

General Editor: Andreas Umland,
Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, Kyiv, umland@stanfordalumni.org

Commissioning Editor: Max Jakob Horstmann,
 London, mjh@ibidem.eu

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE*

DOMESTIC & COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Prof. **Ellen Bos**, *Andrássy University of Budapest*
 Dr. **Ingmar Bredies**, *FH Bund, Brühl*
 Dr. **Andrey Kazantsev**, *MGIMO (U) MID RF, Moscow*
 Prof. **Heiko Pleines**, *University of Bremen*
 Prof. **Richard Sakwa**, *University of Kent at Canterbury*
 Dr. **Sarah Whitmore**, *Oxford Brookes University*
 Dr. **Harald Wydra**, *University of Cambridge*

SOCIETY, CLASS & ETHNICITY

Col. **David Glantz**, *“Journal of Slavic Military Studies”*
 Dr. **Marlène Laruelle**, *George Washington University*
 Dr. **Stephen Shulman**, *Southern Illinois University*

POLITICAL ECONOMY & PUBLIC POLICY

Prof. em. **Marshall Goldman**, *Wellesley College, Mass.*
 Dr. **Andreas Goldthau**, *Central European University*
 Dr. **Robert Kravchuk**, *University of North Carolina*
 Dr. **David Lane**, *University of Cambridge*
 Dr. **Carol Leonard**, *Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
 Dr. **Maria Popova**, *McGill University, Montreal*

ADVISORY BOARD*

Prof. **Dominique Arel**, *University of Ottawa*
 Prof. **Jörg Baberowski**, *Humboldt University of Berlin*
 Prof. **Margarita Balmaceda**, *Seton Hall University*
 Dr. **John Barber**, *University of Cambridge*
 Prof. **Timm Beichelt**, *European University Viadrina*
 Dr. **Katrin Boeckh**, *University of Munich*
 Prof. em. **Archie Brown**, *University of Oxford*
 Dr. **Vyacheslav Bryukhovetsky**, *Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*
 Prof. **Timothy Colton**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*
 Prof. **Paul D’Anieri**, *University of Florida*
 Dr. **Heike Dörrenbächer**, *Friedrich Naumann Foundation*
 Dr. **John Dunlop**, *Hoover Institution, Stanford, California*
 Dr. **Sabine Fischer**, *SWP, Berlin*
 Dr. **Geir Flikke**, *NUPI, Oslo*
 Prof. **David Galbreath**, *University of Aberdeen*
 Prof. **Alexander Galkin**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
 Prof. **Frank Golczewski**, *University of Hamburg*
 Dr. **Nikolas Gvosdev**, *Naval War College, Newport, RI*
 Prof. **Mark von Hagen**, *Arizona State University*
 Dr. **Guido Hausmann**, *University of Munich*
 Prof. **Dale Herspring**, *Kansas State University*
 Dr. **Stefani Hoffman**, *Hebrew University of Jerusalem*
 Prof. **Mikhail Ilyin**, *MGIMO (U) MID RF, Moscow*
 Prof. **Vladimir Kantor**, *Higher School of Economics*
 Dr. **Ivan Katchanovski**, *University of Ottawa*
 Prof. em. **Andrzej Korbonski**, *University of California*
 Dr. **Iris Kempe**, *“Caucasus Analytical Digest”*
 Prof. **Herbert Küpper**, *Institut für Ostrecht Regensburg*
 Dr. **Rainer Lindner**, *CEEER, Berlin*
 Dr. **Vladimir Malakhov**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*

FOREIGN POLICY & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Dr. **Peter Duncan**, *University College London*
 Prof. **Andreas Heinemann-Grüder**, *University of Bonn*
 Dr. **Taras Kuzio**, *Johns Hopkins University*
 Prof. **Gerhard Mangott**, *University of Innsbruck*
 Dr. **Diana Schmidt-Pfister**, *University of Konstanz*
 Dr. **Lisbeth Tarlow**, *Harvard University, Cambridge*
 Dr. **Christian Wipperfürth**, *N-Ost Network, Berlin*
 Dr. **William Zimmerman**, *University of Michigan*
HISTORY, CULTURE & THOUGHT
 Dr. **Catherine Andreyev**, *University of Oxford*
 Prof. **Mark Bassin**, *Södertörn University*
 Prof. **Karsten Brüggemann**, *Tallinn University*
 Dr. **Alexander Etkind**, *University of Cambridge*
 Dr. **Gasan Gusejnov**, *Moscow State University*
 Prof. em. **Walter Laqueur**, *Georgetown University*
 Prof. **Leonid Luks**, *Catholic University of Eichstaett*
 Dr. **Olga Malinova**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
 Prof. **Andrei Rogatchevski**, *University of Tromsø*
 Dr. **Mark Tauger**, *West Virginia University*

