

香港中文大學天主教研究中心

《天主教研究學報》

〈宗教交談〉

香港中文大學天主教研究中心

《天主教研究學報》

〈宗教交談〉

目 錄

- 6 作者簡介
- 8 主編的話
- 19 John BORELLI 〈梵二與天主教的宗教交談：五十年之後〉
- 40 John PAWLIKOWSKI 〈猶太背景中的基督與教會〉
- 57 Rita GEORGE-TVRTKOVIC 〈穆斯林與基督徒的關係，過去與今日〉
- 78 Vincent SEKHAR 〈與宗教鄰舍建立關係：宗教交談在印度：陰影與支柱〉
- 102 James FREDERICKS 〈今日佛教與基督教的關係〉
- 135 Richard MADSEN 〈二十世紀天主教史中的宗派合作與宗教對話：過去的遺產與將來的希望〉
- 151 周景勳 〈香港六宗教領袖座談會：與周景勳神父訪談〉
- 168 賴品超 〈利他主義與儒耶比較〉
- 189 陳曦 〈保羅與親鸞信心觀之比較研究：從「信心和行為的關係」出發〉
- 214 Peter FELDMEIERS 〈「正名」與比較神學〉

- 231 Fabrice BLÉE
〈包容作為對話的基礎：隱修群體宗教交流經驗〉
- 249 Leo LEFEBURE 〈世界宗教議會：希望的聚會〉
- 273 Peter PHAN 〈梵二後五十年：天主教會與宗教對話〉

Table of Contents

- 6 Presentation of Authors
- 8 Editor's Word
- 19 John BORELLI, "Vatican II and Catholic Interreligious Relations: Fifty Years Later"
- 40 John PAWLIKOWSKI, "Christ and the Church in Their Jewish Context"
- 57 Rita GEORGE-TVRTKOVIC, "Muslim-Christian Relations, Past and Present"
- 78 Vincent SEKHAR, "Building Relationship with Religious Neighbours: Interreligious Dialogue in India – Shades and Shores"
- 102 James FREDERICKS, "Buddhist-Christian Relations Today"
- 135 Richard MADSEN, "Ecumenical Cooperation and Inter-religious Dialogue in 20th Century Catholic History: Legacies of the Past and Prospects for the Future"
- 151 Edward CHAU, "Colloquium of Six Religious Leaders of Hong Kong: Interview with Fr. Edward Chau"
- 168 LAI Pan-chiu, "Altruism and Confucian-Christian Comparison"

- 189 CHEN Xi, “A Comparative Study of the Theories of Faith of Paul and Shinran: The Relationship between Faith and Work”
- 214 Peter FELDMEIER, “The Rectification of Names and Comparative Theology”
- 231 Fabrice BLÉE, “Hospitality as a Condition for Dialogue: The Monastic Interreligious Experience”
- 249 Leo LEFEBURE, “The Parliaments of the World’s Religions”
- 273 Peter PHAN, “Fifty Years after Vatican II: The Catholic Church and Interreligious Dialogue”

作者簡介

- John BORELLI 美國佐治敦大學(Georgetown University) 宗教交流事務校長特別助理 (Special Assistant to the President for Interreligious Initiatives)
- John PAWLIKOWSKI 美國天主教神學聯盟 (Catholic Theological Union)社會倫理學教授
- Rita GEORGE-TVRTKOVIC 美國本篤會大學(Benedictine University) 神學系助理教授
- Vincent SEKHAR 印度清奈羅耀拉學院(Loyola College, Chennai)文化與宗教教談中心(Institute of Dialogue with Cultures and Religions) 主任
- James FREDERICKS 美國耀拉瑪麗蒙特大學 (Loyola Marymount University)神學系教授
- Richard MADSEN 美國加州大學聖地牙哥分校(University of California, San Diego)社會學系卓越教授

- CHAU King Fun Edward** 天主教香港教區司鐸，教區宗教聯絡委員會主席
周景勳
- LAI Pan-chiu** 香港中文大學文化及宗教研究系教授
賴品超
- CHEN Xi** 香港中文大學文化及宗教研究系博士，
陳曦 武漢大學宗教學系博士後研究員
- Peter FELDMEIER** 美國托雷多大學(University of Toledo)
Thomas and Margaret Murray & James J. Bacik 天主教研究講席教授
- Fabrice BLÉE** 加拿大聖保祿大學 (Saint Paul University)神學系教授
- Leo LEFEBURE** 美國佐治敦大學(Georgetown University)
神學系利瑪竇講席教授，香港中文大學
天主教研究中心校外顧問
- Peter PHAN** 美國佐治敦大學(Georgetown University)
神學系天主教社會思想史埃拉庫里亞
(Ignacio Ellacuria)講席教授，香港中文大學
天主教研究中心校外顧問

主編的話 (中譯)

在基督宗教的歷史上，一直意識到宗教間的相互關係，這亦是今日最具挑戰性的問題。自基督宗教之始，基督徒已開始思索不同的宗教傳統，並形成了的各種的關係。耶穌最早的追隨者均為猶太人，他們認為耶穌就是默西亞，而對他們而言，這不是參加了一個新的宗教，不過，他們很快便發現，在理解納匝肋人耶穌的意義和重要性上，與其他猶太人有很大的爭議。這些爭議在新約聖經中留存並影響了基督宗教往後的歷史。基督徒建構的自我形象是與新約中負面的猶太人相對比，如叛徒猶達斯依斯加略又或是偽善的法利賽人。在歷史上，基督徒亦視穆斯林為敵人，並對穆斯林和伊斯蘭教有著強烈的負面印象。當基督宗教傳至世界各地，亦視所遇到的其他宗教為迷信。

雖然基督徒與其他宗教亦曾經有過相互尊重的對話，但在更多的情況下卻是敵對，而在歷史上，宗教間的關係經常是充滿衝突甚至是暴力，直至二十世紀中，基督徒仍帶著歷史上宗教仇恨的陰影。即使有來自不同宗派的基督徒理解及尊重其他宗教及其信眾，但終歸是少數，對整個基督宗教群體的影響十分有限。

現代基督宗教其中一個最重大的轉變是其對其他宗教的態度轉變，而這個轉變是廣泛地影響基督宗教，並仍然持續著。在天主教方面，第二次梵蒂岡大公會議是決定性的事件，而與此同時，其他基督宗教的宗派亦有這種轉變。在歷史上，天主教的大公會首次公開對其他宗教表示尊重，承認其他宗教亦包含真理與神聖，並呼籲天主教徒要以接受和仁愛的精神，與其他宗教的信眾致力在共同的價值上合作。其他宗派的基督徒亦在梵二的精

神中找到鼓舞、贊同和靈感。梵二閉幕距今近五十年，這是一個合適的時間去回顧這個轉變，和對二十一世紀的重要意義。

本期期刊的文章便是探究基督徒，特別是天主教徒與其他宗教傳統的關係的轉變，並反思當今基督宗教的宗教對話。部份文章集中討論天主教與其他宗教的關係，部份則將討論擴至其他基督宗教宗派。有些文章旨在提供該範疇的導論，有些文章則針對一專題作深入探究。由於宗教間的關係是一宏闊的課題，本期期刊目的是希望讀者留意這個課題，並提供進一步研究和討論的線索，而無意囊括所有的範圍。

多年來代表美國天主教教團主事宗教間關係的 John Borelli 在其文章中，回顧梵二及梵二後天主教在宗教對話方面的貢獻，其中可看到，梵二文獻至今仍是歷久常新及令人深省，而改善宗教間的關係至今仍是世界的重要課題。而當中最戲劇性的轉變是猶太教與基督宗教的關係。曾出任國際基督徒及猶太教徒理事會會長的 John T. Pawlikowski，便在文中探討這個課題，並為讀者提供神學上的反思和近期的轉變。

其中一個最重要而又最難以發展的宗教關係要算是基督徒與伊斯蘭教徒的關係。Rita George-Tvrtković 曾代表天主教芝加哥總教區處理與伊斯蘭教徒的對話，並曾研究中世紀兩者之間的互動關係。她在文中指出基督徒在中世紀對伊斯蘭教徒的關係的模式如何持續影響至今。她亦探討梵二如何革新天主教與伊斯蘭教的關係，並以在美國的發展為例子分析。

印度自古已是一個包容多種宗教傳統的世界，當中不少延續至今並以和諧的方式共存，但其中亦有不少衝突。印度清奈羅耀拉學院文化與宗教教談中心主任 Vincent Sekhar 介紹了在現今印度宗教關係的正面與困難情況，在有建設性的發展下，印度教中的民族主義卻對少數宗教帶來挑戰和衝突。Sekhar 指出，儘管有著「種族的陰影」威脅宗教對話，但「正面的支柱」亦同時存在並以求同存異的精神歡迎人與人間的和諧與相互理解。佛教和基

基督教在世界不同的文化地域均有接觸，兩者之間的關係並不能簡單地一概而論。研究比較神學和佛教與基督教關係的 James Frederick 在其文中提供了世界不同角落佛教和基督教間多元的關係的概覽。

本期數篇文章特別關注宗教對話在中國的情形。以研究宗教在中國和美國著稱的社會學家 Richard Madsen 探討了天主教在十九、二十世紀中國、香港、澳門和臺灣與其他宗教的關係。他指出，在中國大陸，天主教徒多數集中在鄉村的群體，並十分強調保存自己天主教徒的身份。在香港、澳門、臺灣的天主教徒則在城市中與其他宗教共存，儘管間或亦有衝突。周景勳神父是在香港擁有最豐富的宗教交談經驗的宗教領袖之一，他長年擔任香港天主教區的宗教聯絡委員會主席及香港教區聖神修院神哲學院的宗教學主任。本期期刊透過與周神父的訪談，回顧香港的六宗教領袖座談會的歷史。在香港，不同宗教透過對話來互相影響，但同時亦專重彼此間的差異和合作的限度。

另一種富有意義的宗教研究是透過比較分析不同宗教間對相類近的品德的看法。精於研究中國基督教的賴品超在他的文章中探討了儒家和基督宗教傳統中的利他主義。儒家自古到今是以「仁」作為其獨特的思想，而基督宗教則以「愛」(agape)為核心。儘管兩者的理想並不相同，但相似之處卻富有啟發性並值得深入研究。在香港中文大學修讀研究生的陳曦則研究保祿和日本佛教淨土真宗的創始人親鸞的思想中，信心的重要性。透過慎密的文本研究，陳曦比較了保祿的書信與親鸞的《教行信證》中，信心和行為間的關係。保祿和親鸞的信仰儘管有天淵之別，但他們某些觀點的相似性卻很值得我們反思。

一個宗教傳統中特別的觀點亦或能為其他宗教帶來新的啟發。儒家思想以正名作為一個很重要的核心行為和價值。人們均是以名相互指稱，因此名是生命中最重要組成之一。不同宗教往往被其他人冠以他們反對的名。錯誤的名亦能扭曲真義，造成誤解和猜疑，甚至引起衝突。研究基督教與亞洲著稱的學者 Peter

