



<https://doi.org/10.23939/shv2024.01.046>

РЕЛІГІЙНИЙ ДОСВІД: МІЖ ВІРОЮ ТА ЦЕРКВОЮ¹

Огляд дослідження: Amber L. Griffioen, A. L. (2021). *Religious Experience*. Series: *Elements in the Philosophy of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 74 p.

Марія Набіт

Національний університет “Львівська політехніка”

ORCID: 0009-0002-8522-6537

mariia.nabit.fl.2021@lpnu.ua

(Отримано: 14.11.2023. Прийнято: 07.03.2024)

© *Набіт М.*, 2024

Розглянуто актуальне дослідження Амбер Гріффоен “Релігійний досвід”, оскільки прогнози щодо секуляризації у XX столітті не справдилися, а релігія залишається впливовою у різних сферах життя людей. Проаналізовано погляди Ф. Шляєрмахера, Р. Отто, В. Джеймса, А. Трейвса, Р. Свінборна і трактування ними понять “релігійний досвід”, “релігійні почуття”, “містичні переживання”. Висвітлено виникнення упереджень та віри. Висновки зроблено про те, що філософські дослідження релігійного досвіду змушують переглянути традиційні і неактуальні інтерпретації релігійного досвіду. Акцентовано, що релігійний досвід повинен включати тільки такі поняття, які стосуються релігії та які можна перевірити на підставі емпіричного підтвердження.

Ключові слова: *релігія, релігійний досвід, церква, містицизм, містичний досвід.*

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE: BETWEEN BELIEF AND CHURCH

Review of: Amber L. Griffioen, A.L. (2021). *Religious Experience*. Series: *Elements in the Philosophy of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 74 p.

Mariia Nabit

Lviv Polytechnic National University

ORCID: 0009-0002-8522-6537

mariia.nabit.fl.2021@lpnu.ua

(Received: 14.11.2023. Accepted: 07.03.2024)

The review considers the research of “Religious experience” by Amber L. Griffioen, which remains relevant due to predictions of secularization in the 20th century, which were false. Therefore religion remains influential in various spheres. The views of F. Schleiermacher, R. Otto, V. James, A. Traves, R. Swinborn and their interpretation of the concepts “religious experience”, “religious feelings”, and “mystical experiences” are considered. The author also analyzes the emergence of superstitions and faith. The conclusion is made that philosophical studies of religious experience force us to revise traditional and outdated interpretations of religious experience. The author argues that “religious experience” should include only those concepts related to religion that can be verified on the basis of empirical data.

Key words: *religion, religious experience, church, mysticism, mystical experience.*

In the book “Religious Experience”, the author explores the reinterpretation of “religious experience” by philosophers from the XX century to the beginning of the

XXI century. She makes a significant analysis of the ideas of well-known scholars of religion and compares them with modern empirical data.

Apart from religious experience, it’s brought up different models, terminologies, questions, problems,

¹ Науковий керівник доц. Кадикало А. М.

claims and rethinking. Religion was governed by European norms. It is mentioned about “experiential turn”, which gave rise to the thought of philosophy literature. In Europe, with the rise of scholasticism and natural theology, it is called by (religious) mysticism. Everything comes across instances of divine or saintly encounters. Mysticism has its own complicated history, where had less to do with the experiential aspect of religion. The men used of both literacy and ecclesial power, but women were excluded from such activity. Christianity had played a central role in theological reflection. There are lots of stories of passive religious encounters such as Moses, the burning bush etc., in the Bible. An upsurge in literacy and the production of devotional literature allowed both women and laypersons to explicitly enter into theological discourses previously reserved for male scholars. It is also policed by the Church, especially, who advised of this experience were women or members of other socially marginalized groups. They accepted “false mystics” and hallmark of religious experience and presented very important part of history of experiential revolution. In addition, we can find different opinions by three philosophers, as F. Schleiermacher, R. Otto and W. James.

Religious experience was formulated in a special way. F. Schleiermacher puts: “Religion is the sensibility and taste for the infinite” [Fales 1996: 23]. He argues that religious piety is not liberation, but religious feeling is the basis of religious faith. R. Otto echoes after F. Schleiermacher that religion belongs to the realm of feeling and he placed the category of value, namely “Numinous”. It is the basis of all religions and evokes unique and irreducible to other forms of feelings; it serves to transform religion into a universal one.

W. James is a proponent of “personal religion” and associates it with experience, feelings, and emotions. Present cases taken from various world religions, tended to focus on their commonality. The author proposed four “characteristics” of mystical experience, namely: ineffability, noetic quality, transience, and passivity.