Dr. **Luke March**, *University of Edinburgh*
 Prof. **Michael McFaul**, *Stanford University, Palo Alto*
 Prof. **Birgit Menzel**, *University of Mainz-Germersheim*
 Prof. **Valery Mikhailenko**, *The Urals State University*
 Prof. **Emil Pain**, *Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
 Dr. **Oleg Podvintsev**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
 Prof. **Olga Popova**, *St. Petersburg State University*
 Dr. **Alex Pravda**, *University of Oxford*
 Dr. **Erik van Ree**, *University of Amsterdam*
 Dr. **Joachim Rogall**, *Robert Bosch Foundation Stuttgart*
 Prof. **Peter Rutland**, *Wesleyan University, Middletown*
 Prof. **Marat Salikov**, *The Urals State Law Academy*
 Dr. **Gwendolyn Sasse**, *University of Oxford*
 Prof. **Jutta Scherrer**, *EHESS, Paris*
 Prof. **Robert Service**, *University of Oxford*
 Mr. **James Sherr**, *RIIA Chatham House London*
 Dr. **Oxana Shevel**, *Tufts University, Medford*
 Prof. **Eberhard Schneider**, *University of Siegen*
 Prof. **Olexander Shnyrkov**, *Shevchenko University, Kyiv*
 Prof. **Hans-Henning Schröder**, *SWP, Berlin*
 Prof. **Yuri Shapoval**, *Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*
 Prof. **Viktor Shnirelman**, *Russian Academy of Sciences*
 Dr. **Lisa Sundstrom**, *University of British Columbia*
 Dr. **Philip Walters**, *“Religion, State and Society”, Oxford*
 Dr. **Zenon Wasyliv**, *Ithaca College, New York State*
 Dr. **Lucan Way**, *University of Toronto*
 Dr. **Markus Wehner**, *“Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung”*
 Dr. **Andrew Wilson**, *University College London*
 Prof. **Jan Zielonka**, *University of Oxford*
 Prof. **Andrei Zorin**, *University of Oxford*

* While the Editorial Committee and Advisory Board support the General Editor in the choice and improvement of manuscripts for publication, responsibility for remaining errors and misinterpretations in the series' volumes lies with the books' authors.

Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society (SPPS)

ISSN 1614-3515

Founded in 2004 and refereed since 2007, SPPS makes available affordable English-, German-, and Russian-language studies on the history of the countries of the former Soviet bloc from the late Tsarist period to today. It publishes between 5 and 20 volumes per year and focuses on issues in transitions to and from democracy such as economic crisis, identity formation, civil society development, and constitutional reform in CEE and the NIS. SPPS also aims to highlight so far understudied themes in East European studies such as right-wing radicalism, religious life, higher education, or human rights protection. The authors and titles of all previously published volumes are listed at the end of this book. For a full description of the series and reviews of its books, see www.ibidem-verlag.de/red/spps.

Editorial correspondence & manuscripts should be sent to: Dr. Andreas Umland, Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, vul. Volodymyrska 42, off. 21, UA-01030 Kyiv, Ukraine

Business correspondence & review copy requests should be sent to: *ibidem* Press, Leuschnerstr. 40, 30457 Hannover, Germany; tel.: +49 511 2622200; fax: +49 511 2622201; spps@ibidem.eu.