Feldmeier 在其研究中，探討儒家的正名觀念如何成為處理宗教問題的有用概念。

一些組織如何促成不同宗教的信徒間的交流亦是研究宗教交流的另一重要層面。「隱修群體宗教交流經驗」Dialogue Interreligieux Monastique/Monastic Interreligious Dialogue 是由天主教的隱修士組成，從事與其他宗教的隱修群體進行對話。Fabrice Blée 曾深入研究這段歷史，在他的文中會介紹這個運動的起源和歷史。包容是天主教的隱修群體生活中的核心部份，Blée 在文中指出這個傳統美德如何成為今日進行宗教對話的重要行動。

另一個致力各宗教相聚交流的組織是世界宗教議會，其歷史始自 1893 年，由部份美國基督新教領袖所構思，以鼓勵宗教間的相互理解、和諧共存為目的的第一次世界宗教議會。在 1893 年的議會中，亞洲的宗教領袖對北美產生重大的形響。印度教、佛教、伊斯蘭教、拜火教、祆教、道教、神道教和儒教的領袖在會議上發言，在當時，大部份美國人對這些宗教是聞所未聞。不少學者將這次會議作為現代宗教交流的開端。筆者的文章考察了世界宗教的議會自 1893 年至今的歷史。

作為本期期刊的總結，出生於越南並作為今日亞洲、美國最傑出的神學家，Peter Phan 考察了五十年來梵二引領天主教至何方。Phan 指出梵二對天主教會過往的立場與經驗的鮮明革新。Phan 提出了一個聖神在眾人的生命中工作的神學，並期望教宗方濟各所帶來的希望和慷慨的精神，將有助建立宗教間的關係。

(中譯：吳家齊)

Editor's Word

Interreligious awareness is as old as Christianity and is one of the most pressing challenges of the present. From the very beginning of the Christian movement, followers of Jesus Christ have been aware of other religious traditions and have been in a variety of relationships with followers of other religious paths. Most of the very first followers of Jesus were Jews who accepted Jesus as Lord and Messiah without any sense of leaving one religion to join another, but they soon found themselves debating with other Jews over the meaning and significance of Jesus of Nazareth. The expressions of these debates in the New Testament have shaped all subsequent Christian history. For centuries, Christians shaped their self-understanding in sharp contrast to a negative image of “the Jews,” who were often viewed as being traitors like Judas Iscariot and hypocrites like the Pharisees as portrayed in the New Testament. Historically, Christians often encountered Muslims as competitors and foes; for centuries Christian self-understanding was shaped by the harshly negative images of Muslims and Islam. As Christians moved around the world, they often condemned other religious traditions as idolatrous.

While there were some settings in which Christians engaged in respectful dialogue with their contemporaries, all too often Christian attitudes towards other religions were hostile; and interreligious relations were repeatedly marked by controversy and violence. In the middle of the twentieth century, Christian relations continued to suffer from this heritage of hostility. To be sure, there were Christians

from a variety of communions who understood and respected other religions and esteemed their followers. However, these tended to be a minority without major influence on the largest Christian communities.

One of the most remarkable developments in recent decades has been the widespread and ongoing transformation of Christian attitudes and practices towards other religions and their followers. For Catholics, the Second Vatican Council was the most important single event in this transformation, and there were analogous developments in many other Christian communities. For the first time in history, a Catholic ecumenical council publicly expressed respect for other religious paths, acknowledged truth and holiness in them, and called on Catholics to cooperate in prudence and charity with followers of other religious paths in working for common values. Many Christians in other traditions found encouragement, support, and inspiration in the Catholic conciliar initiatives. Fifty years after the Second Vatican Council, it is a propitious time to survey these changes and reflect on their significance for the twenty-first century.

This issue explores how Christian, and especially Catholic, relationships with other religious traditions have changed in recent decades; and it reflects on the current situation of Christian interreligious relations. Some articles focus particularly on Catholic interreligious relations; others range more broadly to include other Christian interreligious activities as well. Some essays offer a general overview of a particular field; others explore a particular topic in greater depth. Given the breadth of the subject of interreligious relations, this issue does not pretend to cover all areas exhaustively but rather seeks to broaden awareness and provoke further discussion.

John Borelli, who for many years represented the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in interreligious relations, recounts

the story of the developments at Vatican II and some of the major Catholic initiatives since the Council. It is striking how fresh and challenging the Council's statements remain today; its call to improve interreligious relations for the sake of the world remains an agenda for the present day. Perhaps the most dramatic revolution occurred in Jewish-Christian relationships. John Pawlikowski, O.S.M., who has served as president of the International Conference of Christians and Jews and who has long been a leader in Jewish-Catholic relationships, focuses particularly on Christian relations with Jews, offering theological reflections on the changes in recent decades.

One of the most important but most difficult interreligious relationships involves Christians and Muslims. Rita George-Tvrtković, who has represented the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago in relationships with Muslims and who has studied the dynamics of medieval Muslim-Christian relations, notes how medieval patterns in Christian relations with Muslims continue to shape the contemporary world. She explores how the Second Vatican Council renovated Catholic-Muslim relations, and discusses relationships in the United States as one example of the situation today.

From ancient times the subcontinent of India has been a world vigorously shaped by a variety of religious practices. Many traditions continue to thrive in India today, often in harmony; but tragically there are also many situations in India marked by conflict. Vincent Sekhar, S.J., the Executive Director & Dean of Research of the Institute of Dialogue with Cultures and Religions (IDCR) of Loyola College, Chennai, provides an overview of both the positive relations and the difficulties in India today. He notes the many positive initiatives, but also the severe challenges posed by Hindu nationalism in particular to the religious minorities on the subcontinent. As

Sekhar explains, there are “communal shades” that threaten to keep interreligious relations in darkness, but there are also “positive shores” that welcome people and invite them to harmony and understanding based on the principle of unity in diversity. Buddhists and Christians encounter each other in extremely varied settings around the world, and no easy generalizations are possible to encapsulate all relations under a single rubric. James Fredericks, a leader in comparative theology and in Buddhist-Christian explorations, offers a careful, nuanced overview of the many varieties of Buddhist-Christian relations around the world today.

Several articles focus on various aspects of interreligious relations in the Chinese world. Richard Madsen, a noted sociologist who has published extensively on religion in China and the United States, examines developments in Catholic interreligious relationships in mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He notes that Catholics in mainland China are often in rural communities with a strong concern for preserving identity. By contrast, Catholics in Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan are in urban contexts where interreligious initiatives have often flourished, though not without controversy in some quarters. The Rev. Edward Chau is one of the most experienced leaders in interreligious relations in Hong Kong, serving as the Chairman of the Catholic Diocesan Commission for Interreligious Dialogue and also as the Director of the Institute of Religious Sciences at Holy Spirit Seminary College of Theology and Philosophy in Aberdeen-Hong Kong. An interview with Fr. Chau recounts the development of the Colloquium of Six Religious Leaders of Hong Kong. Through dialogue, the traditions in Hong Kong came to influence each other while also respecting the differences among them and acknowledging the limits of common activities.

Another fruitful approach to interreligious exploration is to focus on a particular virtue in one tradition and to explore a virtue that may be comparable in another religious context. Lai Pan-chiu, a leader in the study of Christianity in China, examines the virtue of altruism in the Confucian and Christian traditions. From ancient times to the present, Confucianism has nurtured its distinctive approach to *ren*, while Christians have their own particular understanding and practice of *agape* (love). While these ideals are clearly different, the similarities between them are illuminating and call for careful reflection. Chen Xi, a graduate student at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, focuses on the importance of faith in the Apostle Paul and in Shinran, the founder of the Japanese Jodo Shinshu tradition of Buddhism. In a careful textual study, Chen Xi compares the relationship of faith and work in Paul's letters and in the *Kyogyoshinsho* of Shinran. While these leaders have important differences, the resonances between their perspectives offer much to consider.

A virtue prized in one tradition may well have ramifications for all other paths. The Confucian tradition has long valued the rectification of names as a crucial practice and value. For better or worse, the names we call one another are among the most significant forces in our lives. Often religious traditions have been called by names that they themselves reject. When names distort reality, they can nurture misunderstanding and suspicion, even leading to violent conflict. Peter Feldmeier, a leading scholar in Christian-Asian studies, reflects on the ancient Confucian virtue of rectifying names as a resource for addressing today's interreligious challenges.

Another important dimension of interreligious relationships involves the organizations that bring together followers of different religious paths. Dialogue Interreligieux Monastique/Monastic

Interreligious Dialogue is an organization of Catholic monastics who dialogue with monastics and other practitioners from other religious traditions. Fabrice Blée, who has studied the history of this movement in detail, recounts the origins and history of Dialogue Interreligieux Monastique/Monastic Interreligious Dialogue. For Catholic monasticism, the virtue of hospitality has long been essential to their way of life. Blée explains how this traditional virtue finds vital new application in interreligious relationships today.

One of the organizations that convenes interreligious assemblies is the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions, whose roots go back to the first World Parliament of Religions in 1893, when a few American Protestant leaders conceived the idea of holding an assembly to encourage understanding and harmony among the world's religions. At the World Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893, Asian religious leaders made a significant impact on North American consciousness. Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, Zoroastrian, Parsee, Daoist, Shinto, and Confucian leaders addressed the Parliament at a time when most Americans had never encountered such representatives before. Many scholars date the birth of the modern interreligious movement to this event. My essay traces the history of the Parliaments of the World's Religions from 1893 to the present.

Finally, Peter Phan, who is originally from Vietnam who is today one of the leading Asian-American Christian theologians, reflects on where Catholics have come in the fifty years since Vatican II. Phan notes the sharp change that the Second Vatican Council made from earlier Catholic attitudes and practices. Phan proposes a theology of the Holy Spirit universally at work in human life, and he notes the hopeful and generous spirit that Pope Francis brings to interreligious relations.

宗教交談

Vatican II and Catholic Interreligious Relations: Fifty Years Later

John BORELLI

梵二與天主教的宗教交談：五十年之後

John BORELLI

[ABSTRACT] The Second Vatican Council had a profound and far-reaching impact on Catholic relations with all other religious traditions. Even though Pope John XXIII's original announcement of the council did not explicitly mention interreligious relations, discussions over relations with the Jewish community quickly became a major point of attention and international controversy. As the discussions proceeded, the focus broadened to include other religious traditions as well. *Nostra Aetate*, *The Declaration on the Relation of the Church with Non-Christian Religions*, reversed centuries of negative attitudes towards the Jewish community and other religious traditions. The result was an unprecedented expression of respect for other religious traditions and a major impetus to improve interreligious relations. The most daring implementation of the Council's interreligious vision was the World Day of Prayer for Peace in Assisi, Italy on 27 October 1986, when Pope John Paul II invited religious leaders to join him in Assisi to fast, to pray, and to bear witness to a new era for religions to put differences aside to become strengthened as instruments for peace.

Catholic life since Vatican II has been enriched in countless ways by these developments.

The Second Vatican Council, or Vatican II, was the most significant and far-reaching event in the twentieth century for the Catholic Church. No one knew exactly what to expect when Pope John XXIII (Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, 1958-1963) announced his intention on 25 January 1959, to convoke a council to be a means for spiritual renewal for Christians, reconciliation of the Catholic Church to the modern world, and service to the unity of Christians. These reasonably vague intentions gave few hints of the results to come, especially those affecting how Catholics would be encouraged to engage in dialogue with others.¹

Although a most solemn occasion for bishops to exercise their teaching authority in communion with the pope, who is first among equals as the Bishop of Rome, Vatican II was only the twenty-first such council in the history of the Catholic Church. It got underway on 11 October 1962 and met for about eight weeks that autumn, and again in similar sessions in 1963, 1964, and 1965.

