

Our traditions are always alive among us,
even when we are not dancing;
But we work only that we may dance.
– Uito cannibals (cited by Eliade)

Welcome to Religion 201, a course not so much focused on particular religions as on the lenses through which we view religion. We will read the 20th and 21st century “greats” in the field of religious studies, each with his or her own explanation as to why humans in every culture resort to religion. Some of these authors are outsiders, explaining away religious experience as a sociological, psychological, economic or (most recently) physiological phenomenon. Others are insiders, defending spiritual experience as a natural expression of the “really real.” Still others lament that the hunt for *homo religiosus* is doomed because outsiders cannot truly understand religious experience and the insiders are biased. And then there are those who say “religion” really isn’t a true category of anything – it’s not *sui generis* – and we shouldn’t privilege such a discourse. Regardless, the hunt is on, and we will join it.

Religion 201 is one of the heaviest reading courses you will experience because we will be closely reading the most influential arguments of these greats in their own words, in many cases tackling their magnum opera from cover to cover. (Sometimes knowing what they do not say is just as important as knowing what they do say.) The syllabus is structured in such a way as to give you the maximum amount of reading time per author, usually from Wednesday to Monday with Friday devoted to a lecture on that author. Please keep up because the conferences can be an engaging, thought-provoking experience. And they usually tend to be lively as everyone has an opinion when it comes to religion.

I. Resources

We will read the greats (and a couple not-so-greats) without the filters of later summaries and commentaries, although in lecture and conference I will note how each of these texts has been received in the field. The following seven texts are required:

- Freud, Sigmund. *The future of an illusion* (London: Penguin, 1991 [originally published in 1927]).
- James, William. *The varieties of religious experience: A study of human nature* (New York: The modern library, 1994 [originally the Gifford lectures of 1901-1902].)
- Rappaport, Roy A. *Ritual and religion in the making of humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Weber, Max. *The sociology of religion* (Boston: Beacon press, 1967 [originally published after his death in 1920].)
- Boyer, Pascal. *Religion explained: The evolutionary origins of religious thought* (New York: Basic books, 2001).
- Patton, Kimberley C. and Benjamin C. Ray, *A magic still dwells: Comparative religion in the postmodern age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- Pals, Daniel L. *Introducing religion: Readings from the classic theorists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

NOTE: There is also an extensive set of additional readings – more than twenty-five shorter pieces – on this course’s Moodle site. As already noted, Religion 201 is an intense reading course.

If there are specific terms or traditions requiring explication, please use the library’s *Encyclopedia of Religions* (either hardcopy or CD-ROM). Also, please make use of myself and my colleagues – Kristen, Kambiz, Mike and Steve – as resources. If you find particular materials of interest, we may be able to assist you by pointing out other works.

II. Requirements

- *Conference participation.* Close reading of the texts and thoughtful, informed engagement. Please don't fall behind, or else you will enjoy the conferences less.
- *Six exploratories.* Please see the appended description of the "exploratory," and note that you will be writing them on James, Weber, Geertz, the post-postmodernists, Boyer and Rappaport. Lest we lack time to handle all the exploratories, we will divide into two groups, the 'A' group exploratories focused on the first conference for a given author or set of readings and the 'B' group on the second. (Needless to say, I have many of my own discussion points I want us to handle as well, and I will attempt to compose reading maps for each text.) Exploratories should be e-mailed to me (embedded in the message and *not* as an attachment) by 7 p.m. the evening before that particular conference so I can read them in advance. Please bring a hardcopy of your exploratory to conference so that you can refer to it. Even when you aren't responsible for an exploratory on a given day, please note that I still expect your full conference participation in reacting positively and constructively to the exploratories of your colleagues and in bringing your own questions and perspectives to the table.
- *Two papers* (eight to ten pages each). At some point during the first half of the semester, we will divvy up the early "greats" on our syllabus such as James, Durkheim, Weber, Freud and Eliade among ourselves, and I would ask you to write two papers on that author.
 - In the first paper (due just before fall break), please research and evaluate the modern critique of your chosen author. This first paper will not be difficult because there are numerous books available evaluating the field of religious studies and the early contributors to it. (I will give you a beginning list of texts you might want to consult.) Because you will have worked through these early greats for yourself, I also want you to discuss whether you think these critiques are justified.
 - In the second paper (due at the end of the semester), please search for the modern application of the same author. I don't want this course to simply be a "history of the field": I want it to produce a useful set of lenses we can use today. This paper will be much harder, but through internet and library research, you should be able to find modern writers who still make use of these authors in various ways. A self-addressed, stamped envelope must accompany the final paper if you want comments.
- *Final project presentations.* As is already evident in the syllabus, each author views religion through a particular lens. Our conference will divide into three groups, and each group will choose one observable religious phenomenon such as a specific ritual or creed. (YouTube makes this rather easy.) After studying it, your group will create an outline of scholarly lenses or theoretical approaches to it with sufficient sub-structure to relate one approach to the next. The offering of incense in Bell's "Performance" article is a good model for this activity. The group will then present its project to the rest of the conference. In the past, groups have worked with video documentaries of Muslim ceremonies, attended Buddhist temple meditations, demonstrated particular Shabbat rituals and even created replicas of self-mutilation instruments from bike chains and gears. (A more detailed handout will follow closer to the time, but be thinking early about what you might like to do.)

