

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

To participate in a revision of Mircea Eliade's *Encyclopedia of Religion*, first published in 1987, is an occasion of intense humility, but also a grand opportunity. Though not without its critics, the first edition was suitably heralded as the standard reference work in the field, a truly landmark achievement. The work of revision has, at nearly every turn, amplified rather than diminished appreciation for the accomplishment of those original volumes. Dealing firsthand with the conceptual and organizational challenges, coupled with the logistical labors of coordinating the efforts of countless scholars and editors, redoubles a sense of admiration, respect, and gratitude for the makers of the original version of this encyclopedia.

If the making of that original set posed innumerable theoretical, organizational, and practical challenges, the revision of such a work evokes no fewer questions of balance and compromise. On the one hand, the building and remodeling of a work of this wide scope is a preeminently collaborative enterprise. It is born of a vast community of scholars, together participating in an immensely collective project; the interactivity among editors, consultants, and contributors has indeed provided perhaps the most rewarding aspects of this project. Yet, on the other hand, such a large and multifaceted undertaking has a deeply impersonal, even anonymous, quality. Face-to-face meetings among participants are few, schedules fast, authors and editors far-spaced. By engaging the talents of so many people from so many places, large encyclopedias, and even more so their revisions, perpetuate the pretense of anonymous, objective, and interchangeable authors; numerous hands touch every piece, and the target of responsibility either for credit or for blame is not always easy to locate.

Such an encyclopedia requires, in one respect, a large measure of consensus among contributors as to what religion is and what academic students of religion ought to and ought not to circumscribe within their view. But, in another respect, it is a scholarly consensus of a very broad and pliant

sort. Careful reading reveals enormous diversity of perspective among first-edition contributors, far more than is often assumed; and for the revision, even among the principal decision makers, and positively among the contributors, there is a very wide spectrum of opinions as to the most serviceable definitions of religion and the most worthy purview for the field of religious studies.

On the one hand, encyclopedias seem by nature vehicles of convention, destined to simplify, reify, essentialize, and provide falsely stabilized views of dynamic historical eras, religious traditions, doctrines, and practices. Yet, on the other hand, a large percentage of the contributors to this project understand their academic calling to be primarily one of disruption and destabilization; many have explicitly dedicated their careers to complicating and calling to question conventional wisdoms about religion and things religious. Thus in order to capitalize on their talents, contributors were provided explicit instructions, tidy scope descriptions, and specific word allotments, but they were also provided a fair measure of space for improvisation and flexibility. One member of the editorial board framed the balance this way:

The letters to all contributors should include a general statement that we wish to respect their judgment in defining the general contours of each article, and the scope descriptions are meant only to be suggestive, although of course we do hope that we will be taken seriously. Also that we are looking for entries that reflect the current state of the field and that we are hoping that each entry will not gloss over problems of evidence or conceptualization in the current state of the field but will instead frankly acknowledge such problems and make them key parts of the entry in a bid to make the [second edition of the *Encyclopedia of Religion*] look to the future and help to shape things to come.

The intellectual challenges are likewise reflected in more practical tensions and balancing acts. Perhaps most onerous-

ly, the recruitment of literally hundreds of qualified scholars, available and willing to deliver their work in a timely manner, is no mean task. For some, participation in an encyclopedia of this stature is a high calling, a fortuitous opportunity to engage a uniquely wide readership; others, however, admit far less enthusiasm about undertaking assignments construed as diversions from their more technical research, more public service than privilege. Once aboard, contributors had to balance the standards of accuracy, sophistication, and scholarly nuance that would satisfy themselves and their academic peers with the encyclopedia's incentive to reach a far more broad, less specialized audience.

The balancing of word counts is likewise a constant concern, and the space allotted to various topics is, to some real extent, a telling indicator as to the relative importance of those topics, at least in the eyes of the editorial board. Yet, equations of article length and significance, a familiar assumption among reviewers, are invariably too simple, too little aware of the practical exigencies of accepted and declined invitations, met and missed deadlines, obeyed and ignored editorial recommendations. The most well considered intentions and the clearest of visions are, not infrequently, casualties in the stiff competition for the time of twenty-first century academics. In fact, it is both noteworthy and deeply disappointing that several dozen additional new articles were conceived but never successfully assigned, and also that at least three dozen promised articles had not arrived by the production deadline, and thus had to be omitted from the revision. Gaps and asymmetries in coverage could, therefore, have innumerable explanations.

Be that as it may, perhaps the most vexing acts of balance and compromise are built into the very notion of "revision" itself. Neither defense nor attack, revision demands commingled attitudes of respect for and discontent with the original. To revise requires, on the one side, that a goodly portion of the previous work will remain intact; this editorial board was not afforded a fully fresh point of departure. Yet, on the other side, the initiative of revising does afford, even necessitates, changes, reconceptualizations, and wholly new additions that respond both to recent events and to recent trends in scholarship. Revision is, by nature and by design, a balancing and a juxtaposition of old and new elements.

This complex intermingling of first-edition and new components enriches but also greatly complicates the critical use and assessment of these volumes. The synoptic outline of contents, the alphabetical list of entries, and the index provide usefully comprehensive guides, but to discover all that is new and different between the second edition and its precedent can, nonetheless, pose a difficult challenge. The remainder of this preface works, therefore, to direct attention (1) to some of the most prominent new elements of this revision; (2) to the decision-making processes that put those adjustments in place; and (3) to the conventions in this edition that can assist in ascertaining the precise status of individual entries.

ASSESSMENTS, ADJUSTMENTS, AND CONVENTIONS

The initial step in the revision process was a comprehensive evaluation of every one of the 2,750 first-edition entries. As though dealing out an enormous deck of cards, each of the original articles was assigned to suitable members of the thirteen-person board of associate editors or the slate of some two dozen consultants. Parity did not apply insofar as a sturdy few were taxed with assessing hundreds of articles, others with only a handful. In the subsequent entry-by-entry review, a relatively small number of articles were completely jettisoned while the huge remainder was assigned to one of three categories.

A first category of entries is composed of those approved to be reprinted with few or no changes. Though roughly 1,800 articles in this set were to remain largely or fully intact, attempts were made to reach the authors of those first-edition entries both with an invitation to modify or update their contribution in ways that they saw fit and with a request that they augment the bibliography with relevant sources that had appeared in the interim. Of course, many of those scholars were no longer active in the profession; others did not reply; and others declined to make any alterations to their original articles. Articles that were, therefore, reprinted essentially unchanged have a designation of "(1987)" following the author's name. In numerous instances, however, first-edition authors did take the occasion to adjust their own articles in small or large ways. For these articles, the attribution of authorship is followed by two dates, for example, Eleanor Zelliot (1987 and 2005). Additionally, where original authors of articles in this set were unavailable or nonresponsive, many of the respective bibliographies were nonetheless supplemented with relevant new sources; this accounts for those bylines that include the designation "Revised Bibliography," which signals that a "New Sources" section is appended to the bibliography.

A second category of entries comprises those judged to need significant revision or updating. These articles are perhaps most properly worthy of the title "revised" insofar as they both retain a substantial portion of the original work and introduce substantially new information and/or new conceptual formulations. This sort of revision took one of three forms. In some cases, original authors were enlisted to rework and update their own articles; those articles (not unlike those in which authors voluntarily revised their original articles) are consequently attributed to a sole author but with two dates, for example, David Carrasco (1987 and 2005). In many other cases, the revision was undertaken by a different scholar, which accounts for those articles that are attributed to two authors, for example, Robertson Davies (1987) and Eric Ziolkowski (2005). Irrespective of whether the modifications were completed by the original author or by someone else, the revisions are, in some instances, modest, perhaps addressing recent events or attending to an important new publication on the topic; but, in other cases, the adjustments and reconceptualizations are more thor-

oughgoing. All of the revisions and “updates” of these sorts do, however, eventuate in entries that are, at once, old and new.

A third variation on this revision theme—and one of the more distinctive features of the second edition of *Encyclopedia of Religion*—is a consequence of those situations in which the original article was assessed as a still-valuable exposition of the topic, worthy of reprinting, but not a treatment that could any longer be represented as state-of-the-art. In many of these instances, the first-edition entry provided a seminal statement on the subject, but was distinctive, or sometimes idiosyncratic, in ways that precluded revision or updating per se. Thus, instead of reworking the original, it was more suitable to retain the integrity of that article by reprinting it unchanged and then augmenting it with a kind of supplementary addendum. For instance, Mircea Eliade wrote the first-edition entry “Sexuality: An Overview,” which articulates a prominent, still-important exposition of the topic, but not one that can be regarded as current in a field of study where there has been enormous activity in the past two decades. The original entry is, therefore, allowed to stand with the parenthetical designation “[First Edition]” and then is complemented by a completely new entry titled “Sexuality: An Overview [Further Considerations],” which focuses attention on research and perspectives that have emerged since the first edition. This pairing of prominent but now dated first-edition entries with new complementary pieces—there are roughly fifty of these juxtapositions of old and new—adds a special texture to the revision; it facilitates a kind of historical, even archaeological, appreciation of the unfolding succession of ideas on a topic. But the same editorial tactic also places a special burden on readers. Accordingly, as a cautionary note, it would, in principle, never be suitable to rely on one of these “First Edition” pieces without reading ahead also to its complimentary, sometimes quite critical, “Further Considerations” counterpart.

In any case, the initial article-by-article assessment of the first edition eventuated also in a third category constituted of those entries for which a topic and title were retained but the actual article was completely replaced. There are well over three hundred of these new renditions of already-standing topics. As a rule, authors of these replacement articles were invited to employ the original entry as a resource but not necessarily a model, that is, to compose an essentially new treatment of the existing topic. Not surprisingly, one can find instances in which there is considerable continuity between the original and present articles while, in other cases, the first-edition article and its new, second-edition iteration share little beyond the title. That is to say, the great majority of these so-termed replacement articles are, for all practical purposes, thoroughly new entries. Consequently, author attribution for these articles includes a parenthetical date precisely like other new articles, for example, Mary MacDonald (2005).