On 5 June 1960, Pope John XXIII announced the preparatory commissions, and among these was a Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity (SPCU).² Initially it was to help those Christians

¹ The best single volume history of Vatican II is John W. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008). See especially the first chapter, "Big Perspectives on a Big Meeting," and the conclusion for general descriptions of Vatican II. The best multivolume history of Vatican II is *History of Vatican II*, edited by Giuseppe Alberigo and English version by Joseph A. Komonchak, 5 vols, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995-2005). These three goals of Vatican II were suggested by Komonchak, "Is Christ Divided? Dealing with Diversity and Disagreement," 2003 Common Ground Initiative Lecture, published in *Origins, CNS Documentary Service*, Vol 33 Issue 9 (17 July 2003)p. 141.

² *Superno Dei nutu* (5 June 1960),

who are not Catholics to follow the work of the council. On 6 August 1962, Pope John confirmed the SPCU as a commission of Vatican II, and on 19 October 1962 he decreed that it could prepare drafts to submit to the bishops.³ Eventually, it prepared three of the final sixteen documents of Vatican II and was partly responsible for a fourth. One was a *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, and its history indicates how Vatican II was a complex event launching far-reaching trajectories.⁴

On 13 June 1960, Pope John received Jules Isaac, a Jew and an important historian and citizen of France, who had survived German occupation in hiding and had dedicated his remaining life to researching what contributed to the situation in Europe which allowed the Holocaust of the Jews to happen. He asked Pope John to form a commission so that the upcoming council would address the Christian teaching of contempt towards Jews and anti-Semitism.⁵

<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/apost_letters/documents/hf_j-xxiii_apl_19600605_superno-dei_lt.html> [2013-07-09]. Documents of the Holy See (the Vatican) are often known by their Latin titles taken from their first two or three words in Latin, in this case, *Superno Dei nutu* or "By the heavenly will of God." While most documents are available on the Internet, there is an official published record of documents of the Holy See, and *Superno Dei nutu* is found in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. LII, 1960, pp. 433-437.

³ Thomas F. Stransky, CSP, "The Foundation of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity," in *Vatican II Revisited by those who were there*, edited by Alberic Stacpoole (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986), p. 70.

⁴ The whole story of the declaration has yet to be spelled out. One can find pieces of it in the *History of Vatican II* volumes and the volume by O'Malley and in articles by Thomas F. Stransky cited in this essay. After the council, René Laurentin and Joseph Neuner, S.J., produced a commentary on the text with a brief history, *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions of Vatican Council II* (Glenrock, NY: Paulist Press, 1966). On Vatican II as a complex event, see Joseph A. Komonchak, "Vatican II as an 'Event,'" in *Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?.*, edited by David G. Schultenover (New York: Continuum, 2007), pp. 24-51.

⁵ Recent studies of Jules Isaac include Marco Morselli, "Jules Isaac and the Origins of Nostra Aetate," in *Nostra Aetate: Origins, Promulgation, Impact on Jewish-Catholic Relations*, edited by Neville M. Lamdan and Alberto Melloni (Muenster: LIT, 2007), pp. 21-28; and André Kaspi, *Jules Isaac ou la passion de la vérité* (Paris: Plon, 2002). Isaac's report about his audience with John XXIII appeared after his death in "La Réception de Jules Isaac par Jean XXIII," *La Documentation Catholique* 65/1528(17

Pope John said he thought of the idea the moment he saw Isaac and asked him to meet also with Cardinal Augustin Bea, S.J., a scholar of the Jewish scriptures (the Old Testament), whom Pope John had appointed President of the new SPCU. The two met on 13 June 1960, and Cardinal Bea studied the portfolio of materials that Isaac had brought with him. On 18 September 1960, Bea recommended to the pope that the SPCU facilitate “the Jewish question” during the preparation for the council, and the pope agreed to add it to its ecumenical mandate.⁶

That Catholic bishops would address relations with other Christians was already a major change for the Catholic Church in 1960, but that they would also address Jewish relations, and eventually relations with the followers of other religions was beyond the expectations of all but a handful of those dedicated to interreligious relations. There had always been a slim tradition within the Catholic Church of engagement with other religions through scholarship, friendship, and dialogue. For example, the Jesuit missionary Matteo Ricci (1552-1610), Li Mǎ-tòu, lived in China for 27 years, translated a number of the Confucian books into Latin and composed original texts in Chinese in the Confucian style. Despite his efforts and the accepting efforts of others, Catholic officials through a series of decrees ordered a stop to accommodating the practices and ideas of Asian cultures to Christian practices and beliefs. This was completed by 1742.⁷

November 1968), pp. 2015-6.

⁶ Stjepan Schmidt, *Augustin Bea, the Cardinal of Unity* (New Rochelle, NY: New City Press, 1992), p. 137. See also Thomas Stransky, “The Genesis of *Nostra Aetate*: An Insider’s Story,” in *Nostra Aetate: Origins, Promulgation, Impact on Jewish-Christian Relations*. Proceedings of the International Conference, Jerusalem, 30 October – 1 November 2005, edited by Neville Lamdan and Alberto Melloni (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2007), pp. 29-53.

⁷ See George Minamiki, S.J., *The Chinese Rites Controversy from Its Beginnings to*

After Catholic leaders had participated in the 1893 Parliament of Religions in Chicago, Pope Leo XIII (Vincenzo Gioacchino Pecci, 1878-1903) advised Catholic bishops in the United States that Catholics should no longer participate in common meetings with dissenters from the Catholic Church to discuss matters of religion and moral but should "have their meetings by themselves." The pope did recognize that benefit of these assemblies should not be limited to Catholics and recommended that they should be planned in such a way that those separated from the Catholic Church might have the opportunity to listen.⁸ In early 1928 and in response to the organizational success of Protestant Christians in holding the first international Faith and Order meeting in Lausanne, Pope Pius XI (Achille Ratti, 1922-1939) warned Catholic bishops of the dangers of attempts at church unity by "pan-Christians."⁹ Already Catholics were instrumental in the development of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the United States, beginning in 1927 and growing successfully especially during World War II. Immediately after the war ended, a series of conferences with Catholic participation occurred across Europe bringing Christians and Jews together for reconciliation. The Catholic policy on outreach to other

Modern Times (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985); James Duncan, S.J., "The Chinese Rites Controversy. A Clash of Cultures," *Centro Pro Unione, semi-annual Bulletin* 75 (Fall 2009) pp. 13-24. The year 1742 is when Pope Benedict XIV issued the most restrictive decree, *Ex illa die*, in the Chinese rites controversy, that dictated policy until the twentieth century.

⁸ Letter to Archbishop Satolli, 18 September 1895, *Leonis XIII Acta* 14, pp. 323-324; see Francis J. Connell, "Pope Leo XIII's Message to America," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. 109, Issue 4 (October 1943), pp. 244-256; James F. Cleary, "Catholic Participation in the World's Parliament of Religions, Chicago, 1893," *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 55, Issue 4 (January 1970), pp. 585-609.

⁹ This was in the document *Mortalium Animos*,

<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_1928_0106_mortalium-animos_en.html> [2013-07-10]. See the reference by Marc Agostino, "Pius XI," in *The Papacy: An Encyclopedia*, 3 vols. (New York: Routledge, 2002) Vol. 2, p. 1204.

believers softened a little more with an instruction from the Vatican in late 1949, *Ecclesia Cattolica*, largely in response to the 1948 inaugural assembly of the World Council of Churches. The document acknowledged the good intentions, sound principles, and prayerful aspects of these efforts by other Christians and gave a provision for Catholic bishops to appoint trustworthy and sufficiently educated priests to attend ecumenical meetings as observers, as long as they did not actively participate. Thus in the decades leading up to Vatican II there were groups of Catholic pastors, laypersons and civic leaders, theologians, and scholars involved in ecumenical studies and relations with other Christians and in studies and relations with Jews and with representatives of other religions.¹⁰

At Vatican II, Catholic bishops had overwhelmingly endorsed the ecumenical movement among Christians to restore unity and formally committed the church to reach out in dialogue and cooperation with other Christians, with Jews, and with the followers of other religions. Enthused about interreligious relations from the start, Pope Paul VI (Giovanni Battista Montini, 1963-1978) succeeded John XXIII in June 1963 and guided the bishops at Vatican II to base their deliberations in council on the church's understanding of itself and in relation to all peoples.¹¹ In this context

¹⁰ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 42 (1950), p.143; English translation taken from *Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement*, Unity Studies 1, Commentary by Rev. William Conway (Garrison, NY: Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, 1954), p. 3. For the Catholic Conference for Ecumenical Questions see *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, edited by Nicholas Lossky and others, 2nd edition (Geneva: WCC Publications, 2002) and also George H. Tavard, *Vatican II and the Ecumenical Way* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2006). On Jewish relations see John Connelly, *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1939-1965* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012). For various interreligious relations, one needs to read the work and life of Louis Massignon, Henri Le Saux, (Swami Abhishiktananda), William Johnston and Hugo Enomiya Lassalle as examples.

¹¹ Cardinal Montini, the future Paul VI, first mentioned this near the end of the first period council before he was elected pope, see O'Malley, *Vatican II*, p. 158. In this first address to Vatican II as Paul VI on 29 September 1963, he laid out this elaborate

of an expansive vision of the church, Paul VI prepared his first encyclical, *Ecclesiam Suam* (6 August 1964), and employed the term "dialogue" over 70 times for various relationships, including interreligious relations. This is the first magisterial document of the Catholic Church to use the term "dialogue" for defining the relationship of Catholics with other believers in a positive way. Paul VI had already announced the establishment a Secretariat for Non-Christians (SNC) on 17 May 1964 so that "no pilgrim, no matter how distant he may be geographically, no matter his country of origin, will any longer be a complete stranger in this Rome." ¹² He intended this Secretariat to implement the work of interreligious dialogue after the council.

The major teaching of Vatican II in regard to interreligious relations was in *Nostra Aetate*, the declaration mentioned earlier. Shortest of all the documents of Vatican II but in many ways the most revolutionary, it reversed centuries of anti-Jewish teaching and negative attitudes towards the followers of other religions:

The Catholic Church rejects nothing that is true and holy in these religions. She regards with sincere reverence those ways of acting and of living, those precepts and teachings which, though differing in many aspects from the ones she holds and sets forth,

plan to organize the deliberations of the council around the self-understanding of the church. The Latin text is at:

<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1963/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19630929_concilio-vaticano-ii_it.html>[2013-07-15]. An English translation can be found in Xavier Rynne, *The Second Session* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Company, 1963), p. 347 ff.

¹² *Insegnamenti di Paolo VI*, II (1964), p. 342n.6. A collection of teaching documents of the Catholic Church on interreligious religious is *Interreligious Dialogue: The Official Teaching of the Catholic Church from the Second Vatican Council to John Paul II (1963-2005)*, edited by Francesco Gioia (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006), p. 194.

nonetheless often reflect a ray of that truth which enlightens all. . .

