



## Plural World Interpretations

### The Case of the Tyvans of South Siberia

Anett C. Oelschlaegel

**Abstract.** – “Plural World Interpretations” are part of our everyday life even if we are not aware of the fact. They result from the simultaneous existence of different but equal models for interpreting the world we live in. These models are products of human creativity and coexist as parallel realities, complementing and contradicting each other. Based on fieldwork among the Tyva of southern Siberia, the article discusses the practice of dealing with this multiplicity of world interpretations and shows how individual actors oscillate flexibly between two of many possible models for interpreting specific situations, and act on them. The rules Tyvans apply in varying contexts, the reasons behind their choices and the consequences they have to deal with, are also analyzed. The result is an account of contemporary culture that explores the flexibility and plurality of human interpretation, action, and behaviour. [*Southern Siberia, Republic of Tyva, Tyvans, plural world interpretations, models of world interpretations, interaction model, dominance model, model switching*]

**Anett C. Oelschlaegel, Dr.** – studied Anthropology, Central Asian and Religious Studies in Leipzig, Germany, where she presented her PhD dissertation in 2011. Currently she is an associate staff member at the Siberian Studies Centre of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology in Halle (Saale). – Her research focuses on the societies of Siberia and northern Central Asia. She has conducted fieldwork in the region since 1995 and spent a total of 18 months in the Republic of Tyva. Her research interests include plural world interpretations, social anthropology of religion (animism, historical and contemporary shamanism, and divination), oral tradition (contemporary legends), social anthropology of economy (herders and combining modes of economy), post-socialist studies, and oral history. – Publications: See References Cited.

### Introduction

“Plural World Interpretations” stands for the plurality of world interpretation models to be observed in the world today, and for the human ability to handle

them in a flexible manner. By analyzing the plurality of world interpretations among the southern Siberian Tyvans, the present article proposes an alternative to sociocultural studies that characterize societies as “traditional” or “modern.” Instead of making a strict distinction between traditional and modern elements of culture, the present study demonstrates their coexistence and cooperation. In addition, the term “Plural World Interpretations” will help to meet the challenge of adopting a widened perspective that shows tradition and modernity as equal, coexisting side by side.

The Tyvans themselves, as well as many Russian ethnographers, use the term “tradition” in the conventional way, similar to Handler and Linnekin’s (1984: 286) description: “The prevailing conception of tradition, both in common sense and in social theory, has envisioned an isolable body or core of unchanging traits handed down from the past.” Against this “naturalistic paradigm, which presumes boundedness and essence,” Handler and Linnekin argue that while “tradition is a symbolic process ... ‘traditional’ is not an objective property of phenomena but an assigned meaning.” On this understanding of the term, “the past is always constructed in the present.” Furthermore, I agree with Hobsbawm und Ranger (1992) who understand tradition as “invention.” In this way, it becomes clear how all phenomena we call “traditional” are permanently changing and how difficult it is to distinguish historical elements of culture from contemporary ones. Both traditional and modern elements of culture are in a process of development and are the object of exter-

nal influences. These are some of the reasons for not adopting classic terms like “tradition” and “modernity” in the present work and for replacing them by more specific terms.

Using the practice of individual actors as a frame of reference, the term “Plural World Interpretations” enables us to describe contemporary culture as comprising many parallel models of world interpretation, which are both coexistent and equally valued as well as complementary and contradictory. Based on field data collected in the Republic of Tyva (Russian Federation) during 2004–2005, I shall demonstrate how individual local actors deal with the choice between many different models of world interpretation and how they use them flexibly in order to respond to events and act in daily life situations. In doing so, I propose to study the actual plurality of world interpretation models as well as the human ability to handle them flexibly in everyday life.

In this case study, two of many different models of world interpretation are identified. They exist as equally valued realities but can structurally be differentiated as “model of human dominance” and “model of interaction between human and nonhuman subjects.” Both models refer to coherent systems and are part of the repertoire of knowledge, behavior, and acting of West Tyvan agents. To them, these models count as equal and mutually contradictory. The models compete and oppose each other, but form a continuum within a single person to the effect that the human agent is constantly positioning him- or herself, depending on situations and contexts. The empirical material makes clear that West Tyvans use these models in various ways – replacing, complementing, and mixing them according to their individual needs in specific contexts.

Furthermore, this case study will demonstrate how local actors deal with the plurality of world interpretation models, how they switch from one to another and how they mix them in different situations and contexts. The rules of their flexible handling of plural world interpretations, the reasons behind their choices between one of them, or for a special mix of several models, as well as the consequences of their choices, will be analyzed.

The Tyvans of South Siberia (249,299 in 2010<sup>1</sup>) are one of the peoples that belong to the Turkish language family and who in recent years have become known to Western society by cultural elements like pastoralism (Humphrey 1980), their nomadic way of life and yurts, a neoshamanism that is very much alive (Zorbas 2007), and the tradition of throat-sing-

ing (Van Deusen 2004; Levin and Süzükei 2006). The settlement area of the South Siberian Tyvans has the status of a republic of the Russian Federation (168,600 square kilometer; in 2010 altogether 307,930 residents) and is located between the Altai Mountains and Lake Baikal in South Siberia, bordering on northwestern Mongolia. The contemporary and historical culture of the Tyvans unites characteristic attributes of societies of northern Central Asia (Mongolia, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan) as well as south and east Siberia (particularly Altai and Buryatia). Common to the Republic of Tyva is a kind of pastoralism (Humphrey 1980, 1989; Humphrey und Sneath 1996, 1999) that rests upon the breeding of five species of livestock, typical for northern Central Asia and South Siberia: Bactrian camels, horses, yaks, goats, and sheep. Currently the livestock is complemented by cattle. Apart from the Tyvans in South Siberia, Tyvans are living in northern and northwestern Mongolia (Taube 1981a/b, 1994, 1996) as well as in the Chinese Altai (Monguš 1994).

## Theoretical Background

The term “Plural World Interpretations,” which gave this article its title, is based on phenomenological and constructivist insights that view human beings as the creators of multiple realities.<sup>2</sup> At the same time, socially constructed realities shape human interpretations of the world as well as human actions and behavior, which, in turn, are based on these interpretations. The following definition clarifies how I use this term in the present article:

“Plural World Interpretations” refer to human interpreting as well as human acting and behaving, based on these interpretations which rest upon the flexible use of simultaneous and equivalent models for interpreting the world. These models of world interpretation are coherent systems having both structure and content. They supplement and contradict each other and are part of the knowledge, behavioral, and action repertoire of human beings.

In studying the flexible handling of just two of many possible models of world interpretation by

<sup>1</sup> See <[http://www.gks.ru/free\\_doc/new\\_site/population/demo/per-itog/tab7.xls](http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/population/demo/per-itog/tab7.xls)> [25.04.2014].

<sup>2</sup> “But there are several, probably an infinite number of various orders of realities, each with its own special and separate style of existence. James calls them ‘sub-universes’ and mentions as examples the world of sense or physical things (as the paramount reality); the world of science; the world of ideal relations; the world of ‘idols of the tribe’; the various supernatural worlds of mythology and religion; the various worlds of individual opinion; the worlds of sheer madness and vagary” (Schütz 1945: 533).