NEW FEATURES AND CONFIGURATIONS

In addition to these various layers of revision and replacement, the second edition introduces entries on nearly six hundred topics that did not appear in the first edition. New topics and titles are added to almost every portion of the revision, but especially noteworthy are those that appear in related sets of articles—or so-termed composite entries. Many of these composite sets, which were also a very prominent feature of the first edition, provide a means of surveying the geographical distribution of a large tradition: The “Buddhism” composite entry, for example, is composed of articles that treat, in succession, “Buddhism in India,” “Buddhism in Southeast Asia,” “Buddhism in Central Asia,” and so on. In many other cases, however, these composite sets are trained on a broad topic or theme such as “Pilgrimage,” “Iconography,” “Music,” or “Soul,” which is then addressed in a cross-culturally comparative fashion. In the main, these thematically configured composites open with a broad overview article, which is then followed by a series of articles that explore that large theme either in different contexts and/or from different angles of view. And, although every sort of composite entry enjoys a measure of revision, it is these thematically linked sets that are subject to the most venturesome innovation and growth. Several permutations and outstanding examples deserve quick comment.

In numerous instances, thematic composite entries that appeared in the original edition were reworked and very substantially expanded. For example, the first-edition “Afterlife” composite entry included an overview and only two area-specific articles, one on Jewish concepts of the afterlife and another on Chinese concepts. In the new edition, however, that pair is complemented by completely new entries on African conceptions of the afterlife, as well as Australian, Oceanic, Mesoamerican, Christian, Islamic, Greek and Roman, and Germanic concepts. The first-edition “Cosmology” composite is similarly expanded with thoroughly new entries on the cosmologies of Africa, indigenous Australia, Oceania, indigenous North America and Mesoamerica, South America, Islam, and finally, so-termed “Scientific Cosmologies.” Or, to cite just one more such example of the enhancement of a standing composite entry, the original cluster of entries under the rubric of “Rites of Passage,” which had included entries solely on Hindu, Jewish, and Muslim rites, is fleshed out to include new articles on African, Oceanic, Mesoamerican, and Neopagan rites of passage.

Other second-edition composite entries—article sets that provide some of the most notable new contributions to the revision—result from cases in which a topic that had received fairly limited coverage in the first edition becomes the subject of a much more extensive block of new articles. For instance, where the original edition had modest-length and broadly-framed articles devoted to “Healing,” “Medicine,” and “Diseases and Cures,” the revision explores those themes far more fully via a composite entry that opens

with “Healing and Medicine: An Overview,” which is then followed by fourteen completely new articles trained on healing practices in various regions and traditions, for example, in Africa, in the African diaspora, in the Ancient Near East, in Judaism, in Islamic texts and traditions, in the popular healing practices of Middle Eastern cultures, in Greece and Rome, and so on. A sole first-edition entry on “Ecology” is supplanted by a full constellation of “Ecology and Religion” articles that includes eleven new tradition-specific articles on various ways of conceiving the interrelations between humans, the earth, and the cosmos, as well as thematic entries on environmental ethics and on science, religion, and ecology. “Law and Religion” is also much expanded and fully reconfigured in a set of thirteen articles that address the topic in six different regions or traditions and then in relation to six different sorts of themes, such as law and religion in connection with literature, with critical theory, with human rights, with morality, with new religious movements and, finally, with punishment. And, by the same token, the free-standing entry on “Politics and Religion” in the first edition is replaced by a ten-part composite entry that begins with a broad overview of the topic and then engages intersections of religion and politics in each of several traditions.

Additional composite entries are completely new insofar as they have no direct counterpart in the first edition. The treatment of literature, for instance, an enormous and multifaceted topic that streams through countless sections of the encyclopedia, was reconfigured in ways that issued in a completely new ten-part composite entry on fiction and religion in various guises. In that case, a lead entry titled “Fiction: History of the Novel” is complemented by all new entries that survey connections between religion and the Western novel, Latin American fiction, Chinese fiction, Japanese fiction, Southeast Asian fiction, Australian fiction, Oceanic fiction, African fiction, and Native American fiction. Another fully new composite entry under the rubric of “Transculturation and Religion” opens with an overview that situates “the problem of religion” within the context of the making of the modern world; subsequent elements of the set address the role of religion in the formation of, respectively, modern Canada, the modern Caribbean, modern Japan, modern India, and modern Oceania. Other innovative new composite entries, though on somewhat more modest scales, engage such topics as “Orgy,” “Sociobiology and Evolutionary Psychology,” and “Humor and Religion.”

Particularly notable among new composite entries is the twenty-one-part “Gender and Religion,” a wholly new set that deserves special mention not only as the largest such grouping in the revision, but also as part of a three-tiered initiative to engage the abundance of important work that has appeared in that field since the original version. At one level, the instructions to authors of *every* article for this edition, whether revised or completely new, included an incitement to consider seriously, and to make explicit, the gendered dynamics of the religious doctrines, practices, and institu-

tions under consideration. A second level of revision focused on individual entries: standing articles like “Women’s Studies,” “Human Body,” and “Spirit Possession” were revisited, then replaced or heavily reworked in light of contemporary approaches to gender and religion. Space was opened also for numerous new topical entries such as “Beauty,” “Gynocentrism,” “Lesbianism,” “Men’s Studies in Religion,” “Patriarchy and Matriarchy,” and “Theology”; for several mid-sized composite entries on “Feminism,” “Feminist Theology,” and “Nuns”; and for numerous new biographical entries on women. Finally, at a third and especially ambitious level, the completely new “Gender and Religion” composite entry employs the familiar pattern of an overview article, followed by a succession of region- or tradition-specific articles; but this set is unique in its scale of execution.

New religious movements is yet another area of major growth and reconceptualization. In fact, no segment of the encyclopedia enjoys quite such extensive enlargement. The original five-part composite entry is replaced by an eleven-part set that includes not only a revamped overview and new or reworked area-specific articles on the United States, Europe, Japan, and Latin America, but also thematic and comparative articles on the scriptures of new religious movements and on new religious movements in relation to women, to children, to millennialism, and to violence. Where the first-edition synoptic outline listed a couple dozen supporting articles under the heading of “New Religions and Modern Movements,” the revision includes nearly three times that many. Among the wealth of new topical entries are “Anticult Movements,” “Brainwashing (Debate),” and “Deprogramming”; “Neopaganism” and “Wicca”; “Swedenborgianism,” “Rastafarianism,” “UFO Religions,” “Heaven’s Gate,” “Aum Shinrikyō,” and “Falun Gong.” Similarly abundant new biographical articles address figures ranging from Aleister Crowley, Daddy Grace, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Emma Curtis Hopkins, and L. Ron Hubbard to Jim Jones and David Koresh, to mention just a few.

An innovative new composite entry under the rubric of “Study of Religion” is one of several components designed to engage matters of theory, method, and intellectual history, concerns that were very important for the first edition and remained a priority for the second. Where the original edition had entries focused primarily on the emergence and development of religious studies in Western Europe and the United States, this new “Study of Religion” grouping works to survey ways in which the nature and study of “religion” have been conceptualized and institutionalized also in Eastern Europe, Japan, North Africa and the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, and South Asia. Also in a methodological realm, most of the eighteen first-edition “History of Study” entries (e.g., “Australian Religions: History of Study”; “Chinese Religion: History of Study”; “Egyptian Religion: History of Study”; etc.) were substantially updated or replaced, and entirely new entries were added to address the history of the study of African American religions, Baltic religion, Celtic religions,

Confucianism, and Germanic religions, along with new entries on the history of the study of gender and religion, of Gnosticism, and of new religious movements. Numerous of the “Methods of Study” entries were revised, and wholly new offerings include “Ethology of Religion,” “Literature: Critical Theory and Religious Studies,” “Subaltern Studies,” and a two-part set on “Sociobiology and Evolutionary Psychology.” Of more than one hundred first-edition entries listed in the synoptic outline under so-called “Scholarly Terms,” very few were deleted; some are substantially revised (e.g., “Conversion,” “Dualism,” and “Tradition”); some prominent terms are augmented with “Further Considerations” pieces (e.g., “Mysticism,” “Ritual,” “Religion,” “Sacrifice,” and “Syncretism”); and many others are replaced with essentially new entries (e.g., “Charisma,” “Folklore,” “Religious Experience,” and “Sacred Time”). Completely new offerings under that heading include “Colonialism and Post-colonialism,” “Creolization,” “Globalization and Religion,” “Implicit Religion,” “Invisible Religion,” “Orientalism,” “Spirituality,” and “World Religions.” And with respect to “Scholars of Religion,” another area of special distinction for *Encyclopedia of Religion*, we retained the policy of separate biographical entries only for scholars who are deceased, but nonetheless added more than fifty new names to the list.

The enumeration of important new articles and features could, as they say, go on and on. In the Judaism section, nearly all of the principal articles, the main “Judaism: An Overview” included, are thoroughly rewritten and more than thirty new topics were added. Among the articles on Islam, a high percentage both of the large geographical survey entries and the dozens of shorter supporting articles are revised in variously minor and major ways, and numerous wholly new topics have been introduced. The treatment of Buddhism, including the several composite configurations devoted to that tradition, received especially thoroughgoing reconceptualizations, as well as the introduction of more than two dozen completely new topics, numerous of them focused on Tibet. North American Indian religions was also a zone of especially extensive revision and expansion in ways that reflect the tumultuous changes in that field over the past two decades and the emergence of a generation of native scholars whose presence was largely absent from the first edition. The large lists under “Art and Religion” and, even more, “Science and

Religion” were areas of considerable growth and innovation. Yes, the enumeration of new and reworked features could go on and on. It is, to be sure, only via direct engagement of the entries themselves that one can really begin to appreciate all that is new and different between the second edition and its precedent.

In sum, then, it is important to note that the associate editors and consultants—all of whom deserve enormous credit for their expertise, insight, and endurance—worked without any fixed quota as to how much would change and how much remain the same. This open policy proved a proverbial mixed blessing—both an ample benefit and what became a heavy burden insofar as, it is safe to say, the extent of revision and enlargement far exceeded anyone’s expectation. The final tally of new and essentially new entries, in fact, exceeds by fourfold the initial projections, which were only whispered at the outset of the process. Were there anticipation in the beginning that this revised second edition would include, as it does, well over five hundred new topics, nearly one thousand completely new articles, and 1.5 million more words than the original *Encyclopedia of Religion* perhaps fewer would have agreed to participate in the editorial initiative.

The fortuitous result is, nevertheless, a scholarly resource too large and layered for anyone to master or even appreciate fully; no one can attain that vantage that affords a view of the whole. Instead—and happily—individual readers will inevitably be drawn to those parts that appeal to their distinct interests and serve their special purposes. This encyclopedia is, in an important sense, many encyclopedias, each of which emerges in dynamic relations with the persons who read and use it. Moreover, time and again, searching and serendipity blend so that an entry simply happened upon, an article or aspect other than that which you are seeking, evokes the strongest excitement and provides the most satisfying reward. Even those of us with much invested in this revision, continue to read, reread, and experience these volumes with a sense of discovery. It is our sincere hope, moreover, that this new edition can provide other readers that same ongoing sense of exploration and evocation of interest.