The Church therefore exhorts her sons and daughters to recognize, preserve, and foster the good things, spiritual and moral, as well as the socio-cultural values found among the followers of other religions. This is done through conversations and collaboration with them, carried out with prudence and love and in witness to the Christian faith and life. (2)

Because Vatican II also encouraged bishops to form national and regional conferences of bishops, responsibility for implementation extended to these conferences as well as to all dioceses and wherever Catholics are living. Dioceses and conferences of bishops formed commissions for dialogue. In this way, Vatican II influenced the ordinary lives of Catholics, dioceses and conferences of bishops, universities and communities of scholars, religious life, and the policies and programs of the Holy See (Vatican).

Vatican II was particularly bold with regard to relations with Jews. Dialogue commissions, especially in Europe and North America, reached out to Jewish leaders. Jewish relations remained within the responsibility of the SPCU, and in 1974, Paul VI established the Commission for Religious Relation with Jews (CRRJ) within the SPCU. The CRRJ immediately published “Guidelines on Religious Relations with Jews.” In 1985, it issued “Notes on the Correct Way to Present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechetics.” These documents helped local commissions move beyond first steps in friendship and cooperation. Though Catholics began almost immediately after the council to be welcomed in synagogues for services of prayer and programs, it was not until

1985 that a pope, John Paul II (Karol Wojtyla, 1978-2005), visited the Great Synagogue of Rome. Since 1980, he had repeated a reference to "the covenant never revoked," the implication of *Nostra Aetate* based on the *Letter to the Romans* (9: 4-5 and 11: 28-29) that God had not withdrawn his ancient promises to the Jews. With the momentum given to improving Jewish relations by the statements and acts of John Paul II, who had personally experienced the effects of the war and the Holocaust, the CCRJ issued "We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah" in 1998.

Rabbinic councils and Jewish agencies promoted dissemination and education of the teachings of Vatican II and the CRRJ. They often served as co-sponsors of dialogues with Christians. Since 1972, the CCRJ has worked with the International Committee on Interreligious Consultations, formed specifically by Jewish associations for dialogue on an international level, especially with the Vatican. The CRRJ soon after the Jubilee Year 2000 began meeting representatives of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. The relationship with Jews after Vatican II weighed heavily on Catholics learning to appreciate the Jewish roots of Christianity and to recover the Jewish dimensions of Christian teachings. Biblical scholarship began to catch up with the bold assertions of *Nostra Aetate* providing pastors and Catholic faithful with insights on the Jewish features of Jesus' life and teachings and those of the apostolic churches that produced the New Testament. Interpretations of seemingly anti-Jewish passages were contextualized within the struggles and contingencies of first and second centuries of the Common Era. The number of Jewish scholars of the New Testament and of Christianity has increased significantly over these decades. The *Jewish Annotated New Testament* is one sign of this increase.¹³ A Council of Centers

¹³ *The Jewish Annotated New Testament*. New Revised Standard Version, edited by

on Jewish-Christian Relations now exists with around 40 member institutions in North America and a number of affiliated institutions overseas, most located at colleges and universities. The website is a resource on dialogues, dialogue texts, scholarly articles, and much more—all greatly influenced by the steps taken at Vatican II and now influencing the lives of Jews and Christians, many of whom are Catholics.¹⁴

Back in 1962 when Cardinal Bea and the SPCU were attempting to draft a statement on relations with Jews for the agenda for Vatican II, political pressures nearly overwhelmed their cautious first steps to provide a basis for Catholic-Jewish relations. The Holocaust had been a major reason for the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 and was a leading motivation for Christians and Jews to seek ways for reconciliation in the years immediately after World War II as mentioned earlier. The Arab-Israeli War of 1948 ended in an uneasy military standoff and created an explosive context in which international and interreligious relations played out in the Middle East and elsewhere for decades. Thus, in early June 1962, when the World Jewish Congress announced that Chaim Wardi, the Israeli Minister for Christian Affairs, was going to serve as its official observer to Vatican II, Arab and Muslim political leaders protested that the ultimate goal of this initiative for Catholic-Jewish relations was actually the recognition of the State of Israel by the Catholic Church. Catholic officials could do little else but remove the draft from the agenda. Pope John XXIII restored the initiative to Bea and his SPCU several months later in December 1962.¹⁵

Amy-Jill Levine and Marc Zvi Brettler (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

¹⁴ <<http://www.ccsr.us/>> [2013-07-15]

¹⁵ J. Oscar Beozzo covers the removal from the agenda in “The External Climate,” in

The same political tensions remained after Vatican II ended and *Nostra Aetate* was promulgated. The question of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the State of Israel overshadowed Catholic-Jewish dialogue. These same political pressures contributed to a nearly ten-year delay in publication of the "Guidelines on Religious Relations with Jews" in 1974, while a more complicated directory for ecumenical relations was published more quickly by the SPCU in two parts in 1967 and 1971. In 1993, the Vatican entered into a fundamental agreement that established diplomatic relations with Israel and agreed to diplomatic relations with the Kingdom of Jordan. While Christians are slow to recognize that the land of Israel is inextricably linked Jewish understanding of their relationship with God, Christianity's situation in Israel and the occupied territories is more threatened today than it was fifty years ago. The religious relationship between Christians and Jews ultimately cannot be separated from these political and ethical concerns and political issues spill over into interreligious relations affecting Christians, Jews, and Muslims. Hence, ongoing trilateral dialogue among these three is difficult to sustain.

If *Nostra Aetate* was the council's boldest act, then the World Day of Prayer for Peace on 27 October 1986 remains its most daring implementation. John Paul II invited religious leaders to join him in Assisi to fast, to pray, and to bear witness to a new era for religions to put differences aside to become strengthened as instruments for peace. The pope suggested, reflecting on that day, that "we can indeed maintain that every authentic prayer is called forth by the Holy Spirit, who is mysteriously present in the heart of every

History of Vatican II, Vol. 1, pp. 396-398; Giuseppe Alberigo covers the restoration to the agenda in "The Conciliar Experience 'Learning on Their Own,'" in *History of Vatican II*, Vol. II (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), p. 573.

person.”¹⁶ Before he died, John Paul II had called two more days of prayer in Assisi — 9 January 1993, with war raging in the Balkans, and 24 January 2002, after the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, DC.

In his encyclical on the Holy Spirit (*Dominum et Vivificantem*, 1986: 55), John Paul II underscored an implicit teaching of Vatican II that God offers to everyone the possibility of being associated with the mystery of salvation as Christians understand it. In his encyclical on mission (*Redemptoris Missio*, 1990: 29 and 55), John Paul II incorporated his reflections on the Holy Spirit and the first Assisi gathering and then brought to light an implicit teaching of Vatican II that God is present in many ways, “not only to individuals but also to entire peoples through their spiritual riches, of which their religions are the main and essential expression.”

Since Vatican II, Catholic theologians and scholars gradually expanded their expertise on other religions and increased the ranks of academic specialists in the study of religions. Theologians studied questions on the relationships of mission to dialogue and of other religions to salvation and the implications of the teachings, practices, writings, and symbols of other religions for Catholic teaching, theology, and life. Catholic colleges and universities increased the study of “world religions” in their curricula, and a few universities began to offer doctoral programs focusing on the study of other religions. These programs emphasized methods such as history of religions or comparative theology.

¹⁶ “Pope’s Christmas Address to the Roman Curia, the World Situation Constitutes a Pressing Appeal for the Spirit of Assisi, 22 December 1986,” published in *Bulletin, Secretariat for Non-Christians*, 64 (22/1, 1987): 54–55; also republished in *Interreligious Dialogue* (2006), p. 405.

The SNC responded to the challenges to implement *Nostra Aetate* by providing materials for dialogue with various religious groups. It published a *Bulletin*, nowadays entitled *Pro Dialogo*, and after twenty years summarized the collective wisdom of those within its ever-growing network of associates in dialogue into *The Attitude of the Church towards the Followers of Other Religions, Reflections and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission*. (1984).¹⁷ John Paul II asked the SNC to undertake the study once again, working closely with other offices in the Roman Curia, especially the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples. The result was *Dialogue and Proclamation*. (1991)¹⁸ The relationship between dialogue and mission, so interwoven and unresolved in the texts of Vatican II, continues to need further clarification.

John Paul II reformed the Curia, creating a hierarchical structure and converting the former Secretariats, created with Vatican II, into Pontifical Councils. In this way, he cut back their independence and instituted more control on their interpretation and implementation of Vatican II and their issuing of documents by subordinating them to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF).¹⁹ The SNC became the Pontifical Commission for

¹⁷ Gioia, *Interreligious Dialogue*, pp. 1116-1129. Paragraph 5 makes the link with ES: "Today, twenty years after the publication of *Ecclesiam Suam* and its own foundation, the Secretariat, gathered in plenary assembly, has evaluated the experiences of dialogue which are occurring everywhere in the Church." See also, AAS Vol. 75 (1984), pp. 816-828; and *Bulletin Secretariatus pro non Christianis* Vol. 56 (1984/2).

¹⁸ Cardinal Francis Arinze, SNC President, indicated on the publication of the next document that "already the previous document, published by our office in 1984 ... had taught clearly that dialogue is a part of the Church's evangelizing mission," but he noted feelings of "uneasinesses" to which John Paul II was responding. Cardinal Francis Arinze, "Dialogue and Proclamation: Two Aspects of the Evangelizing Mission of the Church," *Bulletin* (SNC) 26/2 (1991), pp. 201-202. The text of *Dialogue and Proclamation* can be found at:

<http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/documents/rc_pc_intereleg_doc_19051991_dialogue-and-proclamatio_en.html> [2013-07-15].

¹⁹ Pope John Paul II accomplished this reform of the offices in Rome with his

Interreligious Dialogue (PCID). The name change indicates a growth in respect for other believers by removing the negative identifier “non-Christians” in the original name, but its effectiveness has been limited by the doctrinal judgments of its work by the CDF. In 2000, the CDF issued a declaration, *Dominus Iesus*, which sought to clarify in its own interpretation not only of the relationship between those who belong to other religions but also the relationship of other Christians to the Catholic Church.²⁰ The document stirred up considerable debate and reaction among Catholics and their partners in dialogue. Combined with a number of disciplinary cases against Catholic theologians who have written on interreligious dialogue and related matters conducted by CDF or, under its influence, by a doctrine commission of a national conferences of bishops, the effect of *Dominus Iesus* and its principal author, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, later elected Pope Benedict XVI (2005-2013), on interreligious relations was negative. Since he has only recently resigned as pope and Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio was elected to replace him as Pope Francis, the evaluation of the past decade or more of interreligious relations is still to be done effectively.

The Commission for Religious Relations with Muslims (CRRM), established by Paul VI within the SNC in 1974, was successful in gathering expertise within the Church on Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations and in fostering local initiatives, but long-term projects with internationally recognized organizations and centers of Islamic thought were yet to take shape in its first two decades. Because of the extensive missionary effort of the Catholic

apostolic constitution *Pastor Bonus*. The text can be found at:

<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_19880628_pastor-bonus_en.html> [2013-07-15].

²⁰<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_19880628_pastor-bonus_en.html> [2013-07-15].