Map: Autonomic Republic of Tuva.

individual Tyvan actors, I use the term “model” in the sense of a “social construction” as defined by Berger and Luckmann (1966). Since the world interpretation of an individual Tyvan actor at any given moment comprises a selection of many different archetypes and patterns, I propose to regard these archetypes as models and “intersubjective constructions of society.” As models they are neither natural realities nor human biological characteristics but rather products of human creativity. Both models of world interpretation discussed here are socially constructed and the members of Tyvan society are working constantly on their externalization (“production,” in the words of Berger and Luckmann [1966: 52]), objectivation (to become an objective reality, [53–61]), and internalization (annexation, to become a subjective reality, [129–147]).

In the following descriptions of “Plural World Interpretations” I will also use the term “interpretation.” This term is not equivalent to “perception.”

Interpretation means the human behavior that follows the human perception. People perceive something with their senses and afterwards can interpret it in many ways. For interpreting the perceived we use archetypes and patterns predetermined by our culture, which I call models of world interpretation. Our subsequent behavior is oriented towards these exemplary interpretations.

The term “world” is based on the constructivist concept of “lifeworld” that goes back to the phenomenology of Edmund G. Husserl ([1936] 1970, 1954) and was introduced into sociology by Alfred Schütz (1945: 533; Schütz and Luckmann 1973) as “paramount reality.” Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966: 23–25) developed it further as “world of daily life” or “social everyday reality.”

The “social everyday reality” is a “reality of commonsense” (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 20; 2012: 23). It is this reality that “is available to the commonsense of the ordinary members of society”



**Fig. 1:** Preparing for the migration to the next campsite (2005).

(Berger and Luckmann 1966: 19). As one of many realities it precedes all other realities. “Among the multiple realities there is one that presents itself as the reality par excellence. This is the reality of everyday life. Its privileged position entitles it to the designation of ‘paramount reality’” (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 21; 2012: 24). In this sense we need to allocate both models of world interpretation presented here, the dominance and the interaction model, to the “everyday reality.” They are part of and constitute the socially constructed “world of daily life” (“everyday reality,” Berger and Luckmann 1966: 18–26).

As part of the “everyday reality” one can understand the dominance and the interaction model as “social stocks of knowledge” (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 41 ff.), consisting “of recipes for the mastery of routine problems” (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 43). In the sense of “socially constructed” we enrich them permanently with new contents, when managing problems in a creative way. By repeating and copying them, their routines become common knowledge and factual reality. They pressure us to apply them for managing situations of everyday life. We adopt them by several processes of socialization and turn them into our subjective realities, which we then follow voluntarily and usually in a unreflected way (“primary socialization” and “secondary socialization,” Berger and Luckmann 1966: 129–146). This process can be considered as a cycle that steadily goes on in the wide domain of our daily social interactions. The socially con-

structed “worlds” we live in are accepted as realities because we become introduced to them (socialization) by copying them or by attachment persons (e.g., parents) and authorities (e.g., teachers or other psychological peers) and because we share them with our fellow human beings (intersubjectivity). In this sense, both models of world interpretation presented here are shared by all Tyvans. They are intersubjective parts of Tyvan everyday reality.

Once we are aware of the fact that both models of world interpretation are products of human constructiveness, the human ability becomes plausible to handle flexibly a multitude of them. Because the particular models are distinct from each other, however, they belong in equal measure to the repertoire of knowledge, behaving, and acting of the Tyvan community and its members. Diversity and variability of the models enable both to interpret events and situations in a flexible way and to react to and act in them according to the needs of the moment.

It became apparent that Tyvans in their interpreting, behaving, and acting draw on a collection of various contradictory and complementary models of world interpretation that are equal and occur simultaneously. Their flexible use causes seemingly contradictory statements about one and the same circumstance and induces different behavior in comparable situations. For this reason we need to clarify the question how human beings use the models of world interpretation in their everyday life. In trying to solve this problem, all indications showed what Schütz (1945; Schütz and Luckmann 1973)

already had realized: (1) both models are similarly perceived as “true” and “correct”; (2) the models of world interpretation are only coherent in themselves. Findings modelled on one of both models of world interpretation can not be related consistently to findings modelled on the other;<sup>3</sup> (3) in the sense of “multiple realities” both models of world interpretations have their own “specific accent of reality” or “reality accent” (Schütz 1945; Schütz and Luckmann 1973). Schütz and Luckmann argue that if I bestow the accent of reality upon one model of world interpretations, I accept it as true interpretations modelled on it. If the actor shifts the accent of reality to the other model, a new interpretation or truth comes into operation, which can be contrary to the first.<sup>4</sup>

In this sense, the models of world interpretation can be seen as “parallel truenesses” of one and the same person. An argumentation modelled on one of them can be perceived as true if we bestow the accent of reality upon it. If the arguer switches from one model to another, that is, if he or she shifts the accent of reality from one model to another, then the previous argument may appear as illogical and the new argument, that is contradictory to the former one, may be accepted as true.

Schütz (1945; Schütz and Luckmann 1973) describes this change-over as crossing the line between different “finite provinces of meaning.” “The passing from one to the other can only be performed by a ‘leap,’ as Kierkegaard calls it, which manifests itself in the subjective experience of a shock” (Schütz 1945: 18). James (1890) and Schütz (1945; Schütz and Luckmann 1973) show that the change between different “provinces of meaning” is not a contradictory but rather a skill typical for human beings. Likewise, this counts for the shifting between models of world interpretation. The example of the Tyvans shows that the plurality of models of world interpretation enriches everyday life.

## Structure and Contents – Two Models for a Contradictory Whole

The spirit masters of places, waters and Taiga are all *oran èèzi*. Every place has its spirit master. Together the *oran*

*èèzi* save [visible] nature. Furthermore, they are part of nature. They protect and advocate nature. They control and defend nature. They also control human beings and keep them in check. If people behave badly against nature, the *oran èèzi* become angry. We Tyvans explain it in this way: if (for example) a human being cuts down a shaman tree, kills wild game or a bird or any another animate being, he will fare badly or become sick (HG 2).

This statement reflects common knowledge of many Tyvans. It juxtaposes options for interpreting, behaving, and acting, which Tyvans classify as “traditional” and “modern,” in the categories “right” and “wrong.” Using the example of a breach of rule (antirules) against the tradition ways of life, Tyvans explained some of their most important social rules to me, i.e., not to destroy nature or modify their environment without the prior consent of spirit masters to respect the mastery of the spirits over all existing beings, and to maintain respectful interactions with all spirit masters of the Tyvan natural environment. However, both normative ways to explain or interpret everyday occurrences, the modern and the traditional one, coexist in Tyva. Both have an effect on behavior and everyday acting and both are pitted against each other by most Tyvans I met.