LINDSAY JONES
Ohio State University, September 2004

VISUAL ESSAYS: RATIONALE

Without exception, religions around the world and throughout time have included a vital visual dimension—whether it is icons to contemplate, sacred diagrams used in ritual, powerful objects charged with the capacity to protect or heal, the creation of sacred spaces, or the use of clothing, vestments, or liturgical objects in worship. Because human beings rely heavily on sight for information about their worlds, images of different kinds have always played an important role in the design of religious spaces and rites and in the daily practices of the devout. Art historians, anthropologists, archeologists, and historians of religion have long noted the significance of images in religious life.

The fourteen visual essays included in the second edition of *Encyclopedia of Religion* seek to demonstrate how pervasively visual culture permeates religion. Each of the essays is organized around a practice or theme common to many different religions. Since the goal was to explore the relevance and power of the visual culture of religion, the task in each case has been to show how images and visual practices participate in the lived experience of religion. This approach contrasts with the passive use of images sometimes used by scholars and reference works merely to illustrate religious practice or doctrine. In no instance does an image appear here in that capacity. Images are not used in these essays to recall or exemplify religious ideas or topics, but to provide concrete examples of how religions happen visually, that is, how images are put to use in visual practices that are the substance and experience of religious belief. Thus, the emphasis has been consistently on what images do.

The fourteen themes have been selected in order to show the great variety of ways in which images, objects, and spaces make religious practice take the form it does. Broadly speaking, images accomplish at least five operations:

1. They create a sense of time.
2. They create a sense of space.

3. They structure relations with other persons, beings, and communities.
4. They shape one's state of mind and body for ritual and devotional experience.
5. They visualize sacred texts, intermingling word and image or transforming them into one another.

Of course, a single image may do several or even all of these. But for the sake of clarity, selections for each essay focus on one function.

I do not suppose that any of these operations is unique to imagery. One might make the same points regarding food, dress, dance, or any of the arts regarding most, if not all, of the functions. But images will operate in different terms from other media. The larger point here is to show by means of example and comparison how images and visual practices provide rich evidence for the study and understanding of religion as a lived and visually engaging experience.

VISUAL ESSAY THEMES

The fourteen essays are organized under the five broad rubrics outlined above. It is important to underscore the fact that any given image might be classified simultaneously under several of the themes and rubrics. In fact, categories such as “space” and “time” are only extricated and regarded *in abstracto* since, in practice, they are often collapsed into a single domain of experience, as several examples of the sacred diagrams in the third essay will show. Moreover, images that perform such acts as healing or protection, or images that help one to remember or convey information, do so within the cultural contexts of their users. An image is not an autonomous entity, but is embedded in a life-world and a history, and charged with meaning and purpose within its society and civilization, deprived of which its function and power to signify and operate to purpose are necessarily compromised. Like any cultural artifact, images are not things in

themselves, but organic components of an operating whole. But in order to convey as clearly as possible the individual functions of images, the fourteen themes are placed under discrete rubrics.

To remove images and visual practices from one habitat and history, as often happens through migration, colonization, warfare, and trade, means to inaugurate new cultural and historical meanings. The ability of images to transcend one context, to synthesize different systems of meaning, to help invent new traditions of practice and thought, and to lead many lives beyond those originally ascribed to them are all part of the power of images that will be explored visually in these essays.

The operative question posed throughout the organization of these themes and the examples gathered under each has been: what do images do in religious life? Images are not used identically in various religions, though there are many striking parallels. And images often mark and remember the boundary of one tradition and another. Not all of the categories listed below apply to every religious tradition. Not every religion in human history is represented. Indeed, far from it. The task was not universal coverage, but rather an attempt to register some of the most important things that images do, things that belong at the heart of any study of religious practice and history. Students and scholars should find in these categories and their examples a prompt for the visual investigation of virtually any religious group, behavior, or idea.

I. Time

1. Sacred Time—the creation of time in ritual, memory, prophecy, or dream time; that is, remembering, looking ahead, and stepping out of time.
2. Visual Narrative—the visual means of storytelling.
3. Cosmic Visions—maps, calendars, *mandalas*, *yantras*, astrological charts, and sacred diagrams.

II. Space

4. Sacred Matter—the use of images and objects such as relics, reliquaries, amulets, or liturgical objects in religious practice.
5. Sacred Space—the role of images in creating shrines, monuments, gardens, temples, mosques, churches, and pilgrimage sites.

III. Structuring Social Relations

6. Community—imaging clan, tribe, ancestor, family, nation, congregation, ethnicity, and race.
7. Commerce of Images—the role that images play in the metaphysical as well as social economies of the sacred.
8. Appropriation and Identity—the manner in which images facilitate transformation, migration, and evolution of religious ideas and practices.
9. Efficacious Images—images that heal, protect, or enable their users to benefit or harm others.
10. Portraits—images of ancestors, teachers, saints, or deities that enable veneration, adoration, or union.

IV. Shaping Mind and Body

11. Sacred Gaze—images that assist meditation, visualization, memory, and aesthetic contemplation.
12. The True Image—visual traditions in certain religions that seek nonhumanly created images of a deity, founder, or saint.
13. Images and the Body—how images are used to condition the body, affect its operation, and control it.

V. Imaging Sacred Text

14. Word and Image—artifacts involving the integration of text and image in order to intensify the artifact's meaning and effect or evade taboos against pictorial representation.

DAVID MORGAN
Valparaiso University, September 2004

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

Such an encyclopedia as this has long been overdue. In all areas of religious studies—in the historical religious traditions as well as in nonliterate (“primitive”) religious systems—the “information explosion” of recent decades has demanded a new presentation of available materials. Further, in the last half century, new methodological approaches and more adequate hermeneutics have enhanced our knowledge of the existential value, the social function, and the cultural creativity of religions throughout history. We understand better now the mind and the behavior of *homo religiosus* (“religious man”), and we know much more about the beginnings, the growth, and the crises of different religions of the world.

These impressive advances in information and understanding have helped to eradicate the clichés, highly popular in the nineteenth century, concerning the mental capacity of nonliterate peoples and the poverty and provincialism of non-Western cultures. To realize the radical change of perspective, it suffices to compare, for instance, the current interpretations of an Australian Aboriginal ritual, a traditional African mythology, an Inner Asian shamanistic seance, or such complex phenomena as yoga and alchemy with the evaluations *en vogue* a few generations ago. Perhaps for the first time in history we recognize today not only the unity of human races but also the spiritual values and cultural significance of their religious creations.

I shall not here attempt to survey all the decisive contributions of recent research to a more correct appreciation of the dialectics of the sacred and of so many ethnic and historical religious systems. A few examples will serve to underscore my point.

In some areas of religious studies, unexpected and astonishing consequences of recent archaeological or textual discoveries have become almost immediately apparent. Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa, for instance, have revealed the grandiose proto-historical urban civilization of the Indus Valley, and discoveries of the library of

gnostic writings at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt and of a great number of Essene manuscripts at Qumran, near the Dead Sea, have given us documents of immeasurable value. Although publication and translation are not yet completed, much light has already been thrown on two problems that were extremely controversial until a generation ago.

A specific characteristic of the last several decades’ activities has been the amazing number of Asian religious texts that have been edited and, in many cases, translated for the first time into a European language. This editorial enterprise has been accompanied by the publication of a series of monographs spanning a range of scholarship difficult to imagine a few generations ago. The significance of such works is enormous, and the consequences of their publication are far-reaching.

The esoteric and occult traditions, misunderstood or neglected by former generations of scholars born and brought up in a positivistic milieu, constitute but one area of study on which recent research has cast new light. Here, much that was once obscure has been illuminated by, for instance, the classic monographs of Gershom Scholem on Qabbalah and on Jewish gnostic and mystical systems. Scholem’s erudition and insight have disclosed to us a coherent and profound world of meaning in texts that had earlier been generally dismissed as mere magic and superstition. Likewise, our understanding of Islamic mysticism has been radically improved by Louis Massignon’s works, while Henry Corbin and his disciples have revealed the neglected dimensions of Ismā’īlī esoteric tradition.

Also, in the past forty years we have witnessed a more correct and comprehensive appraisal of Chinese, Indian, and Western alchemies. Until recently, alchemy was regarded either as a proto-chemistry—that is, as an embryonic, naive, or prescientific discipline—or as a mass of superstitious rubbish that was culturally irrelevant. The investigations of Joseph Needham and Nathan Sivin have proved that Chinese

alchemy has a holistic structure, that it is a traditional science *sui generis*, not intelligible without its cosmologies and its ethical and, so to say, “existential” presuppositions and soteriological implications. And it is significant that in China alchemy was intimately related to secret Taoist practices, that in India it was a part of Tantric Yoga, and that, in the West, Greco-Egyptian and Renaissance alchemy was usually connected with gnosticism and Hermetism—all of which are secret, “occult” traditions.

A most surprising result of contemporary scholarship has been the discovery of the important role that alchemy and Hermetic esotericism have played in Western thought, not only in the Italian Renaissance but also in the triumph of Copernicus’s new astronomy, in the heliocentric theory of the solar system. Frances A. Yates has brilliantly analyzed the deep implications of the passionate interest in Hermetism in this period. For almost two centuries, Egyptian magic, alchemy, and esotericism have obsessed innumerable theologians and philosophers, believers as well as skeptics and cryptotheists. Yet, only recently has the importance of alchemy in Newton’s thinking, for example, been revealed. Betty J. T. Dobbs has pointed out that Newton probed in his laboratory “the whole vast literature of the older alchemy as it has never been probed before or since.” In fact, Newton sought in alchemy the structure of the small world to match his cosmological system.

Among many other examples of the progress realized in the last several decades, I may also recall the reevaluation of European popular traditions. Until the 1930s, the religious systems of Australian Aborigines and North American Indians were more seriously investigated, and were better understood, than were European folk traditions. On the one hand, researchers were interested mainly in folk literature; on the other hand, their interpretations of rituals and “popular mythologies” usually followed one of the fashionable theorists, such as Wilhelm Mannhardt or James G. Frazer. Furthermore, many scholars, in both eastern and western Europe, considered rural traditions as fragmentary and debased survivals from a superior layer of culture, from that, say, represented by the feudal aristocracy or that derived from church literature. In sum, taking into account the powerful influences of the church and of urban culture, one was inclined to doubt the authenticity or the archaism of rural religious traditions in Europe.

