

# The Japanese Dictionary of Religious Studies: Analysis and Assessment

H. BYRON EARHART

As its editors rightly claim, the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* [Dictionary of religious studies] published by the University of Tokyo Press in December 1973, is the first Japanese dictionary devoted to the discipline of the study of religion, and one of the few such dictionaries in the world. It is, in fact, probably the best one-volume reference work on the study of religion ever published. This general assessment is readily supported by a review of the work in terms of its intentions, the diverse scholarly influences represented by its contributors and their articles, its general organization, and sample contents from it, as well as by comparison with other Japanese and Western works.

## THE INTENTIONS OF THE "SHŪKYŌGAKU JITEN"

In the preface to the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* the authors take pains to clarify the development and nature of religious studies, and their intentions in compiling a dictionary on the subject. According to the editors, the scientific study of religion began first in Europe over a century ago, and in Japan about seventy years ago, with "comparative" studies of religion.

Though in both the West and in Japan, "comparative religion" and *vergleichende Religionswissenschaft* (*hikaku shūkyō* or *hikaku shūkyōgaku* in Japanese) have given way to terms omitting the word "comparative," that dimension is still implied in the

---

Oguchi Iichi 小口偉一 and Hori Ichiro 堀一郎, eds., *Shūkyōgaku jiten* 宗教学辞典 [Dictionary of religious studies]. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1973. xiii, 767 pp. + indexes. ¥4,800.

discipline of the study of religion (*shūkyōgaku* in Japanese).

A few words are necessary here to clarify terms in English for the study of religion. In fact, both German and Japanese languages are more fortunate than English in having a commonly accepted term to define this discipline: *Religionswissenschaft* and *shūkyōgaku*—*Wissenschaft* and *gaku* both referring to “scientific” studies in the sense of being systematic, and both being equally applicable to cultural and natural studies. By contrast, “science of religion” never gained currency in the English-speaking countries (even though the French *science des religions* is additional support for the German and Japanese usage). Although the term “religiology” has been urged by some—including the late Kishimoto Hideo,<sup>1</sup> it has never been widely used. More recently, especially in the United States, “history of religions” has come to be used in a much wider sense than *Religionsgeschichte* (*histoire des religions*, or *shūkyōshi* in Japanese) which in the classic subdivision of *Religionswissenschaft* was opposed to *Religionsphilosophie* (*shūkyōtetsugaku* in Japanese).<sup>2</sup> However, the term “history of religions” is too narrow to describe the all-inclusive character of *shūkyōgaku*, and the more general term “religious studies” more closely approximates the generic character of *shūkyōgaku* as the entire discipline of the study of religion. Therefore, in this review the term *shūkyōgaku* will be used interchangeably with “religious studies” in the sense of “the discipline of the study of religion” (which is unnecessarily awkward). The exact meaning and scope of *shūkyōgaku*—which is distinctively different from both the earlier European *Religionswissenschaft* and the more recent American “history of religions”—will become apparent through discussion of this dictionary;

1. Kishimoto Hideo, “Religiology,” *Numen*, vol. 14 (1967), pp. 81–86.

2. For the whole problem of *Religionswissenschaft* see Joachim Wach, *Religionswissenschaft: Prolegomena zu ihrer wissenschafts-theoretischen Grundlegung* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1924).

for one of the purposes of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is to establish this discipline in Japan once and for all with a unified terminology.

The editors are just as concerned as the reviewer with proper designation of their discipline, emphasizing its scientific character. While admitting that theology is not completely unrelated to religious studies, they state that the distinction between the two disciplines is insufficiently recognized, and generally religious studies is the discipline which became emancipated from theology. (Here theology, *shingaku*, is not limited to Christian theology, but refers to denominational and doctrinal studies undertaken within the conceptual framework of any one religion, even Buddhism and Shinto.) The scientific character of religious studies was stimulated by ethnology, psychology, sociology, and related disciplines. At this point the editors use the term "scientific" in the very simple sense of eliminating value judgment concerning the object of study, and studying it objectively; similarly, the terminology of religious studies, if it is to be scientific, must be free of value judgments. However, the technical terms in religious studies in Japan heretofore have lacked clarity and uniformity, due to a number of factors: many denominational terms have been accepted uncritically into religious studies; Greek and Latin terms and their compounds also came into use alongside the denominational terms; since the nineteenth century technical terms from Western studies of religion were translated into Japanese, but different Japanese scholars provided different Japanese translations for the same Western term; and, to add to the confusion, the terms arbitrarily created by Japanese scholars have caused the disruption of the very concept of religious studies. The present dictionary strives to clarify this dilemma of confused terminology, and therefore is concerned more with comparing and evaluating items seen commonly in various religions; to do this, description of individual religions is held to an absolute minimum. Rather,

to clarify theoretically points of agreement and disagreement, focus has been placed on the tracing of previous scholarly interpretation.<sup>3</sup> These are the editors' intentions, and we will see that they and their contributors have carried them out remarkably well.

SCHOLARLY INFLUENCES WITHIN THE "SHŪKYŌGAKU JITEN"

The wide range of articles in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* can be understood by Western readers only through acquaintance with the very diverse scholarly background of its contributors and of religious studies in Japan generally. It may be safe to say that Japan houses one of the most diversified expressions of religious studies in the entire world. Among Japanese scholars are found either students or proponents of most Western philosophical and religious positions, from Judaism and Christianity to Greek philosophy and Marxism. In modern Japan, Christianity has been proportionately more influential in intellectual matters than the small percentage of Japanese Christians would lead one to expect. Religious studies in Japan were from the outset influenced heavily by *Religionswissenschaft*, and all sub-branches of *Religionswissenschaft* are still vital in Japan, more so than in the United States. More recently, attention has shifted to such figures and trends as Eliade and history of religions, Lévi-Strauss and structuralism. (Eliade's works have been translated into Japanese both individually and in a multi-volume series, perhaps outstripping his popularity in the Western world.)

Found represented in Japanese *shūkyōgaku* are not only the full range of Western methods, but also the standard subject matter of Western scholarship, from Greek mythology to primitive religions and Islam. Another factor behind the diversity of religious studies in Japan is the fact that the social sciences

---

3. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, Preface, pp. i-ii.

in Japan have been more closely related to religious studies than in the West. (This is one reason Bellah's work has been so influential in Japan.) In the West, especially in the United States, humanistic studies of religion (usually identified with history of religions) tend to be sharply divided from the social scientific study of religion, but in *shūkyōgaku* these two tendencies—while in tension—have remained in closer contact. We may not be stretching the point to say that both the editors, Oguchi and Hori, have considered themselves social scientists as much as scholars of religion (*shūkyōgakusha*). It seems that in the West schools of religious studies are characterized by methodological commitments, whereas *shūkyōgaku* is held together mainly by the common object of study—religion. In discussing the organization of the dictionary we will see that this tendency influences the treatment of particular items, and even results in the inclusion of whole sections of material not usually found in Western works of the same kind.

*Shūkyōgaku* is also graced by a long tradition of studies on religious traditions found within Japan. There is, of course, a venerable tradition of classical studies, referring especially to Chinese culture (including Taoism and Confucianism), but also indicating Japanese forms of Taoism and Confucianism, and Japanese culture and thought. Shinto, in its many nuances, from prehistoric evidence to early myths and later forms, has been studied meticulously. But perhaps the giant of all Japanese studies on religion is Buddhology, which under titles such as Indian and Buddhist philosophy has documented extensively the whole of Asian Buddhism in a host of countries, and philosophical and religious aspects of the larger Indian tradition. More narrowly confined to Japan has been the school of folklore studies, founded by Yanagita Kunio (the father-in-law of Hori Ichirō). After World War II folklore studies have tended to blend with and yield to more precise anthropological research—

not only in adjacent areas such as Okinawa and other parts of Asia, but also in field work outside Asia.