Authors, reviewers, referees, and editors for (as well as all other persons sympathetic to) SPPS are invited to join its networks at www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=52638198614
www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=103012
www.xing.com/net/spps-ibidem-verlag/

Recent Volumes

- 167 *Oksana Kim*
The Effects and Implications of Kazakhstan's Adoption of International Financial Reporting Standards
A Resource Dependence Perspective
With a foreword by Svetlana Vlady
ISBN 978-3-8382-0987-6
- 168 *Anna Sanina*
Patriotic Education in Contemporary Russia
Sociological Studies in the Making of the Post-Soviet Citizen
With a foreword by Anna Oldfield
ISBN 978-3-8382-0993-7
- 169 *Rudolf Wolters*
Spezialist in Sibirien
Faksimile der 1933 erschienenen ersten Ausgabe
Mit einem Vorwort von Dmitrij Chmelniczki
ISBN 978-3-8382-0515-1
- 170 *Michal Vit, Magdalena M. Baran (eds.)*
Transregional versus National Perspectives on Contemporary Central European History
Studies on the Building of Nation-States and Their Cooperation in the 20th and 21st Century
With a foreword by Petr Vágner
ISBN 978-3-8382-1015-5
- 171 *Philip Gamaghelyan*
Conflict Resolution Beyond the International Relations Paradigm
Evolving Designs as a Transformative Practice in Nagorno-Karabakh and Syria
With a foreword by Susan Allen
ISBN 978-3-8382-1057-5
- 172 *Maria Shagina*
Joining a Prestigious Club
Cooperation with Europarties and Its Impact on Party Development in Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine 2004–2015
With a foreword by Kataryna Wolczuk
ISBN 978-3-8382-1084-1
- 173 *Alexandra Cotofana, James M. Nyce (eds.)*
Religion and Magic in Socialist and Post-Socialist Contexts II
Baltic, Eastern European, and Post-USSR Case Studies
With a foreword by Anita Stasulane
ISBN 978-3-8382-0990-6

Alexandra Cotofana, James M. Nyce (eds.)

**RELIGION AND MAGIC IN
SOCIALIST AND POST-SOCIALIST
CONTEXTS II**

Historic and Ethnographic Case Studies of
Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy, and Alternative
Spirituality

With a foreword by Anita Stasulane

ibidem-Verlag
Stuttgart

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Cover picture: © Aziz Fatnassi. Reprint with kind permission.

∞

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem, säurefreiem Papier
Printed on acid-free paper

ISSN: 1614-3515

ISBN-13: 978-3-8382-0990-6

© *ibidem*-Verlag
Stuttgart 2017

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und elektronische Speicherformen sowie die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher. Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

Printed in the EU

Contents

Anita Stasulane

Foreword: Religion and Magic behind the Iron Curtain 9

James M. Nyce, Alexandra Coțofană

Introduction..... 21

Larisa Jasarevic

**Science of the ‘Almost Marvelous’: Storytelling Bees
among (Non)Moderns 37**

Zlatina Bogdanova

**The Heritagization of “Kalinitza” feast in Assenovgrad,
Post-socialist Bulgaria: A Case of Syncretism between
Paganism and Christianity..... 71**

Sibelan Forrester

Lingering Orality in the Contemporary Russian Zagovor..... 91

Gabriel Girigan

**Conversion to Pentecostalism and the “Rudari” Community
from Filiași in the Context of Romanian Post-Socialism 115**

Reet Hiimäe

Magic in Soviet and Post-Soviet Estonia..... 135

Danijela Jerotijević

**Trust and Credibility of Folk-healers and other Magical
Agents in Contemporary Serbia 161**

Iveta Leitane

**From Tartu Semiotics to Enlightened Magic: Transformations
within Scholarly Discourse in Latvia during the Transition
from Socialism to Post-Socialism 189**

René Provis

Spiritual Hybridity and Religion in Post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan .. 213

Ioana Repciuc

**Getting into the Spirit of the Season: Winter Customs
between Magic and Religion in Rural Romania 245**

James M. Nyce, Alexandra Coțofană, and Jessica Pollock

**The Moral and Ontological Ambiguity of a Borderland: Identity,
Magic, and Witchcraft in Bucovina, Northern Romania 281**

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the contributors to the volume and the authors of the volumes' prefaces, Patrick Michelson, Associate Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at Indiana University Bloomington and Anita Stasulane, Director of the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences at Daugavpils University in Latvia. We also wish to thank the *ibidem*-Verlag *Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society* Series editor Andreas Umland and Valerie Lange for their assistance, advice, and enthusiasm. We wish to thank Aziz Fatnassi for the cover art of both volumes.