Church throughout Asia and Africa from the sixteenth century onwards, the change of course at Vatican II to view Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists and others as partners in dialogue and not simply as objects of conversion took more than a few years to be accepted. Hence, on an international level there was little success in establishing ongoing dialogues. With Muslims, not until after the Assisi event of 1986, and when later initiatives, gestures, and policies of John Paul II proved positive in the promotion and respect for Muslims were their organizations willing partners in dialogue with the Vatican. These would include a series of colloquia with the World Islamic Call Society, ongoing conversations the Al Albait Foundation of Jordan, yielding six publications, a series with the Iranian Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance, a joint Catholic-Muslim Liaison Committee with four international Islamic organizations convening annually, and ongoing meetings with the Permanent Committee of Al-Azhar for Dialogue with Monotheistic Religions.²¹ In 2006, in response to negative descriptions of Islam and Muhammad quoted by Benedict XVI in an address in Regensburg, Germany, a widely representative group of Muslim leaders and scholars sent a letter to Pope Benedict that was both respectful and critical, and that cited *Nostra Aetate* and John Paul II. A year later in 2007, a larger group, more broadly representative of the Islamic world issued an invitation to Christian leaders everywhere under the title of "A Common Word Between Us and You."²² This statement was the first broadly representative response to *Nostra Aetate* by Muslims. A series of international conferences and dialogues, including a forum with the PCID, has resulted.

²¹ See, John Borelli "From the Tiber to the Nile," *The Tablet* (8 April 2006).

²² The text and its history can be found on the website, <<http://www.acommonword.com/>> [2013-07-15].

Only in those countries and regions where Catholics were a small minority among Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists and others and political conditions allowed it, did conferences of bishops engage quickly and profoundly in interreligious dialogue after Vatican II. Hence one can find examples in India, Africa, Taiwan, and Japan, as well as through the Federation of Asian Bishops Conferences (FABC).²³ In Europe and the Americas, progress in promoting interreligious dialogue beyond relations with Jews was only gradual. Eventually, conferences of bishops and dioceses began to participate in programs of dialogue. Generally, the conferences and dioceses of Asia outdistanced the efforts by the Vatican, and the initiatives of dioceses and conference of bishops in general have been more extensive and successful by comparison.²⁴

Catholic-Buddhist relations sprang up in pastoral, monastic, and academic settings principally in Asia and North America in the decades after Vatican II. Many of these are chronicled in the SNC's *Bulletin* and then in the publication of PCID, *Pro Dialogo*. In 1984, a Buddhist-Christian International Theological Encounter group with Catholic participation began holding a series of dialogues that continued until 2004. Papers and reports from these dialogues and from similar meetings, dialogues and events have filled pages of the annual *Buddhist-Christian Studies* from its first issue in 1981. It was not until several years after the SNC became the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue that this office in the Vatican responsible for dialogue with Buddhists seized an opportunity to establish an

²³ For the FABC and documentation and studies see: <<http://www.fabc.org/>> [2013-07-15].

²⁴ Michael L. Fitzgerald and John Borelli give accounts of this progress at the PCID and in the United States in their book, *Interfaith Dialogue: A Catholic View* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006).

ongoing series of dialogues with Buddhist leaders on an international level.

The opportunity came after Pope John Paul II had described Buddhism in negative terms in a series of responses to questions submitted by a journalist and then edited and published commercially by the journalist under the title *Crossing the Threshold of Hope* (1994). The distinction between official pronouncements of Catholic teaching and private reflections based on the pope's personal and deficient understanding of complicated Buddhist teachings was lost on many, especially Buddhists. When John Paul II traveled to Sri Lanka in January 1995, he expressed esteem for Buddhists and many of their religious values.²⁵ Some Buddhist leaders protested the pope's message and stayed away from the public events. As a result, the PCID took the initiative and was successful in inaugurating a series of dialogues with a variety of Buddhist leaders beginning with the topics that the pope had described unfavorably. These included their respective doctrines of the human condition and salvation and liberation, the roles of teachings and of prayer and silence, and the meanings of community.²⁶

With ongoing conversations as the goal for successful and productive exchange, the PCID has been moderately successful with Muslims, held a short series of meetings with Buddhist leaders, and

²⁵ On January 20, 1995, John Paul II praised the four great Buddhist virtues of loving kindness, compassion, equanimity and sympathetic joy, pointed out the great values of Buddhist monasticism, and quoted an important Buddhist text. See Gioia, *Interreligious Dialogue*, p. 819*.

²⁶ Donald W. Mitchell, "The Making of a Joint Buddhist-Catholic Statement," in *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, Vol. 16 (1996), pp. 203–208. The Taiwan text also appeared in *Origins* 25, 14 (September 21, 1995) and in *Pro Dialogo*, Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, Bulletin Vol. 90 (1995/3). A second meeting took place in India and was reported in *Pro Dialogo*, Bulletin Vol. 100 (1999/1), and a third meeting took place in Tokyo and was reported in *Pro Dialogo* Vols. 112 and 113 (2003/1 & 2).

has had little success with Hindu leaders. On the practical levels of social cooperation, inculturation of practices and customs in Catholic life, and spiritual practice, Catholics have been most influenced by Vatican II. On the recommendation of the SNC in the 1970s, Catholic monastics began exploring how they could develop ongoing exchanges, dialogues, and relations with their counterparts among Buddhists, Hindus and Muslims. The result today is Dialogue Interreligieux Monastique/Monastic Interreligious Dialogue.²⁷ The website does not give the rich heritage of meetings that occurred as Gethsemani encounters, named for the Trappist Abbey in Kentucky or the meetings and groups that contributed to or spun off these meetings.²⁸

The 1984 text on mission and dialogue of the SNC identified four arenas of interreligious dialogue and activity that overlap in the lives of Catholics and their partners in dialogue. *Dialogue and Proclamation* in 1991 reiterated these: the dialogue of life, the dialogue of action, the dialogue of theological exchange, and the dialogue of religious experience. Depending on their social, political and economic situations, Catholics feel freer to form deeper friendship with followers of other religions now fifty years after Vatican II than before it. Whereas before the council and *Nostra Aetate* and all that it brought into existence, Catholics had friends who were Jews, Hindus, Muslims and so forth, and surely many of these were relationships of trust and support. The added feature, and a good one, is that Catholics can more easily believe that their friends

²⁷ The website is: <<http://www.dimmid.org/>> [2013-07-15].

²⁸ For the initial history of the group see, Pascaline Coff, O.S.B., "How We Reached This Point: Communication Becoming Communion," in *The Gethsemani Encounter*, edited by Donald W. Mitchell and James Wiseman, O.S.B. (New York: Continuum, 1997), pp. 4-17. The other volume resulting from a Gethsemani Encounter is *Transforming Suffering*, edited by Donald W. Mitchell and James Wiseman, O.S.B. (New York: Doubleday, 2003).

are practicing a religion that has true and holy elements and are related in some mysterious way to God's plan of salvation through the church now that these teachings on other religions are explicit. Catholics willingly attend the religious services and houses of worship of their friends, where custom and harmony allow it. The same is true for Catholics, and other Christians, joining with Jews, Muslims and others in projects of charity and social justice. The Assisi gatherings of John Paul II spawned countless interfaith gatherings for good and just causes. Theological dialogue, the kind of dialogue many may conceptualize first when they hear about "interreligious dialogue," has increased too among scholars and religious representatives for improving mutual understanding and spiritual companionship. And probably on the level of religious experience and spiritual practice, Catholics have been most influenced by *Nostra Aetate*. Meditation and contemplation are more widespread, in part due to the influence and outreach to the spiritual traditions of Asia. Comparative study of religious literature and mutual study of religious texts have become valuable ways for Catholics and others to become more reconciled with one another when the goal of their dialogue is not the absorption or synthesis of all religions into one. Rather, interreligious dialogue has become an important way for Catholics to address and understand the religious pluralism that surrounds them.

A good example of Catholic attitudes today are those of Pope Francis, elected on 19 March 2013 and who is the first pope after the Vatican II who was nowhere near the council when it met. Yet, he embodies in his person and attitudes the openness for interreligious friendships and dialogue that Vatican II promoted. His relationship in Argentina with Rabbi Abraham Skorka is such that the two of them

have published a book of friendly reflections together.²⁹ On 20 March 2013 Pope Francis reminded representatives of Christian, Jewish, Muslim and other groups who attended his installation: “The Catholic Church is conscious of the importance of promoting friendship and respect between men and women of different religious traditions – I want to repeat this: promoting friendship and respect between men and women of different religious traditions – a sign of this can be seen in the important work carried out by the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue.”³⁰

For Further Reading

Alberigo, Giuseppe, ed. *History of Vatican II*. English version by Joseph A. Komonchak, 5 vols. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995-2005.

Connelly, John. *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1939-1965*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Fitzgerald, Michael L. and John Borelli. *Interfaith Dialogue: A Catholic View*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006.

Gioia, Francesco, ed. *Interreligious Dialogue: The Official Teaching of the Catholic Church from the Second Vatican Council to John Paul II (1963-2005)*. Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006.

²⁹ Jorge Mario Bergoglio and Abrahm Skorka, *Sobre el cielo y la tierra* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 2010), translated into English as *On Heaven and Earth* (New York: Image, 2013).

³⁰ <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/francesco/speeches/2013/march/documents/papa-francesco_20130320_delegati-fraterni_en.html> [2013-07-15].

Laurentin, René and Joseph Neuner, S.J. *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions of Vatican Council II*. Glenrock, NY: Paulist Press, 1966.

O'Malley, John W. *What Happened at Vatican II*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.

Stransky, Thomas F. "The Foundation of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity." In *Vatican II Revisited: by those who were there*, edited by Alberic Stacpoole. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986.

[摘要]第二次梵蒂岡大公會議對天主教及其他宗教傳統之間的關係有深遠的影響。雖然教宗若望二十三世在原本的會議宣佈中沒有明確提及跨宗教關係，但當中關於與猶太族群之間的關係的討論迅速成為主要焦點及引起國際爭議。討論的重點後來延伸至包括其他宗教。《教會對非基督宗教態度宣言》放棄了以往數世紀對猶太族群及其他宗教的負面態度。這個宣言結果引發前所未見地對其他宗教傳統表達尊重及成為改善跨宗教關係的推動力。其中一個大膽實踐梵二會議中的跨宗教銳見的活動是於1986年10月27日在意大利阿西西市舉行的全球祈禱和平日。當時教宗若望保祿二世邀請了其他宗教領袖一同齋戒、祈禱及見證一個讓各宗教為鞏固和平而放下異見的新時代。由於這些發展，天主教生活自梵二會議後在多方面都有所豐富。

Christ and the Church in Their Jewish Context

John PAWLIKOWSKI

猶太背景中的基督與教會

John PAWLIKOWSKI

[ABSTRACT] The Second Vatican Council radically transformed Catholic understanding not only of Jews and Judaism but also of Jesus Christ and the origins of the Church. Traditionally, Catholics presented Judaism as a superseded religion with no continuing value and the Jews as people doomed to perpetual wandering on the earth until the end of days without ever again having a nation-state as a punishment for their supposed complicity in the death of Jesus. In sharp contrast to Catholic attitudes in earlier ages, both official church statements since the Second Vatican Council and biblical scholarship have reversed the traditional views and have developed an appreciative understanding of Jews and Judaism, leading to vastly improved Jewish-Catholic relations. Today Catholics are urged to become familiar with how Jews view themselves and their tradition. Recently scholars of early Christianity have recognized that Jewish-Christian identity intermingled for far longer than many previously believed. Discussion continues on how best to understand the covenantal heritage that Jews and Christians share. The author proposes viewing the Christian-Jewish relationship in terms of two distinctive, but not totally distinct, paths that intersect

at times but will fully converge only in the eschatological age through a process known only to God.