III. Incompletes, absences and extensions – the draconian stuff so PLEASE READ

As the great early Chinese legalist Han Feizi warned, indulgent parents have rowdy kids and overly lenient rulers have inefficient subjects; by extension, a permissive teacher can't maximize a student's learning potential. By laying down the law now, we'll also never need to raise it again in the future, and I can pretend to be a kindly Confucian rather than a draconian legalist.

"An Incomplete [IN] is permitted in a course where the level of work done up to the point of the [IN] is passing, but not all the work of a course has been completed by the time of grade submission, for reasons of health or extreme emergency, and for no other reason," according to the Reed College Faculty Code (V A). "The decision whether or not to grant an IN in a course is within the purview of the faculty for that course." Like many of my colleagues, I read this as restricting incompletes to acute, extreme emergencies and health crises that have a clear beginning date and a relatively short duration only, that are outside the control of the student, and that interrupt the work of a student who was previously making good progress in a course. Incompletes cannot be granted to students unable to complete coursework on time due to chronic medical conditions or other kinds of ongoing situations in their academic or non-academic life. Those kinds of accommodation requests need to go through established channels and must be brought

to my attention right away.

Regular, prepared, and disciplined conferencing is intrinsic to this course, and so at a certain point when too many conferences have been missed – specifically more than six which translates into a “fail” for the course – it would be advisable to drop or withdraw and to try again another semester. There’s no shame in that. Longer-term emergencies indeed happen, and you ought to make use of Student Services when they do. In sum, I’ll help you out as much as I can to get you across the finish line, but it’s the same finish line for everyone and to be fair to your colleagues I need to have you there in the race. To that end, **I would ask that you please e-mail me whenever you are absent** just to let me know you’re okay. (More students seem to be doing this without prompting anyway, perhaps because we’re all increasingly dependent upon virtual connectivity.)

I’m happy to give paper extensions for medical problems and emergencies, and you should take advantage of the Health and Counseling Center in such circumstances. Please note that here, too, the honor principle provides a standard for expectations and behavior, meaning that none of us (including myself) should resort to medical reasons when other things are impeding work. (Please just be honest. Simple as that.) In non-medical situations, late papers will still be considered, but the lateness will be taken into account and no comments given. Ken’s Subjectivity Curve: The later it is, the more subjective Ken gets. It's a gamble. I’m not a legalist like Han Feizi, but even the Confucians resorted to hard law when ritualized conduct and exemplary leadership failed.