If it is difficult to believe that *shūkyōgaku* includes within its bounds all these disciplines and areas of study, it is more nearly incredible that all these disciplines and areas are represented within the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* in a joint effort by contributors who are recognized authorities of the respective fields. This is one of the monumental achievements of the dictionary, and Western scholars would do well to note the beneficial result of joint cooperation across disciplinary lines.

#### GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF THE SHUKYOGAKU JITEN

Items in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* are arranged, as in most Japanese dictionaries, according to the Japanese phonetic system. The overall organization, however, is made transparent in the "Classified Table of Contents" at the front of the dictionary. For the benefit of those who have not seen the dictionary, or who do not read Japanese, it may be of service to provide a rough translation of the eight classification headings:

##### *Shūkyōgaku* and Related Disciplines

##### General Religious Terms

##### Religious Thought

1. World View
2. The Sacred, Divinities, Spirits
3. Nature
4. Man
5. Symbols

##### Rituals and Asceticism

##### Religion and Psychology

##### Religion and Society

##### Religion and Culture

##### Types of Religions and Specific Religions

The classification with the greatest number of items, as evident

from its five subdivisions, is Religious Thought. Two classifications have fewer items: Religion and Psychology, and Religion and Culture; the remaining categories receive about the same number of individual items. Of course, the number of items in a classification is only one measure of its significance: for example, the many items under Symbols tend to be one or two columns (two columns to the page), while items under *Shūkyōgaku* and Related Disciplines (such as *kinōshugi* or “functionalism”) may run to six columns.

This form of organization is very handy, making it easy to see at a glance the key items in a general area. For example, if we look at the first classification, *Shūkyōgaku* and Related Disciplines, we find thirty items, from *kaishakugaku* (“hermeneutics”) to *rishinron* (“deism”), (arranged according to the Japanese phonetic system). Other, more important items that might be singled out for mention are: *kinōshugi* (“functionalism”), *kōzōshugi* (“structuralism”), *shūkyōgaku* (“religious studies”), *shūkyōgenshōgaku* (“phenomenology of religion”), *shūkyōshigaku* (“history of religions”), *shūkyōtetsugaku* (“philosophy of religion”), *shinwagaku* (“mythology”), and *yuibutsushikan* (“historical materialism”). This sampling may serve as some indication of the thoroughness in including all the key concepts, without letting minor items consume vital space. Indeed, according to a Japanese reviewer of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, “The fact that in a dictionary of this kind with a total of 800 pages, the number of terms selected is less than 390, illustrates one of the important features of this dictionary.”<sup>4</sup> The reviewer goes on to complain that too many Japanese dictionaries err on the side of overly numerous items, the result being that the all too brief explanations make them almost useless. My sampling

4. Munakata Iwao 宗像巖, reviewing the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* in *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究, no. 220 (1974), pp. 89-92. (The translation of the dictionary title into a Western language is given in German as *Wörterbuch der Religionswissenschaft*.)

of the briefer items confirms the Japanese reviewer's comment that they are more than adequate and helpful.

Treatment of each item is carefully considered, obviously reflecting efficient and consistent editorial skills. Each item is listed by Sino-Japanese characters (or Japanese phonetics for some loan words, such as "pragmatism"); it is followed by pronunciation in Japanese phonetics, and identified by foreign term if it is the translation of a foreign term. For most items, the first paragraph is titled *definition*, unless the religious significance of the term needs to be specified: for *ishi* ("rock") the first paragraph is titled *reverence of rocks*. Subsequent subdivisions of the subject are clearly labeled, indicating the important categories of the conceptual items, or types of the religious phenomena. (Some subjects, such as Specific Religions, naturally lend themselves more to historical and geographical treatment.) The tendency is to place the item within the range of religious phenomena and in terms of its significance for religious studies, tracing the significant descriptions and interpretations of the item, leading up to the present status of scholarship on the subject. Each item is closed by the name of the contributor, followed by cross-references, and generous bibliographical references to the best Japanese and Western sources. This plan of treatment is an ideal means of marshalling the essential information on the key terms of a discipline, and my reading of a limited number of items leads me to conclude that the actual content of most items comes close to realizing the ideal.

A formal assessment, leaving aside for the moment discussion of particular items, leads to the following points. Terms are carefully considered etymologically, tracing the origin of crucial terms and significant equivalents in various languages (first emphasis is placed on English equivalents). Definitions are succinct and balanced, capturing conciseness without yielding

to partiality. (The Japanese style in the dictionary is rather simple and straightforward—especially in comparison with dictionaries of the prewar period.) After the primary nuances are mentioned in the first paragraph, the subsequent paragraphs again reveal a remarkable success in reaching conciseness without slighting important aspects of the phenomenon or schools of interpretation. One's general impression, after reading a dozen items on widely ranging topics, is the admirable restraint with which the subjects are treated. The intention, obviously, is to acquaint us with the religious phenomenon and steer us through the significant scholarship to the present state of knowledge. Some users of the dictionary will be disappointed that the treatments do not attempt to break through the present scholarly framework to propose new definitions and interpretations. The present reviewer, however, would like to praise the restraint of the contributors and editors in responsibly tracing earlier scholarship, rather than attempting new scholarly solutions. It is more than sufficient that the contributor end his article with an indication of the significant problems of scholarship on that item at present. The cross-references to a half dozen or so other items are helpful signals to the most closely related items. The bibliographies at the end of each article conveniently gather together the most important research concerning the item. The number of Japanese works cited, as well as the number of Japanese translations of Western works, is a reminder of the great amount of Japanese research in religious studies. Where Western works are relevant, they are cited in the original edition; enough Western works are cited to make the dictionary useful for Westerners in investigating any religious subject.

Four carefully planned indexes aid in practical utilization of the dictionary: Japanese terms, Western terms, Japanese names, and Western names. Japanese words are arranged

according to the Japanese phonetic system, and Western words are printed in roman letters, following alphabetical order. Page numbers also specify left or right column; bold type singles out independent articles for a term, whereas ordinary type refers to major mention of the word within other articles. The comprehensive scope of the indexes is borne out by the fact that they occupy over forty pages. Such thoroughness is a boon to users of the dictionary, especially less advanced students.

SAMPLE CONTENTS OF THE "SHŪKYŌGAKU JITEN"

Up to this point our remarks have not focused on the most important feature of the dictionary—its contents. A final judgment as to the contents of the dictionary will have to await the test of years of use. The present evaluation, based on the reading of a limited number of entries, cannot substitute for the test of time, but perhaps can provide an initial assessment of the nature and quality of the contents. The central question we would like to pursue is the relative success of the editors' intentions in achieving a truly "scientific," unified terminology for the discipline of the study of religion.

Users of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* may naturally turn first to those areas of their greatest interest. This reviewer was no exception, but to get off his own beaten track, he tried the experiment of reading some items outside his special interests. It was enlightening, for example, to read the first item in the dictionary in order to discover major clues to the nature of the dictionary, and to trace some of these issues through other items. The first item in *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is *ai* ("love"). This item begins neither with etymological analysis nor with a standard definition. Rather, there is a general discussion of love as a latent capacity in all human and animal life, whatever it is called. Love has been considered in all ages as an inexhaustible subject. The example immediately offered is that the discipline inquiring

about the very essence of man is named philosophy (*philo* and *sophia*). *Ērōs* is also examined. The first formal subdivision of the item, dealing with the religious interpretation of love, makes the claim that love is the attempt to go beyond finitude, and that love, in any religion, is one of the essentials. Namely, Christianity is the religion of love, Buddhism is the religion of compassion (not “love”), Confucianism focuses on benevolence, and Hinduism’s key term is *bhakti*. The general rule is that “Religion heightens love, love deepens religion.” There are four numbered aspects of the religious interpretation of love. First, the Old Testament’s interpretation of love is treated: God is love, and God creates man out of love. Second, the New Testament interpretation of love is offered: love in the sense of *agápē* is expressed in Christ. (*Ērōs* is self-centered, whereas *agápē* is other-centered.) The life and death of Christ on the cross is for *agápē*. Third, the Buddhist interpretation of love is handled (in a negative fashion): the key terms *trṣṇā*, *tanhā*, *priya*, and *piya* indicating love are rejected by Buddhism as forms of desire. And desire must be overcome in order to achieve liberation. Fourth, the Buddhist interpretation of *jihī* (“compassion”) is offered (in a more positive fashion): compassion is neither other-centered nor self-centered, since technically both other and self are empty. Rather, the emphasis is on the possibility of every person to achieve enlightenment (and the *bodhisattva* ideal of Mahāyāna Buddhism not to enter enlightenment until all sentient beings enter enlightenment).

