



Stanislaw Grodź  
Sebastian M. Michael  
Roger Schroeder [Eds.]

# Giants' Footprints

90th Anniversary of Anthropos Institute  
(1931–2021)



Collectanea Instituti Anthropos | 53

Stanisław Grodź  
Sebastian M. Michael  
Roger Schroeder [Eds.]



## Giants' Footprints

90th Anniversary of Anthropos Institute  
(1931–2021)



ACADEMIA

© Coverpicture: Montage, Nomos Verlag

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

ISBN 978-3-98572-014-9 (Print)  
978-3-98572-015-6 (ePDF)

**British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-98572-014-9 (Print)  
978-3-98572-015-6 (ePDF)

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Grodź, Stanisław | Michael, Sebastian M. | Schroeder, Roger  
Giants' Footprints

90th Anniversary of Anthropos Institute (1931–2021)

Stanisław Grodź | Sebastian M. Michael | Roger Schroeder (Eds.)

358 pp.

Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-98572-014-9 (Print)  
978-3-98572-015-6 (ePDF)



Onlineversion  
Nomos eLibrary

1st Edition 2021

© Academia Verlag within Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden, Germany 2021.  
Overall responsibility for manufacturing (printing and production) lies with Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers. Under § 54 of the German Copyright Law where copies are made for other than private use a fee is payable to “Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort”, Munich.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Nomos or the editors.

Visit our website  
[academia-verlag.de](http://academia-verlag.de)

# Table of Contents

Introduction	9
<i>Stanisław Grodź and S.M. Michael</i>	

## ***Part 1 Historical Context and Foundations***

Anthropos Institute – An Institution in the Background	17
<i>Stanisław Grodź</i>	

The Significant Collaborators of Wilhelm Schmidt (before 1931)	39
<i>Joachim G. Piepke</i>	

<i>Anthropos</i> – A Journal that Introduced a Missionary Order into the Curious World of Academia	81
<i>Darius J. Piwowarczyk</i>	

<i>Urmonotheismus</i> – again	119
<i>Thomas Bargatzky</i>	

## ***Part 2 Local Outreach from the Beginning to the Present***

The Anthropos Institute in Japan	143
<i>Robert Kisala</i>	

The Contribution of Stephen Fuchs and the Institute of Indian Culture, Mumbai, and other Branch Institutes in India	153
<i>Bernd Pflug, in collaboration with S.M. Michael</i>	

The Institute “Anthropos do Brasil”	169
<i>Joachim G. Piepke</i>	

*Table of Contents*

The Tamale Institute of Cross-Cultural Studies (TICCS) and the  
Anthropos Tradition of the SVD in Ghana 183

*A. Joshua Gariba*

The Melanesian Institute of Papua New Guinea and the Anthropos  
Tradition 189

*Philip Gibbs*

***Part 3 Current Projects, Methodologies, and Perspectives***

Anthropos Institute International and Interculturality 197

*Roger Schroeder*

Medical Anthropology and Mission: Health, Well-Being, and  
Pastoral Ministry among Resettled Karenni Refugees in Omaha 207

*Alexander Rödlach with Hsaw Reh and Hugh Truempi*

Anthropos Institute and Studies in Early Music from South America 223

*Piotr Nawrot*

Jesus Christ and Krishna. Salvation Stories of Kalamkari  
Iconography 233

*Othmar Gächter*

A Study of the Y-Chromosome Lineage Markers among the Austro-  
Asiatic Speaking Khasi of East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya, India 253

*Bhaskar Das*

Kakure Kirishitan Survivors and Kirishitan Shrine Festivals in Japan:  
Some Ethnographic Research Perspectives 265

*Roger Vanzila Mumsi*

Migration from Rural to Urban Areas and the Shifting of  
Anthropological Object 279

*Jacek Jan Pawlik*

The Practical and Ethical Challenges of Doing Research on Land Conflicts in Ghana: Perspectives from Anthropology <i>A. Joshua Gariba</i>	289
Anthropos Institute: An Outsider's View <i>Michael A. Rynkiewich</i>	307
Conclusion <i>Roger Schroeder</i>	321
 <b><i>Appendices</i></b>  	
The AI membership <i>Stanisław Grodź</i>	327
Members of the Anthropos Institute	329
The members' list in alphabetical order	347
Editors-in-Chief of <i>Anthropos</i> (1906–2020)	349
Directors of the Anthropos Institute (1931–2001) and Coordinators of Anthropos Institute International with their Councillors (2001– 2021)	355



## Introduction

*Stanisław Grodź and S.M. Michael*

The articles collected in this book focus on Anthropos Institute – the institution that has remained long in the shadow of its founder – Wilhelm Schmidt – and of the journal *Anthropos*. The journal was in its 26<sup>th</sup> year of publication when the Institute was formally established at St Gabriel’s Mission House of the Society of the Divine Word (SVD) in Mödling near Vienna at the end of 1931. The publication of the journal has been the Institute’s priority from its very inception. Both the journal and the Institute have always functioned as the endeavours of the Society of the Divine Word (SVD), a Roman Catholic missionary order founded by Arnold Janssen in 1875.

Ninety years of existence makes no obvious occasion for celebration. We take it rather as an opportunity for casting a glance into the past in order to understand better where we have come from, where we are, and to consider where we want to go in the future.

As Schmidt wrote, the Institute had not really been “created” or “founded”. It grew naturally out of the group of Schmidt’s collaborators who devoted their talents, passions and time to publishing the journal (Schmidt 1932). The introduction to the first Statutes also underlines the fact that the name “Institute” had been ascribed to the group of editors of the journal from outside (by the SVD Generalate) and did not come from the group itself.

During its ninety years of existence, the Institute was located in three places – at the SVD Sankt Gabriel’s House in Mödling near Vienna (until 1938), at Chateau de Froideville, a house near Posieux by Fribourg in Switzerland (1939–1961) and at the SVD house in Sankt Augustin near Bonn in Germany (since 1962). These relocations were not particularly sharp watershed moments as the Institute has always functioned within the structures of the Society of the Divine Word and continuously focused on publishing the journal *Anthropos*.