Vatican II

The late Cardinal Carlo Martini, S.J., the former archbishop of Milan and a biblical scholar in his own right, wrote the following in light of the Second Vatican Council and its historic declaration *Nostra Aetate*, which totally transformed the church's understanding of its ties to the Jewish People:

Without a sincere feeling for the Jewish world and a direct experience of it, one cannot fully understand Christianity. Jesus is fully Jewish, the apostles are Jewish, and one cannot doubt their attachment to the traditions of their forefathers.¹

These words from Cardinal Martini closely parallel the document issued by the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews issued in 1985 to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of *Nostra Aetate*: "Jesus was and always remained a Jew...Jesus is fully a man of his time, and his environment—the Jewish Palestinian one of the 1st century, the anxieties and hope of which he shared."²

Both Cardinal Martini and the Vatican *Notes* build on the foundation laid in chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*. In that chapter the bishops of the Council completely reversed centuries of thinking

¹ Carlo Maria Martini, S.J., "Christianity and Judaism: A Historical and Theological Overview," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jews and Christians: Exploring the Past, Present and Future* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), p. 19.

² "Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church. June 24, 1985," in *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue*, Vol 1: *The Road to Reconciliation (1945-1985)* edited by Franklin Sherman (New York: Paulist, 2011), p. 208.

regarding the church-synagogue relationship. Since the patristic era when many church fathers developed what is termed the *Adversos Judaeos* as well as the notion of the Jews as a “witness people,” the church in its preaching, theology, liturgy, and art had presented Judaism as a superseded religion with no continuing value and the Jews as people doomed to perpetual wandering on the earth until the end of days without ever again having a nation-state as a punishment for their supposed complicity in the death of Jesus. Their perceived responsibility for Jesus’ crucifixion resulted, so church doctrine claimed, in their expulsion from any further covenantal relationship with God. They were replaced in that covenantal relationship by the church. They were not to be annihilated as a people (this is where Nazism went beyond classical Christian thought) but were to be kept in a marginal and miserable state in human society as a warning to others about the consequences in rejecting Christ.

Nostra Aetate totally undercut this classical theology of Judaism within the church with three major assertions: (1) Jews cannot be held collectively responsible for the death of Jesus; (2) Jews remain within the covenant after Jesus’ death; (3) Jesus and his disciples drew significantly from the Jewish tradition of their day. The first assertion was especially significant because it undercut the prevailing outlook on Jews and Judaism on the part of Christians. If Jews were not collectively responsible for Jesus’ death, then there is no basis for the classical claim that they were expelled from the covenant nor for the so-called theology of perpetual wandering as a divine punishment for their murder of the Messiah.

The Canadian scholar Gregory Baum, who was an official expert at Vatican II and had a hand in the original draft of what became *Nostra Aetate*, argued in a 1986 address to the Catholic Theological Society of North America meeting in Chicago that

chapter four of this conciliar declaration represented the most radical change in the ordinary magisterium of the church to emerge from Vatican II.³ Baum was quite on target with this evaluation. This fundamental shift from Jewish covenantal exclusion to continuing Jewish covenantal inclusion carries with it profound implications for Christological thinking in the church as well as for the church's core identity. Those implications have only been gradually drawn out within Catholic biblical and theological scholarship, as well as in church documents, in the almost fifty years since the passage of *Nostra Aetate* in the closing session of the council in October 1965.

Official Developments after Vatican II

In terms of Vatican documents building on chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*, the following would be included: (1) the 1974 and 1975 documents from the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews; (2) the 1998 declaration on the Holocaust from the Holy See's Commission with an introductory letter from Pope John Paul II; (3) the 2001 document on the Jews and their Scriptures in the New Testament from the Pontifical Biblical Commission; (4) the many addresses of Pope John Paul II as well as a few from Pope Benedict XVI.⁴

The first two documents contained several important statements. One was the injunction in the 1974 document that

³ Gregory Baum, "The Social Context of American Catholic Theology," in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Vol. 41 (1986), p. 87.

⁴ These documents can be found in the following volumes: Franklin Sherman (ed.), *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue*, Vol. 1; Helga Croner (ed.), *More Stepping Stones to Jewish-Christian Relations: An Unabridged Collection of Christian Documents 1975-1983* (New York: Mahwah: Paulist, 1985). Eugene J. Fisher and Leon Klenicki (eds.), *In Our Time: The Flowering of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue* (New York, Mahwah: Paulist, 1980).

Christians should not create stereotypical views of Jews and Judaism but need to discover how Jews themselves define their identity and interpret their tradition. The 1985 document which focused on the presentation of Jews and Judaism in catechetics and preaching makes several important points about the presentation of biblical themes in both areas. Among the points underlined in that document are the need to present the Old Testament or Hebrew Scriptures as a source of meaning and revelation for Christians and not merely as a foil or prelude for the New Testament, as well as the urgency of properly interpreting the apparent attacks on Jews as an entire community in the gospel of John, which historically has often generated antisemitism within Christianity. In brief, the 1985 documents insist that religious education and preaching must reflect the fundamental changes in the church's understanding of its relationship with the Jewish people that were highlighted in *Nostra Aetate*.

The 1998 document on the *Shoah*⁵ or the Nazi Holocaust recognized Christian responsibility and complicity in this horrific event and mandated Holocaust education for Catholic students on a global scale. While the Holocaust occurred within the context of Western Christianity, its roots and its ethical implications impact the faith understanding of Christians everywhere. The Holocaust forces the church to move to a serious examination of its history of antisemitism and the extent to which seeds of antisemitism might still linger within Christian theology, preaching, liturgy, and catechetics. The forceful introduction to this document by Pope John Paul II gives this document added weight in terms of its significance.

⁵ Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the "Shoah"* (Vatican City: Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, 1998). For a discussion of the document cf. contributions to Judith H. Banki and John T. Pawlikowski (eds.), *Ethics in the Shadow of the Holocaust* (Franklin, WI/Chicago: Sheed & Ward, 2001).

The last major statement from the side of the Vatican is the 2001 document from the Pontifical Biblical Commission,⁶ a unit of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, at the time of its release Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger served as President of this Congregation and he contributed a laudatory introduction to the biblical commission's text which runs some two hundred pages. Its analysis turns around how Jews and their scriptures are presented in the various books of the New Testament. It makes two major assertions which remain crucial for the contemporary Christian-Jewish Dialogue. The first is that Jewish messianic understandings are not in vain. This means that the church recognizes the validity of Jewish messianic claims even though their interpretation of messianic prophecies differs in many cases. In his introduction to the document Cardinal Ratzinger supported this interpretation.

The second assertion of continuing importance is the biblical commission's argument that when the Jewish messiah appears he will exhibit the same basic traits that Christians have seen in and through Jesus. So the 2001 document closely connects the fundamental Jewish and Christian messianic visions. This has important implications for Christian theology though the document does not draw these out in any comprehensive way. This is a task left to the church's theologians.

Developments in Biblical Scholarship

In addition to church documents, the half century since Vatican II has seen remarkable developments in biblical exegesis as it

⁶ Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (Vatican City: Liberia Editrice Vaticana, 2002).

impacts our understanding of the relationship between the church and the Jewish People. Cumulatively this scholarship is often given the title “The Parting of the Ways.” It began in the latter years of the twentieth century and has continued to lift up new perspectives on the Christian-Jewish relationship in the first centuries of the Common Era and on St. Paul’s view of Christianity’s links with Judaism after the Christ Event. One of the first scholars to develop on this perspective was Robin Scroggs. His work influenced the outlook of the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago, one of the episcopal pioneers in the implementation of chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*.⁷

The “Parting of the Ways” movement has many voices with diverse perspectives. But one finds coalescence on several key points: (1) The separation between church and synagogue was a slow, drawn out process that took at least a century or more in most places and even longer in certain regions. Some scholars such as David Boyarin see the Council of Nicea in 325 C.E. as the decisive point of rupture. (2) There was no clear-cut Christian identity in the first century. Most believers in Jesus and his message continued to regard themselves as part of the Jewish community and engaged in various forms of Jewish religious practice. (3) The Apostle Paul was not inherently opposed to the continuation of the Jewish Torah tradition and in fact personally remained a practicing Jew to some degree even after his “conversion” to Christ. (4) The supposed conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees and Jesus and “the Jews” in John’s gospel was largely rooted in internal battles among various groups of Jews

⁷ Robin Scroggs, “The Judaizing of the New Testament,” *The Chicago Theological Seminary Register* Vol. 75 Issue 1 (Winter 1986), pp. 36-45. Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, *A Blessing to Each Other: Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and Jewish-Catholic Dialogues* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996).

who had accepted Jesus and his teachings in different ways and were vying for the dominance of their specific perspective.

An additional word is in order regarding Paul and Judaism. Both Christian and Jewish scholars traditionally have pointed to him as the one responsible for the final rupture between Judaism and Christianity. But that traditional outlook on Paul has been undergoing substantial revision in the last several decades. Biblical scholars such as E.P. Sanders and Krister Stendahl launched this new effort and many others, including some Jews such as Daniel Langston and Mark Nanos, have advanced the original initiative with regard to Paul and the Jewish question.⁸

In light of the new research on Paul, the question arises, was he the founder of Christianity or merely a faithful Jew? In some ways the answer is that he was both. There is little doubt that Paul took a very positive attitude towards Judaism and its Torah, though he had important criticisms about its provisions. He would have been aghast at the "denuded" form of Christianity separated from its Jewish soul that eventually emerged in so many quarters of the church, where in the light of the strong "against the Jews" theology in much of patristic theology it became laced with outright contempt for the Jewish People and their faith. In that sense he remained a "faithful Jew." But he did not believe that the coming of Christ had resulted in a fundamental reorientation of faith into a system of belief rooted in the experience of Christ. For Paul, the experience of the resurrected Christ was personally transforming. Paul certainly wanted Jews to

⁸ Cf. E.P. Sanders. *Paul, The Land, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); *Paul and Judaism: Cross Currents in Pauline Exegesis and the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations*, edited by Reimund Bieringer and Didier Pollefeyt (London: T&T Clark, 2012); John T. Pawlikowski, "Rethinking Pauline Theology: Can it Undergird a Positive Christian-Jewish Relationship," in *Justification According to Paul: Exegetical and Theological Perspectives*, edited by Ondrej Prostendnik (Bratislava, Slovakia: Comenius University, 2012), pp. 231-240.

recognize Jesus as the Messiah of Israel as well as of the nations, but this did not mean any wholesale repudiation of the Torah. In fact, from the Pauline perspective, a contradiction between Jesus as the Messiah and the Torah would in fact be rather ridiculous as he sometimes appears to draw a parallel and even identifies the Law with the gospel of God's acts in Jesus Christ.

Single Covenant or Double Covenant?