Experience of this kind is practically the only kind of religious experience. However, there is something that unites these three thinkers. They try to reduce religion to morality, focusing on individual religious “virtuosos” or “geniuses” together. F. Schleiermacher and R. Otto unite the interpretation of religious feelings. F. Schleiermacher and W. James insisted on our ability to provide a naturalistic explanation. Also, there are made out questions: whether or not there is some common experiential “core” fundamental to all religion and whether religious experiences across time, culture, and place have some common element that unites them. Unfortunately, a lot of scholars don’t share someone’s position. Many peren-

nialists came around to Otto’s opinion, who had mentioned earlier.

M. Eliade agreed with R. Otto and had the same opinion. He argues that historical and cultural context were significance, but the experiential structure of hierophanies remain the same in spite of this [Eliade 2001: 12].

In addition, scholars were taken up, who examined mysticism: E. Underhill and W. T. Stace.

E. Underhill stresses that mysticism is active and practical, neither passive nor theoretical. At that time, W. T. Stace took to be universal, namely “extrovertive” and “introvertive” mystical experience. Not everyone agrees with him, but somebody examines “important” mystical phenomena. Influential proponents of this critical approach, such as S. Katz and W. Proudfoot, have argued that experience cannot be viewed as independent from the concepts that give it shape.

Religious experience is acultural, ahistorical, preconceptual, and experientially constructed. S. Katz is motivated by a resistance to both experiential perennialism and uncritical religious essentialism: “all religions, even if appearing different, but special” [Griffioen 2021: 13]. The perennialist scholar ensures conformance with their favored religious perspective. Together with W. T. Stace, they task for cherry-picking similar-sounding examples from multiple traditions. For S. Katz, the relationship between religious experience and religious belief is never unidirectional, because “beliefs shape experience, just as experience shapes belief” [Griffioen 2021: 14].

Practically, all scholars have different views of constructivism. Obviously, some opinions are congruent. What counts as experience is neither self-evident nor straightforward; it is always contested, and always therefore political. A lot of scholars argue among themselves. Certainly, in someone concurs with opinion, but not everyone. That is why they march in debates that listen somebody’s opinion and say own. Perceiving God is the most interesting and important question. There are different models, traditions, approaches and beliefs. Everyone go away opinions in this plan. Not all believe in His existence. They said that for this must be evidence. The only proof for some scholars is Bible. They believe every word, which is there. It tells about the exploits of God, what He did for us, what torments he went to. Other scholars told that they hadn’t believed into what they did not see. Somebody from religious experience said that God exists and He is miraculous.

Philosophers had claims for this expression. So, they have religious particularity and difference more seriously. Most philosophers of religion will readily admit that religious experiences can take many forms,

including sensory ones. It is not necessarily shared beliefs, but rather how they faithfully use shared religious ideas, models, and narratives in their pursuit of a religious life of human flourishing.

Religion got over from the passive to the active. Practice, ritual, and religious experience were appeared. In addition, new books declared that everything went on to change quickly. There was transfer from the spiritual senses to the bodily senses, experiencing things other than God, from the positive to the negative: experiencing evil and absence, collective and collected experience, from disagreement to dialogue. A lot of things were taken up and tried to come out at consent. Obviously, not all people backed up these ideas, but like-minded people were here. Religious experience is a personal and unique sphere of every person's life. It is important to note that religious experience is subjective and individual. Each person can have their own understanding and interpretation of their religion, beliefs and spiritual practices. Religious experience can influence moral values, views on the world, a person's place in it, and relationships with other people.

Religious experience can also have negative aspects, such as bigotry, discrimination, conflicts based on religious beliefs. It is important to consider that religion should be based on tolerance, mutual understanding and respect for human rights. In general, religious experience is an important component of human life.

Griffioen's book provides a framework for moving beyond the traditional, rational study of religion. This approach is quite original and innovative. This allows to get a new range of knowledge about religions that has remained outside the boundaries of researchers, ceasing to fit into the traditional ways of studying religion. This is important, because it involves a significant layer of empirical data.

БІБЛІОГРАФІЯ/REFERENCES

- Griffioen, A. L. (2021). *Religious Experience: Studies in Religious Myth and Symbol*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108699952>
- Eliade, M. (2001). *Mephistopheles and the Androgyne*. [In Ukrainian]. Kyiv: Osnovy Publ.
- Fales, E. (1996). Mystical Experience as Evidence. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 40(1), 19–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00141751>