Securing the regular publication of the journal and the adjacent book series<sup>1</sup> was the main purpose of giving the editorial group a more formal structure. It did not bind, though, the members of the core editorial group to exclusively one residence. Even before 1938, some of them drifted away to other locations (e.g. Koppers to Vienna). Not all the members were happy about the relocation of the Institute to Switzerland (e.g. Schebesta, after his return from fieldwork, used the first opportunity to return to Mödling and Vienna. Koppers had to wait until the end of the war but immediately after, he was back in Vienna. Burgmann was also not all the time present in the house by Posieux).

We could also talk about the fourth relocation that was not geographical but virtual in the sense that the Institute was to develop into a worldwide network of scholars, maintaining its earlier headquarters as the publishing centre of the Institute (for more details on the history of the Institute see the article by Grodź in this volume). That “relocation” into the virtual world, although formally accepted, has not still taken place fully. Perhaps, the step was taken too early, or not at the right moment, or does this “relocation” just need more time and attention for further development?

The formalisation of the structure of the early editorial group did not prevent the Institute’s members from undertaking exploratory journeys with long fieldwork periods and/or researching topics, they found particularly pertinent. The activities of the members of the Institute have been dedicated to researching the culture of people among whom the Christian missionaries, especially the SVDs, were active. A part of the research was also conducted in order to contribute to Schmidt’s theory of the genesis of the idea of God. However, some of the researchers, e.g. Paul Schebesta, did not always agree with Schmidt’s deliberations drawn from the submitted material. The goal of doing research was expressed with a strong emphasis on “searching for the truth” in order to understand the other culture and not so much as “developing tools” for missionary work, i.e. finding “shortcuts for converting” the others. The Institute – although clearly named as supporting the missionary work of the SVD and despite Schmidt’s apologetic goals – tried not to be engaged in any purely theological projects. A struggle to show a firm standing within the social sciences was strong-

---

1 Schmidt started two monograph series – an ethnological one in 1909 and a linguistic one in 1914. Thirty-one volumes were published altogether. In 1950, both series were combined into one named *Studia Instituti Anthropos*. Fifty-nine volumes appeared until 2021. Still another series – *Collectanea Instituti Anthropos* – was started in 1967 with fifty-two volumes published until 2021.

ly underlined. How successful that has been is not for us to judge. In examining the list of the Institute's members (cf. Appendix 1), one notices that for a few initial decades all of them had doctorates in ethnology or linguistics and not theology (when the latter was the case, they had a second doctorate in social sciences). The emphasis on engaging in basic research in fieldwork (*Grundlagenforschung*) was strong, although Schmidt himself remained "an armchair scholar". There were opinions expressed that the admittance of theologians/missiologists to the Institute would diminish the initial demand of doing the fieldwork (cf. Piepke 2005: 189–190). However, it should be noted that a number of those belonging to the "old group of members" never conducted fieldwork, while a number of members doing their studies within the faculties/departments of theology, missiology or the study of religion did study social/cultural anthropology and conduct fieldwork as a helping tool in substantiating their hypotheses.

The title of the book requires a few words of explanation. Over thirty years ago, Ernest Brandewie published his book *When Giants Walked the Earth. The Life and Times of Wilhelm Schmidt SVD* (Fribourg 1990). Although the title ends with a full stop, it can be taken as an open-ended sentence that one could finish in various ways. "When giants walked the Earth... they left footprints" is one of the possibilities. Hence the title of the current volume. Anthropos Institute is a "footprint" of Wilhelm Schmidt, the giant that laid its foundations and shaped its beginning. In a way, this title is also a tribute to the late Ernest Brandewie on whose life Wilhelm Schmidt left his footprint, too.

The contents of the book are divided into three parts: "Historical Context and Foundations", "Local Outreach from the Beginning to the Present" and "Current Projects, Methodologies, and Perspectives". The Appendices contain three lists: of all the members of the Institute, of the directors and coordinators of the Institute, and of the editors-in-chief of the journal. Part I consists of four contributions covering the history of the Institute (Grodź), the presentation of the early collaborators of Wilhelm Schmidt (Piepke), the insider's view on the development of the journal *Anthropos* (Piwowarczyk) and a new take on Schmidt's concept of original monotheism (Bargatzky). Part II is composed of five contributions on the local outreach of the Institute in Japan (Kisala), India (Pflug in collaboration with Michael), Brazil (Piepke), Ghana (Gariba) and Papua New Guinea (Gibbs). Part III contains nine articles. In the first eight, the authors report and/or reflect on their recent or current projects (Schroeder, Rödlach in collaboration with Reh and Truempi, Nawrot, Gächter, Das, Munsu, Pawlik, and Gariba). The last article in this section contains an outsider's view on the activities of the Institute (Rynkiewich).

Most of the authors are members of the Institute. The basic information on their scholarly standing can be found in the list of the Institute's members in the appendix to this volume. When writing on the Institute, they naturally present the insider's perspective. The volume, though intended to present such perspectives, could not be devoid of contributions from scholars presenting views from outside. Bernd Pflug, a long-time scholarly collaborator of the Institute of Indian Culture in Mumbai, who presented and assessed the input made by Stephen Fuchs SVD, masterly combines the perspectives of the insider and outsider in his contribution. We are grateful that he agreed to contribute to this volume. Our gratitude goes equally to Thomas Bargatzky, a retired professor of ethnology at Bayreuth University, a researcher in Samoa and the North-American south-west who focuses his work, among others, on issues of religion and myth, and to Michael A. Rynkiewich, a retired professor of anthropology in the School of Mission at Asbury Theological Seminary and a researcher in the Marshall Islands and Papua New Guinea, for their contributions to the volume. We also acknowledge with appreciation the work of Alexander Rödlach's collaborators in his article.