Recent and more rigorous studies have revealed a quite different situation. The Austrian ethnologist Leopold Schmidt, for example, has shown that certain mythico-ritual scenarios that were still current among peasants of central and southeastern Europe at the beginning of the twentieth century preserved mythological fragments and rituals that had disappeared in ancient Greece before the time of Homer. Other scholars have concluded that Romanian and Balkan folklore preserves Homeric and pre-Homeric themes and motifs. According to the American linguist and anthropologist Paul Friedrich, “The attitudes of contemporary Greek

peasants toward the Virgin Mary might bear in some way on our understanding of the Classical Demeter.” And the archaeologist Marija Gimbutas has pointed out that the pre-Christian layer in Baltic folklore “is so ancient that it undoubtedly reaches back to prehistoric times—at least to the Iron Age or in the case of some elements even several millennia deeper.” As to the archaism of Irish popular traditions, recent studies have demonstrated numerous analogies with ancient Indian ideas and customs.

Even more important, popular traditions around the globe reveal a specific originality in their reinterpretation of the Christian message. In many cultures, peasants practice what can be called a “cosmic Christianity,” which, in a “total” history of Christendom, ought to have a place, for it represents a new type of religious creativity. Thus, parallel to the different Christian theologies constructed both on Hebrew scriptures and on Greek metaphysics, one must also set the “popular theology” that assimilated and christianized many archaic traditions, from Neolithic to Oriental and Hellenistic religions. In this way, the religious history of Christian Europe will be deprovincialized and its universal values will become more evident.

I may also recall some of the results of contemporary work on the religious meaning—or function—of oral, and even written, literature. Some years ago, a number of scholars pointed out the initiatory symbols and motifs of certain categories of fairy tale. Significantly, almost at the same time many critics in Europe as well as in the United States began to investigate the patterns of initiation recognizable in various literary works. In both types of narrative, oral and written, we are led into an imaginary world, and in both we meet characters who undergo a series of initiatory ordeals, a common plot structure that is generally presented more or less transparently. The difference is that, while some fairy tales can be regarded as reflecting the remembrance of actual initiation rites practiced in the past, such is not true of modern literary works.

Specialists have also identified initiatory elements in such classical sources as the sixth book of Vergil’s *Aeneid*, in a number of scenarios and personages of the Arthurian legends, in the neo-Greek epic *Digenis Akritas*, in Tibetan epic poetry, and elsewhere. Most probably, these elements are ghostly souvenirs of the distant past, memories, vaguely recalled, of ancient initiatory rituals. But such cannot be so with initiatory structures found in modern literature from Coleridge’s *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* and Eliot’s *The Waste Land* to the many novels of James Fenimore Cooper, Jules Verne, Mark Twain, and William Faulkner. Nevertheless, these facts are relevant for an understanding of modern Western man. Indeed, in a desacralized world such as ours, the “sacred” is present and active chiefly in imaginary universes. But imaginary experiences are part of the total human being. This means that nostalgia for initiatory trials and scenarios, nostalgia deciphered in so many literary and artistic works (including the cinema), reveals modern man’s

longing for a *renovation* capable of radically changing his existence.

Of course, this is only an example of the unconscious reaction against the desacralization of modern Western societies, in some regards a phenomenon parallel to the acculturation of many traditional (“primitive”) cultures. This complex and delicate problem warrants far more attention than I can give it here, but I do wish to note that what has been called the “occult explosion” in contemporary North America belongs to the same desperate effort to react against the growing desacralization of the modern world, specifically the almost general crisis of the Christian churches.

The most significant advance in religious studies of the past several decades has been realized in our understanding of primal religions—that is, the religious systems of “primitive,” nonliterate peoples. There is no doubt that improvement of fieldwork methods and the growing interest of anthropologists in depth psychology, linguistics, and historiographical methodology have contributed to this success. Especially the researches, hypotheses, and controversies in relation to myths and mythological thinking have played a decisive role. The once-popular theories of the intellectual inferiority of “savages,” or of their “pre-logical mentality,” have been obsolete for some time. Anthropologists and sociologists as well as historians of religions nowadays emphasize the structural coherence of “primitive” religious beliefs and ideas. Although, as is always true in humanistic disciplines, no general theory on the “primitive mind” has been universally accepted, one methodological presupposition seems to be shared by the majority of today’s scholars: namely, the “normality” and, consequently, the creativity of the primal religions.

Indeed, it has been repeatedly pointed out that the archaic mind has never been stagnant, that some nonliterate peoples have made important technological discoveries and that some others have had a certain sense of history. Such radical modification of our former understanding and evaluation of nonliterate religious traditions has been in part a consequence of growing interest in the structure and the morphology of the sacred—that is, in religious experience and in its ritual and symbolic expressions.

Progressively, scholars have realized the necessity of trying to discover the meanings given by nonliterate peoples to their own religious activities. W. E. H. Stanner, who dedicated his life to the study of Australian Aborigines, emphatically asserted that their religion must be approached “*as* religion and not as a mirror of something else.” Stanner repeatedly criticized the fallacious presupposition “that the social order is primary and in some cases causal, and the religious order secondary and in some sense consequential.” Equally significant is the affirmation of the British Africanist E. E. Evans-Pritchard that knowledge of Christian theology, exegesis, symbolic thought, and ritual better enables the anthropologist to understand “primitive” ideas and practices.

An obvious corollary may thence be drawn: that knowledge of the religious ideas and practices of other traditions better enables anyone to understand his or her own. The history of religions is the story of the human encounter with the sacred—a universal phenomenon made evident in myriad ways.

These, then, are some of the themes and topics that the interested reader will find in the hundreds of articles that constitute this encyclopedia. In planning it, the editors and the staff have aimed at a concise, clear, and objective description of the totality of human experiences of the sacred. We have, we hope, paid due attention to traditions both great and small, to the historical religions as well as to the primal religions, to the religious systems of the East as well as to those of the West. Wishing particularly to avoid reductionism and Western cultural bias, we have given far greater space to the religions of non-Western areas than have earlier reference books on religion. Finally, and in conformity with the international design of our encyclopedia, we have invited scholars from five continents to contribute articles related to their specific areas of research.

Our encyclopedia was not conceived as a dictionary, with entries covering the entire vocabulary in every field of religious studies. Rather, it was conceived as a system of articles on important ideas, beliefs, rituals, myths, symbols, and persons that have played a role in the universal history of religions from Paleolithic times to the present day. Thus, the reader will not find here entries on all the popes or on all the patriarchs of the Eastern churches, nor on all the saints, mystics, and minor figures of the various religious traditions. Instead, here is a great network of historical and descriptive articles, synthetical discussions, and interpretive essays that make available contemporary insight into the long and multifaceted history of religious man.

Here, among many others, are articles devoted to recent archaeological and textual discoveries and, particularly important, articles devoted to the reevaluation of facts and systems of thought ignored or neglected until a few decades ago: for instance, the history of Hermetism and of alchemy, the occult revival in our time, the creativity of “popular” religions, the millenaristic movements among contemporary “primitive” societies, and the religious dimensions of the arts. A more rigorous study of such themes not only illuminates their meanings but, in some cases, opens new perspectives on the evaluation of other cultural phenomena.

By consulting various entries in the encyclopedia, the reader will learn the latest results of anthropological research and the current evaluation of various primal religions. These, in turn, have led to the burgeoning contemporary interest in the structure, meaning, and functions of myth and of religious symbols. A number of articles herein are devoted to these subjects, which are equally important, I might add, for recent Western philosophical inquiry. As a matter of fact, the exegesis of mythical thinking has played a central role in the

works of many distinguished modern philosophers and linguists. Similarly, a more adequate understanding of symbolic thinking has contributed to the systematic study of religious symbols, and, thus, to a reevaluation of the central role of religious symbolism.

I need not list here other examples of recent methodological progress that has made possible our present comprehension of religious structures and creations. It suffices to say that the researches of the last half century concern not only the historian of religions, the anthropologist, and the sociologist but also the political scientist, the social historian, the

psychologist, and the philosopher. To know the great variety of worldviews assumed by religious man, to comprehend the expanse of his spiritual universe, is, finally, to advance our general knowledge of humankind. It is true that most of the worldviews of primal societies and archaic civilizations have long since been left behind by history. But they have not vanished without a trace. They have contributed toward making us what we are today, and so, after all, they are part of our own history.

MIRCEA ELIADE
Chicago, March 1986

FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

Mircea Eliade, the editor in chief of this encyclopedia, died in April 1986, shortly after drafting his preface. The publisher wisely chose to leave his preface substantially as he had composed it, and it was suggested that I spell out in a foreword what might be called the encyclopedia's "angle of vision," to supplement what had already been said by its editor in chief.

Needless to say, it would be virtually impossible for an encyclopedia of this sort to cover adequately every religious idea, practice, and phenomenon known to the human race. At the same time, the publisher, the editors, and our many advisers wished to produce not a dictionary but a genuine encyclopedia that would introduce educated, nonspecialist readers to important ideas, practices, and persons in the religious experience of humankind from the Paleolithic past to our day.

The present work has much in common with another major English-language encyclopedia produced earlier in this century, namely, the thirteen-volume *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings with assistance from John A. Selbie, Louis H. Gray, and others (Edinburgh, 1908–1926; reprint, New York, 1955; hereafter designated *ERE*). Both came into being at times when knowledge about the various religions had grown to such a degree that without an encyclopedic work of some sort, it would not be possible, as the architects of the *ERE* put it, "to have at our command the vast stores of learning which have accumulated."

The planners of both encyclopedias attempted to solicit contributions from the most advanced scholars at work in the various fields of study; they asked their contributors for the most up-to-date information available, to be sure, but also for histories of interpretation and the most current interpretive schemas. That much of what was said in the *ERE* has now gone out of date and that all of it reflects the scholarship of the time in which it was produced are melancholy

reminders that any encyclopedia, including this one, begins to grow obsolete almost before it is published.