These materials serve as the basis for the ensuing discussion of love and compassion, and a comparison of Christianity and Buddhism. The gist is that Christianity is equal to a religion of love, especially love for the needy and love of one’s neighbor: charity is one of Christianity’s distinguishing features. Buddhism, too, has the practice of giving alms, with precedents from King Aśoka in India to Prince Shōtoku in Japan. But charity

for Buddhism is not conspicuous in India, China, or Southeast Asia, because Buddhism is more concerned with *prajñā* or *paññā* ("wisdom"). Christianity makes love the first principle, whereas Buddhism ranks *prajñā* and compassion first (enlightenment, for both self and other).

The final subdivision for "love" deals with love and the contemporary world. The contemporary expression of love is humanism, which has been present from ancient times, but modern humanism is distinctively different. The modern form abandons the earlier foundations of humanness (*ningensei*) and focuses critically on human existence as such, even in desperation. The basic contemporary problem concerning love is to understand how man originally, beginning with the love at the root of life, out of sympathy for others in his daily existence proceeds to purely religious love (*ai*), compassion (*jihi*), and takes these as the origin of humanism. This is a general summary of the item *ai*, which runs for a little more than five columns.<sup>5</sup> The main bibliographical citations are Nygren's *Eros und Agape*, Bultmann's *Jesus*, and the Buddhist works *Dhammapāda* and *Suttanipāta*.

Careful analysis of the contents and omissions in this item throw much light on the nature of this dictionary. The item *ai* is handled according to the "scientific" intentions of the editors: value judgments are eliminated (neither Christianity nor Buddhism, nor denominational aspects of either are treated with special favor). In this sense, the materials are presented in a balanced, "objective" fashion, and major aspects of love and compassion are presented, leading up to the contemporary developments of humanism out of religious love. However, there are two reasons the term *ai* does not meet the criteria of "scientific" investigation, using the word "scientific" in a more technical sense. First, the term *ai* is not a scientific term,

---

5. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, pp. 1-3.

since it is not universal; second, the treatment of *ai* is not scientific, since it does not represent a universal body of material.

That *ai* or love is not a scientifically universal term is apparent from the fact its central definition comes from the Christian tradition. Consequently, when Buddhism is treated, it must first be approached negatively. In the final analysis, it is shown that Christianity is the religion of love and charity, whereas Buddhism focuses on intuition and enlightenment. To highlight this point, one might ask why the Buddhist term *jihī* is not the generic term? If *jihī* constituted a separate item, then within this context, Christian love would be treated first negatively, to show that Christian love is really incapable of compassion for enlightenment, since it places concern for others as the primary principle. When the argument is reversed, its limitations become more apparent. The general principle would seem to be that any time a religion is treated negatively (as when Westerners first labeled Buddhism as atheistic, nihilistic) it is mistreated: furthermore, universal categories yield positive, rather than negative results.

That *ai* is not treated scientifically, in terms of a universal body of material, is patent from the fact that only two world religions, Buddhism and Christianity, are included. If, as the article claims, love is present in all religions and at all times, then it would be necessary to provide an overview of all traditions. The reviewer, for one, would grant the possibility of the universal character—and the universal treatment—of the concept of love, even within primitive religions. For example, note the features of love and charity in the following excerpt from an American Indian (Delaware or Lenape) prayer to the Creator (*Gicelēmû'kaong*):

No sun shines there, but a light much brighter than the sun, the Creator makes it brighter by his power. All people who die here, young or old, will be of the same age there; and those who are injured, crippled, or made blind

will look as good as the rest of them. It is nothing but the flesh that is injured: the spirit is as good as ever. That is the reason that people are told to help always the cripples or the blind. Whatever you do for them will surely bring its rewards. Whatever you do for anybody will bring you credit hereafter. Whenever we think the thoughts that Gicelémû'kaong has given us, it will do us good.<sup>6</sup>

However, to include the full range of primitive religions and various world religions within the notion of love would necessitate the reconception and redefinition of the term; perhaps it would entail a new term to indicate religious sanction for human interrelationships of various kinds, of which love and compassion are just two types (or concrete manifestations) within two particular historical traditions.

The reviewer may seem to have belabored the consideration of the scientific character of this item, but he would argue that such issues must be faced directly if the *scientific* character of the study of religion is to advance. The explanation for the nature of the item *ai* is probably rather simple: this term enters the dictionary out of the stream of studies on the history of Christianity (and Western studies on religion influenced by Christianity). In fact, this proves to be one of the disadvantages of a dictionary written by contributors not sharing a sufficiently common methodological viewpoint. From this one item we can suspect that each of the various scholarly fields represented within the dictionary will exert particular influence similar to this.

The preceding critical remarks concerning *ai* are based on a reading of other items, for example the listing "humanism" (*hiyūmanizumu*), which is one of the cross-references at the end of the *ai* item. The article on humanism begins as a historical

---

6. M. R. Harrington, *Religion and ceremonies of the Lenape*, quoted in Mircea Eliade, *From primitives to Zen: A thematic sourcebook of the history of religions* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 160.

treatment of Western cultural and religious developemnts. Then, somewhat as a surprise, a universal claim is made for the concept of humanism, with passing mention that in the recent century "oriental humanism" has come to be recognized. However, the universal claim is not made good, because: (1) it is not made clear if the concept is limited to world religions or high religions, deliberately excluding primitive religions; (2) the article focuses almost exclusively on the Western tradition; (3) "oriental humanism" is only given lip service; (4) definition and organization of the article are historically limited, not taking into account a universal approach. While many Western works are mentioned, R. L. Shinn's *Man: The new humanism* seeming to be the central work, the Western citations are entirely philosophical and theological. Conspicuously absent is the fine article by the historian of religions Eliade, which frames the reinterpretation of humanism within the context of the entire human heritage of religion.<sup>7</sup>

A quick check of several other items reveals their rather one-sided presentation. Treatment of the item *zange* ("repentance" or "confession"), is similar to that of the item *ai* in that both are essentially a comparison and contrast of Buddhist and Christian phenomena. A Japanese work on *zange* and Schleiermacher's *Der christliche Glaube* are the two lone bibliographical references.<sup>8</sup> Without going into detail, we can invoke once more the reasons why this item is not scientific: neither its definition nor its treatment is universal. The "provincial" treatment of repentance could be made more truly universal by reference to the general phenomena of repentance in major religious traditions, both world religions and primitive religions. The precedent for such an approach was already laid down in

7. Mircea Eliade, "History of religions and a new humanism," *History of religions*, vol. 1 (1961), pp. 1-8.

8. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, pp. 222-223.