In the initial plan, the first section of the book was to contain a separate article on the scope and significance of Schmidt's work and another article that would assess the significance of the journal from the perspective of an outsider. However, we discovered that scholars who could write on Schmidt for various reasons were unable to do it for this volume.<sup>2</sup> The offer of Thomas Bargatzky, whom we had contacted on another matter, to submit an article on a re-examination of Schmidt's concept of *Urmonotheismus* came at the very right moment. We are grateful for it and publish his article with a hope of moving further the discussion he has reignited.

The other article on the journal – trimmed to a more moderate form of assessing the significance of some issues discussed in the journal – felt out due to difficulties linked to the Covid-19 pandemic situation. It is still to be written though, and we hope to possibly take it as starting point for another volume that would assess the significance of the journal from various perspectives and for various scholarly disciplines.

The second section on the local outreach of the Institute in various corners of the world could have contained more articles-reports but they still wait to be written (e.g. one on the CEEBA in Congo). Strictly speaking,

---

2 On the other hand, we have noticed a number of scholars who have engaged with various aspects of Schmidt's work and legacy – both academic and non-academic (Schmidt had been active on many levels of life).

the Institute “authorized” only three “formal” branches (in Japan, India and Brazil) but other enterprises sprang up in various countries “in the tradition of the Anthropos Institute”, although not always with a clear reference to it.

We are happy that our call for papers found a reasonably good response in the network of members who report on their research interests in the third section of the volume.

Our thanks go to all who encouraged and helped us at various stages of the preparation of the book. As is often the case, they are too many to be named. We keep them in grateful memory with the acknowledgment that most of our work would not have been possible without the help of our confreres, friends, collaborators, and critics.

### *Bibliography*

**Piepke, Joachim G.**

2005 The Anthropos Institute. *Verbum SVD* 46/2: 179–192

**Schmidt, Wilhelm**

1932 Die Errichtung des ‘Anthropos-Institutes’. *Anthropos* 27: 275–277.



**Part 1**  
**Historical Context and Foundations**



# Anthropos Institute – An Institution in the Background

*Stanisław Grodź*

For reasons already mentioned in the introduction to the volume, the Anthropos Institute (AI) has so far remained in the shadow of the journal *Anthropos*. After 90 years of existence, the time has come to put it more into the limelight and acquaint the readers with its history. The scope of the article allows only for an outline of the Institute's history.<sup>1</sup> Its full version, containing a more detailed description of events, is still to be written. Perhaps the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the AI will provide an ample occasion for that. The current outline is presented from an insider's perspective, i.e. by an AI member with an access to archival material. His is, though, also partly an "outsider's" perspective, because his insights into the history of the Institute were gained only recently.

The article will begin with a chronologically ordered outline of the major developments concerning the AI. The author will not refrain from his own comments in this section as presenting "facts only" would mean to put them in a form of a dull list. Besides some of these facts would still require an immediate comment or reference indicating their connectedness.<sup>2</sup> Then, the relationship of the AI to the SVD, the issue of the Institute's staff and the question of relevance of the AI for the SVD will be briefly addressed.

## *1 Chronological framework of the AI history*

Fritz Bornemann (1982: 216–217) pointed out that publication of the journal had been perceived internally and externally as a "self-standing endeavour" already around 1925. The SVD golden jubilee book contains an article "Das Anthropos-Unternehmen" by Wilhelm Koppers and presents

---

1 J. Piepke (2005: 64–72) treated briefly the Institute's early history. We both used basically the same sources.

2 Several people read a draft of this article and commented upon the contents. I am grateful for that. Of course, if the current version of the text contains any inaccuracies or mistakes, I alone carry the responsibility for that.



the editorial board of the journal *Anthropos* as a separate unit among the SVD Mission Houses and provinces, although formally no such unit existed (yet) (Koppers 1925). In addition, Wilhelm Schmidt's small portrait picture with the caption "Gründer und Leiter des 'Anthropos-Institut'" features on one of the inlay picture pages.<sup>3</sup>

The Anthropos Institute was founded at the SVD Sankt Gabriel House in Mödling near Vienna. Wilhelm Gier, the SVD Superior General at that time, signed the first Institute Statutes on 1 November 1931, and then on 19 December named Schmidt as the Institute's director (Bornemann 1982: 222; Piepke 2005: 66). Any confusion surrounding the foundation date of the Institute comes from the fact that the foundation only confirmed the already existing perception of the "Anthropos-Unternehmen" and reformulated the work that had been already carried-on, as Schmidt informed the readers of *Anthropos* in a short text published in the journal in 1932.<sup>4</sup> He explained further that the Institute was founded in order to provide and secure an institutional support for the publication of the journal. Schmidt needed more time to pursue the work on his theory. Other collaborators on the editorial board had their own obligations and interests, some undertook longer fieldwork in various parts of the world.<sup>5</sup>

According to Bornemann's account, there were problems with the location of the Institute. Several people had different opinions on the matter and there were various interests at play. A suitable house was searched for in Vienna but all in all the Institute remained at Sankt Gabriel, Mödling until the *Anschluss* of Austria into the Nazi German Third Reich.<sup>6</sup>

Schmidt was at odds with the Nazis already before the *Anschluss*, although the matter requires more explanation as there were many factors

---

3 Schmidt's picture features on the inlay page between pp. 48–49 (Fischer 1925). Dr. V. Wojciech, the bishop of Breslau, published an article on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the SVD in various German newspapers in 1925 in which he referred to "Anthropos Institute" (Bornemann 1982: 216).

4 Schmidt (1932: 276) did not give a clear date but used a phrase "im Laufe des vergangenen Jahres". Rahmann (1982: 657) writing on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the AI stated: "The Institute was never really *founded*: it merely grew out of a journal began by Father Wilhelm Schmidt 'for and by missionaries' a quarter of a century ago".

5 For further information on the division of responsibilities in the Institute – see the article by Piepke in this volume, p. 40.