IV. Syllabus

In the first week, you will reify your own opinions on what religion is and its role in the world. Then we will work our way from past to present, examining the various lenses used to analyze religion. Some authors will explain away religion into another discourse such as sociology or biology; others will argue that religion is *sui generis*, worthy as a discipline in its own right; still others will say outsiders to religion will simply never get it. (I think ours is the only discipline in which the subjects of scrutiny flatly deny the validity of that scrutiny and in which the scrutinizers aren’t sure their scrutiny belongs to an actual, identifiable discipline. Why didn’t I study math instead?) To help you develop your own opinions about “religiology” – I made that word up – I will lecture on many of our authors, my lectures usually being on Fridays and thereby giving you the maximum amount of time – from Wednesday to Monday – to get all the conference reading done. As you will thus hear my own perspectives in lecture, I hope to hand the subsequent conferences over to you with my providing only limited guidance.

31 Aug	Introduction	
2 Sep	“Religion” (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Braun, “Religion,” 3-18.• Arnal, “Definition,” 21-34.• Smith, “Classification,” 35-44.• Martin, “Comparison,” 45-56.• Penner, “Interpretation,” 57-71.
4 Sep	An awareness of “religion” before its systematic study (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sharpe, “The antecedents of comparative religion,” 1-26.• Brashier, “The early Chinese endeavor to interpret early Chinese religions.” (Search for “Oxford Handbooks Online” in our library catalogue or our Religion Research Guide on the library website.)• Campany. “On the very idea of religions (in the modern West and in early medieval China),” 287-319.
7 Sep	Labor Day	
9 Sep	“He who knows one, knows none”: Religious studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• E.B. Tylor, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 1-35.• James Frazer, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 37-70.

	begins through comparison (Conference)	
11 Sep	“Spiritual agencies touching us in the dreamy Subliminal”: William James (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wm. James’ <i>The varieties of religious experience</i>
14 Sep	James I (Conference)	Exploratory 1: Group A
16 Sep	James II (Conference)	Exploratory 1: Group B
18 Sep	Tabernacles, toy gardens and <i>homo religiosus</i> : Mircea Eliade (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rudolf Otto, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 205-235, Mircea Eliade, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 271-308. McCutcheon, “The imperial dynamic and the discourse of religion,” 158-191.

21 Sep	Eliade (Conference)	
23 Sep	Mysto-centrism? (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Katz, “Language, epistemology, and mysticism,” 22-74. Forman, “Introduction: Mysticism, constructivism, and forgetting,” 3-49.
25 Sep	Durkheim’s communal spirit (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emile Durkheim, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 99-142. Durkheim, “The positivist cult,” 330-391.
28 Sep	Durkheim (Conference)	
30 Sep	Weber’s religious roadmap (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Max Weber’s <i>The sociology of religion</i>
2 Oct	Weber I (Conference)	[I need to be away this day. Yet I still want you to meet and discuss Weber, and we will continue those discussions in the next two sessions.]
5 Oct	Weber II (Conference)	Exploratory 2: Group A
7 Oct	Weber III (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Max Weber, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 237-255.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Karl Marx, in in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 143-153.
9 Oct	Freud in first-person singular (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Sigmund Freud's <i>The future of an illusion</i>.
12 Oct	Freud (Conference)	
14 Oct	Gender as a lens in religious studies (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Juschka, "Gender," 229-242. · Shaw, "Feminist anthropology and the gendering of religious studies," 65-76. · Jay, "Social-scientific interpretation of ritual" and "Theories of sacrifice," 1-16, 128-146.
16 Oct	A meaning-full Weberian without a roadmap (Lecture)	<p>Mid-term paper due: "The modern critique of a classic"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · E.E. Evans-Pritchard, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 309-340 · Clifford Geertz, in <i>Introducing religion</i>, 341-372. · Geertz, "Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture," 3-30. · Asad, "The construction of religion as an anthropological category," 27-54.
FALL BREAK		
26 Oct	Geertz I (Conference)	Exploratory 3: Group A
28 Oct	Geertz II (Conference)	Exploratory 3: Group B
30 Oct	Religion inside and out I (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Knott, "Insider/outsider perspectives," 243-258. · Orsi, "Introduction," 1-13. · Orsi, "The problem of the holy," 84-105.
2 Nov	Religion inside and out II (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Luhrmann, "Metakinesis: How God becomes intimate in contemporary U.S. Christianity," 518-528. · Luhrmann, "Bridging the gap," 300-325. · Proudfoot, "Explanation," 190-227.
4 Nov	Post-postmodernism I (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>A magic still dwells</i>, "Introduction" and "Part one." <p>Exploratory 4: Group A</p>
6 Nov	Post-postmodernism II (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>A magic still dwells</i>, "Part two." <p>Exploratory 4: Group B</p>
9 Nov	Post-postmodernism III (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>A magic still dwells</i>, "Part three." <p>[Kimberley C. Patton, editor of and contributor to this book, will join our conference.]</p>