Readers will notice, of course, some basic differences between these two encyclopedias. Joachim Wach (1898–1955) often reminded us that religion usually has three "expressions" (his term) or dimensions, namely, the theoretical (e.g., doctrines, dogmas, myths, theologies, ethics), the practical (e.g., cults, sacraments, meditations), and the sociological (e.g., religious groupings, ecclesiastical forms). Our encyclopedia tries to do justice as much as possible to these three dimensions of religion, in contradistinction to the *ERE*, which focused primarily on the theoretical aspect to the exclusion of the practical and the sociological. Admittedly, the division of human experience into various compartments—religion, philosophy, ethics, art, and so on—is largely a Western convention; and historically, in the West, theology (cognitive attempts to systematize religious teachings) has occupied a conspicuously important place in defining religion, which in turn has enjoyed a traditionally ambiguous but close relationship with ethics and the philosophy of religion. Thus it is not surprising that the *ERE* was primarily concerned with theologies and philosophies of religion and with ethics, for it was the underlying theological and philosophical interest of the planners of the *ERE* that led them to look for normativeness in religion and ethics. In this sense, the *ERE* and the present encyclopedia are very different.

It is important to appreciate the difference between the mental world of the planners of the *ERE* and our own mental world. Unconsciously if not consciously, the planners of the *ERE* viewed non-Western peoples, histories, cultures, and religions primarily from the Western perspective. It was doubtless true that politically, socially, culturally, religiously, economically, and militarily the power of Western colonial nations reached its zenith during the nineteenth century, and that the most important events of the modern world occurred through the impetus and initiative of the West. Moreover, as has been aptly remarked, the ethos of the nine-

teenth century lasted rather longer than the actual calendar end of the century; and furthermore, although World War I undeniably weakened the unity and cohesiveness of the European family of nations, a persistent carryover of the vitality of the Western powers, Western civilization, and Western learning remained even in Asia and Africa until the end of World War II.

To many non-Western peoples, the year 1945 marked a significant line of demarcation between two worlds of experience. In their eyes, the Western colonial powers—even when they meant well—had acted in the manner of parents who refuse to allow their children to grow up by making all the important decisions for them. The years after World War II witnessed not only the emergence of many new and inexperienced nations but, more important, a redefinition on a global scale of the dignity, value, and freedom of human beings, including non-Western peoples. While knowledgeable Western scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw non-Western peoples only as sources of religious and cultural data for Western scholars to analyze within their own (i.e., Western) methodologies and frameworks, after World War II these same non-Western peoples rightly began to insist on participating in the global effort to develop adequate interpretive schemes for apprehending the entire religious experience of humankind, past and present, prehistoric to modern. Accordingly, the present encyclopedia has attempted to enlarge the mental world of contemporary scholarship by drawing a large number of contributors from the non-Western world. This has turned out to be a far more difficult approach—but a far more rewarding one—than a primarily Western-based compendium modeled on the *ERE* would have been.

During the early twentieth century, three major areas of “scholarly” or “scientific” study of religion(s)—often called “comparative religion” or the “comparative study of religions”—were taken for granted. The first comprised a narrow historical and ethnological survey of a short series of particular religions, conceived as the simple collection of “raw” religious data—beliefs, practices, feelings, moods, attitudes—often colored by an evolutionary ideology. Scholars were keenly aware, however, of the personal and corporate aspects and the immanent and transcendental dimensions of religions. The second area aimed to classify religious data according to what Stanley A. Cook in the *ERE* called “certain persistent and prevalent notions of the ‘evolution’ of thought and ... practices ... in the history of culture” (*ERE*, vol. 10, p. 664). The third area was usually reserved for the philosophy of religion or sometimes for theology. In all three areas, scholars were conscious of the virtues of the comparative method of inquiry—“the unbiased co-ordination of all comparable data irrespective of context or age”—which aims to break down “racial, social, intellectual, and psychical boundaries, and to bring into relation all classes and races of men” (ibid.). They were careful to point out, however, that “similar practices can have different meanings or motives, and

similar ideas and beliefs can be differently expressed ... [so that] confusion has often been caused by naive comparisons and rash inferences” (ibid.). A rational scheme of interpretation of religious ideas, usually a philosophy of religion although sometimes a theology, was brought in to introduce order and to adjudicate nebulous, confusing, and competing religious claims. The following statement succinctly expresses the main concern of the *ERE*:

Whenever the ethical or moral value of activities or conditions is questioned, the value of religion is involved; and all deep-stirring experiences invariably compel a reconsideration of the most fundamental ideas, whether they are explicitly religious or not. Ultimately there arise problems of justice, human destiny, God, and the universe; and these in turn involve problems of the relation between ‘religious’ and other ideas, the validity of ordinary knowledge, and practicable conceptions of ‘experience’ and ‘reality.’ (ibid., p. 662)

Undeniably the *ERE* was an important embodiment of the deep concerns of informed Western theologians and philosophers with religion and ethics in the early twentieth century, and it represented a high standard, with contributions from many of the most erudite scholars of comparative religion at the time.

Clearly, our encyclopedia of religion is the product of a different time and a different sort of scholarship. The multi-dimensional scholarly style of Mircea Eliade, our editor in chief, might best exemplify the character of our encyclopedia. Born in Romania, Eliade early aspired to be a physical scientist but was lured into the study of the philosophy of the Italian Renaissance during his college days. He studied Indian philosophy and Yoga at the University of Calcutta and in the Himalayas. Once back in Romania, he taught at the University of Bucharest and also established his reputation as a creative writer. After serving as a cultural attache in both London and Lisbon, he taught and wrote in Paris as a self-styled refugee. In 1956 he was invited to teach at the University of Chicago, and there he spent the next thirty years, until his death in 1986. While he taught the history of religions in the Divinity School and in the Committee of Social Thought, he also collaborated often with philosopher Paul Ricoeur and theologian Paul Tillich. His numerous writings include systematic works; historical studies; monographs on yoga, shamanism, folk religion, and alchemy; autobiographies; drama; stories of the occult; and novels.

Eliade hoped that the present encyclopedia would implement his lifelong vision of a “total hermeneutics,” a coherent interpretive framework for the entire human experience (called once by Wach “integral understanding”). Eliade’s total hermeneutics was based on his understanding of the general scientific study of religions (*allgemeine Religionswissenschaft*), known as the “history of religions” to the international association of scholars of the discipline, and was dependent as well on various social, physical, and bio-

logical sciences; law; humanistic disciplines, especially the arts and literature; philosophy (more particularly the philosophy of religion); and theologies. It was Eliade's conviction that all of these disciplines in combination must attempt to decipher the meaning of human experience in this mysterious universe. Indeed, from the dawn of history, human beings have been working, discovering, and religious beings simultaneously.

The editors agreed with Eliade that the basic methodology underlying our encyclopedia should be that of the history of religions (*Religionswissenschaft*), which consists of two dimensions, historical and systematic. In this framework, the historical dimension depends upon a mutual interaction between histories of individual religions—any of the prehistoric, early historic, historic, premodern, modern, or contemporary “primitive” religions—and the history of *religion-myths*, symbols, rituals, and so on. The systematic task consists of phenomenological, comparative, sociological, and psychological studies of religions. (Eliade's particular contribution here has been termed the “morphological” study of religion.)

Eliade and the editors were convinced that with the combination of the history of religions and all the other disciplines mentioned previously it would be possible to arrive at certain disciplined generalizations about the nature of religion, as well as a structuring of religious data, which would increase our understanding of the meaning of human experience or the mode of being human in this universe. Accordingly, in the early planning stage, at least, we created three categories of articles. Our first broad category was planned to include historical and descriptive essays on particular religious communities and traditions, both the “great” traditions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam) and the “small” (traditional African societies, Australian Aboriginal groups, Mesoamerican cultures, and others). Our second broad category was slated to cover topics in the history of religion (e.g., “afterlife,” “alchemy,” “myth,” “ritual,” “symbol,” and so on). Finally, our third broad category was planned to include examinations of the relationships between religion and other areas of culture (e.g., law, science, the arts, and others).

Inevitably, there were bound to be duplications among topics in different categories, as in the case of “ritual,” “ritual studies,” and the rituals of individual religious traditions. There are also, we found, some religious phenomena that defy easy categorization. Thus, our three categories were merely the framework on which we based our plans; we expanded and embellished it as need arose.

In editing an encyclopedia on “religion,” we have had to face many problems that editors of encyclopedias on other subjects might easily avoid. One such problem involves what H. Richard Niebuhr called the “inner” and the “outer” meanings of religious phenomena. Wilfred Cantwell Smith once remarked that to outsiders Islam is a religion of the

Muslims but to the Muslims Islam is a religion of truth. Our encyclopedia has made a serious effort on this account to balance the inner, theological, soteriological meanings and the outer, historical, sociological, anthropological, historical, and cultural meanings; but it is doubtful that our efforts will completely satisfy those partisans who seek only the “inner” or the “outer” meanings of religious phenomena. There are surely some people who think that their religious tradition alone encompasses the whole and final truth. It is beyond the scope of our encyclopedia to address this issue.

Readers should, however, know what our stance toward religion(s) is. We have assumed that there is no such thing as a purely religious phenomenon. A religious phenomenon is a human phenomenon and thus is not only religious but also social, cultural, psychological, biological, and so on. Yet as Eliade rightly said, “To try to grasp the essence of such a phenomenon by means of physiology, psychology, sociology, economics, linguistics, art or any other study is false; it misses the one unique and irreducible element in it—the element of the sacred” (*Patterns in Comparative Religion*, London, 1958, p. xi). Thus, throughout this encyclopedia we have made every effort to avoid “reductionist” interpretations of religion.

By the same token, we have avoided the currently fashionable theory of dividing history into a simplistic formula of tradition versus modern. We recall that from the time of the Enlightenment in Europe many scholars sought the “origin” of religion in order to understand the meaning of religions. In their inquiry, they paid scant attention to the historical dimensions of religions because to them, history signified primarily the accretions of time and the process of degeneration, presumably from the origin of religion. On the other hand, many scholars today are preoccupied with the contemporary manifestations of religions without adequate appreciation of the historical processes that impinge on the present. They often equate the traditional with an inherited culture long identified with a stagnating society, and thus to them what is not modern has the derogatory connotation of tradition. It is our intention, therefore, to avoid both such a facile use of history and the formula of tradition versus modern.

Our editor in chief sincerely appreciated the dedication of the editors and the staff members who, over the years, created entries; wrote up descriptions for articles; solicited consultants, advisers, and contributors; read the submitted articles; made suggestions for revisions; and much more. Among the editors, Charles J. Adams and Annemarie Schimmel made important contributions in the history of religion in addition to their original assignment in the histories of religions, Islam. Martin E. Marty, Richard P. McBrien, and Robert M. Seltzer handled not only their original assignments of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism, respectively, but were also indispensable in formulating theories and frameworks. Seltzer's assignment also included Israelite religion as well as other religions of the ancient Near East.