Traditional rules prescribe to take nothing from nature without previously asking for the spirit masters’s consent, and not to modify the environment according to human will. Yet most Tyvan men break this rule, e.g., by cutting trees or hunting wild animals. Similarly, most Tyvan women ignore this rule when collecting wild berries, onions, or spices. Nevertheless, most Tyvans are aware of the *target condition* of correct behavior in accordance with their traditions. What Tyvans categorize in their statements as “false behaviour,” e.g., a self-serving and unsolicited intervention in nature, is in accordance with a mode of thinking, behaving, and acting that scholars allocate to modern industrial societies. People of industrial societies mostly follow a model of world interpretation that I identify as “model of human dominance” (dominance model). This term denotes a model of world interpretation that postulates “the human dominance over the environment, seen as a series of more or less passive objects of human agency.” The principles of the “dominance model” are related to cartesian dualism, which, according to René Descartes (1596–1650), differentiates between “mental substance” (*res cogitans*) and “corporeal substance” (*res extensa*). The latter are seen as passive objects of human acting.

A comparison of human beings imbued with rationality and intelligence to all exclusively existent “things” shows the following characteristics:

3 “By no means will that which is compatible within the province of meaning P be also compatible within the province of meaning Q. On the contrary, seen from P, supposed to be real, Q and all the experiences belonging to it would appear as merely fictitious, inconsistent and incompatible and vice versa” (Schütz 1945: 18).

4 “... there are different finite provinces of meaning upon which I may bestow the accent of reality” (Schütz 1945: 17).

- (1) It separates human beings from their nonhuman environment and opposes them.
- (2) It differentiates between actively acting subjects (humans) and passive objects of human agency as the constituent parts of the non-human environment; the act takes place from the subject to the object.
- (3) The nonhuman components of the environment follow natural principles. Humans are able to understand the principles and use them to their own advantage.
- (4) Interaction is possible only between subjects (human beings). Animal instincts are a border case: they appear to modern humans as an interaction between humans and animals, but are not regarded as equal to the rationality and intelligence of humans.
- (5) Nonhuman components of the environment have no rationality, intelligence, or will. Humans by themselves have the ability to consciously and deliberately create human lives, even if the possibilities for doing so are limited by natural principles.
- (6) While human beings shape their own lives, they create their environment too. Only a false understanding of natural connections curbs the human ambitions to create their own world to live in.

In the specific ways in which Tyvans shape their lives, the “model of human dominance” is also a mode for interpreting the world, which to a large extent codetermines Tyvan everyday life.

The specific Tyvan model of human dominance is accompanied by a model of world interpretation, that many Tyvans call *their* “traditional world view.” The following excerpt demonstrates its requirements on people.

You must neither destroy nor kill not the wild animals of the world, not the grass, simply nothing. If you would do so, nonetheless, you would anger the spirit masters of the world .... All the lakes and high mountain ranges have spirit masters. If you wish to hunt the wild animals of the earth or collect medicinal herbs, you must learn to be devout. Only in this way will the spirit masters of the world not become angry (HG 24).

The spirit masters of the forests are called *arga ééleri* in Tyvan. They protect the animate nature, the plants, and animals. If a human wants to cut a tree, collect berries or medical herbs, or to hunt, then he or she has to conduct a ritual. If he wants to cut wood for building a house, – for example –, he first has to ask the spirit master of the forest, where he plans to do it. ... He is not allowed to begin work before he has conducted the ritual smoke sacrifice (*saj*). If he does not conduct a smoke sacrifice first, he will not be happy in the new house (HG 36)

All instructions of proper behavior in the Tyvan world point to an absolutely necessary and respectful interaction between human and nonhuman com-

ponents of that world. This model of world interpretations, and the action and behavior patterned on it, gives Tyvan actors the need and the obligation to interact with the different components of the Tyvan world, such as stones, trees, fire, cars, or even spirit masters. Tyvan knowledge, to be part of a world consisting of human and nonhuman subjects or “actors” (actor-network theory, see Law and Hassard 1999; Belliger and Krieger 2006), and comprising humans as well as spirits and other nonhuman subjects, gives Tyvan the certainty of being in permanent interaction with all nonhuman components of the Tyvan world. According to this model for interpreting the world, humans participate in the power of non-human elements of the Tyvan world (e.g., religions considered as energies), undergo the influences and the will power of nonhuman subjects, and perceive the reasons why they are highlighted, controlled, and dominated by nonhuman subjects (e.g., spirits), which they have to fear or are afflicted by. The model described is a specific Tyvan version of the “interaction model” that I want to define as a “model of interactions in a world encompassing both human and nonhuman subjects.” It has the following attributes:

- (1) Humans are integral components of the world.
- (2) In addition to humans the world includes non-human subjects.
- (3) Interactions take place between human and nonhuman partners or actors. The term “interactions between subjects” is not only related to humans.
- (4) Apart from humans, spirits, gods, animals and plants, articles of daily use, tools, and machinery are seen as operative subjects.
- (5) An awareness, similar to the human awareness, is not ascribed to all subjects. However, spirits and gods without will, intelligence, rationality, and intentional acting are unthinkable. Furthermore, an assessment of animals and plants is possible, e.g., a hunter apologizes to a killed wild animal or a tree cutter apologizes to a felled tree to avoid the negative consequences of his act.
- (6) The subjects of the “interaction model” are hierarchically arranged. The first place is held by the gods and spirits, the second by humans. Placed parallel are energies and powers without awareness that will act on all components of the world. Wild and domestic animals, plants, components of landscape, tools and articles of daily use seem to be subordinated to humans and spirits, energies, and powers.
- (7) This hierarchy is not universally valid. According to the situation in which the interaction takes place, different subjects can be superior, equal, or inferior. For example, a tree can not consent to being cut and a wild animal can avoid to being killed, preventing this by thwarting an obstacle.

The definitions of both models of world interpretation include a separation between structure and content. Content means, with Schütz and Luckmann (2003: 657; 1973), “intersubjective symbolic meanings” that are specific for different cultures and historical times. They exhibit an enormous “diversity of socially-historical forms” (ibid.). Whereas the content of models of world interpretations is in a permanent process of modification, development, and influence, their structure by contrast appears as global and permanent through time.

The limitation to only two models of world interpretation in the present study does not presuppose that the Tyvans are unfamiliar with other models of world interpretation. Rather, the Tyvans have as many models of world interpretation as members of globalized Western societies. In Tyva, apart from the interaction and the dominance model of, e.g., buddhistic-lamaistic variants (Monguš 1992, 2001) that are geared to Tibetan buddhism, we find different Christian variants originated by proselytization of mainly the American Baptist Church but also of the Russian Orthodox Church and other European churches as well as animist models of world interpretation oriented on European and American esoterics and New Age. These are described by Johansen (2003, 2004) and Zorbas (2007), documenting the change from shamanism to neo-shamanism. Such religious models of world interpretation belong to what Schütz (1945: 551) calls “realities of religion.” They may mix with other models of world interpretation or complement each other. By themselves and through their interplay with other models of world interpretation they have thus far not been investigated.

A study of the dominance and interaction models will suffice for our aim to describe plural world interpretations, because they exhibit a “global” and “permanent” tendency and together are part of and compose the “world of daily life” (Schütz 1945: 533) that William James (1890/1: 290 ff.) called the “paramount reality.” Furthermore, they provide the mental basis for the majority of alternative models of world interpretation. Both the dominance and the interaction model are related to other models of world interpretation, in the same way that Schütz’s “world of daily life” as a “finite province of meaning” (James’ “paramount reality”) relates to all other “finite provinces of meaning” (James 1890/1: “sub-universes”). It seems possible that all other models of interpreting the world derive from the dominance and/or the interaction model and have to be seen in connection with them.