As biblical scholars and theologians have begun to explicate this new appreciation of Christianity's Jewish roots, a perspective strongly endorsed by Pope John Paul II in his numerous addresses on Christian-Jewish relations,⁹ two initial approaches have come to the fore in terms of understanding the early Christian community's relationship with Jewish groups of the time. While within each approach different nuances appear, as we move from scholar to scholar we can generally characterize the two trends as "single covenant" and "double covenant."

The "single covenant" approach holds that Jews and Christians basically belong to one covenantal tradition that began at Sinai. In this perspective the Christ Event represented the decisive moment when the Gentiles were able to enter fully into the special relationship with God which Jews already enjoyed and in which they continued. Some espousing this viewpoint maintain that the decisive features of the Christ have universal implications, including for Jews. The 2001 Pontifical Biblical Commission's document discussed earlier appears to argue that within historical time Jews await the Messiah through their own covenant. There is no need for the organized evangelization of Jews according to Cardinal Walter Kasper, former President of the Holy See's Commission for

Religious Relations with the Jews. But when the Jewish Messiah arrives, his person will be very similar to that Christians have discovered in and through Jesus. Thus Jesus' messiahship retains universal implications. Other scholars in this continuing discussion are more inclined to argue that the Christian reorientation of the original covenant in and through Jesus applies to all people, including Jews.

The "double covenant" theory begins at the same point as its "single covenant" counterpart, namely, with a strong affirmation of the continuing bonds between Jews and Christians. But then it prefers to underline the distinctiveness of the two traditions and communities, particularly in terms of their experiences after the final separation of church and synagogue; Christians associated with this perspective insist on maintaining the view that through the ministry, teachings and person of Jesus a vision of God emerged that was distinctively new in terms of its central features. Even though there may well have been important groundwork laid for this emergence in Second Temple or Middle Judaism, something that Jewish scholars such as Benjamin Sommer⁹ and Daniel Boyarin¹⁰ have suggested of late, what came to be understood regarding the divine-human relationship as a result of Jesus has to be regarded as a quantum leap.

Discussion of the best way to present the theological relationship between Jews and Christians continues in earnest. Cardinal Walter Kasper, both during his tenure as President of the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations¹¹ with the Jews and

⁹ Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

¹⁰ Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospel: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. Foreword by Jack Miles (New York: The New Press, 2012).

¹¹ Cardinal Walter Kasper, "The Good Olive Tree," *America* Vol 185 Issue 7 (September 2000), pp. 2-14.

subsequently after his retirement from that post¹² has attempted such reformulation. At this point of history many scholars working within the Christian-Jewish dialogue are looking for other ways of stating the relationship beyond the options of single or double covenant. A single covenantal framework now serves as the generally preferred option but one that is expressed in considerably different way than its predecessor. The dissatisfaction with the original formulation of the single covenant perspective stems from new research on the nature of Judaism in the first century C.E. as well as new insights into the process of church-synagogue separation.

With regard to the composition of first century Judaism, scholars such as Jacob Neusner, Hayim Perelmuter, and Efraim Shmueli have emphasized that Judaism in the first century was far from monolithic.¹³ In fact, this was a very creative period in Jewish history. New groups were emerging that challenged the viewpoints of traditional Judaism. What Ellis Rivkin termed “the Pharisaic Revolution,” a revolution that clearly seeded the perspectives of Jesus and early Christianity, was challenging established Jewish perspectives in many areas. Neusner and Shmueli prefer to speak of “Judaisms” rather than “Judaism.”

Since Christian interpretations of the single covenantal perspective are often rooted in an ongoing, linear understanding of the Jewish tradition, it also has to be said that a single covenantal

¹² Cardinal Walter Kasper, “Foreword,” in *Christ Jesus and the Jewish People Today: New Explorations of Theological Interrelationships*, edited by Philip A. Cunningham, Joseph Sievers, Mary Boys, and others (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2011), pp. x-xvii.

¹³ Cf. Jacob Nuesner, *Death and Birth of Judaism: The Impact of Christianity, Secularism, and the Holocaust on Jewish Faith* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); Efraim Shmueli, *Seven Jewish Cultures: A Reinterpretation of Jewish History and Thought* (Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); and Hayim Goren Perelmuter, *Siblings: Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity at their Beginnings* (New York: Paulist, 1989).

theory can often mask a continued understanding of Christianity as the fulfillment of Judaism along Christian lines. Such theologies of fulfillment, even if they contain a positive view of the Jewish biblical tradition and argue for Jewish covenantal retention after Christ, have difficulty answering the question, to which of the Judaisms is Christianity linked and which might it complete. Most advocates of a single covenantal model have not really dealt with this new, complex picture of the Jewish community in the time of Jesus.

Separation of Church and Synagogue

The other dimension of recent scholarship relevant for a theological understanding of the Christian-Jewish relationship has to do with the view of how and when the separation of church and synagogue actually took place. Most Christians were weaned on the idea that the church was basically established as a distinct religious entity by the time Jesus died on Calvary. On the Jewish side, the prevailing position was that, while Jesus obviously retained ties with the Jewish community, it was Paul, through his mission to the Gentiles, who really brought about the total separation between Christianity and Judaism. As already indicated, both perspectives now appear quite simplistic. Even if we factor in the supposed decisions made on the Christian side at the so-called Council of Jerusalem spoken of in the book of Acts and on the Jewish side at the Synod of Jabneh which supposedly expelled Christians from authentic standing in the Jewish community, we now know that neither the Council nor the Synod gave final closure to the issue of whether Christians are merely followers of the Way of the Jew Jesus or a distinctively new religious community whose views have definitely broken any ties to Judaism.

Important Christian and Jewish scholars are now arguing that the actual separation between the church and the synagogue, while already ongoing by 100 C.E., was not completed until several centuries afterwards. These scholars such as Robert Wilken, Wayne Meeks, Alan Segal, and Anthony Saldarini have uncovered continued ties between certain Jewish and Christian communities, particularly in the East.¹⁴ Evidence of such ties is apparent in the second, third and, in a few places, even in the fourth and fifth centuries. And these ties were not just on the level of religious self-identity. They also affected popular practice. John Chrysostom, for example, launched a harsh critique of Judaism partly out of frustration that Christians in his area were continuing to participate in synagogue services on a regular basis. What sort of role these Christians played in the Jewish service remains a mystery, but their involvement with Jewish worship shows a mindset among them that belief in Christ and his message did not automatically sever connection with the Jewish tradition and the Jewish community. From the Jewish side it is an indication that at least some Jews at the time still considered followers of Christ as belonging to the Jewish community in some way.

In light of the above scholarly developments, some scholars in the Christian-Jewish dialogue have moved away from the earlier option of “single” and “double” covenant. They lean towards new images of the Christian-Jewish relationship that go beyond “elder” and “younger” brother or “mother-daughter,” both of which tend to establish a fundamentally linear relationship between Judaism and

¹⁴ Cf. Wayne Meeks and Robert Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978); Robert Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983); Anthony J. Saldarini, “Jews and Christians in the First Two Centuries: The Changing Paradigm,” *Shofar* Vol. 10 (1992), pp. 32-43.

Christianity. In their place they substitute more parallel images such as "fraternal twins" (Mary Boys), "guests in the house of Israel" (Clark Williamson), "siblings" (Hayim G. Perelmuter), or "co-emergent" religious communities (Daniel Boyarin). None of these are fully satisfactory, but they point us in the right direction for further reflection. The "co-emergent" model is the one that seems more likely to bear fruitful results. In this perspective both post-biblical Judaism and Christianity are "new" religious approaches that were each generated by a quiet revolution in Second Temple Judaism.

Concluding Reflections

Let me conclude with a brief outline of my own theological model for the Christian-Jewish relationship. It is one that has been evolving for several decades.¹⁵ I would argue that in the lengthy process of separation from Judaism, Christianity lost sight of the original revelatory vision associated with the Sinai covenant, a relationship as crucial for Christian identity as the subsequent revelation in and through the Christ Event. As a result as Christians we must envision the Christian-Jewish relationship in terms of two distinctive, but not totally distinct, paths that intersect at times but will fully converge, as Cardinal Walter Kasper has insisted (though Kasper does not use the term "paths"), only in the eschatological age through a process known only to God. These paths must be seen as "parallel," replacing the classical vision of a "linear" relationship

¹⁵ John T. Pawlikowski, *Christ in the Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue* (New Edition. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001); John T. Pawlikowski, *Jesus and the Theology of Israel* (Wilmington, DE; Michael Glazier, 1989); John T. Pawlikowski, "Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue: A Personal Theological Journey," *Irish Theological Quarterly* Vol. 72 (2007), pp. 147-167.

between the two faith communities. As Christianity became an essentially Gentile religion without much appreciation for its Jewish roots and saw theology translated into Greek philosophical categories and language, it lost an important revelatory dimension rooted in the Torah which Jesus himself manifests and which Paul struggled to maintain even though it was a struggle he would eventually lose, thanks in part to the author of Acts. Thus Judaism as well preserves a distinctive revelation based in history and in creation, something that R. Kendall Soulen has correctly identified as the hallmark of the Jewish covenantal religion.¹⁶ Christians will need to recover this Jewish revelation as part of eschatological completeness.

The Christian and Jewish revelatory paths cannot be merged all that easily. That is why I speak of “distinctive paths” within a single covenantal framework. In the pre-eschatological age I see them continuing to play off each other, both “blessed” by God (to embrace the term used by Mary Boys) until the end of days. This represents a far from complete model, but it answers some of the outstanding questions. Certainly we shall have to continue its development, including whether there is a possibility of opening up this essentially inclusivist Christian-Jewish relationship to a wider pluralistic model without endangering the specificity of the Christian-Jewish relationship. Any expansion towards a trilateral model (Jewish-Christian- Muslim) must include the fundamental changes in the Church’s understanding of the Christian-Jewish relationship.

¹⁶ R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).

For Further Reading

Bernardin, Joseph Cardinal. *A Blessing to Each Other: Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and Jewish-Catholic Dialogues*. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996.

Boyarin, Daniel. *The Jewish Gospel: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. Foreword by Jack Miles New York: The New Press, 2012.

Cunningham, Philip A., Joseph Sievers, Mary Boys, and others, eds. *Christ Jesus and the Jewish People Today: New Explorations of Theological Interrelationships*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2011.

Fisher, Eugene J. and Leon Klenicki, eds. *Pope John Paul II: Spiritual Pilgrimage: Texts on Jews and Judaism, 1979-1995*. New York: Anti-Defamation League and Crossroad, 1991.

Pawlikowski, John T. *Jesus and the Theology of Israel*. Wilmington, DE; Michael Glazier, 1989.

Pawlikowski, John T. *Christ in the Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue*. New Edition. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001.

Pawlikowski, John T. "Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue: A Personal Theological Journey." *Irish Theological Quarterly* Vol. 72 (2007), pp. 147-167.

Pawlikowski, John T. "Pope John Paul II on Christian-Jewish Relations: His Legacy, Our Challenges." *The Inaugural John Paul II Lecture on Christian-Jewish Relations*. Boston: Center for Christian-Jewish Learning, Boston College, 2012.

Sherman, Franklin, ed. *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue, Vol 1: The Road to Reconciliation (1945-1985)*. New York: Paulist Press, 2011.