Jacob Needleman undertook the formidable task of relating religion to other areas of life. Eliade himself not only functioned as our editor in chief but also acted as a supervising editor for archaic, primal religions (with Victor Turner and Lawrence E. Sullivan, our associate editor) and for Hinduism (helped by William K. Mahony, our assistant editor). Turner, of course, covered the vast area of anthropology, folklores, and folk religions; and I, besides collaborating on the history of religion, was in charge of Chinese, Korean, and Japanese religions and of Buddhism. Sullivan worked with Eliade on the history of religion and with Turner on primal religions; Mahoney worked with Eliade on Hinduism and with me on Buddhism. All of us enjoyed the help of the project editors on the Macmillan staff.

We all witnessed Eliade's deep grief at the news of Victor Turner's death in 1983. Turner had at one time chaired the Committee on Social Thought at the University of Chicago, a committee on which Eliade served for many years. In him were combined abundant energy and multidimensional interests and a broad learning, all of which he freely offered to the encyclopedia. His death was a great blow to us all.

Eliade wished to acknowledge publicly all the formal and informal consultants, advisers, and contributors, many of whom were friends, colleagues, and former students of the editors. This is an appropriate place to express our gratitude to Franklin I. Gamwell, dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and to Bernard McGinn, program coordinator of the Institute for the Advanced Study of Religion in the Divinity School, for providing facilities for editorial meetings of the encyclopedia. We also wish to thank Wendy D. O'Flaherty (on the study of Hinduism especially),

other Chicago colleagues, and Gregory D. Alles and Peter Chemery, who served as Eliade's research assistants, for generously offering their scholarship, their time, and their labor.

All of the editors share Eliade's sentiment, often expressed at various meetings, in recognizing the initiative of Jeremiah Kaplan, president of Macmillan Publishing Company, and of Charles E. Smith, vice-president and publisher, for undertaking this gigantic and expensive enterprise, and the efficiency and effectiveness of the project editors on the publisher's staff in bringing this undertaking to a successful conclusion.

Of course, everyone involved in the realization of *The Encyclopedia of Religion*—editors, consultants, contributors, and staff—laments the untimely death of Mircea Eliade. But we should recall the epitaph of Sir Christopher Wren at Saint Paul's in London: "If you seek his monument, look around you." In like vein, we can say about Mircea Eliade, who passed away before his encyclopedia came to full fruition, "If you seek his monument, look in these volumes." This encyclopedia was his final undertaking, and he will remain alive in the minds of its readers for decades to come.

I consider it a great privilege to have known and worked with Mircea Eliade for more than three decades. I wish to express my personal gratitude to the Macmillan staff, to fellow advisers, and to the contributors who made this encyclopedia possible. Although the foregoing statement is largely mine, I hope that it expresses as well something of the sentiments of my colleagues on the board of editors.

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA
Chicago, August 1986

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EDITION

During the early days of the development of this encyclopedia, the board of editors and the senior members of the staff met often, both formally and informally, to exchange ideas, to decide editorial policies, and to discuss plans for the contents of the work we had undertaken to produce. At first, given the enormous scope of our topic, and the great variety of religious traditions and fields of study that it includes, it seemed impossible that any coherent system of articles could be devised that would limn the entire circle of current learning on religion and that would, further, serve the purposes both of the general reader and of specialists in various areas of religious studies. Soon, however, it became apparent that the conceptual scheme mapped out by Mircea Eliade, our editor in chief, and the editorial formats and systems used by Macmillan were extremely compatible. Indeed, quite early in our planning stage, we realized the possibilities of creating a work that would be both truly encyclopedic and widely useful. At the conclusion of the editorial meeting in which we had reached this happy consensus, Victor Turner remarked, with evident delight, "And so, then, we shall let a thousand flowers bloom."

As usual, Turner's metaphor was apt. Not only did his horticultural image echo Eliade's particular interest in vegetative symbolism—from the Goethean notion of the primordial plant to the widespread image of the cosmic tree—but it suggested a correspondence between editing and gardening that I have long known to be true.

The editor and the gardener do, in fact, have much in common. The one, just as the other, must know taxonomy, and he must plan his garden with care. He must consider the genera and species of vegetal materials he wishes to include, the size and shape of his plot, the number and arrangement of plants, their growing season and their heights and textures and colors. Then the soil must be prepared, stones removed, seeds sown and nourished. After a while, germination occurs and plants emerge. With an eye toward the planned appearance of the garden at maturity, individual plants must be

tended and encouraged to grow; some must be pinched back to improve their shape, propped up to permit their development, or given extra nutriment to build their strength. Attention must constantly be paid, and the garden must be rid of noxious weeds and pernicious pests. This all done, and given favorable atmospheric conditions, a garden may grow and flourish.

The end result may be much as the gardener had planned, forming the orderly patterns of the original design and exhibiting the structural symmetries, pleasing contrasts, and pretty juxtapositions that the gardener had first imagined. But there will surely be some surprises along the way. Some seeds may fail to sprout; others may yield proliferous growth. A natural balance seems to obtain. Just as a few seedlings may be undersized, weak, and thin, some few early blossoms of disappointingly pallid hue, other plants may foliate and flower with unexpected vigor and splendor. For all a gardener's careful planning, a garden grows as it will.

Yet, if the conceptual scheme of a garden has been judiciously and imaginatively wrought and if the gardener works with skill and patience and knowledge of the needs of the various plants, the garden may, in the end, be a wondrous thing. A thousand flowers may indeed one day bloom, to enchant the eye, engage the mind, and enrich the spirit.

The present encyclopedia is a garden of nearly three thousand flowers, grown from seeds sown in scholarly fields around the globe and transplanted here to form this great collection of articles. The board of editors and the Macmillan staff have gladly labored in this large and elaborate plot during the seven years of its planning and cultivation, sharing our chores with uncommon congeniality and good will. Now that the season of bloom is upon us, it falls to me, as the senior project editor on the Macmillan staff, to recapitulate some of the editorial policies we established, some of the editorial decisions we made, and some of the editorial practices we followed in making our garden grow.

To cover the vast territory outlined by our editor in chief in his general plan for the encyclopedia, the editors undertook to develop specific plans for articles in their various areas of specialization. Governed only by a general word allotment and suggestions for certain patterns of coverage, each editor was given free rein to determine the number, kind, and length of articles for the area(s) assigned to him or her. Staff members assigned to corresponding areas coordinated and supplemented the editors' plans for coverage but did not substantially alter them. Some parts of our plans were assigned to project editors on the Macmillan staff and were developed by them on the expert advice of special consultants. Consequently, in the final conceptual scheme of things, selection and arrangement of materials on the various religious traditions and fields of study turned out to be generally similar but particularly diverse, reflecting not only the different states of current scholarship in different fields but also the personal judgments and emphases of the various supervising editors.

Entries in the encyclopedia, it was early decided, would be alphabetically arranged. To avoid the dilemma of "alphabetization versus systematization," however, we also planned to follow the admirable practice of earlier Macmillan encyclopedias in using "composite entries" to group two or more articles under one heading, thus permitting systematic discussion of various aspects of broad topics. As an aid to the reader, we planned to put a headnote to each composite entry to explain its organization and, where appropriate, to offer a rationale for its partition. In developing composite entries, I should note, we did not always strive for exhaustive systematization; instead, we sometimes allowed ourselves to design pairs or groups of articles reflecting the idiosyncracies of current scholarly interest in various topics.

Once our plans were laid, and details of the several parts of our conceptual scheme began to fall into place, contributors selected from the international community of scholars were invited to undertake assignments in their special fields of study. For each article, a length was specified and a brief scope description was suggested. Except in terms of length, however, contributors were not restricted. On the contrary, as experts in their fields, they were encouraged to develop their articles according to their best judgment. We requested that a selected bibliography accompany each article, to call attention to some of the most useful publications on the topics discussed, to make recommendations for further reading, and to indicate bibliographic resources. Our general aim was to procure fresh, original articles from the best writers and thinkers and scholars in the world, forming a collection that would accurately reflect what we currently know—or, as one distinguished contributor put it, what we think we know—about the particular histories of religions past and present, great and small, as well as of the general history of religion viewed on a universal scale.

Our reach, we believe, did not exceed our grasp. The response to our invitations was overwhelmingly affirmative,

and as manuscripts began to arrive in our offices from all the four corners of the earth, we soon saw that our encyclopedia would fulfill its promise. Our garden flourished from the very beginning; almost every seed sprouted, and there were remarkably few weeds.

There were, however, many gardening tasks to be done. The arrival of manuscripts brought us finally and squarely face to face with certain editorial problems of writing style that we had earlier anticipated, and with a few that we had not. We were confronted, of course, by problems of translation, transliteration, and romanization of many foreign languages, which, given the international tenor of our contributors and the pandemic scope of our project, we had fully expected. But we were also confronted by some surprisingly thorny problems of vocabulary and orthography that arose from the need to coordinate various conventions employed in different areas of religious studies and the need to establish standards of writing style that would be both acceptable to scholars and intelligible to nonspecialists.

Given that we had set out to produce an English-language encyclopedia and that we had decided to invite contributions from leading scholars around the globe, regardless of their native languages, the specter of translation loomed large and early. Contributors who preferred to write their articles in languages other than English were encouraged to enlist the aid of a trusted colleague as translator. Many of them did so, and submitted their articles to us in English. Many more did not, and submitted their articles to us in a great variety of European and Asian languages. Drawing upon the talents of translators both here and abroad, as well as upon the language skills of staff members, we undertook to put all these articles into clear and accurate English. We hope that we have successfully avoided an equation that Italians make—"Traduttore a traditore" (roughly, "Translation is treachery")—and that we have everywhere been faithful to our contributors' meanings. Translators are credited at the end of each article that has been rendered into English.

Translation of prose does not, of course, lay to rest all editorial problems with foreign languages. Many linguistic issues hovered over us, awaiting resolution. As a general policy, we had decided to restrict ourselves to the Latin alphabet, not venturing into such other alphabets as those of Sanskrit, Hebrew, Greek, or Arabic or into such other writing systems as those used to transcribe spoken Chinese, Japanese, or Korean. Yet all these languages, and many more, are the stuff of religious studies, and we were obliged to deal with them sensibly within an English context. A multitude of names and technical terms in all the world's languages, couched in various alphabets and writing systems, demanded to be appropriately spelled via transliteration or romanization into the Latin alphabet of English.