6 Piepke (2005: 66–67) highlights the organisational-disciplinary issues that were at stake. See more on the topic below in the section on the relationships with the SVD. See also Bornemann (1982: 223–227 and 216–219). Bornemann's accounts deserve special scrutiny because he was at odds with Schmidt.

at play there – Schmidt was active in many areas of his contemporary socio-political life (Brandewie 1990: 200–242).<sup>7</sup> When the Nazis took over Austria, Schmidt was interrogated, dismissed from his position at the University of Vienna and placed briefly under house arrest. After Pope Pius XI intervened through Mussolini, Schmidt was allowed to leave Austria and travelled with Cardinal Innitzer from Vienna to Rome. After a short stay there, he found a new haven in Switzerland. A house (Château de Froideville) in Posieux near Fribourg was bought and adjusted for the needs of the Institute that was transferred there (Brandewie 1990: 245–271; Bornemann 1982: 276–290; Piepke 2015).<sup>8</sup> The Institute’s library arrived there from St. Gabriel in instalments. The last part was confiscated by Gestapo and handed over to the Ethnological Museum (*Völkerkundemuseum*) in Vienna. The books were returned after the war (Bornemann 1982: 289; Brandewie 1990: 272). Koppers also lost his position at the University of Vienna. He left for India but had to return to Europe soon after in order to avoid internment by the British (1940). Some other Institute members joined Schmidt at Posieux (some willingly, some less). During the war years there was quite a turnout of the personnel there. Schebesta managed to obtain a transfer to Mödling soon after his return from fieldwork in 1939 (Bornemann 1982: 300–303).

“The Swiss period” lasted until the beginning of the 1960s. Schmidt found a new publisher for the journal in Switzerland and the work was carried on, although the volumes from the 1940s were published jointly (1940–1941; 1942–1945; 1946–1949).<sup>9</sup> After the war Koppers returned to Mödling and was reinstated as the professor at the university. 77 years old Schmidt, upholding many of his contacts and making visits (often linked with public lecturing) in various parts of the German-speaking area, remained at Posieux.

With Schmidt’s recommendation, Bornemann became the editor-in-chief of the journal (1949–54) and the director of the Institute (1950). He had done his doctorate in ethnology with Schmidt in Vienna in the 1930s but openly styled himself as a critic of Schmidt’s ethnological concepts

---

7 Suzanne Marchand (2006) argued that Schmidt’s vision of a restoration of the German state to its former (“medieval”) glory did not correspond with the one the German National Socialists had.

8 In the SVD documents and parlance the residence was referred to as “Froideville”. I will use the name “Posieux” to avoid confusion with Froideville located near Lausanne some 40 kilometres south-west from Freiburg.

9 Schmidt was also instrumental in creating (1942) *Institut für Völkerkunde* at the University of Fribourg.

and theory.<sup>10</sup> Bornemann combined two book series started by Schmidt (ethnological monographs, 1909 and linguistic monographs, 1914) into one called *Studia Instituti Anthropos* (SIA).<sup>11</sup> His time in office as the director of the AI was marked by a conflict with Schmidt. It is actually not easy to establish what exactly was going on. It seems that Schmidt felt being side-lined in most matters of the Institute and the journal by Bornemann and Arnold Burgmann, an AI member and the rector of the house. Schmidt, used to being the key figure, took it very hard. He openly regretted recommending Bornemann and the conflict escalated to the point that the Generalate sent an extra-ordinary visitor to Posieux in 1953 and in 1954. When one reads Brandewie's account with extensive quotes from Schmidt's letters, then Bornemann and Burgmann were the perpetrators making life unnecessarily difficult for Schmidt, e.g. introducing inconveniences as "care-taking" efforts (Brandewie 1990: 283–332). The fact that it was Bornemann who published Schmidt's biography in an official SVD publication series after Schmidt's death complicates the perception of the whole affair further (Bornemann 1982).<sup>12</sup> There, it appears that it was after all Schmidt who was unmanageable and difficult to live with. Not able to accept the younger confreres as leaders, he chose to leave the house in Posieux.

It seems that Bornemann saw Posieux as too remote.<sup>13</sup> Eventually, he left it for Germany and resigned as the AI director in 1955. No one was named as his successor. Schmidt had died in Fribourg in 1954. The editing of the journal was carried on by Rudolf Rahmann (the editor-in-chief 1955–1958) and the members living in Posieux, but the Institute seemed to have lost its driving force.<sup>14</sup>

By the end of 1950s, the idea to relocate the Institute was ripe.<sup>15</sup> Wilhelm Saake, another of Schmidt's students, who after his graduation

---

10 Bornemann (1938). For the self-styled critical attitude see: Bornemann (1978: 170).

11 Thirty-one large monographs in total were published until 1950 and 59 volumes within SIA until the end of 2020.

12 Brandewie (1990: 293) highlighted that Schmidt had thought Bornemann not suitable for a university position in Münster and blocked his appointment.

13 Bornemann (1982: 300–303) stressed that e.g. Schebesta and Koppers shared the view.

14 *Kulturkreislehre* was side-lined after the war, although Schmidt held to it until his death.

15 J. Schütte, the SVD Superior General, wrote in a letter to the AI members on 30 March 1960: "Schon seit Jahren ist immer wieder die Frage nach der Verlegung des Anthropos-Institutes aufgetaucht. Viel ist darüber diskutiert und

(1950) worked as a lecturer in Brazil and did his research among various Indian groups there, was appointed the AI director in 1960. The decision was taken to move the Institute to Sankt Augustin near Bonn in Germany, where the SVD had already a Major Seminary. The Institute members could help in preparation of the new missionaries. Additionally, Sankt Augustin was near the academic centres of Bonn and Cologne. The new buildings were erected in Sankt Augustin and the Institute moved in by the end of 1962.<sup>16</sup> Saake not only took up lectures at the Major Seminary but became active in establishing new contacts with the German scholars, e.g. he initiated *Colloquia Ethnologica* – periodic short academic meetings with the purpose of discussing a topic presented by an invited speaker.<sup>17</sup> The Institute hosted the yearly meeting of the German Ethnological Society (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde) on 9–13 October 1967.<sup>18</sup> Saake started the second current book series *Collectanea Instituti Anthropos* (CIA) in order to publish documents related to preliterate societies in 1967 and strove to build up the library collection (Luzbetak 1982).<sup>19</sup>

However, the late 1960s and the 1970s were also marked by a new wave of personnel problems. Several young members decided to leave the SVD, which automatically excluded them from the Institute's membership. A smooth generational change was disrupted despite the fact that not all of them cut their contacts with the Institute.