Pettazzoni's earlier work, *La confession des péchés*.<sup>9</sup>

If love and repentance are given Buddhist and Christian interpretations, one might suspect that the theme of purification (*harai*) would be cast in a Shinto mold. This suspicion is quickly confirmed when the separate listing of *harai* is located: it deals entirely with Shinto, and cites only Japanese works referring to Shinto and Japanese folk religion.<sup>10</sup>

By the same token one would expect that *nenchū gyōji* ("annual celebrations") would be framed after the fashion of the Japanese folklore school. In fact, within the definition of the item *nenchū gyōji* the English categories of "calendar custom" and "seasonal observance" are mentioned as comparable to *nenchū gyōji* only in order to defend the uniqueness of the Japanese practices. What is distinctive about *nenchū gyōji* (as in various Asian countries), in contradistinction to American and European seasonal festivals, is that the Japanese phenomenon features a blend of various religions, whereas the American and European seasonal festivals are unified on a national or Christian basis. The distinctive quality of Japanese *nenchū gyōji* is found in the agricultural rituals taking rice agriculture as their base, and in the belief in ancestors as the kami protecting abundant harvest. The theories of Yanagita are invoked to show that what links rice agriculture rituals and ancestral festivals is the fact that the rice-protecting kami and the ancestral kami are one and the same. All this is directly opposite to all foreign religions.

With this rendition of *nenchū gyōji* as uniquely Japanese phenomena, one is prepared for the fact that not a single Western reference is cited in the bibliography, not even Frazer. Still,

---

9. Raffaele Pettazzoni, *La confession des péchés*, 2 vols., transl. (from Italian) by R. Monnot (Paris: E. Leroux, 1931-32). As Pettazzoni points out in his preface, "La confession des péchés telle qu'elle se pratique dans les différentes religions est étudiée ici pour la première fois d'une manière systématique."

10. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, pp. 614-615.

one cannot help but be puzzled when he considers that there must be other instances of annual celebrations with a pattern of vegetation-fertility-earth-ancestors-divinity sufficiently similar to Japanese *nenchū gyōji* to qualify the uniqueness of the Japanese phenomena. Surely the distinctiveness of Japanese material must be relative. Otherwise, one could argue for the uniqueness of the religious practices of any people or area: methodologically one can take the radical extreme that any two phenomena—human beings or religious rites—are so uniquely distinguished that nothing common can be said about them.

When we question the treatment of *nenchū gyōji* in this instance, however, we are not debating with Japanese *shūkyōgaku* as such; rather, we are inquiring about the intentions and assumptions of Japanese folklore studies (to ascertain and protect the uniqueness of Japanese culture). While we laud the fruitful results of folklore studies in Japan, we doubt the validity of using the assumptions and conclusions of folklore studies for the foundation of a *scientific shūkyōgaku*. The same comment can be applied to all the items from *ai* to *nenchū gyōji*. Our reservation concerning the notion of *ai* (“love”) is that it injects certain Christian assumptions into the foundation of the study of religion. And why should the notion of *harai* (“purification”) be limited to Shinto: here the influence of Shinto studies is brought to bear upon *shūkyōgaku*.

At this point one must question whether there was a lack of communication between the editors and the contributors. It almost appears that some contributors have the alternate intention of presenting concise statements from the viewpoint of theology, Shinto studies, folklore studies, etc. The articles such as *nenchū gyōji* and *harai*, which make no attempt at a universal argument, lead one to believe this; and they are easier to accept than items such as *ai* and *zange*, which make a universal claim. As pointed out earlier in the review, the broad scope of

*shūkyōgaku* in Japan is partially explained by the fact that religion as the object of study, and not a unified methodology, is what holds it together. The disadvantage of this type of compromise-consensus is that the individual items cannot always be approached on the same basis, for some terms are historically and conceptually limited, whereas some terms are universal (both in ideal and in actual utilization). And lest these remarks be seen as overly critical, it should be admitted that the problematics of the items previously analyzed reflect a widespread dilemma in the study of religion internationally: harmony between historical and scientific approaches. The tendency for traditional branches of religious study has been to make the particular historical forms of that tradition serve the purpose of universal (if not normative) categories. In some cases an indigenous term such as “shaman” or “shamanism” becomes the reducing lens through which the concentrated powers of many scholars working on widely separated phenomena are focused to produce a genuinely universal concept adequate for use in any geographical or chronological context. However, in many instances there is still much confusion between historical terms used in a supposedly scientific sense, and “scientific” terms with hidden traditional content. This is a problem to which we will return in our concluding remarks.

What is further puzzling to the reader of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is that, alongside these more traditionally treated items, universal categories such as “shamanism” abound. Indeed, when one comes to the end of the item *nenchū gyōji* he finds three cross-references: *girei* (“ritual”), Shinto, and *nōkō girei* (“agricultural rituals”). The article on *nōkō girei*, written by the author of *nenchū gyōji*, is almost completely in tune with this more universal style: the article begins with a general definition, moves to death and rebirth, then seasonal festivals, and finally New Year, before taking up “Japanese agricultural festivals.” Eliade is quoted

within the article, and his works form the only Western references in the bibliography. The article *girei* (“ritual”) takes us to the other extreme of a strictly scientific article which invokes no traditional assumptions, defines the subject immediately on a universal basis, and quotes all the relevant Western material (as well as the Japanese); if the article were translated it would not necessarily be obvious that this article was written by a Japanese scholar—which is not to play down Japanese scholarship, but to say that this scholarship reaches an international level beyond provincial assumptions. It is a host of these articles which, in the estimation of this reviewer, bespeak the great achievement of the dictionary.

It is fascinating how, starting with the initial item in this dictionary, we encounter basic issues which interconnect with other items, and reveal so much of the nature of the work. If one chooses to proceed from the final item of the dictionary, he finds another trend. For the final item *wa* (“circle” or “wheel”), is treated as a universal symbol, traced back to pre-historic times, and then analyzed mainly in terms of Buddhism; here the interpretation is more along the lines of phenomenology of religion.<sup>11</sup> The single cross-reference is *jūji* (“cross”), and this item, written by the author of the *wa* article, is cast in the same mold: it describes the types of crosses and their representation within various cultures, emphasizing the symbolic significance of the cross.<sup>12</sup>

The previous sleuthing, of course, is less than a systematic analysis of the dictionary—it is offered, rather, to go beyond mere description of contents, and to afford a dynamic perception of the dictionary in actual use. But there is not space to apply this detective approach to the entire dictionary, and it may be best to jump to the conclusions of the reviewer’s investigation of

11. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, p. 767.

12. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, pp. 353–356.

as many kinds of items as possible. The most general conclusion is that the dictionary's own classification headings in eight categories (translated into English earlier in this review), while helpful in gaining an overview of the dictionary and in finding particular items, is not really indicative of the major lines of description and interpretation. A partial reading of the dictionary has yielded for the reviewer at least seven kinds of items, listed as follows.

(1) Some items, such as animism and animatism, are mainly of interest for the history of the study of religion, to ascertain what the terms meant when Tylor and other scholars used them, rather than to urge their present application.

(2) Other terms, such as *ai* ("love"), *zange* ("repentance"), *nenchū gyōji* ("annual celebrations"), and *harai* ("purification") describe mainly the aspects of a particular tradition, or results of a particular subdiscipline (theology, folklore studies, Shinto studies) within Japanese *shūkyōgaku*.

(3) Terms such as *wa* ("circle") and *jūji* ("cross") are representative of the symbols treated within the phenomenology and morphology of religion, with considerable use of the insights of scholars such as Jung and Eliade.

(4) *Nōkō girei* ("agricultural rituals"), *girei* ("rituals"), and *matsuri* ("festival") are genuinely universal-scientific terms, but their treatment tends to go beyond the descriptive and interpretive work of the morphological items to focus mainly on theoretical issues.

(5) A whole range of items, including the most important ones in the whole dictionary, concentrate on disciplinary matters—the history and divisions of the study of religion and its related disciplines. (Viewed from this perspective, we can lump together the classifications of *Shūkyōgaku* and Related Disciplines, Religion and Psychology, Religion and Society, and Religion and Culture.)

(6) The articles on specific religions—individual religions such as Shinto, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity, as well as geographical divisions such as Asian religions and African religions—naturally constitute a category of direct description. The other items within the dictionary's classification Types of Religions and Specific Religions, items such as *genshi shūkyō* ("primitive religions"), *shizen shūkyō* (*Naturreligion*), and "shamanism" seem to fall within other categories.