11 Nov	New lenses: Evolutionary biology (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collins, “The origins of the universe” and “Life on earth: Of microbes and man,” 57-84, 85-107. Dawkins, “The roots of religion,” 161-207.
13 Nov	New science: old questions (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pascal Boyer’s <i>Religion explained</i> Taylor, “Hemispheric asymmetries” and “Bare to the bone,” 26-35, 66-75.

16 Nov	Boyer I (Conference)	Exploratory 5: Group A
18 Nov	Boyer II (Conference)	Exploratory 5: Group B
20 Nov	“If you say it enough times...”: Ritual invariance and authority (Lecture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roy Rappaport’s <i>Ritual and religion in the making of humanity</i>

23 Nov	Rappaport I (Conference)	Exploratory 6: Group A
25 Nov	Rappaport II (Conference)	Exploratory 6: Group B
27 Nov	Thanksgiving	

30 Nov	Timothy Leary will help you “Start your own religion” (Conference)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leary’s “Start your own religion” (handout)
2 Dec	Marketplace I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Student projects]
4 Dec	Marketplace II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Student projects]
7 Dec	Marketplace III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Student projects]
9 Dec	The Benediction	

16 Dec (noon)	Final paper due: "The modern usage of a classic"
------------------	---

V. Consciousness of conference technique

Much of our educational system seems designed to discourage any attempt at finding things out for oneself, but makes learning things others have found out, or think they have, the major goal.

– Anne Roe, 1953.

At times it is useful to step back and discuss conference dynamics, to lay bare the bones of conference communication. Why? Because some Reed conferences succeed; others do not. After each conference, I ask myself how it went and why it progressed in that fashion. If just one conference goes badly or only so-so, a small storm cloud forms over my head for the rest of the day. Many students with whom I have discussed conference strategies tell me that most Reed conferences don't achieve that sensation of educational nirvana, that usually students do not leave the room punching the air in intellectual excitement. I agree. A conference is a much riskier educational tool than a lecture, and this tool requires a sharpness of materials, of the conferees and of the conference leader. It can fail if there is a dullness in any of the three. Yet whereas lectures merely impart information (with a "sage on the stage"), conferences train us how to think about and interact with that information (with a "guide on the side"). So when it *does* work

I look for the following five features when evaluating a conference:

1. Divide the allotted time by the number of conference participants. That resulting time should equal the leader's ideal speaking limits. (I talk too much in conference. Yet when I say this to some students, they sometimes tell me that instructors should feel free to talk more because the students are here to acquire that expertise in the field. So the amount one speaks is a judgment call, but regardless, verbal monopolies never work.)
2. Watch the non-verbal dynamism. Are the students leaning forward, engaging in eye contact and gesturing to drive home a point such that *understanding* is in fact taking on a physical dimension? Or are they silently sitting back in their chairs staring at anything other than another human being? As a conference leader or participant, it's a physical message you should always keep in mind. Leaning forward and engaging eye contact is not mere appearance; it indeed helps to keep one focused, especially if tired. And iPhones off; ignore your Apple Watch; and while laptops are okay, push the monitor so it's flat with the table.
3. Determine whether the discourse is being directed through one person (usually the conference leader) or is non-point specific. If you diagram the flow of discussion and it looks like a wagon wheel with the conference leader in the middle, the conference has, in my opinion, failed. If you diagram the flow and it looks like a jumbled, all-inclusive net, the conference is more likely to have succeeded.
4. Determine whether a new idea has been achieved. By the end of the conference, was an idea created that was new to everyone, including the conference leader? Did several people contribute a Lego to build a new thought that the conferees would not have been able to construct on their own? This evaluation is trickier because sometimes a conference may not have gone well on first glance but a new idea evolved nonetheless. The leader must be sure to highlight that evolution at the end of the conference.
5. Watch for simple politeness. "Politeness" means giving each other an opportunity to speak, rescuing a colleague hanging out on a limb, asking useful questions as well as complimenting a new idea, a well-said phrase, a funny joke.