---

korrespondiert worden. Allmählich scheint der Zeitpunkt gekommen, die Frage einmal allen Ernstes und unter allen Rücksichten zu untersuchen und vielleicht einer baldigen Entscheidung zuzuführen, denn das Anthropos-Institut befand sich ursprünglich in St. Gabriel, von wo es nur durch die besonderen politischen Zeitumstände herausgedrängt wurde. Es fand in der neutralen Schweiz eine herzliche und gastfreundliche Aufnahme. Es erhebt sich nun die Frage: Soll diese zeitbedingte, vorläufige Lösung eine endgültige bleiben oder sollen wir nach einer anderen, definitiven Lösung suchen?“ He set criteria for a suitable place, analysed pros and cons of four possible locations (Froideville, St. Gabriel, Munich, St. Augustin) with a hint of favouring the latter.

16 The official opening of the new Institute's building was held on 6 November 1963.

17 55 meetings took place between 1965 and 1973. Then the formula was reorganised to make the meetings more accessible for general public. The *Colloquia* initiative was re-established later with 17 new meetings that took place between 2 February 1985 and 27 June 1993.

18 [https://www.dgska.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/AmtszeitenTagungsorte\\_Stan d-2020.pdf](https://www.dgska.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/AmtszeitenTagungsorte_Stan d-2020.pdf).

19 The series' scope expanded later to include the preservation of items of cultural significance. 52 volumes dealing with linguistic material, general and religious ethnography were published until the end of 2020.

By the end of the 1970s, Saake became increasingly ill and the old problem of leadership reappeared. Louis Luzbetak, a North-American anthropologist with a missionary experience in Papua New Guinea and a former student at Fribourg, accepted the appointment for the position of the editor-in-chief of the journal and joined the Institute members at Sankt Augustin (August 1979). He extensively described his vision of the job and sketched out plans for reorganisation of the AI in a number of “Memoranda” and letters. Intending to implement the reorganisation plans, he initially resisted to be nominated as the new AI director but finally consented to the General’s wish.<sup>20</sup> He took office in 1980 but already by mid-1982 he was back in the USA. It seems that his initial enthusiasm was curbed by a feeling of having run ashore.<sup>21</sup> Still, he left clear information on the state of affairs at the Institute to his prospective successor and a colloquium to mark the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of the Institute took place as planned on 26 November 1982. Karl Jettmar from Heidelberg University spoke there on “Ethnologie und Archäologie in den Hochgebirgen Zentralasiens”.

Anton Quack, still busy with finishing his doctoral studies and partly with the editorial work on the journal, was appointed an interim director until the new nomination would be announced. Eventually, the SVD General appointed Karl Müller, a missiologist, as the new AI director in 1983. Müller made it clear that he took it as a temporary solution of the leadership problem but took the job seriously and successfully recruited several SVDs working in various provinces as new members of the Institute during his three years office time.

---

20 In the short introduction to the circular letter No. 38 (January 1981), he wrote: “As you know, after various attempts to find a successor to Father Wilhelm Saake, the Generalate finally decided that I assume both roles, that of editor-in-chief and (‘auf bis weiteres’) also that of director. As I understand my appointment, I am to try to revitalize and reorganize the Institute”.

21 Some readers of the article’s draft pointed out that this sentence sounds enigmatic. I leave it in that way, because it expresses only my assumption of what happened, gained from “reading between the lines” of the archival and published sources in an attempt to make sense of the events. Luzbetak saw the need of giving the work of the AI members a more practical (applicable) dimension. It was apparently perceived as an unwelcome attempt at “diluting the pristine” academic work by turning it into “a mere tool”. It seems that Luzbetak’s efforts were also resisted on the ground that an expatriate tried to reform an institution that was informally but at that time still strongly perceived as a “German endeavour”. The German SVDs (not only the AI members) were not ready for that, yet. Consider the account of Glinka’s encounters at Sankt Augustin given in his memoirs (2013: 96–97).

In 1986, Joachim Piepke, a relatively new member of the Institute, was entrusted with the leadership position.<sup>22</sup> He was not an anthropologist but a theologian with a missionary experience and educational practice. The scope of his expertise was later extended to Latin American studies. He proved to be a good organiser. Several crucial developments took place during his time of office. As the reappearing question of the relevance of AI for the SVD was again addressed, the Generalate convoked an international consultation to that topic to be held in Pune, India (29 December 1986 – 4 January 1987). It was attended by a number of the Institute members from various provinces. It was important, since with the 1984 intake of a number of new members the Institute entered a phase in which the concept of “the centre” began to acquire increasingly fuzzy borders. The proceedings were published in a book (Piepke 1988). The issue of Institute’s relevance inspired the participants to give a few recommendations. Their implementation kept the AI members busy for a couple of years. One initiative concerned promotion of the journal. The occasion of the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of moving the Institute to Sankt Augustin gave an opportunity to acquaint a bigger number of people with the work of AI. A short academic session was held at Sankt Augustin on 27 November 1987.<sup>23</sup> An appeal for sponsoring a journal subscription programme, was initiated. Over 160 individuals and institutions were asked to support it, so that various scholarly institutions (secular and ecclesial) with very limited financial possibilities to build up their library collections, would get regular access to the journal contents. The response was big enough to offer several dozens of gift subscriptions. A few years later a cooperation agreement was made with another similar programme operating from New York (Journal Donation Program).<sup>24</sup>

Sending out a circular letter with information on the current activities of the Institute to the members residing away from the centre was already practiced by Saake. His successors continued the practice. In December 1988 that letter was given a new more public form and named “Interlink”. It was meant to reach not only the members but also be available to other

---

22 His candidature was prospectively considered while he was still busy with his doctoral studies in Rome.

23 On that occasion Patrick Gesch SVD gave a lecture “Initiation und die Verwandlung des Menschen in Kulturen der Sepik-Region Neuguineas“.