(7) Some items might be considered under the philosophy of religion, and therefore be included in the category of disciplinary matters; however, it seems that "pragmatism" (*puragumateizumu*), "historical materialism" (*yuibutsushikan*), and "existentialism" (*jitsuzonshugi*) might be considered as a separate category of philosophical concerns.

We will review each of these seven kinds of items, spending less time on the items of lesser significance and those already surveyed, devoting more time to the more central items.

The first kind, historically important terms, is essential in the history of the study of religion, as in any discipline, in order to follow the empirical and conceptual development of the discipline. The inclusion of these terms in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is essential, especially to help people from outside the discipline in becoming acquainted with the terms that have been used to discuss religious phenomena. In the opinion of the reviewer, older terms such as "monotheism" (*isshinkyō*) and "polytheism" (*tashinkyō*) are no longer really that useful for contemporary research, but it is necessary to know how the terms have been used. Indeed, in a term like *Urmonotheismus* (*genshi isshinkan*), important methodological issues are still lurking. Terms of this kind seem to be well covered in this dictionary.

Items of the second kind, those borrowed from other particular traditions or particular subdisciplines, are scattered through the

dictionary, and do not represent its greatest contribution. As has been argued at length above, the presence of these terms in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is questionable, for although the dictionary claims to be scientific, the treatment remains rather traditional. And, if traditional treatments are in order, there are many other dictionaries for Christianity, Buddhism, folklore studies and the like that can better cover these fields. The difficulty these terms pose, of course, illustrates the need for a more highly unified discipline of the study of religion.

The third kind, symbols treated phenomenologically, constitute the material of an important subject area discovered early in the study of religion, and highly refined by the works of scholars such as Jung and Eliade. While the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* cannot compare with a dictionary of symbols, it does contain the key articles important for the study of religion, not only *wa* ("circle") and *jūji* ("cross"), but also a provocative discussion of *iro* ("color") drawn mainly from the work of Victor Turner. There is a long article on *jikan* ("time") which treats the general religious significance of time, especially according to Eliade, and analyzes time within Christianity and Buddhism. While these items may appear as standard to Westerners who have long known works like the venerable *Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics*, they represent something of a breakthrough in the Japanese academic scene. For although there are many Japanese dictionaries dealing with religion, such as dictionaries of folklore studies and annual rites as well as of Buddhism and Shinto, symbols have ordinarily been treated within the confines of particular traditions rather than in a broad comparative fashion. The inclusion of even a selection of significant symbols in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is a major achievement for Japanese religious studies. For example, *akuma* ("demon" or "evil spirit") is treated across the entire religious spectrum. Technically, the term derives from the Sanskrit word *Māra*, and was first present

in the Buddhist tradition. But in the Japanese folk tradition *akuma* can mean any bad spirit, and the term has come to be used to refer to bad spirits in any tradition. Described very briefly are “bad spirits” in primitive religions, European beliefs, and Islam. Although this is a minor item in a large dictionary, the inclusion of many of these items preclude provincialism and provide a broader understanding of the universal phenomena of religion.

The number and selection of symbols and symbolism generally seems fine, but the reviewer might make one suggestion on behalf of a female colleague, with whom the reviewer was discussing the dictionary. There seems to be no item dealing with the religious symbolism of women. There are items for “pregnancy” (*ninshin*), “marriage” (*kekkon*), “hierogamy” (*seishō*), “witch” (*majo*), and “mother goddess” (*chiboshin*), but none dealing with the religious symbolism and religious significance of woman. Since there are items for “children” (*kodomo*), “the aged” (*rōjin*), and “the dead” (*shisha*), it might be expected that women would also be included. There is a general article on *hitogami* (literally, a person who is a kami or divinity), but this too does not deal directly with the problem of femininity and the sacred. A more pertinent suggestion, perhaps, is greater bibliographical help in the area of symbols. The article on “symbol” (*shōchō*), which is treated more in the theoretical fashion of *girei* (“ritual”) and similar items, includes in its bibliographical section neither a single dictionary of symbols nor a single bibliography of symbols. Since the number of references in an article such as symbol (*shōchō*) must be limited, it might be advisable to refer to existing bibliographical publications.<sup>13</sup>

13. For symbolism one might suggest Manfred Lurker, ed., *Bibliographie zur Symbolkunde*, 3 vols. (Baden-Baden: Heitz, 1964-68) as well as the same editor's continuing work in the periodical *Bibliographie zur Symbolik, Ikonographie und Mythologie* (5 volumes through 1973).

The fourth kind of items, universal-scientific terms focusing on theoretical issues, certainly marks one of the major contributions of the dictionary. To take one example, the article on *girei* ("ritual") is a comprehensive summary of both the problem of the study of ritual, and also the various aspects of ritual. The article on *girei* is broken down into the following subdivisions: character and definition, history of studies on ritual, the structure of ritual, and ritual and society. Anyone who wants an up-to-date, fresh interpretation of religious ritual will do well to read this article. The bibliography contains the best Western literature, and one might suggest only a recent article which appeared after the dictionary was published.<sup>14</sup> The item *kōzōshūgi* ("structuralism") is treated with the same care and theoretical concern as is evident in the *girei* article. First there is a general definition followed by a discussion of the subject through the two subdivisions of "social structuralism" and "logical structuralism." The major bibliographical citations are found at the end of the article. The item *kinōshūgi* ("functionalism") is another good illustration of the fine theoretical work in the dictionary: the item begins with a definition, then treats the subject under the rubrics of theoretical development and the prospects of functionalism. It is worth noting that the author, after tracing the earlier developments and the most recent proponents and modifications, is rather critical of the theoretical assumptions of functionalism, particularly in light of the insights of structuralism. The bibliography is briefer than in some other items, and, especially because the article ends on a note critical of functionalism, it would seem that there might have been room for one of the most recent critiques of functionalism by a historian of religions.<sup>15</sup> At least one

---

14. "Ritual," *New encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed., vol. 15 (1974), pp. 863-866.

15. Hans H. Penner, "Poverty of functionalism," *History of religions*, vol. 11 (1971), pp. 91-97. Note the references to theoretical works critical of functionalism.

social science critique of functionalism might also have been mentioned, such as one of the works of Hempel or Runciman. However, all these suggestions are minor, and one concludes from reading these theoretical items that the methodology of the study of religion is being actively and fruitfully pursued in contemporary Japan.

The fifth kind of items, articles on aspects of the discipline of the study of religion and related fields, form another key contribution of the dictionary. From *shūkyō* ("religion") to *shūkyōgaku* ("religious studies"), and on to fields such as *shūkyō chirigaku* ("geography of religions"), the whole range of disciplinary matters concerning the study of religion are covered comprehensively and treated in depth. The item *shūkyō* ("religion") includes interesting nuances that a Western dictionary would never feature. First there is a detailed etymological analysis of the two Sino-Japanese characters for *shūkyō*, tracing Chinese usage of the two characters and their use to translate Buddhist terms. In Japan the two characters *shūkyō* came to mean religion in general, and in 1968 this was the term used to translate *Religionsübung*. Following this Asian etymology, there is the standard Western etymology of the Latin *religio* and interpretations of figures such as Cicero and Augustine. The fact that Japanese scholars of religion are able to relate their own cultural notions of religion and intellectual tradition of the study of religion in an integrated fashion to Western notions of religion and the Western conceptual framework for religious studies puts them in a very good position to further the international-scientific character of the study of religion. The next subheading for the item *shūkyō* ("religion") is *various types of definitions*, which begins with Leuba's three categories of intellectualistic, affectivistic, and voluntaristic; added to Leuba's categories are value and attitude, social character (of religion), sacred and profane, and structure and function. In

brief, the focus is on the various approaches to religion and the kind of definitions they reach. The final subdivision of *shūkyō* ("religion") is *methodological significance of definition*, in which the author surveys contemporary approaches to the definition of religion, and notes that methodologically even if a person does not attempt to define religion, an assumed definition will be present within the framework of his study. The intention of this article is to provide a balanced survey of the whole range of religious studies, both humanistic and social scientific, as reflected in the bibliography, which includes a number of Japanese works as well as the Western range materials, from William James and Eliade to Parsons and Geertz. One item that might also be suggested for inclusion, to balance these more theoretical works, and to provide a convenient discussion of Western *religio*, is Smith's *Meaning and end of religion*.<sup>16</sup>