Foreword:

Religion and Magic behind the Iron Curtain

Anita Stasulane

This volume explores perspectives and foundational issues, and their implications in the study of religion and magic in socialist and post-socialist contexts. As religion in the former Soviet Union is usually interpreted as “a uniquely post-atheist phenomenon, [but it is] inseparably linked with the Soviet past” (Menzel 2013, 269), in the following pages I would like to discuss what the religious policies were in the USSR and how religion and magic were able to survive under the Soviet regime.

After WWII, a specific political and cultural situation developed in Europe, which directly impacted religion, as well as other areas of life. German National Socialism was defeated in 1945, which freed Western European countries, but many Central European nations, the Baltic States and Eastern Europe ended up under communist regimes. Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which were already occupied by the Soviet army in 1940, remained part of the USSR, while Central European and Eastern European countries (Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria) became part of the Soviet sphere of influence. The Communist Party in each of these countries became the sole political formation to govern, all parties adopting Marxism-Leninism. Behind the Iron Curtain, religion was framed as a relic of the past and an opium-like escape for the poor from economic misery and oppression. As late as the 1980s, scientific atheism in USSR universities taught antiquated theories about the evolution of religion: religion progressed through various evolutionary stages of development, beginning with the most primitive expression (animism), while subsequent development found expression in ancestor worship,

polytheism, and finally in monotheism. Monotheism was postulated as the belief in a masculine, paternal deity developed with the rise of *patriarchal* culture.

In order to eradicate religion, the Communists first repressed the leaders of religious organizations and the most active members of congregations. How this was implemented can be shown through a specific example: In Latvia (1944–1965), there were two authorities responsible for religious matters: (1) the Council Representative for the Affairs of Religious Cults and (2) the Council Representative for Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Council for Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church was created in 1943. Because other Christian denominations and religions (Judaism, Islam and Buddhism) also operated in the territory of the USSR, the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults was created in May 1944. In nearly every Soviet republic (except the Armenian SSR), the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults was established, subordinating separate institutions. (Krūmiņa-Koņkova 2015)

Because the USSR cared, to some extent, about its image in the eyes of Western democracies, the main goal of the communists' religious policy was to create the illusion of religious freedom (Spasov 1951). Consequently, the communists decided not to close religious organizations, but to tightly control them and to ban the creation of underground religious groups (Talonen 1997). The representatives of the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults operated in the Soviet republics according to a single instruction issued in early 1945, which indicated that the representative was to inform the government about religious cults and their position and activities within each republic; to provide opinions on issues related to the operations of religious organizations; to monitor correct implementation of Soviet legislation; to carry out record-keeping and registration of operating religious associations and groups, churches, houses of worship, as well as clerics. The Government Commission for KGB Research conducted these investigations. The instruction was secret, which is why it was forbidden to refer to it in the representatives' discussions with clergy and all reports, letters, or any

other kinds of documents from the representative mentioning the instructions, were also kept secret (Krūmiņa-Koņkova 2015). The representatives' discussions with clergy had to be secret as well: when various organizational issues were established, the provision of any written directions, *memoria* or instructions was also forbidden, meaning there would be no material evidence of the state interfering in the internal affairs of the religious organization. This in turn implied that the separation of state and religion would be kept in place long after occupation.

The activities of the Church were controlled, information on the political views of priests and their activities during the Nazi occupation were collected, and this evidence was used to identify priests who were seen as anti-Soviet elements. In 1949, each congregations and clergy member in Latvia was been registered by the regime. Each priest was tracked through a personal file, which contained information on his activities: a form with important biographical information, their life story, complaints, various proceedings, references, and press publications which were usually meant to reveal a priest's vices, anti-Soviet sentiments and other compromising information. The intent here was to help discredit an anti-Soviet priest in front of their congregation and society, which was often aided through publishing defamatory articles about them in the national press. These practices were an attempt to cleanse clergy of "anti-Soviet elements", and continued until the death of Stalin (1953). The post-Stalin Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR eventually issued an amnesty decree. This allowed many sentenced individuals to be released from detention, to have their sentences reduced by half, their criminal records erased, the restrictions on their rights revoked, or their criminal procedures terminated. The amnesty did not apply to those who had been sentenced to five years or more for counter-revolutionary crimes, so it often did not apply to clergy or political prisoners.