Both models of world interpretation, the dominance and the interaction model, are “intersubjec-




Fig. 2: A famous hunter (1995).

tive” and “universalized” among the Tyvans. Both models are well known and shared by all Tyvans I met. Furthermore, my data suggest that most Tyvans in using terms like “tradition” and “modernity” are aware of the existence of both models and distinguish between both. They use them not only unconsciously but also consciously by deciding for one type or for a suitable mix of both types of interpreting, behaving, and acting. According to their situation and needs, the Tyvans I observed preferred to interpret a situation and to behave or act in it either in accordance with their “traditional” worldview or in a “modern” way. In doing so, they select the use of one model of world interpretation in its clear shape or quite often a reasonable mix of both models. When Tyvans decided for a special kind of explaining an event, they were aware of the model they were following, but preferred terms like “following our tradition” or “according to Russian and modern influences.”

### Why “Either ... or”? – Why Not “Both ... and”??

The Kombinat Tuvaasbest in Ak-Dovurak, Tuva, is said to be one of the largest open pit asbestos mines in the world. Half the mine is no longer operating and of the 3000 people who used to work there only 600 now have jobs. We asked the ones we met about the risks of asbestos poisoning. They smiled and said they had heard it was dangerous but quickly added that they felt fine and, besides, at least they had a job.<sup>5</sup>

5 “The Asbestos Factory.” <[www.fetchphrase.com/russia/tuva/asbestos/asbestos01.html](http://www.fetchphrase.com/russia/tuva/asbestos/asbestos01.html)> [25.04.2014].

Asbestos and the company with shrinking employment are a reality in the everyday live of Tyvans living in Ak-Dovurak (White Powder). Most of the inhabitants of Ak-Dovurak were previously or are now afflicted by asbestos poisoning. One of them, a 54-year-old shaman, explained to me why the traditional Tyvan boots have pitched cones. While walking, the design of these boots prevents mother earth from being hurt; if she would become angry, she could punish people (see Oelschlägel 2004). The Tyvans of Ak-Dovurak seem no less familiar with the interaction model than Tyvans living in other regions of the republic. However, like the shaman, who is living in Ak-Dovurak and was working in the asbestos company, just cited, they have arranged themselves with the open mine and the mining dump next to their habitat. The Tyvan inhabitants of Ak-Dovurak are no less believers but they are living in permanent contradiction to the model of respectful interaction between human and nonhuman subjects that is typical for many of the Tyvans I interviewed.

Many Tyvans – even if they believe in spirits (animism) – do not always observe the rules prescribed by their specific Tyvan interaction model. I observed men who crossed rivers with their Jeeps but bowed to sacred springs. I have seen unfortified roads in the steppes, extending for 80 metres or more, and passengers who made libations with milk tea or wodka for their cars, in order to safeguard them and their passengers from danger. Also typical are landladies, who in the morning make libations from the first part of the morning milk tea to the spirit masters of the campground and the landscape around it, while in the evening they depose of their waste behind the yurt. And to all of them the flexible handling of both contradictory models of world interpretation presented here seems to be a common behavior that occurs in Tyvans social contexts.

Hence it will be interesting to reconstruct how local actors apply both models of world interpretation in different situations and contexts, in order to understand everyday occurrences, to communicate them, act in, or respond to them. Because Tyvan actors have at least two models at their disposal, they adopt them according to situation, need, time, location, or counterpart. William James (1890/1: 293, 290) identified this potentiality as characteristic for human beings: “first, that we are liable to think differently of the same; and second that, when we have done so, we can choose which way of thinking to adhere to and which to disregard” (see also Schütz 1945: 551).

The following example illustrates the opposition between both types of world interpretation and the

inner conflicts, which for many Tyvans are associated with the existence of two or more models for interpreting, behaving, and acting. It concerns the adventures of a man who told me about it in private, only because his wife pushed him. The speaker regarded himself as an enlightened atheist and was sceptical of many Tyvans’ superstitiousness. He insisted that his adventure had happened in the way he told me, but was unsure how to interpret it. In public, he usually abstained from interpretations modelled by the interaction model in favor of the dominance model.

Two or three years ago a friend traveled from Mugur Aksy to Kyzyl. With another friend he drove in a car of the label “ČAZ” through the place “Adar Töš.” However an *aza* (a damaging spirit) dwells there. While they were in the car, an old aged man on the side of the road tried to stop them. At this time it was dark and the driver was tired and edged. That is why he did not stop. His companion was sleeping on the seats behind him. After a little while, about one kilometer along the road, suddenly the old man who had wanted to stop the car was sitting beside the driver on the codriver’s seat. He looked just like the man on the road. The driver drove on. As he looked a second time, the old man had disappeared. When they arrived at Šagonar, he woke up his companion and after he had told him about the old man, they ritually cleansed the car with juniper. But the car broke down. They did not have to go far, but because of the damage to their car, they needed a long time to arrive at their destination (AZ 6).

The wife of the storyteller associated the breaking down of the car with the old man whom she identified as an *aza* spirit. The storyteller himself, in contrast, thought it could have been a simple damage of the engine. He was tired and nervous, for which reason he thought that the hitcher was sitting beside him in the car. Both interpretations of the event contrast both models of world interpretations, the dominance and the interaction model. The explanation of the driver’s wife is oriented on the interaction model, whereas her husband explained the event by drawing on the dominance model.

The driver’s wife saw in the event interactions between the driver and his companion, an *aza* and the car. The *aza* tried to stop the travellers but the driver drove on. Suddenly the *aza* sat beside the driver on the the codriver’s seat and finally the car broke down, which can be interpreted as damage caused by the *aza*. The traveller ritually cleaned the car with juniper to eliminate the bad influence of the damage spirit. Since the prevention of the damage failed to come about, they were delayed on their journey. Human and nonhuman subjects influenced the event likewise. It turns out that the *aza*, as an intelligent and acting subject, had more force over the situation than the people involved.

The storyteller himself knew interpretations following the interaction model, but he refused to believe in the existence of nonhuman intelligent interaction partners. Hence he preferred to orient his interpretations on the dominance model and limited his analysis of the event to the empirical lowdowns. He interpreted the emergence of the old man in the car as a hallucination caused by his own tiredness and nervousness. A damage to the car can hit everyone and has nothing to do with the acting of spirits.

The example shows – in the self-expression of many Tyvans – how the dominance and the interaction models appear in an almost clear form, which is nearly inviolated by the opposite pole, that is, in a “narrative idealized clear form.” By observing the Tyvans talking with each other, their behaving or acting, we perceive the wide domain of “transdifference” (Breinig and Lösch 2002, 2006), passing the border between different models of world interpretation and the abidance in the continuum between interaction and dominance model, sometimes tending to the first, at other times to the second model. Whereas replacement and alternating are in accordance with an oscillation from one extreme to the other, complementing and mixing shows the transdifferent space between the extremes and the constant situational positioning of many Tyvans along transdifference continuum.