The item *shūkyōgaku* presents a carefully argued case for the distinction between normative and descriptive studies of religion, in order to safeguard the objective character of religious studies. It is interesting that the term *shūkyōgaku* is immediately identified as a translation of the German *Religionswissenschaft*. After this identification, *shūkyōgaku* is treated under the subheadings of *meaning of the word*, *questions concerning religion*, *the standpoint of religious studies*, *the limits and goals of religious studies*, *the formation of religious studies*, and *the development of religious studies*. Except for the concluding paragraph, which traces the history of *shūkyōgaku* in Japan, this article is a straightforward presentation, with the standard Japanese and Western references in the bibliography.<sup>17</sup> To sample one of the lesser known branches of *shūkyōgaku*, the item *shūkyō chirigaku* ("geography of religions")

---

16. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Meaning and end of religion: A new approach to the religious traditions of mankind* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), especially chapter 2, "‘Religion’ in the West."

17. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, pp. 267-274.

was read, with gratifying results. This article is subdivided into *definition, the history of geography of religion—focusing on the difference between religious geography and geography of religion, the framework of religion within geography of religions, the classification of religions within geography of religions, and approaches within geography of religions*. The article traces this academic area from classical times to the present, analyzing seven different approaches which geography of religions can take. The author admits to the dilemma of geography of religions as a separate field, but provides a lengthy bibliography of German, French, and American works dealing with the subject. (As the bibliographical references for this item in *Shūkyōgaku jiten* illustrate, most of the work in this area has been done by geographers.) The reviewer was gratefully enlightened by the reading of this item and was informed of Western works previously unnoticed.<sup>18</sup> One recent English work, which appeared after the dictionary was published, will no doubt find its way into a second edition of the work.<sup>19</sup>

Other branches of *shūkyōgaku* are well represented, and perhaps the general area of greatest importance and greatest interest will be the number of entries dealing with the social scientific study of religion. This aspect of the dictionary deserves more lengthy consideration, for the items go far beyond the theoretical items such as functionalism and structuralism. But at least some indication of the scope of these items and their significance can be gained merely by listing some of them. There are practical items, such as *shūkyō chōsa* (“religious investigations”), and some particular concepts, such as “charisma” (*karisuma*). Of central importance, of course, is the item *shūkyō shakaigaku* (“sociology of religion”). Results of this field are seen in items

18. *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, pp. 322–325.

19. Isma'īl Rāgī al Fārūqī and David E. Sopher, eds., *Historical atlas of the religions of the world* (New York: Macmillan, 1974).

such as *shūkyō henyō* (literally, “religious acculturation”) and *shinkō shūkyō* (“newly founded religions” or *shin shūkyō undō*, “new religions” or “new religious movements”). Even “church-sect-denomination” is included. These selected items demonstrate the comprehensive concern with disciplinary matters, not limited to *shūkyōgaku* itself and sociology of religion.

The sixth kind of items, articles on specific religions and geographical divisions, take up less space in this dictionary than in standard dictionaries of religion, for the intentions of the editors are directed more to the discipline of religious studies than to the subject matter of particular religious traditions. (The dictionary’s classification Types of Religions and Specific Religions includes items such as new religions and primitive religions, which the reviewer has considered elsewhere: considered within this sixth kind of items are only those which deal with identifiable traditions.) The editors’ intentions are carried out in these items on specific religions, with concise overviews of all the “world religions,” archaic traditions (Egyptian religions), individual religions (Shinto), and major areas (Asian religions). These items are convenient as first articles for the beginning student, as well as summary and review for the more advanced student and scholar.

Subheadings of three items will give the reader an idea of the kind of topical and historical description found in them. The article on Islam (*isuramukyō*) begins with a discussion of the term Islam and its meaning, and then is divided into: *Islamic studies and the study of religion*, *Muhammad*, *Qur’ān*, *Hadīth*, and *contemporary Islam*. The article on Christianity (*kirisutokyō*) has the following subheadings: *definition*, *Bible*, *formation of Christianity*, *early Christianity*, *the church and the Roman Empire*, *medieval period*, *Reformation*, *modern times*, and *American Christianity*. The item for Buddhism (*bukkyō*) has the following subheadings: *meaning of the word and definition*, *life of the Buddha (Śākyamuni)*,

*original form of doctrine* (divided into the subcategories of *modern studies, dharma, and paṭiccasamuppāda*), and *the development of Buddhism* (broken down into the subcategories of *the formation of scriptures and sectarian Buddhism, Mahāyāna Buddhism, Buddhology, and the development of Mahāyāna Buddhism*). It appears that the authors of these articles have been given freedom to pursue their subjects according to historical or topical approaches, but all major aspects seem to be well covered, and the bibliographies are adequate. (It is unfortunate that the 15th edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, published in 1974, did not appear before the preparation of *Shūkyōgaku jiten*; the completely new articles on religion in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* constitute probably the most comprehensive set of accurate and concise treatments of specific religions now available in English. Many of these articles would make good references within the bibliographical sections of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten*.)

The seventh kind of items, within the area of philosophy of religion or philosophy, includes the following items: “pragmatism” (*puragumateizumu*), “historical materialism” (*yuibutsushikan*), and “existentialism” (*jitsuzonshugi*). By itself it is not a large group, but it indicates the philosophical thrust contained in lesser degree in other items. For example, some items, such as *rishinron* (“deism”), express the philosophical reflection of an earlier period. Some items, for example *kami no sonzai* (“existence of God”), express theological reflections, focusing on classical arguments. Some items, notably *kaishakugaku* (“hermeneutics”) and *shinkaron* (“evolutionism”) shade into disciplinary and methodological issues. It is noteworthy that the author of the *shūkyōgaku* item tends to exclude theology, philosophy, and philosophy of religion from *shūkyōgaku* proper. However, it is just as difficult to exclude as to include these items, which range from “philosophical” questions *within* religious traditions (the existence of God) to philosophical questions

about the study of religion (hermeneutics). It seems that there is lack of clarity in this whole area of religious studies throughout the world. And one cannot fail to notice that most of these terms reflect the intellectual tradition of Western studies. Therefore, rather than remark on these specific items, one is tempted to look to future developments in this area which may be forged by the joint cooperation of these items' authors, and their successors. The leading question is whether previous historical and philosophical issues can be reforged in the crucible of a scientific *shūkyōgaku*. For example, "existentialism" (*jūsuzonshugi*) is treated in the dictionary as an aspect of Western philosophy, discussing Sartre, Jaspers, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and other Western forerunners. This is fine in terms of the history and philosophy of Western intellectual developments, but the scientific question is whether the data of religion yield up a universal category of existentialism. In fact, Eliade has argued that existentialism as "anxiety" is basic to the human condition and expressed even in primitive culture and religion.<sup>20</sup> Some such reinterpretation is needed, possibly calling forth more accurate terminology, and requiring the reformulation of philosophy of religion on the scientific basis of the entire set of known religious phenomena.