Note that most of the above points (with the exception of the fourth) are content-free. Content obviously counts most of all, but the proper dynamics can serve as a catalyst to fully developed content. If you feel a conference only went so-so, instead of simply moving on to the next one, I would urge you, too, to evaluate the conference using your own criteria and figuring out how you (and I) can make the next one a more meaningful experience.

In the end, as long as you are prepared and feel passionate about your work, you should do well, and if passion ever fails, grim determination counts for something.

VI. The exploratory

Sometimes conferences sing. Yet just when I would like them to sing opera, they might merely hum a bit of country-

western. After my first year of teaching at Reed, I reflected upon my conference performance and toyed with various ideas as to how to induce more of the ecstatic arias and lively crescendos, and I came up with something I call an "exploratory."

Simply put, an exploratory is a one-page, single-spaced piece in which you highlight one thought-provoking issue that caught your attention in the materials we are considering. This brief analysis must show *thorough* reading – don't just draw from the first few pages and call it done – and must show *your own* thoughtful extension:

- Your own informed, constructive criticism of the author;
- Your own developed, thoughtful question (perhaps even inspired by readings from other classes) that raises interesting issues when seen in the light of the author's text;
- Your own application of theory and method to a primary source or case study;
- Your own personal conjecture as to how this data can be made useful; or (best of all)
- Your own autonomous problem that you devised using the data under discussion.

I am not here looking for polished prose or copious (or any) footnotes – save all that for our formal papers. (I do not return exploratories with comments unless a special request is made.) Exploratories are not full, open-heart surgeries performed on the text. Instead, exploratories tend to be somewhat informal but focused probes on one particular aspect in which you yourself can interact with the text and can enter into the conversation.

What is *not* an exploratory? It is not merely a topic supported by evidence from the book, nor is it a descriptive piece on someone else's ideas, nor is it a general book report in which you can wander to and fro without direction. Bringing in outside materials is allowed, but the exploratory is not a forum for ideas outside that day's expressed focus. (Such pieces cannot be used in our conference discussions.) It is instead a *problematique*, an issue with attitude.

The best advice that I can give here is simply to encourage you to consider *why* I am requesting these exploratories from you: I want to see what ignites your interest in the text *so I can set the conference agenda*. That is why they are due the evening *before* a conference. Thus late exploratories are of no use to anyone. (Being handed a late exploratory is like being handed your salad after you've eaten dessert and are already leaving the restaurant.) I base roughly half my conferences on exploratories, and I will use them to draw you in, parry your perspective against that of another, and build up the discussion based on your views. Exploratories help me turn the conference to issues that directly interest you. They often lead us off on important tangents, and they often return us to the core of the problem under discussion. So if you are struggling with finding "something to say," simply recall why I ask for these exploratories in the first place. Is there something in the text you think worthy of conference time? Do you have an idea you want to take this opportunity to explore? Here is your chance to draw our attention to it. Your perspectives are important, and if you have them crystallized on paper in advance, they will be easier to articulate in conference.

Since I began using exploratories, most students have responded very favorably. Students like the fact that it is a different form of writing, a bit more informal and more frequent, somewhat akin to thinking aloud. It forces one not just to read a text but to be looking for something in that text, to engage that text actively. And it increases the likelihood that everyone leaves the conference singing Puccini.