### **The One and the Other – A Reasonable Complementing**

With regard to the activities belonging to the work of cattle breeders, we can observe a clear case of complementing or mixing both models of world interpretation. It usually occurs during the castration of the young male lambs and goats, an act that represents a direct intervention in the reproduction of the flock. Livestock breeding is a pragmatic goal or profit-oriented work on the environment and can be seen as an example of human acting oriented to the dominance model at least since the invention of domestication and breeding in the neolithic Orient (10,000 to 9,000 B.C.E.).

On the 1st of June, 2005, at the spring camp of the herders Ajas Kara-oolovič Kyrgys and Čečena Michajlovna Ojun, a place located north of Yenisei River, the male lambs and goats of their herd were castrated. To this purpose, the owner of the animals sent for a veterinarian. The work took the whole day. The cattle breeders caught the male lambs and goats in the drove that was pent-up close to the camp. The children assisted in catching the animals. To the general amusement they needed a long time

to catch each goat or sheep. Assisted by the cattle drivers, the veterinarian examined the animals and castrated them. The castration serves both the breed selection of fertile animals and a better utilisation of forage. Castrated animals fatten faster than uncastrated ones. The removed testicles were put in a bucket filled with water, milk, and juniper, in order to prepare a feast in the evening.

Spittler’s (2003) arguments about “interactive work” confirm my observations of the playful fight between the boys and the male lambs and goats. The catching of the young animals takes place interactively between the catcher and the animal, and both have self-will. The son of a professional herder feels the will and the fear instinct of the young cattle. This interaction becomes an amusing play of power between the boys and the animals. But the superior element in this “game” is the human being and the catching of the young animals follows a rational aim, namely, to catch the animals not selected for reproduction that will be castrated in order to beef up.

I assume that we should allocate the intentional selection of the animals for castration and the castration itself predominantly to the model of human dominance over an environment that consists of exploited and, therefore, rather passive objects of human agency. The castration is an active, pragmatic, goal- and profit-oriented intervention in the fertility and reproduction of the flock. It follows the will of humans and not the will of animals, and – apart from the interests of the spirits in continuing human society – not the will of spirits and other nonhuman subjects. The human owner of the flock and the colleagues he consults decide by themselves which animals can still be fertile for the purpose of breeding and which animal will be extracted from the ability to reproduce. In relation to breeding I could not find influences of the specific Tyvan interaction model. Only the resistance of the young animals and their fight with the boys adumbrate an interaction between human and nonhuman subjects.

Nevertheless, the interaction model also influences the castration event. During the castration of lambs and goats the Tyvans comprised two resources known from the Tyvan version of the interaction model. It seems that the stock owner not only wants to rely on his farsightedness and competence for cattle breeding but, instead, includes religious resources in order to secure themselves from evil with the help of the interaction model. The successful prosperity of the stock not only depends on the competence of the cattle breeder but also on the benevolence of the spirit masters and other natural subjects. These resources are milk and juniper. As

the cattle breeder told me, both nonhuman subjects used during all rituals and in everyday life ensure ritual and religious purity. Milk and juniper make the wounds heal quickly, the flock prosper, and ensure that its owners stay well and healthy. In relation to the use of milk and juniper we discover several interactions. In the first place, we find an interaction between the cattle breeder, the flock, and the milk that is classified as pure and contributing to religious and ritual purity. In the second, there is an interaction between the human owner, the flock, and the juniper, its purifying power and the power of the wilderness in which the juniper grows. Finally, we can discover an interaction between people, flock, and spirit masters, which take much pleasure in milk and juniper and which safeguard the flock. However, apart from ritual hygiene I could not detect any form of medical hygiene. The veterinarian wiped the knife on his trousers or dipped it into the mixture of water, milk, and juniper. He did not disinfect the wounds. What the owners of the flock could not secure themselves – the healthy prosperity of the flock – they secured with the help of the spirit masters by using milk and juniper. Thus, it seems that the most important property of Tyvan nomads, their herd of cattle, depends both on the self-determined acting of the breeder and on a successful interaction between the cattle owner, the flock, several subjects of nature (milk, juniper), and the spirit masters.

In the castration example both models of world interpretation are mixed complementing each other. Furthermore, the example shows that the boundary between both models of world interpretation – which type of behavior and what explanation belongs to either model of world interpretation – is not absolute and clear-cut. In the first instance, and clearly visible from the outside, the human cattle owner personally decides about his cattle in observing a dominant and purposeful intervention in the fertility of the flock. In castrating particular male lambs and goats, he regulates the breeding and the beefing up of the flock. According to the dominance model, we can allocate the prosperity of the flock to the human ability for cattle breeding. However, according to the interaction model, the success of livestock farming depends on the invisible influences and control of the spirit masters. In the reflections of many Tyvans a mix of both models is the most frequent. Depending on the situation and context, they interpret their success or failure in livestock-breeding either according to the dominance or to the interaction model. Both models of world interpretation – in as far as they are different and contradictory – complement one another to form a whole that for many Tyvans is reasonable.

### **The One after the Other – The Difficulty to Decide**

Many events I participated in showed me that the first spontaneous reaction to an event (statement or action) in Tyva emanated from the “model of human dominance,” whereas the reflexion of the same occurrence, that often occurred substantially, later rather followed the “interaction model” of world interpretation. Thus, one of the models of world interpretation could be replaced, supplemented, or mixed by the other. This is in accordance with the principle of oscillating between both extremes or on the continuum of the transdifferent space between them. The Tyvans I observed always renewed their position in the transdifferent space, tending once to the first, another time to the second extreme. For a better understanding of this shifting I want to give the following case:

In July 2004, I was fortunate, together with two other foreigners, to accompany a shamaness well-known in Tyva, her younger sister, and her two younger brothers, who also work as shamans, to their homeland. The reasons for our trip were religious ones. Tyvan shamans regularly travel to their homeland to renew contact with the spirits residing there and to reload the power of the wilderness (in this case, the power of the taiga). The wilderness – far away from human settlement areas – is considered as full of energy. That is why it is important for Tyvan shamans to participate in nature’s energy and renew their own power, at least once a year. In addition, most of the shamans feel indebted to the spirits of their homeland where they were called to become a shaman. Many shamans find it important to maintain professional interaction with the spirit masters of their homeland. The spirits want to be attended, otherwise they withdraw the power and skills from the shamans that do not care for them.

For the journey, the four shamans borrowed two jeeps from friends. During one of our trips through the taiga one of the jeeps broke down. All involved persons, including the four shaman siblings, interpreted the breakdown in the following way: The car was old. Many parts of the engine were worn out. The unhitched driveways we used through the muddy taiga, rivers, and wood was a strain on our vehicles. The persons involved reacted to the situation by trying to repair our jeep. It was a spontaneous and rational interpretation of the problem and an attempt to solve the problem in accordance with the “model of human dominance.” All persons involved saw as the cause of the problem their manner of driving, the condition of the jeep, and the unhitched driveways. In addition, they understood it as their duty to find a way to repair the car.

During the repair the oldest of the four shaman siblings suggested to perform a ritual for the spirits in order to influence the condition of the vehicle and safeguard a problem-free further journey. However, because the men were busy repairing the car, and because it became late,



Fig. 3: Shamaness (2004).

and it was still far a long way to our accommodation, the siblings abandoned this plan and instead hurried to get the repair done. But they did not succeed. In the twilight one of the men went on foot to the next camp of yurts and later returned with the landlord and another jeep. The men solved our problem by towing the damaged car to our hosts where they needed several days to find spare parts and temporarily repair the car so that we could use it to return home.