Now that the seven kinds of items have been outlined, it is fitting to point out what types of items are *not* to be found in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten*. As previously explained, the authors have deliberately excluded concrete details of various religions,

20. Mircea Eliade, "Religious symbolism and modern man's anxiety" in *Myths, dreams and mysteries*, transl. by Philip Mairet (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 231-245. The paper was delivered at a conference on the problem of anxiety, and proceedings of the conference include a fascinating debate over the issue of whether anxiety is found only among modern societies possessing historical consciousness (historicism), or whether, as Eliade argues, anxiety is a universal human category, even among primitives. See *L'angoisse du temps présent et les devoirs de l'esprit* (Neufchâtel: Editions de la Bacconière, 1954).

limiting such references to items on a whole religious tradition or religion in a large geographical area or religion of a certain "type." These excluded items are the ones that tend to fill Western dictionaries and encyclopedias, but the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* takes the alternative focus of the discipline of religious studies. Also excluded are the names of specific scholars of religion. But this is not a serious omission, for some items clearly treat the theories of prominent scholars: *Urmonotheismus* is Schmidt's theory, the item on structuralism includes a discussion of Lévi-Strauss's work, and the item on color is drawn mainly from Turner's publications. And the two indexes for Japanese and Western names make it simple to locate where any scholar's work is mentioned.

#### COMPARISON WITH OTHER JAPANESE AND WESTERN WORKS

The full significance of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* for Japanese scholarship can be gauged only by viewing it in the light of other Japanese reference works on religion. Those who do not read Japanese may not be aware of the long tradition of high quality dictionaries and encyclopedias in Japanese, which abound in every field. Any Westerner who undertakes the study of Japanese religion cannot fail to be impressed by the abundance of superb reference works dealing with all aspects of Japanese religion, and the reviewer is glad to take this opportunity to acknowledge with gratitude his own indebtedness to such works. Mention of some leading reference works will highlight the company of scholarship which the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* now joins.

Of all the religious traditions within Japan, Buddhism is the most thoroughly researched, with works ranging from concise one-volume dictionaries to multi-volume encyclopedias. Perhaps the foremost example of the one-volume works on Buddhism is Ui Hakuju's *Bukkyō jiten* [Dictionary of Buddhism], which has gone through many printings and serves as the basis for

the *Japanese-English Buddhist dictionary*,<sup>21</sup> a convenient reference for those who do not handle Japanese. The standard multi-volume work on Buddhism is *Bukkyō daijiten* [Encyclopedia of Buddhism] edited by Mochizuki Shinkō; brought out forty years ago, it has enjoyed a more recent reprinting. There are a number of more specialized works on Buddhism, such as the three-volume *Mikkyō daijiten* [Encyclopedia of esoteric Buddhism], also brought out forty years ago. The outstanding reference work for Shinto is the three-volume *Shintō daijiten* [Encyclopedia of Shinto], first published about forty years ago, and recently reprinted. There are also special dictionaries for Shinto kami, and reference works for analyzing Japanese literature, just as there are detailed reference works for Buddhist literature. This is not to mention the many dictionaries and encyclopedias dealing with related fields such as Japanese history. More closely connected with Japanese religion are the works dealing with popular aspects of Shinto and folklore. For example, *Neijū gyōji jiten* [Dictionary of annual festivals] was edited by Nishitsunoi Masayoshi less than twenty years ago, and brought out in the rather popular Tōkyōdō series of dictionaries. A few years earlier in the same series there appeared *Minzokugaku jiten* [Dictionary of folklore], edited by Yanagita Kunio.<sup>22</sup> Yanagita was also responsible for the publication of more detailed reference works on folklore. Beyond these

---

21. (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1965). Complete information will not be given for Japanese works; two good references for Japanese works on religion are: Donald Holzman et al., *Japanese religion and philosophy: A guide to Japanese reference and research materials* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959 [Center for Japanese Studies, Bibliographical series, number 7]) and *K. B. S. bibliography of standard reference books for Japanese studies with descriptive notes, vol. 4: Religion* (Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai, 1963).

22. This work has been translated as *Japanese folklore dictionary* by Takatsuka Masanori (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1958). It is little known and little used, probably because it was published in microcard form.

standard works on major traditions and aspects of Japanese religion, one is surprised to find reference works on highly specific topics. The reviewer, while doing research on Haguro Shugendō, was amazed to find a valuable article entitled “Shugendō Haguro-ha goi ryakkai” [A concise vocabulary of the Haguro Sect of Shugendō]. At the other end of the scale, one also finds the all-inclusive kind of reference work represented by the recently published *Shūkyō jiten* [Dictionary of religion] which covers basic terminology for all religions within Japan, including Christianity.

With all these fine reference works on Japanese religion, the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* might at first appear to be an unnecessary duplication, but such is not the case. The very opposite is true. For these reference works—like the individual scholarly influences within Japanese religious studies previously mentioned—have often been islands of isolation rather than bridges of cooperation in the Japanese world of religious studies. Too often the tendency has been to limit oneself to the particular historical and conceptual aspects of a specific tradition, and to exclude mention of other traditions. This is the general dilemma which the editors of *Shūkyōgaku jiten* refer to in the preface, where they complain about the lack of a uniform terminology for the study of religion. For example, if one looks up the meaning of three particular rituals within a dictionary on Buddhism, a dictionary on Shinto, and a dictionary on annual celebrations, not only will he find different terminology and definitions, but also he will still lack a general understanding of ritual and a knowledge of how the three rituals can be compared and contrasted. The fact that *Shūkyōgaku jiten* has made such progress towards a scientific and unified terminology for religious studies is not only an achievement in its own right, but in turn will help strengthen other disciplines, such as Buddhist studies and folklore studies. In general,

*Shūkyōgaku jiten* carries on the Japanese tradition of excellent reference works on religion, and makes its own distinctive contribution which will have beneficial results for future Japanese scholarship on religion.

Comparison of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* with Western reference works on religion is a difficult, but rewarding task, and sheds considerable light on the nature and quality of the Japanese work. While no single scholar can claim command of all Western-language reference works on religion, several hours of research in the reference section of a Western university library reveals significant patterns within the Western works. First, as might be expected, most Western works deal with the Western heritage—Jewish, Christian, Greek, and Roman. Second, the more specialized research works, especially the multi-volume publications, deal with one particular religion. Third, although the terms “encyclopedia” and “dictionary” are used almost interchangeably in the titles of these works, there seem to be two styles for such works: one is the “encyclopedic” style of essays to discuss at some length the major religious traditions (and sometimes aspects of them) in a limited number of items; the second is the “dictionary” style of endless items, from names of divinities to titles of scriptures, simply to identify and define these terms. Fourth, the Western works attempting to be universal—usually under the name of “comparative religion”—are of later date and lower quality; and, except for works specifically excluding the Judaeo-Christian tradition, they still emphasize mainly the Western tradition. Fifth, the most important comparative works are the outdated, but still useful *Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics* and the more recent *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (third edition); however, the combined articles on religion in the fifteenth edition of the *New encyclopaedia Britannica* will prove to be the best yet

published.<sup>23</sup> Sixth, still there is no satisfactory one-volume work on religion: the older works are outdated, and the newer works are overly popular or less than adequate.

A brief look at three one-volume works in English reveals some of their shortcomings. One of the old standbys is Vergilius Ferm's *Encyclopedia of religion*, but this 1945 publication deals mainly with Western religion and doctrinal-theological matters, paying little attention to non-Western religion. Geoffrey Parrinder's recent *Dictionary of non-Christian religions* follows the "dictionary" style of providing only identification and definition of many items; although illustrations are numerous, this space might better have been devoted to bibliography, which is completely lacking. S. G. F. Brandon's *Dictionary of comparative religion* is probably the best recent attempt, and yet it has been criticized for its unevenness.<sup>24</sup> Brandon's work tries to compromise between the encyclopedia and dictionary approaches, thus falling between two chairs. The essays on individual religions are often so brief as to be almost useless—"Shinto" and "Shingon" each being limited to a brief paragraph. Reading Brandon's work, one becomes much more appreciative of the wisdom of the editors of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* in omitting the innumerable tiny items that devour space in Brandon's dictionary and other Western single-volume works. Of greater deficiency in Brandon's work is the absence or neglect of disciplinary and conceptual matters. While there are some longer articles on traditional disciplines such as philosophy of religion and sociology of religion, comparative religion and phenomenology of religion are each dismissed with one column or less.