The attitude towards religion did not change when Nikita Khrushchev came to power (1894–1971) or under the *Khrushchev*

Thaw (1950s to 1960s). The only thing that changed were the methods by which the Soviet authorities tried to eliminate the Church's influence on society: physical violence against clergy was mostly replaced with psychological intimidation and propaganda campaigns. Regardless of the difficult post-war Soviet economy and the arrest of many clerics, as part of the attempt of Soviet authorities to repress religion, the work of the largest Christian denominations and various religious organizations continued. The Communist Party's decree *On Large-Scale Deficiencies in Scientific Atheist Propaganda and on Measures for its Improvement* (1954) documented the fact that the activities of the Church and various religious sects had increased and so did the number of USSR citizens who carried out religious rituals (Krūmiņa-Konkova 2015). The Communist Party instructed Komsomol, trade unions and educational institutions to undertake "anti-religious work", and to systematically and steadily re-educate believers individually. It should be emphasized that this was not a short-term campaign, but a systematically implemented long-term policy meant to control, if not eradicate, religion. To help ensure this, Latvia, for example, issued a decree entitled *On Regulation of "The Introduction of Soviet Traditions and the Fulfilment of Legislation by Religious Cult Control Committees" approval* (1964) – meant to form special administrative boards and executive committees in every town, district and village. Their task was to establish new Soviet traditions, thus discrediting older traditions, and to supervise how Soviet legislation on religious cults was implemented locally (Krūmiņa-Konkova 2015). According to the decree, these local administrative committees had to control whether religious organizations, clerics and functionaries were implementing Soviet legislation on religious cults, and had to oversee how community organizations, cultural and educational institutions were implementing anti-religious propaganda.

As it became apparent that religion could not be eradicated through repression or anti-religious campaigns, communists changed religious policies. In other words, there was an attempt to use religion to the advantage of the Soviet regime, as Westerners

trusted clerics more than Soviet diplomats and functionaries. In order for this to happen, they needed to have people loyal to the Soviet authorities in key positions within the Church—new clerics raised within the Soviet system who were interested in career opportunities, who could then be used not solely for disinformation, but also for recruiting and espionage especially among the émigré communities. Clerics agreed to collaborate with the KGB for practical considerations: this opened up the opportunity to go on foreign trips, to study theology in the West or to serve larger congregations. A refusal to collaborate with the KGB would often mean the end of a career.

The Soviet regime tried to restrict the number of believers not just through repression, but also through placing a heavy tax burden on congregations and issuing laws that banned religious activity. How was it possible to practice religion under these circumstances? The readers should bear in mind that there were national differences within the Soviet sphere of influence. For example, in Poland and Lithuania, Roman Catholics practiced religion actively, while in Russia, the Orthodox Christians were re-educated in atheism, at least in part, or intimidated. The situation in different denominations could vary even within the same country. For example, in Latvia, the communists desacralized mainly Protestant (Lutheran, Baptist, Adventist and Methodist) churches, setting up clubs, sports halls, warehouses, grain drying-kilns and shops within them, whereas services continued to be held in the majority of the Roman Catholic and Christian Orthodox churches. The church was the only place where the clergy were allowed to preach, and only during services. Religious education in schools was not allowed: in Soviet Latvia, the Criminal Code (1945–1990) prescribed criminal liability for teaching religion to people under 18. On Sundays, during church services, local Communist activists often arrived to check who was attending church. If a minor was observing the mass, the school was informed and teachers had to undertake further measures on atheist education. As a result, the family became the only place for passing on religious traditions and religious

holidays were observed secretly only within a restricted, trusted circle of relatives. This applied not only to Christians, but also to all other religions. In fact, the battle of the Soviet regime against religion achieved its virtual elimination from the public sphere.