Two months later I met the oldest sister of the shaman siblings again and asked her how they had fared with the broken jeep. She told me the following:

1. After our trip through the taiga both jeeps were damaged and their owner demanded high sums of money. I offered her to add money, but she did not accept, saying: “What would the spirits think, if I leave paying my bills to you?”
2. The shamaness associated the damaged car and the requirements of its owner with the circumstance that they took us, the foreigners, along their journey and that they had inducted us into their secrets as shamans. The spirits revealed their secrets to shamans only to allow them to cooperate with the spirits; the secrets cannot be therefore passed onto others. In this sense our interviews amounted to an abuse of confidence against the spirits of the shaman siblings. During our talk, the shamaness showed remorse above this mistake. She told me that for this reason she got punished by her spirits in the form of the financial aftermath.
3. Further, the shamaness explained that she did not succeed in contacting the spirits as intensively as necessary in order to accumulate the power of nature. The spirits withdrew her, especially because we foreigners had disturbed them and because she – as a guardian of the knowledge about spirits – had been too frank with us.
4. The shamaness affirmed never again to undertake a professional journey together with foreigners.
5. When I asked her how she was going to pay for the damages, she explained that she never would repeat her mistake, had not spoken to any foreigner about her business as shaman since our trip, and also had conducted

several reconciliation rituals. For that reason her spirits were helping her again, so that she could earn the money she needed. Her business went very well, she had many clients, and at the time she was one of the most demanded and expensive shamans of her clinic. She attributed her recent success to the fact that she had recognized her own mistake and that the spirits had regained confidence in her.

Thus, the initial situation and the purpose of the journey of the shaman siblings had been conditioned by the interaction model and were based on the contract between the shamans and their homeland spirits. The planned contact with the spirits and the refuelling with spiritual power served – in the frame of the interaction model – their function and work as shamans.

However, after one of our cars was damaged, the interaction model at first had been irrelevant. The men tried to solve the problem in a rational way by repairing the broken engine. The suggestion of the oldest shaman sister to conduct a ritual, suitable for the interaction model, had been refused. At this stage, the interpretation of the situation as well as their behavior and acting had been conditioned by the dominance model. Later on, the eldest of the shaman siblings had modified her interpretations of the events. Her report, two months after the event, attested to the value of the interaction model that now influenced her interpretation as well as her further actions and behavior.

As the cause of the jeep’s breakdown and the ensuing financial demands of the owner, the shaman siblings identified their own mistake that derived from the rules of respectful interaction. The shamans narrative generosity towards us was in breach of their duties in the interaction model and induced the partner spirits of the shaman siblings to punish them. The new interpretation of the event finally led to changes in the shamans’ acting and behaving. The shaman siblings atoned their mistakes with the help of conciliation rituals and the promise to change their behavior. They decided no longer to share their shamanistic knowledge with uninitiated foreigners.

Even some time after our journey, the eldest of the shaman siblings was experiencing problems, which she had solved only by being sensitized for the interaction model. Furthermore, she interpreted the events and her professional and financial situation basing on the interaction model. In our conversation she explained that after the attempt to propitiate her partner spirits, her situation had changed and the spirits helped her again to compensate for her financial losses. In the months after our journey she was successful again in treating her clients, was




Fig. 4: The son of Tyvan stockbreeders (2004).

earning well, and became the most demanded and expensive shamaness of her clinic.

The example of the shaman siblings is typical for the direction of changing models of world interpretation. The sequence of the actual situation → dominance model → reflection → interaction model is common but not the rule. The change between these models can also happen repeatedly and in both directions. The interpretation of an event based on the interaction model does not necessarily remain stable, but can again be shifted to the dominance model.

The flexible handling of plural world interpretations and the possibility of oscillating between the extremes of various models of world interpretation discussed here is in accordance with the needs of the everyday life of Tyvans who try to deal with them by employing a suitable mix of both models, depending on situation and context. Especially in situations that can not be solved with the help of the dominance model, the interaction model pro-

vides an alternative solution that, at least, is able to accomplish psychological success. In addition, the parallel existence of two models of world interpretation in Tyvan culture has a balancing function between a stability that provides safety and identity (the use of the interaction model) and progress and development needed in the globalizing world (the use of the dominance model).

## Summary

Analyzing the case of the Tyvans in southern Siberia, the previous chapters have been aimed at introducing the theory and practice of plural world interpretations. The focal point of the article are two models of world interpretation that are common in Tyva and their flexible use by individuals and groups. On the one hand, there is a specifically Tyvan “dominance model” that Tyvans usually perceive as their modern worldview, influenced by their being part of Russia; on the other hand, we have the specifically Tyvan “interaction model” that Tyvans identify as their own traditional animistic-shamanistic worldview. Both models mentioned here are part of Tyvan everyday reality, which they constitute together at the same time. Although mutually contradictory they are parallel components of the mental culture of all my research partners in Tyva and can be used by every Tyvan as possibilities for interpreting events and as guidelines for proper acting and behaving. To me they were often communicated in a “narratively idealized pure form.” However, they were executed in tendencies, that means, in mixing or complementing them according to situation and context.

Plural world interpretations and their flexible use follow several rules which can be summarized as follows:

1. Both types of world interpretation, the “interaction model” and the “dominance model,” can be found side by side among the Tyvans with specific Tyvan contents.
2. In their extreme forms both models contradict each other in such a fundamental way that an interpretation of a situation from one of them seems to be “fictitious,” “dissonant,” and “inconsistent” (Schütz 1955; 1971a: 397; 1971b), if you compare it using the example of the other and contrariwise.
3. Both models of world interpretation appear in the self-confession of many Tyvans often in the form of a “narrative idealized pure form.” Many Tyvans admit gladly only one of them.

4. The acting and behaving of many Tyvans I observed and their conversations among each other allow conclusions to interpretations that show both models of world interpretation in a supplemented and mixed form. In doing so, Tyvans oscillate from one extreme to another or change their position on the continuum of transdifference between them according to their needs.
5. My conversational partners knew to distinguish between both types of world interpretation and attributed their statements to the emic concepts of “modernity” or “tradition.”
6. None of these models can be exclusively attributed to “the” Tyvans: Many Tyvans feel at home in both models as well as in the space of transdifference between them.
7. Both models of world interpretation seem to be stable in their structure. However, they can rapidly change their content. Responsible for this change is the impact of the media, schools and professional education, the sciences, tourism, and travelling as well as esoterism and the New Age movement.
8. The personal world interpretation results from his or her position in the transdifferent space, i.e., the position that one Tyva in a particular moment, situation, and context adopts and that he or she is willing to follow.
9. For these reasons, the world interpretations of the Tyvans are “not unambiguous” or “one-dimensional and static” but rather “ambiguous,” “flexible,” situational,” and “plural.”