23. Also worthy of mention is the *Encyclopédie française*, tome 19, deuxième partie, "Religion."

24. Mircea Eliade, "Dictionaries and encyclopedias," including a review of Brandon, *Dictionary of comparative religion*, in *History of religions*, vol. 12 (1973), pp. 288-295.

“Rites and Rituals” are treated in one column, but only for Chinese and Japanese religion; the next item “Ritual,” also given one column, deals only with China. Although “syncretism” is included, “symbol” (or “symbolism”) is not.<sup>25</sup>

The best Western-language one-volume work on religion is Franz König's *Religionswissenschaftliches Wörterbuch: Die Grundbegriffe*. This 1956 publication from Herder has many Western and theological items, but it also features an impressive array of articles on various religions and aspects of various religions, written by some of the best European and non-European scholars. Its coverage is amazingly broad—from the standard subjects such as Abraham and Abū Bakr to less known topics such as the Vietnamese movement of Cao Dai. Such items form the bulk of this almost thousand-page (double-column) work. But the basic terms of religious studies—from the older *Deismus* to *Symbol*—are also included. The major branches of *Religionswissenschaft* are included as well—even *Religionsgeographie*. However, this work's major emphasis is the history and phenomena of specific religions—it does not include items such as functionalism and structuralism, nor do its articles focus so sharply on theoretical issues. This German work features bibliographies of the half dozen standard works on each subject (published before 1955). *Shūkyōgaku jiten*, of course, features more recent bibliographies; both works demonstrate admirable consistency and care in editing.

In general, a review of Western reference works on religion makes the *Shūkyōgaku jiten's* virtues all the more glowing: its editorial consistency, the balance in selection of items, and the depth and theoretical concern of the work. For example, few Western works include items such as ritual and symbol, and the few works which do include them give only the briefest

25. S. G. F. Brandon, ed., *Dictionary of comparative religion* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970).

descriptive treatment, overlooking the theoretical dimensions. The article on “color” (*iro*) in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is a fine article, yet few Western works even mention the subject. The older *Encyclopaedia of religion and ethics* has no separate article on color (though the index does contain the entry “colour,” and cross-references mention color in other articles). Better coverage is given the item “Farben” in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*,<sup>26</sup> but its treatment and bibliographical references are outdated in comparison to the “color” article in the *Shūkyōgaku jiten*. Of single-volume dictionaries, Brandon’s work includes an item on “Colours—Religious Meaning,” but its coverage is limited to two small paragraphs simply identifying some religious associations of colors in the two traditions of China and Japan. In short, there appears to be only one single-volume Western-language reference work on religion—the *Religionswissenschaftliches Wörterbuch*—that can hold a candle to the *Shūkyōgaku jiten*. Indeed, a survey of Western reference works on religion brings to mind the same complaints that the editors of *Shūkyōgaku jiten* made concerning the counterpart Japanese works: ambiguous use of traditional terms in a supposedly scientific sense; lack of consistency and clarity in terminology; and arbitrary use of loan-words (such as *tabu*, *shaman*, etc). A Western-language dictionary comparable to the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* is needed, and if and when the editors compile it, they can borrow many of the phrases from the preface of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* to explain their intentions. When the reviewer first heard of this Japanese dictionary while it was in process of compilation, it was his hope that the work might eventually be translated. However, that hope was unfounded: while much of the dictionary is truly universal-scientific, as a whole it is still a distinctive product

26. Hans Frhr. von Campenhausen et al., eds., *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, 3rd ed., 6 vols. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr: 1957–62), vol. 2, pp. 874–875.

of the rather diverse discipline of religious studies in Japan, and defies direct translation into a Western language.

#### CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of all the previous considerations, we must now make a final assessment of the *Shūkyōgaku jiten*. Judged in terms of form—as previously noted—this dictionary is a credit to the Japanese publishing record of fine reference works. Its editors have set a high standard of scholarship by picking the best scholars to write significant articles within a limited area—the discipline of the study of religion. Editorial skill has been exercised in maintaining reasonable consistency in the length and approach of each article. The organization of the dictionary into the eight classifications shows some compromise with earlier schools of thought and the diverse strands represented in Japanese *shūkyōgaku*. But organization as such is not so crucial in this kind of dictionary. As long as the key articles are included, and are accessible, the scheme of classification is not so important. In this instance the classification headings serve more as guides to the material, and are rather effective; the four indexes complement the classification headings to make not only individual items but also other topical materials readily available. What does tend to detract from the contribution of the dictionary, here and there, is the lack of a sufficiently common and sufficiently scientific methodology. This is understandable, due to the diverse background of the contributors, and due to the lack of a unified methodology for religious studies internationally. It goes without saying that the disadvantage of a multi-author work like this will be some divergence of viewpoint among the authors; on the other hand, it would be almost impossible for any single person to compose such a dictionary by himself. But the contents of the dictionary, in spite of some critical remarks made in the course of this re-

view, are still very good, and represent probably the best single volume on the study of religion ever published.

Reading through this dictionary reminds one again of the tensions that exist within the discipline of religious studies, and the need to integrate (not eliminate) these tensions into an overarching disciplinary concern for all religious phenomena. Three sets of tensions are of paramount concern for the future of religious studies, and while these tensions are often healthy alternative viewpoints, a way must be found of letting these tensions speak to each other more effectively in mutual benefit.

One set of tensions, in the area of basic conceptions, is the historical and the scientific. Some studies will always be historical—that is, will trace the chronological cause-and-effect, the combination of continuity and transformation through time of a given tradition or aspect of a tradition. But how can the concepts used in this historical study be tempered with a truly universal or “scientific” validity? On the other hand, some studies will always be scientific—seeking out the universally applicable concept and the most systematic rendering of a single subject. Here the question is how to make sure that scientific concepts do not get lost in abstraction, but are actually the best general expression of the entire history of religious phenomena.

A second set of tensions, concerning the problems to be taken up and the treatment to be used, is the philosophical and the empirical. In part, this tension concerns the size of problem, philosophical questions being much larger and empirical questions being much smaller in scope. But it also has to do with the kinds of questions asked. “Philosophical” is taken here in the classical sense of driving at the general meaning of a subject. And the general or lofty question must not lose sight of specific data. “Empirical” means here the concrete, specific aspect of a subject. And the empirical, although essential,

can never be framed without consciously or unconsciously involving the larger philosophical questions.

A third set of tensions, related to the earlier set of tensions, but focusing on models of interpretation, is the humanistic and the social scientific. Humanistic questions tend to be expressed more in historical concepts and philosophical problems, whereas social scientific questions tend to find expression in strictly scientific concepts and empirical problems. This set of tensions surfaces in the manner in which studies are conceived and problems identified for treatment, but the tension is greatest at the point of interpretation. For humanistic studies tend to interpret the meaning of religious phenomena intrinsically, whereas social scientific studies tend to interpret the significance of religion as interacting with non-religious factors (especially the impact of non-religious factors upon religion). Here the problem is how to maintain the intrinsic meaning of religious phenomena while taking into account the non-religious factors related to them; on the other hand, how can we continue social scientific studies which focus on the interrelationship between religion and environment, while still allowing for the intrinsic character of religious phenomena.

Throughout this review "scientific" has been used in the larger sense of the thoroughly universal, completely unified discipline of the study of religion which would make full use of each side of these tensions in order to achieve a fully matured discipline of the study of religion. That the *Shūkyōgaku jiten* has brought us closer to this goal than any other single reference work is the best standard for recognizing its singular achievement.