Compared to institutionalized religion, religious movements operated underground, and were, therefore, more difficult to identify and control. Esoteric groups (Masons, Spiritualists, Theosophists, Anthroposophists etc.), had activated, prior to the Bolshevik Revolution (1917) in Russia, as branches of the Western European esoteric movement or had collaborated closely with Western European groups. Esoteric groups became equally isolated during the Soviet years and had a hard time operating in states where the esoteric raised suspicion (Burmistrov 2012, 52). Esotericists continued to gather in small groups and worked mostly with oral esoteric traditions, as publishing esoteric texts was too dangerous, and access to esoteric literature published in the pre-Soviet period was restricted, even with the *Samizdat* activities (Samizdat publications were secretly written, copied and circulated literature). For this reason, little is known about esotericism in the areas of Soviet influence after WWII, with the only historical sources being memoirs published after the fall of the Berlin Wall, and KGB documents.

Despite warring atheism, the USSR society did not become less religious, but *differently* religious: “Soviet civilization defined itself as a purely rational society, yet its cult of the rational was taken to such an extreme that one could talk of it in terms of a *rationalistic religion*” (Menzel 2013, 270). Even so, the 1960s marked the rejection of rationalism, with artists manifesting strongly against it—but the rejection was also visible in everyday life, which the Soviet regime was less able to control than other spheres. Interest in Eastern religions, UFO-logy, attempts to contact departed spirits, experimentation with drugs and efforts to expand consciousness, all conflicted with the official Soviet ideology and facilitated the development of an esoteric underground. In the attempts to create a monolithic and easily controllable Soviet society, the

communists exploited the concept of collectivism. Meanwhile, individualism dominated within the esoteric underground groups. *Spiritual* dissidents turned inwards, guided by individualism, and dismissed external authority, showing preference for internal experiences. Even though the USSR had a different socio-political system than Western countries, *spiritual* processes were similar. Even behind the Iron Curtain, there were obvious turns towards the individualization of religion (Jagodzinski 1995), rejections of traditional authority (the Church), and personal searches for spiritual experience with an emphasis on free will. The paradox was that consumer culture (a characteristic of Western countries), and the culture of fear (which dominated in the spheres of Soviet influence), had one thing in common: the rejection of materialism. On both sides of the Iron Curtain, post-material (Inglehart 1990) values emphasizing self-expression, subjectivity and individual experience came to the fore, replacing the material values which ensured the basic necessities of life. Post-materialism created a fertile ground for esotericism, which offered “personal empowerment, metamorphosis, and liberation through illuminated knowledge (gnosis), and, as such, the developing of one’s potential as a human being in relation to the cosmos” (Patridge 2013, 115).

The esotericism, which dominated the USSR’s spiritual underground, interested the elites, mainly artists and intellectuals, but did not appeal to broader societal strata. However, even those who did not consider themselves to be *spiritual* dissidents and accepted Communist ideology, strived for *primal experiences*: dreams, visions, voices, tongues, magical healing, a sense of divine presence, notions of destiny, fate, sightings of ghosts, inexplicable spiritual phenomena, i.e., “unexpected vivid encounters that are considered to be other than normal” (Hexham, Poewe 1997, 59). These experiences allowed contact with the supernatural, creating changes in attitudes towards the material world, and turning towards the discovery of the unseen world. In this way, the existing elements of once traditional or folk religion were also reborn and gained more importance, especially a concern with ancestors, spirits and magical

healing. Those who experienced the collapse of the Soviet regime may still remember the hugely healing sessions, of Anatoly Kashpirovsky (Born 1939), broadcast on Moscow television and throughout the USSR. The post-Soviet boom in healers in the early 1990s provided evidence that spiritual transformation and healing were one important focus for citizens of the ex-USSR. The heightened interest in the spiritual aspects of health, healing and spiritual transformation continues to characterize post-Soviet society. Some social scientists saw this emphasis on spirituality as a source of stability in people's lives, an opportunity to maintain social solidarity and a way of maintaining a sense of meaning and identity in difficult times. However, spirituality has another aspect—it includes personal and individual transformation, which has attracted the attention of psychologists (Westernik 2013). The spiritual transformation phenomenon has also gained the interest of other social scientists (Snow, Machalek 1984; York 1995; O'Sullivan 2012), and post-socialist countries are ideal for such studies.