In order to describe the multifaceted interactions between human and nonhuman subjects I used examples from Tyvan civil religion in the form of reports of events, experiences, or adventures (e.g., contemporary legends), interviews, records of ritual texts, or oral literature. From this material the interaction model can be derived:

1. Tyvans do not perceive themselves as the only intelligent beings or as masters of their world. They are connected to nonhuman subjects in a network and interact constantly with them, both consciously and unconsciously. Human well-being depends on the success of these interactions. That is why Tyvans attach great importance to compliance with the rules and norms of the interaction model and a consciously respectful interaction with nonhuman subjects.
2. Considering the frequency of references to and interactions with the “spirit masters,” these are the most important nonhuman interaction partners for humans. As their real owners the spir-

it masters watch over all existing parts of the world, provide norms and rules for dealing with them, ensure their abidance, and punish non-compliance.

3. All human activities can be seen as “interactions between humans and spirit masters.” Positive aspects include the acknowledgement of the spirit master’s mastery over all existing parts of the world, the observance of standards, norms, and rules prescribed by the spirit masters, rituals of gratitude, requests and reconciliations, different aspects of spiritual culture, and the utilization of aptitudes and talents bestowed upon a person by the spirit masters. Every noncompliance with the norms and rules of the interaction model and the result thereof must be understood as a negative element in interaction between humans and spirit masters.
4. With help of their narrative tradition the Tyvans keep alive their interpreting, behaving, and acting according to the interaction model. One of the most important narrative genres are so-called “true occurrences” (i.e., contemporary legends or reports of events, experiences, or adventures). Typical subjects of such contemporary legends are human failings in the respectful interaction between human and nonhuman subjects as demanded by the spirits and the resulting punishments, such as crises, illness, or death. Legends that inform about wondrous rewards by spirits to those who distinguish themselves in their handling of rules and norms as per the interaction model are also popular.
5. Humans often only become aware of breaches of norms after a crisis occurs in their lives. To avert the consequences of such transgressions Tyvans have to take several steps: (a) interpret the crisis retrospectively according to the interaction model; (b) invite a shaman to review the situation, find out which spirits were involved in what way, and give advice on how the problem may be solved; (c) conduct rituals of reconciliation (possibly under the direction of a shaman); and (d) promise to behave in a more respectful way with the nonhuman subjects.
6. Tyvans consider human talents as connected to the activities of the spirit masters as well. Talents are not inborn attributes and are not considered a form of distinction. Special talents are obligations. In fact, the spirit master of specific talents select and oblige individuals bestowed with such talents to serve these talents by using them in the world of human beings. A person chosen by the spirit masters of a specific talent has to represent it in the human world, is

obliged to practice and apply it with the best of his or her ability, not to hold it back or misuse it and not gain unfair advantages because of it. To do otherwise incurs punishment.

7. The interaction model ensures harmony, balance, and stability in the field of reciprocal dependencies between human and nonhuman subjects. If a Tyvan compromises this balance, he or she runs the risk of being punished by the spirits. The spirit masters will call forth a crisis. But spirits can also compromise the stability of respectful interactions. For example, attacks by evil spirits who the Tyvans regard as playful or vicious are a constant source of danger for humans.
8. The people see themselves as being permanently dependent on the goodwill of various spirits. But the existence and the well-being of the spirits is seen as depending on human behavior and action as well. On the one hand, people depend on that which the spirit masters provide them with. On the other, if people apply incorrectly that what the spirits have given them or destroy it, this may have negative consequences for the spirit masters, not only for the people. If people destroy the property of a spirit master, they destroy the spirit master as well. The incorrect handling of a spirit master's property may rob them of their power; neglecting to use a bestowed talent or forgetting bestowed knowledge about its proper practice may cause the spirit master of the talent to disappear.
9. Shamans endowed with powers by the spirit masters find their function here in the interaction model. They are intermediaries between human and nonhuman subjects. With the help of their partner spirits they clarify situations that endanger the interaction. When interactions become unbalanced, they help to return them to a state of stability and harmony. In so doing, they are obliged to reconcile the spirit masters and fight against several evil spirits. They conduct rituals of reconciliation, appeal, and gratitude. Furthermore, they act as advisers and remind people of the correct path in the respectful interaction with nonhuman subjects.
10. Thus, all aspects of all human and nonhuman subjects in the Tyvan world are interconnected and interdependent.

From the concept of "Plural World Interpretations" presented here arises the question, what rules follow from their flexible use. The following summary, therefore, deals with the flexible application of both models of world interpretation and discuss-

es the subject of connections and regularities, reasons and consequences, as well as several strategies of changing the position on the continuum between their extremes.

1. The "dominance model" is currently the most frequently used model of world interpretation in Tyva. As a guideline for interpreting events, acting in, and reacting to them, Tyvans usually first employ this model.
2. "Spontaneous changes" of the models of world interpretations, therefore, often occur from a first interpretation or problem handling according to the dominance model to the inclusion of the interaction model after a delay of some time.
3. Often a "complementing" takes place, which means a shifting of the tendency from one model to the other.
4. A shift from the first spontaneous application of the interaction model to the dominance model is much rarer.
5. "Spontaneous changes" from the dominance to the interaction model especially occur in "problematic situations," especially after the failure of pragmatic and rational attempts to solve the problem.
6. The shift to the interaction model usually accompanies a "retrospective reflection" on the event.
7. After a switch to the interaction model, a breach of rules of respectful interaction between human and nonhuman subjects is identified as the cause of negative situations.
8. Typical examples of such retrospective reflections from the perspective of the interaction model are so-called "true occurrences" (contemporary legends); in other words: reports of events, experiences or adventures. Often they refer to a breach of norms by people and their subsequent punishment by nonhuman subjects such as spirits.
9. After the spontaneous switch from the dominance to the interaction model "rituals of conciliation" are as typical as follow-up actions.
10. These are followed by "long-term behavior modifications," accompanied by the promise to follow the rules of the interaction model more respectfully.
11. Especially accidents and strokes of fate, that often cause the switch from the dominance model to the interaction model, keep the possibility to interpret events according to the interaction model open.
12. Depending on the situation, further reasons for switching from the dominance to the interaction

- model may include particular spaces (e.g., holy or ritual places), moments in time (e.g., days reserved for rituals), and counterparts (e.g., religious specialists or a researcher working on animism and shamanism).
13. Prompt interpretations of events based on the interaction model and not preceded by a switch from the dominance to the interaction model can especially be demonstrated in *stages after rituals* “stages after rituals.” Rituals keep awake the interaction model in the people involved for a while after conducting them.
  14. Switches between the models of world interpretation can be carried out spontaneously or strategically. Strategic switches in both directions often happen if one person or a group of persons is not satisfied with the results of applying one of the models of world interpretation. The strategical use of the dominance model during Soviet times, in order to hide the own religiousness, was characteristic.
  15. The conscious “strategic switch” can often and well be observed in the case of shamans. Currently, shamans need to command several strategies in their work that borrow instruments from the dominance model. They include networking, publicity, bookkeeping, installation, and organization of shaman clinics, manufacture, and the trade of devotional objects.
  16. In numerous self-expressions of my Tyvan interview partners a tendency to explanations about right and wrong behaving and acting is cognizable. Such a distinction is often accompanied by an effort to oppose both models of world interpretation as right or wrong and, thus, postulate the contradictory character of both models.
  17. In so doing, many Tyvans created a “narratively idealized pure form” of one model of world interpretation. In this way, the interpretations of events and situations approximated the extreme form of this model.
  18. Apart from the “structural stability” of both models of world interpretation, in Tyva the nowadays typical, accelerated “changeability of content” of the dominance and the interaction model is conspicuous.
  19. The frequency of applying both models of world interpretation is also changeable. Currently, the dominance model is more often used than the interaction model, which use is concentrated on particular circumstances.