VII. Course bibliography (both purchase texts and Moodle articles)

- Arnal, William E. "Definition," in *Guide to the study of religion*, Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon, eds. (London: Cassell: 2000): 21-34.
- Asad, Talal. "The construction of religion as an anthropological category," in *Genealogies of religion: Discipline and reasons of power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1993): 27-54.
- Bell, Catherine, "Performance," in *Critical terms in the study of religion*, Mark C. Taylor, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1998): 239-255.
- Boyer, Pascal. *Religion explained: The evolutionary origins of religious thought* (New York: Basic books, 2001).
- Brashier, K.E. "The early Chinese endeavor to interpret early Chinese religions," in *Oxford Handbooks Online*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Braun, Willi. "Religion," in *Guide to the study of religion*, Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon, eds. (London: Cassell: 2000): 3-18.
- Campany, Robert Ford. "On the very idea of religions (in the modern West and in early medieval China),"

- Collins, Francis S. "The origins of the universe" and "Life on earth: Of microbes and man," in *The language of God: A scientist present evidence for belief* (New York: Free Press, 2006): 57-84, 85-107.
- Dawkins, Richard. "The roots of religion," in *The God delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006): 161-207.
- Durkheim, Emile. "The positivist cult," in *The elementary forms of religious life* (New York: The free press, 1995): 330-391.
- Forman, Robert K.C. "Introduction: Mysticism, constructivism, and forgetting," in *The problem of pure consciousness: Mysticism and philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990: 3-49.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The future of an illusion* (London: Penguin, 1991 [originally published in 1927]).
- Geertz, Clifford. "Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture," in *The interpretation of cultures* (London: Fontana Press, 1993), 3-30.
- James, William. *The varieties of religious experience: A study of human nature* (New York: The modern library, 1994 [originally the Gifford lectures of 1901-1902].)
- Jay, Nancy. "Social-scientific interpretation of ritual" and "Theories of sacrifice," in *Throughout your generations forever: Sacrifice, religion, and paternity* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1992): 1-16, 128-146.
- Juschka, Darlene M. "Gender," in *The Routledge companion to the study of religion* (London: Routledge, 2005): 229-242.
- Katz, Steven. "Language, epistemology, and mysticism," in *Mysticism and philosophical analysis*, Katz, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978): 22-74.
- Knott, Kim. "Insider/outsider perspectives," in *The Routledge companion to the study of religion* (London: Routledge, 2005): 243-258.
- Luhrmann, T.M. "Bridging the gap," in *When God talks back: Understanding the American evangelical relationship with God* (New York: Vintage, 2012): 300-325.
- Luhrmann, T.M. "Metakinesis: How God becomes intimate in contemporary U.S. Christianity," *American anthropologist* 106.3 (2004): 518-528.
- Martin, Luther H. "Comparison," in *Guide to the study of religion*, Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon, eds. (London: Cassell: 2000): 45-56.
- McCutcheon, Russell T. "The imperial dynamic and the discourse of religion," in *Manufacturing religion: The discourse on sui generis religion and the politics of nostalgia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 158-191.
- Orsi, Robert A. "Introduction," in *The Cambridge companion to religious studies*, Robert A. Orsi, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012): 1-13.
- Orsi, Robert A. "The problem of the holy," in *The Cambridge companion to religious studies*, Robert A. Orsi, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012): 84-105.
- Pals, Daniel L. *Introducing religion: Readings from the classic theorists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Patton, Kimberley C. and Benjamin C. Ray, *A magic still dwells: Comparative religion in the postmodern age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- Penner, Hans H. "Interpretation," in *Guide to the study of religion*, Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon, eds. (London: Cassell: 2000): 57-71.
- Proudfoot, Wayne. "Explanation," in *Religious experience* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1985): 190-227.
- Rappaport, Roy A. *Ritual and religion in the making of humanity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Sharpe, Eric J. "The antecedents of comparative religion," in *Comparative religion: A history* (London: Duckworth, 1986): 1-26.
- Shaw, Rosalind, "Feminist anthropology and the gendering of religious studies," in *Religion and gender*, Ursula King, ed. (Oxford: Blackwell: 1995): 65-76.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "Classification," in *Guide to the study of religion*, Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon, eds. (London: Cassell: 2000): 35-44.
- Taylor, Jill Bolte. "Hemispheric asymmetries" and "Bare to the bone," in *My stroke of insight: A brain scientist's*

personal journey (New York: Plume, 2009), 26-35, 66-75.

· Weber, Max. *The sociology of religion* (Boston: Beacon press, 1967 [originally published after his death in 1920].)