24 The AI gift subscription programme continues although in a much-reduced form. The Institute is ever grateful to the current and former supporters. The New York-based DJP ended its activity in 2018 due to lack of funding.

interested readers.<sup>25</sup> At roughly the same time (1988–89), the bulletin “Anthropology and Mission” took off with the purpose of acquainting the SVDs and other readers with relevant books and articles from both indicated fields. It has been published twice a year since.<sup>26</sup>

Still another matter found a new solution at the beginning of the 1990s. Piepke spearheaded the creation of the Educational Fund created by a few SVD Provinces under the auspices of the Generalate. The Fund gave the Institute a reasonable financial stability for some time and enabled supporting young SVD members with interest in cultural/social anthropology, study of religion, linguistics and other related disciplines with occasional financial help. Several young confreres took part in Anthropos Training Programme (ATP), a study-training programme that was developed and started in the early 1990s.<sup>27</sup> All in all, however, the ATP formed no new members who would sustain interest in scholarly work and/or be ready to engage in the editorial work for *Anthropos*. Bringing no tangible effect, the programme withered away.

The change of the director in 1998 brought to the fore another vision of the Institute’s future. Ennio Mantovani, a former Papua-New Guinea (PNG) missionary, a lecturer in the Major Seminaries in Australia and the Philippines, and the former director of the Melanesian Institute in Goroka, PNG,<sup>28</sup> intended to give the activities of the Institute a more “practical” application in the form of creating teams of “teaching anthropologists” (“Anthropos Mobile Team” – AMT). These would give courses to the SVD seminarians (and other interested people) in various locations of the world. The publishing activity seemed to Mantovani of lesser importance.<sup>29</sup> His vision was, however, not shared by his colleagues at Sankt Augustin. By the end of his term, Mantovani was ready to work further on

---

25 Saake sent out 37 circular letters (July 1963 – March 1980). Six more (Nos 38–43) were sent out by his successors (January 1981 – December 1986). Then, three issues of “Anthropos Newsletter” appeared in 1987–1988. All “Interlink” issues are available at: <https://www.svdcuria.org/public/anthrop/index.htm>.

26 <http://www.anthropos.eu/anthropos/publications/anthropology-and-mission/index.php>. Full content of issues from No. 30 onwards is available at: <https://www.svdcuria.org/public/anthrop/index.htm>.

27 The programme was planned and described in detail by Piepke and approved by the SVD German provincial and the SVD Superior General.

28 He was the key speaker during a colloquium organized to mark the 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the journal (8 November 1995).

29 He insisted that Arnold Janssen, the SVD Founder, did not want the teaching staff at Sankt Gabriel to excel in publishing and researching but to focus on teaching because formation mattered. *Verbum* 46/2 (2005) 208–211.

the reorganisation and rejuvenation of the AI but not as its director based at Sankt Augustin. The Generalate was consulted on the matter in January 2001 and a seven-person ad hoc committee with the purpose of finding a viable solution was convoked at Sankt Augustin on 17–20 April 2001.<sup>30</sup> The results of the discussions led Antonio Pernia, the then SVD General, to implement a new operational model for the AI *ad experimentum* in 2001. Mantovani was transferred to the SVD house at Nemi in Italy and named “Coordinator of Anthropos International” (CAI; 1 September 2001 – 30 April 2004).<sup>31</sup> “Anthropos International” was intended as a network of members active in various locations without a geographically defined centre, managed by a coordinator, who would inspire the members to take part in common projects.<sup>32</sup> The work on drafting the new Statutes began but no one was able to convince the members at Sankt Augustin that it was the right move. They insisted on editing the journal as the absolute priority. In effect, some kind of a parallel structure developed. What was formerly the central office of the Institute became the “publishing department” of Anthropos International (or Anthropos Institute Sankt Augustin). Piepke was reappointed as its director but at that time only as an official of the German SVD Provincial. All in all, the office at Sankt Augustin was more “real” in the sense of producing a “hard evidence” of its activity. The international network of members remained a “virtual reality” with high potential but hardly any visible coordinated effects of members’ cooperation. That is not to say that the Institute members worldwide were idle. They had been engaged in a lot of local activities.<sup>33</sup> These were, however, credited to various local organizations where they were active.

The idea of AMT (they never materialised) seemed to assume the paramount place in discussions of Mantovani’s new vision for the AI. But when one reads his later published texts (e.g. Mantovani 2004, 2005), his vision for a renewal of the AI was broader. He argued for a creative rethinking of the AI “founding principle” and its application. Mantovani

---

30 A representative of the Generalate, representatives of the four SVD world-zones and the representatives of both visions for the AI.

31 On 31 August 2001 the General sent out a circular letter to all provinces explaining the reorganisation.

32 Augustin Kanjamala (in India) and Jacek J. Pawlik (in Poland) became members of the AI Coordinating Council on 2 September 2003. *MR-NET News* #14, 6 September 2003 (Mission Research Network).

33 At least some of the recent and current ones are accounted for in the 3<sup>rd</sup> section of this book.



moved to Australia in November 2003 taking up teaching and coordinating assignments there and completed his second term as the CAI (2004–2007). There was, however, no any major breakthrough concerning a more effective reorganization of the Institute’s structure. As it was clear that the editorial activity could not suffer any hindrances, no existing funds could have been assigned for any additional project. The world financial crisis after 2008 did not make it easier. In 2007, Roger Schroeder, a missiologist with missionary experience in PNG and a lecturer at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, was appointed the new CAI.<sup>34</sup> After the SVD General Chapter of 2012, he and a few other members of the Anthropos Institute International engaged in a project focused on the issues of interculturality.<sup>35</sup>

In October 2017, Piepke resigned as the head of the AI Sankt Augustin on the grounds of age (he was 74) and Stanisław Grodź<sup>36</sup> was appointed his successor. At the beginning of 2018, Paulus Verlag, that since Schmidt’s time in Switzerland, had printed and distributed a part of the print-run of *Anthropos*, suddenly announced an immediate cessation of its publishing activities due to essential restructuring of the firm. It affected the journal and one of the book series published by the Institute. Luckily, a new publisher – Academia Verlag in the Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbh & Co. KG – was found and the journal appeared without interruption. The new publisher added a digital version of the journal to its printed one and made provision for publishing journal’s special issues.<sup>37</sup>

## 2 Relationship to the SVD

The Statutes of the Institute make it clear that “Anthropos Institute is sponsored by the Society of the Divine Word (SVD) and for this reason is intimately associated with the Society’s missionary service” (1.1.2.). After stating the goals and tasks of the Institute, the Statutes point out that the

---

34 See the list of the directors and coordinators with their council members in the appendices to this volume.

35 See e.g. Stanislaus and Üffing (2018) with articles by Ph. Gibbs, J.P. Kirby, R. Schroeder. See also Schroeder’s article, “Anthropos Institute International and Interculturality” in the third section of this book.