Generally, we agreed to prefer the modern, scholarly spellings that most closely approximate the orthography and/or pronunciation of the original language. Thus we

decided to follow the transliteration and romanization systems used by the United States Library of Congress. These, by and large, are the traditional systems of scholarship in the English-speaking world and are thus to be found in the majority of secondary sources in Western libraries.

For languages for which the Library of Congress has issued no romanization table and for which no scholarly consensus has yet clearly emerged, we have made decisions on romanization based on the most expert advice we could secure. The languages of many indigenous peoples of Africa, the Americas, Australia, and Oceania, for example, have long been spoken but only recently written. For those for which standard systems of romanization have been established (e.g., Khoisan, Navajo), we have used them; for others, we have followed traditional practices. For languages for which scholarly practices of romanization vary widely—as in transcription of the languages of the ancient Near East—we have generally preferred the simplest system commonly used. For languages on which scholarly preference seems to be about equally divided between two standard systems of romanization (e.g., Tibetan), we have, realizing the impossibility of pleasing everyone, chosen to please ourselves. Gardeners' choice, as it were.

The spelling systems we have followed employ a moderate range of diacritical marks to indicate pronunciation in various languages. In addition to standard diacritics (e.g., the acute accent, the grave accent, the macron, the circumflex, the tilde, et al.), we decided to use an apostrophe (') to represent the hamzah in Arabic and the alef in Hebrew, a reversed apostrophe (') to represent 'ayn in Arabic and 'ayin in Hebrew, and a single quotation mark (') to indicate voiced consonants in Chinese. Besides these, we have used a few special characters (e.g., the thorn, the edh, et al.) in spelling Old English and Middle English, venerable ancestors of our modern language, and Old Norse, its ancient Germanic cousin.

Having made all these decisions regarding our preferences for scholarly usage of foreign languages, we found that personal names, both mythic and historical, continued to give us editorial trouble. We wished, wherever possible, to spell names according to the transliteration and romanization systems we had chosen, thus establishing a harmonious editorial consistency and, at the same time, restoring a certain linguistic and cultural integrity to names whose origins had, in Western scholarship, generally been englished or latinized or grecized beyond recognition. We wished, in short, to name Greeks in Greek, Chinese in Chinese, Arabs in Arabic, and so on.

To a certain degree we have been successful in our attempts to spell proper names "properly." Where our spellings differ markedly from those to which English readers may be accustomed, we have usually given traditional forms in parentheses: Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), Meng-tzu (Mencius), Óðinn (Odin), Zarathushtra (Zoroaster). For his-

torical figures who habitually spoke or wrote more than one language, we have transliterated their names from the language of their major works. Appropriate spelling of the names of Jewish scholars—polyglots all, it seems—has involved some particularly fine decisions, but, faced with several choices, we have generally preferred to give them in Hebrew.

Common sense, of course, frequently overruled all our editorial principles. Many names are too firmly embedded in the English language to bear alteration to more scholarly forms. Consequently, we have used latinized forms of most ancient Greek names (e.g., *Athena*, *Plato*, and *Phidias*, not *Athēnē*, *Platon*, and *Pheidias*), and we have invariably used englished names of biblical figures (e.g., *Moses*, *Jeremiah*, and *Jesus*, not *Mosheh*, *Yirmiyahu*, and *Yeshuah*). Otherwise, we have used commonly latinized or grecized names (e.g., *Confucius*, *Maimonides*) followed by more accurate forms in parentheses. Widely known place-names are given in englished forms (e.g., *Tokyo*, *Vienna*, and *Rome*, not *Tōkyō*, *Wien*, and *Roma*); less well known places are named in the language of the locale.

Appropriate spelling of names and terms in foreign languages was thus among our major editorial concerns, but no less so, and perhaps more so, was appropriate use of English terms. In devising our plans for the contents of the encyclopedia, and especially in choosing the terms under which articles would be entered into the overall alphabetical order, we endeavored to be constantly attuned to the nuances of meaning, and to the limits of meaning, of the terms that we chose to employ. We have used English words, of course, as headings for many articles planned to present cross-cultural perspectives of broad topics. But in all instances where genuine doubts about the suitability of an entry term could legitimately be raised with respect to a particular religious tradition, we planned to present a separate discussion under the idiom employed by the tradition itself. In all articles on cross-cultural topics, we encouraged contributors to speculate on the usefulness of the entry term as an organizing principle in the study of religion. We often urged them, too, to venture beyond their customary range of specialization and to take the broadest possible view of their topics, thus developing rare hybrids of unusual texture and variegation.

The plants in our garden, then, are named by terms both English and non-English, and they are arranged in the order of the Latin alphabet, strictly letter by letter. Throughout the alphabetical order, articles are located under the terms that we hope will be first consulted by most readers, both specialists and nonspecialists. Entries under *alternative* spellings and synonyms give cross-references to the actual location of articles. In addition, an extensive system of cross-references within articles has been employed to direct the reader to discussions of related topics. As final aids to the reader, a synoptic outline of contents and a thorough topical index appear in volume 16, and it is there that curious

researchers should turn for systematic references to the names, the terms, and the topics they seek.

Like mushrooms after rain, other issues of appropriate use of language sprang up all over our garden. Perhaps nowhere more than in religious studies are conventions of writing style so bewilderingly diverse and thus so challenging to editors intent on stylistic consistency. In establishing principles of capitalization, italicization, and other such minutiae of editorial style, we tried always to remain flexible, observing the scholarly shibboleths of various religious traditions and, wherever we could without generating confusion, accommodating contributors' preferences. We have striven for consistency, to be sure, but we have always let context be our guide, varying details of style to suit content wherever necessary. Our chief aim in all our decisions has been to make meaning clear.

By no means, however, did we abandon all standards of writing style and let chaos reign. Editing, like all creative acts, is a messy business, but, like gardening, it is also both an orderly process and a process of establishing order.

Order, engendering clarity, is a consummation we have devoutly wished. Through use of standard forms of names and parenthetical notations of alternate forms, we have tried to make sure that all persons and places mentioned are clearly identified. We have standardized year dates to those of the Gregorian calendar, generally cited in terms of the common era, but we have also given dates by other systems of chronology wherever context demanded them. We have kept abbreviations to a minimum, and we have listed those we have

used in the front of each of our volumes. In devising bibliographies, we offered our contributors two standard formats, prose and list, and allowed them to choose the more appropriate to their articles. Regardless of format, our researchers have verified the accuracy of all bibliographic data, and we have taken pains to ensure that English-language editions are cited if they exist.

All these editorial concerns, among numerous others, have entered into the care of our garden. We are happy at last to see it in full flower, and we believe that it presents a splendid array of great variety, worth, and interest. We trust that Victor Turner would have been pleased.

Thanks due from the Macmillan staff to the many people who aided us in our gardening chores are expressed in a special section of acknowledgments in volume 16. I cannot close this introduction, however, without making a general acknowledgment of our gratitude to the contributors, whose ready cooperation greatly eased our efforts; to the consultants, who lent us the conceptual tools and technical devices that we needed; and to the board of editors, who shared our labors and became our friends. Most of all, we are grateful to have known and worked with Mircea Eliade, our editor in chief. In all his dealings with us, his generosity of spirit was boundless, his sweetness, kindness, and gentleness never failing. His genius is represented in these volumes, and through them it will live, in the words of Ben Jonson, as long as "we have wits to read, and praise to give."

CLAUDE CONYERS
New York, October 1986

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS USED IN THIS WORK

abbr. abbreviated; abbreviation	3 Bar. <i>3 Baruch</i>	2 Chr. <i>2 Chronicles</i>
abr. abridged; abridgment	4 Bar. <i>4 Baruch</i>	Ch. Slav. Church Slavic
AD <i>anno Domini</i> , in the year of the (our) Lord	B.B. <i>Bavā batrā</i>	cm centimeters
Afrik. Afrikaans	BBC British Broadcasting Corporation	col. column (pl., cols.)
AH <i>anno Hegirae</i> , in the year of the Hijrah	BC before Christ	Col. <i>Colossians</i>
Akk. Akkadian	BCE before the common era	Colo. Colorado
Ala. Alabama	B.D. Bachelor of Divinity	comp. compiler (pl., comps.)
Alb. Albanian	Beits. <i>Beitsah</i>	Conn. Connecticut
Am. <i>Amos</i>	Bekh. <i>Bekhorot</i>	cont. continued
AM <i>ante meridiem</i> , before noon	Beng. Bengali	Copt. Coptic
amend. amended; amendment	Ber. <i>Berakhot</i>	1 Cor. <i>1 Corinthians</i>
annot. annotated; annotation	Berb. Berber	2 Cor. <i>2 Corinthians</i>
Ap. <i>Apocalypse</i>	Bik. <i>Bikkurim</i>	corr. corrected
Apn. <i>Apocryphon</i>	bk. book (pl., bks.)	C.S.P. Congregatio Sancti Pauli, Congregation of Saint Paul (Paulists)
app. appendix	B.M. <i>Bavā metsi'a</i>	d. died
Arab. Arabic	BP before the present	D Deuteronomic (source of the Pentateuch)
Arakh. <i>Arakbin</i>	B.Q. <i>Bavā qamma</i>	Dan. Danish
Aram. Aramaic	Brāh. <i>Brāhmaṇa</i>	D.B. Divinitatis Baccalaureus, Bachelor of Divinity
Ariz. Arizona	Bret. Breton	D.C. District of Columbia
Ark. Arkansas	B.T. Babylonian Talmud	D.D. Divinitatis Doctor, Doctor of Divinity
Arm. Armenian	Bulg. Bulgarian	Del. Delaware
art. article (pl., arts.)	Burm. Burmese	Dem. <i>Demā i</i>
AS Anglo-Saxon	c. <i>circa</i> , about, approximately	dim. diminutive
Asm. Mos. <i>Assumption of Moses</i>	Calif. California	diss. dissertation
Assyr. Assyrian	Can. Canaanite	Dn. <i>Daniel</i>
A.S.S.R. Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic	Catal. Catalan	D.Phil. Doctor of Philosophy
Av. Avestan	CE of the common era	Dt. <i>Deuteronomy</i>
A.Z. <i>Avodah zarah</i>	Celt. Celtic	Du. Dutch
b. born	cf. <i>confer</i> , compare	E Elohist (source of the Pentateuch)
Bab. Babylonian	Chald. Chaldean	Eccl. <i>Ecclesiastes</i>
Ban. Bantu	chap. chapter (pl., chaps.)	ed. editor (pl., eds.); edition; edited by
1 Bar. <i>1 Baruch</i>	Chin. Chinese	
2 Bar. <i>2 Baruch</i>	C.H.M. Community of the Holy Myrrhbearers	
	1 Chr. <i>1 Chronicles</i>	

