Schuon*. Bloomington: World Wisdom, 2010.
- Sharma, Arvind. *Fragments of Infinity: Essays in Religion and Philosophy*. Prism Publisher, 1991.
- Spindler, George D. (ed.), *Being an Anthropologist: Fieldwork in Eleven Cultures*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Stoddard, William. *The Essential Titus Burckhardt: Reflections on Sacred Art, Faiths, and Civilizations*. Bloomington: World Wisdom, Inc., 2005.
- Sudardi, Bani. *Sastra Sufistik: Internalisasi Ajaran-Ajaran Sufi dalam Sastra Indonesia*. Solo: Tiga Serangkai, 2003.
- Sugono, Dendy (ed.), *Tesaurus Bahasa Indonesia Pusat Bahasa*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional RI, 2008.

Tarimana, Abdurrauf. *Kebudayaan Tolaki*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1993.
2nd printing.

Williams, Monier. *Indian Wisdom: Examples of the Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Doctrines of the Hindus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Zoetmulder, P.J. *Pantheïsme en Monisme in de Javaansche Soeloek-Litteratuur*. trans. Dick Hartoko. Jakarta: Penerbit Gramedia, 1998, 3rd edition.