36 An Institute member since 2005 but at Sankt Augustin only from Autumn/Fall 2016.

37 Special issues were already suggested by Luzbetak in his memoranda written in the late 1970s.

SVD Superior General “has a special responsibility toward the Institute” by approving the Statutes and supervising their implementation, appointing the head of the Institute and his council, appointing the editor-in-chief of the journal, and helping to find staff for the publication department of the Institute (1.4.1 – 6).

Although the Statutes were several times revised over the decades, the relationship between the Institute and the SVD has not basically changed. It does not, however, mean that the relationship has been unproblematic. The Institute has been in a way a separate unit but at the same time its members also belong to a bigger house community (with the exception of the time in Posieux) and their life should be regulated by the daily order of the house. There were problems with that already before the foundation of the Institute. The editors of *Anthropos* found it not easy to comply with all the house community life regulations because the specificity of the editorial and scholarly work had its own requirements. Sankt Gabriel was also the house where younger members of the SVD were still in training, so the discipline of the community life was not a minor issue. According to Bornemann’s account, the General apparently saw a separate location (a house) for the “Anthropos Patres” as commendable, while not all of them wanted a separate house. The rector of Sankt Gabriel’s House, aware of the actual and potential disciplinary problems, did not want the Institute to move out because the Anthropos members drew interest of outsiders to the house and its missionary purpose (Bornemann 1982: 223–227).

After the move to Switzerland, the Institute members directly involved in the editorial work lived in their own small community house in Posieux. The life there had its own problems but the AI members were basically on their own.<sup>38</sup> The move to Sankt Augustin changed that. The old problem of complying with the daily life order of a big community was perhaps not that crucial as retaining the feeling of independence. One can trace in the documents a real struggle to retain as much of it as possible. The AI members must have had a feeling that their situation was undergoing changes from that of being “the owner” to that of being “a tenant”. Soon after the arrival “Anthropos Institut für völkerkundliche Forschung e.V.” was founded and officially registered in order to enable

---

38 Although there were also a few SVDs in the community who were not AI members (brothers, seminarians with their prefect). Bornemann (1982: 299–305). Brandewie (1990: 282–328) focuses more on Schmidt’s biography than on the description of life in Posieux.

the AI to function as a legal non-profit entity.<sup>39</sup> However, when the SVD Generalate handed over the printing press in Steyl, Holland, together with the editing and distribution offices of the SVD mission magazines to the North German Province (retaining the right to a part of the revenue) in 1972, AI felt also affected. Saake informed the members about it in a letter sent out on 29 June 1972, indicating that the North German Province could also be made responsible for financing the AI in future. He requested the opinion of the members whether (a) a status quo should be retained, or (b) under the condition that the Generalate remains responsible for AI personal matters, one could accept financial dependency on the North German Province. Meanwhile, the Generalate decided to incorporate the AI into the North German Province on 20 June 1972 without waiting for further opinions of the AI members on the matter. The information reached the provincial on 25 June. Due to holiday season, it was made public only on 25 August, but still before the AI members were officially informed about it. That led to a “business meeting” with A. Spreti, the provincial, on 14 October 1972. The report from that meeting, after documenting regret over the unfortunate manner of announcing that decision, states that the AI members agreed to the conditions set by the General and took the provincial’s word that regardless of further decisions concerning the property rights, the province would not interfere in the Institute’s scholarly and editorial activities.<sup>40</sup>

The relationship with the Monumenta Serica Institute (MSI), a SVD-founded scholarly institution for researching various aspects of the Chinese culture(s) (Beijing, 1935) should also be addressed here. After being evacuated from China at the end of the 1940s and having its residence several years in Japan and the USA (California), the MSI moved to Sankt Augustin in 1972. Initially, the MSI was allocated offices in the newly constructed building of the ethnographical museum (*Haus Völker und Kulturen*). However, already before Christmas 1974, the MSI moved to the ground floor of the AI building. On that occasion, Saake expressed his hope for a fruitful collaboration of both institutes (*Rundbrief* No. 29). That was, however, harder to achieve than wished for. In the context of the recurring question posed by some SVDs (and upheld with various intensity over the years by the Generalate) on relevance of the institutes’

---

39 „Anthropos Institute for ethnological research, registered association” (e.V. stands for *eingetragener Verein*).

40 Statuten des Anthropos Instituts St. Augustin, Anlage I: Protokoll der Geschäftssitzung vom 14.10.1972.

work for the SVD, talks had already been held among the members of the AI and the Missiological Institute, established at Sankt Augustin in the early 1960s, about a possible collaboration. Luzbetak took the initiative in fostering a new model of cooperation and invited MSI directly to join forces.<sup>41</sup> The invitation was accepted and both institutes were officially merged on 20 February 1981. The merger did not last long, though. On 3 October 1987 the AI General Assembly voted in favour of separating both institutes.<sup>42</sup> The MSI with its exclusively Chinese focus was at odds with the global and multidisciplinary (but in a different way from the MSI's one) perspective of the AI. When the activities of the MSI were linked with a more practically oriented and more directly in the Chinese context engaged "China Zentrum", it was decided that the MSI should return to its previous, separate form and work more closely with the latter.<sup>43</sup> In another way, the separation was also a result of difficulties in collaboration between the members.