## References Cited

### Belliger, Andréa und David J. Krieger

2006 Einführung in die Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie. In: A. Belliger und D. J. Krieger (Hrsg.), ANThology. Ein einführendes Handbuch zur Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie; pp. 13–50. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

### Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann

1966 The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. Garden City: Doubleday.  
2012 Die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion der Wirklichkeit. Eine Theorie der Wissenssoziologie. Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch-Verlag. (Fischer-Taschenbücher, 6623) [1969]

### Breinig, Helmbrecht, and Klaus Lösch

2002 Introduction. Difference and Transdifference. In: H. Breinig, H., J. Gebhardt, and K. Lösch (eds.), Multiculturalism in Contemporary Societies. Perspectives on Difference and Transdifference; pp. 11–36. Erlangen: Univ.-Bibliothek. (Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A, Geisteswissenschaften, 101)  
2006 Transdifference. *Journal for the Study of British Cultures* 13/2: 105–122.

### Handler, Richard, and Jocelyn Linnekin

1984 Tradition, Genuine or Spurious? *Journal of American Folklore* 97/385: 273–290.

### Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger (eds.)

1992 The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### Humphrey, Caroline

1980 (Editor's) Introduction. In: S. Vainshtein, Nomads of South Siberia. The Pastoral Economies of Tuva; pp.1–36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology, 25)  
1989 Perestroika and the Pastoralists. The Example of Mongun-Taiga in the Tuva ASSR. *Anthropology Today* 5/3: 6–10.

### Humphrey, Caroline, and David Sneath

1996 Pastoralism and Institutional Change in Inner Asia. Comparative Perspectives from the Meccia Research Project. London: Overseas Development Institute. (Pastoral Development Network, 39b)  
1999 The End of Nomadism? Society, the State and the Environment in Inner Asia. Durham: Duke University Press; Cambridge: White Horse Press.

### Husserl, Edmund G.

1954 Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Eine Einleitung in die phänomenologische Philosophie. (Hrsg. von W. Biemel.) Den Haag: Nijhoff. (Husserliana, 6)  
1970 The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy. (Transl., with an Introd. by D. Carr.) Evanston: Northwestern University Press. [1936]

### James, William

1890 The Principles of Psychology. Vol. 1/Vol. 2. New York: Holt.

### Johansen, Ulla

2003 Shamanistic Philosophy: Soul – A Changing Concept in Tyva. *Shaman* 11/1–2: 29–49.  
2004 Vom Schamanismus zum Neo-Schamanismus in Sibirien und Zentralasien. *Jahrbuch des Museums für Völkerkunde Leipzig* 42: 65–76.

**Law, John, and John Hassard (eds.)**

- 1999 Actor Network Theory and After. Oxford: Blackwell. (Sociological Review Monographs, 47)

**Levin, Theodore Craig, and Valentina Süzükei**

- 2006 Where Rivers and Mountains Sing. Sound, Music, and Nomadism in Tuva and Beyond. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

**Monguš, Marina V.**

- 1992 Lamaizm v Tuve. Kyzyl: Tuvinskoe Knižnoe izdatel'stvo.  
1994 Tuvincy v Kitae. Problemy istorii, jazyka i kulturey. *Učenyje zapiski* 18: 30–56.  
2001 Istorija Buddizma v Tyve. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".

**Oelschlägel, Anett C.**

- 2004 Der Weiße Weg. Naturreligion und Divination bei den West-Tyva im Süden Sibiriens. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag. (Arbeiten aus dem Institut für Ethnologie der Universität Leipzig, 3)  
2013 Summary of "Plural World Interpretations. The Case of the Tyvans in South Siberia." In: A. C. Oelschlägel, Plurale Weltinterpretationen. Das Beispiel der Tyva Südsibiriens; 249–258. Fürstenberg: Verlag der Kulturstiftung Sibirien.

**Schütz, Alfred**

- 1945 On Multiple Realities. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 5/4: 533–576.  
1955 Symbol, Reality, and Society. In: L. Bryson, L. Finkelstein, and H. Hoagland (eds.), Symbols and Society. Fourteenth Symposium of the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion; pp. 135–202. New York: Harper. (Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion, 14)  
1971a Symbol, Wirklichkeit und Gesellschaft. In: A. Schütz, Gesammelte Aufsätze. Vol. 1: Das Problem der sozialen Wirklichkeit; pp. 331–411. Den Haag: Nijhoff.  
1971b Über die mannigfaltigen Wirklichkeiten. In: A. Schütz, Gesammelte Aufsätze. Vol. 1: Das Problem der sozialen Wirklichkeit; pp. 237–298. Den Haag: Nijhoff.

**Schütz, Alfred, and Thomas Luckmann**

- 1973 The Structures of the Life-World. (Transl. by R. M. Zaner.) Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

- 2003 Strukturen der Lebenswelt. Konstanz: UVK-Verl.-Gesellschaft.

**Spittler, Gerd**

- 2003 Work – Transformation of Objects or Interaction between Subjects? In: B. Benzing, and B. Herrmann (eds.), Exploitation and Overexploitation in Societies Past and Present. IUAES-Intercongress 2001 Göttingen; pp. 327–338. Münster: Lit.

**Taube, Erika**

- 1981a Anfänge der Selbstwertung bei den Tuwinern im Westen der Mongolischen Volksrepublik. In: R. Krusche (Red.), Die Nomaden in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Beiträge zu einem internationalen Nomadismus-Symposium am 11. und 12. Dezember 1975 im Museum für Völkerkunde Leipzig; pp. 97–108. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig, 33)  
1981b Die Tuwiner im Altai (mongolische VR). *Kleine Beiträge aus dem Staatlichen Museum für Völkerkunde Dresden* 4: 34–40.  
1994 Bezeichnungswirrwarr um ein kleines Türkvolk. In: K. Röhrborn und W. Veenker (Hrsg.), *Memoriae munusculum*. Gedenkband für Annemarie v. Gabain; pp. 131–138. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, 39)  
1996 Zur gegenwärtigen Situation der Tuwiner im westmongolischen Altai. In: Á. Berta, B. Brendemoen, and C. Schönig (eds.), *Symbolae Turcologicae*. Studies in Honour of Lars Johanson on His Sixtieth Birthday 8 March 1996; pp. 213–225. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. (Transactions; Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, 6)

**Van Deusen, Kira**

- 2004 Singing Story, Healing Drum. Shamans and Storytellers of Turkie Siberia. Montreal: McGill-Queens's University Press.

**Zorbas, Konstantinos**

- 2007 Agents of Evil. Curse Accusations and Shamanic Retaliation in Post-Soviet Tuva, Siberia. Cambridge. [Unpubl. PhD Dissertation, University of Cambridge]