Yoga and healing movements were another way that Soviet citizens sought spiritual transformation. Yoga became popular in the 1970s as a means of developing personal abilities, but had to be practiced in secret. At the same time, articles about yoga as a way of maintaining one's health through physical exercises were published in popular science magazines. Healers, mainly women, practiced folk healing methods, which also included chants and magic, that often had been passed down from generation to generation. During the Soviet period, healers had to operate in secret. The Latvian word *vārdotājs* translates not only as a performer of ritual magic but also one who is able to achieve the desired result with the assistance of spells. This magical figure works similarly to a magician, fortune-teller, oracle or witch. During the Soviet era, these healers operated mainly in the countryside and their passing down of traditions were largely confined to the realm of the oral. In the post-Soviet period, healers have begun to work in urban areas and to advertise themselves as psychics or fortune-tellers. Folk beliefs and practices commonly classed as 'magic' were deeply rooted in

Baltic, Central European and Eastern European cultures, which meant they were able to survive the period of the Soviet regime and to flourish after its collapse. While some 20th century research claims that religion and magic are declining (Wilson 1966, Thomas 1971, Bruce 1995), 21st century sociologists and researchers of religion have rejected this claim (Stark and Finke 2000, Harrison 2008, Warner 2010), especially in areas that were once dominated by Soviet ideology. In explaining how magic survived the “disenchantment” of the world, Wouter J. Hanegraaff concluded that practices traditionally classed as ‘magic’ have always been relied upon and that the spontaneous human tendency of participation in these traditions is part of human nature (Hanegraaff 2003:378).

The collapse of the USSR opened Central Europe, the Baltics and Eastern Europe to outside influences and enabled the transmission of new forms of religion and magic. Based on extensive historical and ethnographic research, this volume uses a variety of theoretical perspectives and methodologies to examine different forms of religious expression in Bosnia, Bulgaria, Russia, Romania, Estonia, Serbia, Latvia and Kyrgyzstan. The freedom of religious expression is a novelty in societies suppressed for fifty years or more by repressive regime, and these societies are currently experiencing an interest in non-conventional forms of religiosity and spiritual expression.

The opening article of Larisa Jasarevic explores recent and current enchantment with and devotion to *Apis mellifera*: she focuses on two practitioners of phyto- and api-therapy and argues that investigating what is magical about bees in popular science is worthwhile. The paper of Zlatina Bogdanova discusses the transformations of a local tradition: the feast originated in the Greek neighborhoods as a commemoration of the heroic death of a young bride has been continued by a Bulgarian community. Next, Sibelan Forrester explores the ways in which traditional culture and authority can be experienced and imagined in post-modernity: she shows that Russians still believe in the effects of *zagovory* and de-

scribes the contribution that folk genres have made to popular culture. Gabriel Girigan explores the evolution of magical practices and religion during the socialist and post-socialist times: he discusses specifically to the conversion to Pentecostalism of a Roma minority. Reet Hiimäe's paper on magic in Soviet and post-Soviet Estonia illustrates how magic provides a subjective sense of safety and hope over time. Danijela Jerotijević reflects on beliefs in supernatural harm in contemporary Serbia: she shows that representations of a person with supernatural abilities are complex and depend on various psychological and social dimensions. Iveta Leitane's essay on transformations within scholarly discourse in Latvia during the transition from socialism to post-socialism takes up question on the interplay of scholarship, politics, the religious search after the Soviet collapse, and underground resistance in the 1980s. René Provis' chapter addresses contemporary expressions of religious and quasi-magical ritual practices in Kyrgyzstan: his argument on the spiritual hybridity reflected in *bata* (white or good blessings) practices helps us move beyond the political and security-centred analyses that have dominated contemporary studies in the region. Ioana Repciuc focuses on the differences between religion as prescribed and religion as practiced as they are expressed in the traditional celebration of winter holidays in contemporary Romania. The closing chapter, by James M. Nyce, Alexandra Coțofană and Jessica Pollock, returns to issues related to magic and witchcraft as the authors raise questions about the role witchcraft has in Romania today. Each of these studies brings up the complex role of magic, witchcraft and magical figures in communist regimes during and after the Cold War. The volume presents a number of fascinating studies on magic in socialist and post-socialist contexts and raises some interesting questions for anthropological research in the Central Europe, the Baltics and the Eastern Europe.