- Eduy.** *Eduyyot*
e.g. *exempli gratia*, for example
Egyp. Egyptian
1 En. *1 Enoch*
2 En. *2 Enoch*
3 En. *3 Enoch*
Eng. English
enl. enlarged
Eph. *Ephesians*
'Eruu. *'Eruvin*
1 Esd. *1 Esdras*
2 Esd. *2 Esdras*
3 Esd. *3 Esdras*
4 Esd. *4 Esdras*
esp. especially
Est. Estonian
Est. *Esther*
et al. *et alii*, and others
etc. *et cetera*, and so forth
Eth. Ethiopic
EV English version
Ex. *Exodus*
exp. expanded
Ez. *Ezekiel*
Ezr. *Ezra*
2 Ezr. *2 Ezra*
4 Ezr. *4 Ezra*
f. feminine; and following (pl., ff.)
fasc. fascicle (pl., fascs.)
fig. figure (pl., figs.)
Finn. Finnish
fl. *floruit*, flourished
Fla. Florida
Fr. French
frag. fragment
ft. feet
Ga. Georgia
Gal. *Galatians*
Gaul. Gaulish
Ger. German
Giṭ. *Giṭṭin*
Gn. *Genesis*
Gr. Greek
Ḥag. *Ḥagigah*
Ḥal. *Ḥallah*
Hau. Hausa
Hb. *Habakkuk*
Heb. Hebrew
Heb. *Hebrews*
Hg. *Haggai*
Hitt. Hittite
Hor. *Horayot*
Hos. *Hosea*
Ḥul. *Ḥullin*
- Hung.** Hungarian
ibid. *ibidem*, in the same place (as the one immediately preceding)
Icel. Icelandic
i.e. *id est*, that is
IE Indo-European
Ill. Illinois
Ind. Indiana
intro. introduction
Ir. Gael. Irish Gaelic
Iran. Iranian
Is. *Isaiah*
Ital. Italian
J Yahvist (source of the Pentateuch)
Jas. *James*
Jav. Javanese
Jb. *Job*
Jdt. *Judith*
Jer. *Jeremiah*
Jgs. *Judges*
Jl. *Joel*
Jn. *John*
1 Jn. *1 John*
2 Jn. *2 John*
3 Jn. *3 John*
Jon. *Jonah*
Jos. *Joshua*
Jpn. Japanese
JPS Jewish Publication Society translation (1985) of the Hebrew Bible
J.T. Jerusalem Talmud
Jub. *Jubilees*
Kans. Kansas
Kel. *Kelim*
Ker. *Keritot*
Ket. *Ketubbot*
1 Kgs. *1 Kings*
2 Kgs. *2 Kings*
Khois. Khoisan
Kil. *Kil'ayim*
km kilometers
Kor. Korean
Ky. Kentucky
l. line (pl., ll.)
La. Louisiana
Lam. *Lamentations*
Lat. Latin
Latv. Latvian
L. en Th. Licencié en Théologie, Licentiate in Theology
L. ès L. Licencié ès Lettres, Licentiate in Literature
Let. Jer. *Letter of Jeremiah*
lit. literally
- Lith.** Lithuanian
Lk. *Luke*
LL Late Latin
LL.D. Legum Doctor, Doctor of Laws
Lv. *Leviticus*
m meters
m. masculine
M.A. Master of Arts
Ma 'as. *Ma'aserot*
Ma 'as. Sh. *Ma' aser sheni*
Mak. *Makkot*
Makh. *Makhshirin*
Mal. *Malachi*
Mar. Marathi
Mass. Massachusetts
1 Mc. *1 Maccabees*
2 Mc. *2 Maccabees*
3 Mc. *3 Maccabees*
4 Mc. *4 Maccabees*
Md. Maryland
M.D. Medicinæ Doctor, Doctor of Medicine
ME Middle English
Meg. *Megillah*
Me 'il. *Me'ilah*
Men. *Menahot*
MHG Middle High German
mi. miles
Mi. *Micah*
Mich. Michigan
Mid. *Middot*
Minn. Minnesota
Miq. *Miqva'ot*
MIran. Middle Iranian
Miss. Mississippi
Mk. *Mark*
Mo. Missouri
Mo'ed Q. *Mo'ed qatan*
Mont. Montana
MPers. Middle Persian
MS. *manuscriptum*, manuscript (pl., MSS)
Mt. *Matthew*
MT Masoretic text
n. note
Na. *Nahum*
Nah. Nahuatl
Naz. *Nazir*
N.B. *nota bene*, take careful note
N.C. North Carolina
n.d. no date
N.Dak. North Dakota
NEB New English Bible
Nebr. Nebraska

- Ned.** *Nedarim*
Neg. *Nega'im*
Neb. *Nehemiah*
Nev. Nevada
N.H. New Hampshire
Nid. *Niddah*
N.J. New Jersey
Nm. *Numbers*
N.Mex. New Mexico
no. number (pl., nos.)
Nor. Norwegian
n.p. no place
n.s. new series
N.Y. New York
Ob. *Obadiah*
O.Cist. Ordo Cisterciencium, Order of Cîteaux (Cistercians)
OCS Old Church Slavonic
OE Old English
O.F.M. Ordo Fratrum Minorum, Order of Friars Minor (Franciscans)
OFr. Old French
Ohal. *Ohalot*
OHG Old High German
OIr. Old Irish
OIran. Old Iranian
Okla. Oklahoma
ON Old Norse
O.P. Ordo Praedicatorum, Order of Preachers (Dominicans)
OPers. Old Persian
op. cit. *opere citato*, in the work cited
OPrus. Old Prussian
Oreg. Oregon
'Orl. *'Orlah*
O.S.B. Ordo Sancti Benedicti, Order of Saint Benedict (Benedictines)
p. page (pl., pp.)
P Priestly (source of the Pentateuch)
Pa. Pennsylvania
Pahl. Pahlavi
Par. *Parah*
para. paragraph (pl., paras.)
Pers. Persian
Pes. *Pesahim*
Ph.D. Philosophiae Doctor, Doctor of Philosophy
Phil. *Philippians*
Pblm. *Philemon*
Phoen. Phoenician
pl. plural; plate (pl., pls.)
PM *post meridiem*, after noon
Pol. Polish
pop. population
Port. Portuguese
Prv. *Proverbs*
Ps. *Psalms*
Ps. 151 *Psalms 151*
Ps. Sol. *Psalms of Solomon*
pt. part (pl., pts.)
1Pt. *1 Peter*
2 Pt. *2 Peter*
Pth. Parthian
Q hypothetical source of the synoptic Gospels
Qid. *Qiddushin*
Qin. *Qinim*
r. reigned; ruled
Rab. *Rabbah*
rev. revised
R. ha-Sh. *Rō'sh ha-shanah*
R.I. Rhode Island
Rom. Romanian
Rom. *Romans*
R.S.C.J. Societas Sacratissimi Cordis Jesu, Religious of the Sacred Heart
RSV Revised Standard Version of the Bible
Ru. *Ruth*
Rus. Russian
Rv. *Revelation*
Rv. Ezr. *Revelation of Ezra*
San. *Sanhedrin*
S.C. South Carolina
Scot. Gael. Scottish Gaelic
S.Dak. South Dakota
sec. section (pl., secs.)
Sem. Semitic
ser. series
sg. singular
Sg. *Song of Songs*
Sg. of 3 *Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men*
Shab. *Shabbat*
Shav. *Shavu'ot*
Sheq. *Sheqalim*
Sib. Or. *Sibylline Oracles*
Sind. Sindhi
Sinh. Sinhala
Sir. *Ben Sira*
S.J. Societas Jesu, Society of Jesus (Jesuits)
Skt. Sanskrit
1 Sm. *1 Samuel*
2 Sm. *2 Samuel*
Sogd. Sogdian
Soṭ. *Soṭah*
sp. species (pl., spp.)
Span. Spanish
sq. square
S.S.R. Soviet Socialist Republic
st. stanza (pl., ss.)
S.T.M. Sacrae Theologiae Magister, Master of Sacred Theology
Suk. *Sukkah*
Sum. Sumerian
supp. supplement; supplementary
Sus. *Susanna*
s.v. *sub verbo*, under the word (pl., s.v.v.)
Swed. Swedish
Syr. Syriac
Syr. Men. *Syriac Menander*
Ta'an. *Ta'anit*
Tam. Tamil
Tam. *Tamid*
Tb. *Tobit*
T.D. *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, edited by Takakusu Junjirō et al. (Tokyo, 1922–1934)
Tem. *Temurah*
Tenn. Tennessee
Ter. Terumot
Ṭev. Y. *Ṭevul yom*
Tex. Texas
Th.D. Theologiae Doctor, Doctor of Theology
1 Thes. *1 Thessalonians*
2 Thes. *2 Thessalonians*
Thrac. Thracian
Ti. *Titus*
Tib. Tibetan
1 Tm. *1 Timothy*
2 Tm. *2 Timothy*
T. of 12 *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*
Ṭoh. *Ṭohorot*
Tong. Tongan
trans. translator, translators; translated by; translation
Turk. Turkish
Ukr. Ukrainian
Upan. *Upaniṣad*
U.S. United States
U.S.S.R. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uqts. *Uqtsin*
v. verse (pl., vv.)
Va. Virginia
var. variant; variation
Viet. Vietnamese

viz. *videlicet*, namely
vol. volume (pl., vols.)
Vt. Vermont
Wash. Washington
Wel. Welsh
Wis. Wisconsin
Wis. *Wisdom of Solomon*
W.Va. West Virginia
Wyo. Wyoming

Yad. *Yadayim*
Yev. *Yevamot*
Yi. Yiddish
Yor. Yoruba
Zav. *Zavim*
Zec. *Zechariah*
Zep. *Zephaniah*
Zev. *Zevahim*

* hypothetical
? uncertain; possibly; perhaps
° degrees
+ plus
– minus
= equals; is equivalent to
× by; multiplied by
→ yields