### *3 The staff – the AI members and their lay collaborators*

From the very beginning, only the SVDs could become the members of the Institute. The membership, after application and recommendation by the director in consultation with two other members, was granted by the SVD Superior General, who was ultimately responsible for the functioning of the Institute. The 1962 Statutes (III. 5) included a possibility of accepting collaborators and friends of the AI either as members-correspondents, or honorary members but neither included the full membership rights. The changes in the Statutes approved in 1982 made a provision for admit-

---

41 Luzbetak took up a Sankt Augustin's initiative for "interdisciplinary cooperation" from 8–9 September 1968 and prepared a new meeting at Lohmar on 6 December 1979. As that brought no immediate practical results, a committee was established to elaborate the matter further. Its three meetings (2, 24 January, 24 September 1980) brought no tangible results. (All reports in the AI Archive). Matthias Hermanns had suggested a possibility of a merger between the AI and MSI already in 1965. (Protokoll der Außerordentlichen Sitzung des AI, Wien, 27. Oktober 1965, AI Archive).

42 The letter accepting Luzbetak's invitation was signed by Heinrich Busch, Wilhelm Müller and Roman Malek. The separation was approved by the provincial of the North German SVD Province (6 February 1988) and the General Superior (11 March 1988). (AI Archive).

43 Such an explanation was given in the official report from the General Assembly (AI Archive).

ting associate members, who did not need to belong to the SVD (Art. 12), but gave them no voting rights. Further amendments approved in 2015 made it possible to accept scholars from among Sisters Servants of the Holy Spirit (SSpS – a religious order founded by Arnold Janssen) as full members of the Institute.<sup>44</sup> It is also noteworthy that the admission of two Hindu scholars and collaborators with AI activities in India as associate members in 2015–2016 widened AI membership beyond those of the Christian religion for the first time.

The number of members did not exceed 30 until the late 1980s. A list given by Rudolf Rahmann in his 1957 Anthropos Institute Report contained 23 names (typed and 4 added by hand). Saake listed 25 names in 1963. In 2020, there were 46 members, including 6 associate members and 2 with the emeriti status.<sup>45</sup> The membership age structure has remained quite stable over the decades, despite any possible impression of the aging of the membership.

The group of six SVDs editing the journal from early on could have been called the “founding members”, although no such name was ever used. After 1931, new SVDs with no former experiences of work in *Anthropos* were assigned to the Institute. They all officially resided at Sankt Gabriel House, although the academic activities tied some of them to Vienna and others undertook long field research expeditions. After the move to Switzerland, the situation became multifaceted – Schmidt, the students and those directly involved in editing the journal lived in Posieux and the Institute was there. It was, however, accepted that some other members resided elsewhere. Some of the students, after finishing their doctoral studies, took teaching positions at various schools and universities and/or founded new academic centres (including direct “branches” of the AI).<sup>46</sup> Still, the centre (THE Institute) was in Posieux. Similarly, after the move to Sankt Augustin – the group of members in “foreign residence” was increasing but the centre, where most of the work revolved around the publication matters and around the ever-growing library, remained there.<sup>47</sup> The problems of appropriate staffing did not concern only the

---

44 The first SSpS was admitted as a full member in 2015.

45 See a reconstructed list of members in the Appendices.

46 E.g., F.K. Numazawa in Japan, T. Chodzidło in Poland, J.V. César in Brazil. See the articles in the section II of this volume.

47 The 1962 Statutes (II) indicated clearly the “Zentralinstitut”: the director’s and editorial offices, library and members’ offices. One of the members’ lists dated 29 October 1973 marked with a note “für DGV” presents the members in two groups: “Am Anthropos-Institut beschäftigte Ethnologen” and “Mitglieder des

leadership of the Institute – as indicated earlier – but also its publishing activities. Temporary solutions had to be applied occasionally in order to secure the publication of the journal. In the 1970s and again at the beginning of the 1980s a non-SVD was entrusted with the editor's duties.

Now and again, there were members on library research visits at Sankt Augustin. Others – e.g. AI members Patrick Gesch and S.M. Michael – spent time “in residence” there during the late 1980s. A number of the SVDs studied a variety of disciplines (1960s-1990s) with a prospect of joining the Institute.<sup>48</sup> However, from the mid-1980s most editorial responsibilities were entrusted to Anton Quack, Othmar Gächter and Joachim Piepke, with the help from Günther Gessinger.<sup>49</sup> They were joined by Jacek J. Pawlik (1994–1999), a former missionary in Togo and an ethnologist with the doctorate from Sorbonne and experience of substantial fieldwork conducted in Togo.

In 2006, the editorial office at Sankt Augustin was strengthened by two younger SVD anthropologists who had just finished their doctoral studies in the USA – Alexander Rödlach and Dariusz Piwowarczyk. The hopes at reinvigoration of the editorial office and the Institute were only partly fulfilled as Rödlach accepted an academic post in the USA and left Sankt Augustin several months later. In 2008, Piwowarczyk took over the job of the editor-in-chief of the journal and holds it until now. He was additionally entrusted with lecturing at the Philosophical-Theological College at Sankt Augustin. The sudden death of Quack (2009), the long-time member of the editorial team, affected the editorial work. Further attempts at attracting new SVD personnel did not bring any long lasting results. Students became discouraged and decided to pursue their interests in pastoral activities, or they returned to their previous places. Only in 2015, Vinsensus Adi Gunawan, an Indonesian ethnomusicologist with a several-years-long experience as a member of the SVD Polish province, joined the editorial team.

---

Anthropos-Institutes z.Z. im Ausland”. There are 18 names on the list. In Luzbetak's circular letter No. 38 (January 1981) reports on members' activities are divided into two groups: “From Headquarters” and “From the Field”.

48 Naming them all would require at least another lengthy paragraph. This remains to be done in a more detailed history of the Institute.

49 The latter was away on other SVD assignments in the years 1989–2003. See their short biographies (Grodź 2019: 311–313).