[摘要] 梵二會議徹底地改變了天主教對猶太人和猶太教，以至對耶穌基督和教會的起源的認識。傳統上，天主教將猶太教視為基督宗教來臨後已失去其價值，被取代的舊宗教，而猶太人則因他們在耶穌受難中的角色，注定要失去自己的國家，在地上流離失所，直至末日。一反早期天主教的觀點，自梵二以來的教會文件和聖經研究成果均更認同猶太人和猶太教的價值，而天主教會與猶太人的關係亦大為改善。今日天主教關注猶太人如何認識自己和其傳統，而研究早期教會的學者亦發現，猶太---基督宗教相互結合傳統亦在歷史上持續的時間亦比一般所認知的更長。因此，今天仍然在討論如何理解猶太教和基督宗教共同繼承的文化遺產。作者認為基督宗教與猶太教的關係在兩條獨特但非完全相異的道路上發展，在歷史上有交匯的時刻，但在通往末世的旅途上，何時才會完全相融則只有天主才知道。

Muslim-Christian Relations, Past and Present

Rita GEORGE-TVRTKOVIC

穆斯林與基督徒的關係，過去與今日

Rita GEORGE-TVRTKOVIC

[ABSTRACT] Throughout history and down to the present day, Muslim-Christian relations have varied greatly from one context to another. In the medieval Latin world, there was frequent animosity from Christians towards Muslims and Islam, but there were also expressions of interest and respect. The visit of St. Francis of Assisi to the Sultan in Egypt represents the more irenic approach; the polemic of the Greek Emperor Manuel II against Muhammad represents the more hostile stance. Both attitudes of hostility and respect continue to shape present-day encounters of Muslims and Christians. The Second Vatican Council expresses respect for Muslims and provides a basis for positive relationships; Pope John Paul II developed this attitude by referring to the shared Abrahamic heritage of Jews, Christians, and Muslims. Pope Benedict XVI's quotation of the Emperor Manuel II aroused intense controversy throughout the Islamic world, but it also provided the occasion for an unprecedented Muslim outreach to Christians in "A Common Word between Us and You," which stresses the shared values of love of God and neighbor. In various locations today, including the Middle East and Nigeria, Muslims-Christian relations are troubled. The United States offers both positive and negative examples of the

varied relationships of Christians and Muslims at the present time. On the one hand, there is a rise in Islamophobia; on the other hand, there are multiple efforts to improve relations, and numerous Muslim students attend Christian, especially Catholic, colleges and universities in the United States and find a welcome atmosphere.

It is impossible to understand Muslim-Christian relations today without some knowledge of history. But one might ask, what exactly is that history? Recently, two examples of historical Muslim-Christian interactions have played prominently in Catholic news circles, each one suggesting a different side of history. On the more positive side, ever since Pope Francis's election in March 2013, the media has been highlighting the fact that his namesake, Francis of Assisi, met peacefully with the Sultan of Egypt during the Crusades.¹ On the more negative side, a speech given by Pope Benedict at Regensburg in 2006 ruffled feathers with its reference to a fourteenth-century debate between the Greek Emperor Manuel II Paleologus and a Muslim leader.² The former event (Francis and the Sultan) is held up as a paradigm for dialogue; the latter (Manuel and the Muslim), a paradigm for polemic. But what really happened

¹ Just two examples of recent news articles linking Pope Francis to the Francis-Sultan meeting include: "Pope Francis has a Model for Muslim Engagement in St. Francis of Assisi," by Omar Sacirbey, *Religion News Service*, 15 March 2013 and "Pope Francis Embodies the Saint who Talked Peace with Muslims," by Aziz Junejo, *Seattle Times*, 12 April 2013. There are many more. It is interesting to note that Pope Francis himself has not, to date, mentioned St. Francis's meeting with the Sultan; when speaking about St. Francis, the pope always mentions being inspired by his radical poverty, not his interreligious acumen. For a historical analysis of the literature and art surrounding the Francis-Sultan meeting, see John Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

² Pope Benedict XVI, "Faith, Reason, and the University: Memories and Reflections," September 12, 2006, Regensburg. See

<http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html>.

during these two medieval interfaith encounters, and how do historical events such as these continue to inform dialogue today? This article will outline past and present Muslim-Christian relations, and highlight a few connections between the two.

I. Muslim-Christian Relations, Past

Any overview of the history of Muslim-Christian relations must begin with the caveat that one can never generalize about history. Context—both time and place—really does matter. Relations between Muslims and Christians have differed greatly, depending on whether one is talking about ninth-century Baghdad, twelfth-century Andalusia, or twentieth-century Nigeria. While this section will focus on medieval Latin Europe—partly due to the enduring nature of images created during this period and partly due to the author’s area of expertise—it is important to remember that Arabic-speaking Eastern Christians in Egypt or Lebanon have had different experiences of Muslims than Latins have; this is likewise true for Greek-speaking Christians in Anatolia or Syro-Malabar Christians in Kerala.³ But even interfaith relations in medieval Latin Europe—often thought to be uniformly poor—were more complex than is often assumed. Consider just two examples. First, even during the horrendous massacre of Jews by Christians in the Rhineland in 1096, Hebrew chronicles of the event describe diverse responses from Rhenish Christians, depending on the city. There were indeed mass killings in Mainz, Worms, and Speyer, but in Cologne most Jews were saved by their Christian neighbors.⁴ Second, at the end of

³ For more on the history of Eastern Christians living under Muslim rule, see Sidney Griffith, *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque: Christians and Muslims in the World of Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

⁴ For more on the Hebrew Crusade Chronicles, including English translations of them,

the fifteenth century Muslims and Jews were expelled from Iberia, but this was preceded three centuries earlier by the multi-lingual, multi-religious culture of Andalusia, whose thriving intellectual life was centered on translation houses such as the one in Toledo under the direction of Archbishop Rodrigo.⁵ And concurrent with this famous period of Spanish history known as *convivencia* (“coexistence”) is the presence of Muslim legal documents restricting Christian movement in Seville, and Christian legal documents restricting Muslim and Jewish movement in Castile.⁶ In short, it is difficult to generalize about history.

Yet scholars still try to make sense of interfaith relations through time, and sometimes they are able to detect broad patterns. For example, Richard Southern has suggested that medieval Christian views of Islam changed over time in ways we might not expect: instead of advancing in a steady, positive trajectory from the medieval to modern period, the Christian understanding of Islam has waxed and waned. Southern describes three stages: 1. The Age of Ignorance (pre-1100), when most of Western Europe (minus Iberia and Sicily) knew little or nothing about Islam. 2. The Age of Reason and Hope (1150-1350), when new and fairly accurate information about Islam began to pour into Europe; this period includes Peter the Venerable’s commissioning of the first translation of the Qur’an into Latin⁷ and the rise of the mendicant orders, many of whose members

see Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996) and idem, *God, Humanity, and History: The Hebrew First Crusade Chronicles* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

⁵ See Lucy Pick, *Conflict and Coexistence: Archbishop Rodrigo and the Muslims and Jews of Thirteenth-Century Spain* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004).

⁶ For translations of Muslim and Christian legal texts in medieval Spain, see *Medieval Iberia: Readings from Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Sources*, 2nd edition, edited by Olivia Remie Constable (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2011).

⁷ See James Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).

went to live in Muslim countries. 3. The Age of Stagnation (1350-1650), when the same information about Islam gained during the Age of Reason and Hope was recycled over and over again; for example, the first printed edition of the Qur'an, published at Basel in 1542, was none other than the translation commissioned by Peter the Venerable four hundred years earlier. Southern's view of history is useful to a point, but some scholars have criticized it as overly simplistic.⁸ Once again, it is difficult to generalize about Christian-Muslim relations in history.

Mainstream Medieval Theology of Islam

Even when accounting for differences across time and space, one can nevertheless detect a general shape to Latin Christian views of Islam during the medieval period which I will call the "mainstream medieval theology of Islam." By "theology of Islam" I mean Christian reflections on the meaning of Islam vis-à-vis Christianity, written for an internal Christian audience and rooted in traditional theological authorities: scripture, the fathers, and reason, but also drawing on other sources acknowledged by the author as quasi-authoritative, including Islamic texts and firsthand observation of Muslim praxis.⁹ Medieval theologies of Islam can also be called

⁸ Richard Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962). For a critique of Southern, see Stephen Mossman, "The Western Understanding of Islamic Theology in the Later Middle Ages. Mendicant Responses to Islam from Riccoldo da Monte di Croce to Marquard von Lindau." *Recherches de Theologie et Philosophie Medievales* Vol. 74 (2007), pp. 169-224.

⁹ Works representative of the "theology of religions" genre include Michael Barnes, *Theology and the Dialogue of Religions*; Gavin D'Costa, *Theology and Religious Pluralism*; J.A. DiNoia, *The Diversity of Religions*; Jacques Dupuis, *Towards a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism*; Paul Knitter, *Introducing Theologies of Religion*. Theologians who have been working to construct a Christian theology of Islam in the last fifty years include Michael Fitzgerald, Claude Geffré, Robert Caspar, Thomas Michel, Georges Anawati,

nascent because the theology of Islam is a modern theological category, not a medieval one. But nevertheless, these texts do contain theological perspectives on Islam which are sometimes implicit and fragmentary, and sometimes explicit and systematic.

Examples of (usually polemical) texts which exemplify the mainstream medieval theology of Islam abound. Nicholas of Cusa (d. 1464) conveniently provides a laundry list of such texts—the very books he consulted when writing his own argument against Islam, *Cribratio alkorani* (1460/1):

As best I could, I made a careful attempt to understand the book of the laws of the Arabs [the Qur'an]— which I obtained at Basel in the translation commissioned for us by Peter, Abbot of Cluny [Toledan Collection]. I obtained it together with a debate among those noble Arabs, [*Risalah al-Kindi*]... I inquired whether any of the Greeks had written against these foolish errors. And I learned only that John of Damascus... had written the very few things [*De haeresibus*] which were on hand there. [...] Thereafter, in Rome, I saw the book of Brother Ricoldo of the Order of Preachers [*Contra legem Sarracenorum*], who studied Arabic in Baghdad; this [book] was more gratifying than the others. I also looked at the catholic writings of other brothers on this [same] subject-matter — especially at St. Thomas's *De rationibus fidei contra Saracenos, Graecos et Armenos ad Cantorem Antiochenum*, and, lastly, at [the writing] of the most reverend lord and

and David Burrell.

cardinal of St. Sixtus [Torquemada's *Tractatus contra principales errores perfidi Machumeti*], who with cogent reasons refutes the heresies and the errors of Muhammad.¹⁰

Note the frequency of words such as "against, errors, perfidy, heresy, debate, refute" here, both in the book titles and Nicholas's descriptions of them. These polemical books could be categorized under an "adversus Saracenos" genre, parallel to "adversus Judaeos."¹¹ The mainstream theology of Islam articulated in these books includes many of the following points: a recognition of Islam's monotheism; a critique of Muslim Christology; a condemnation of Muhammad as a lascivious, violent, dishonest pseudo-prophet; a judgment of the Qur'an as a fabrication; a critique of the Islamic heaven as entirely physical; and the conclusion that Islam is a lax, carnal, violent, irrational heresy.¹²

Irenic Views

The medieval period also contains positive views of Islam. Examples include the thirteenth-century *Book of a Gentile and Three Wise Men* by Catalonian Ramon Llull, which describes three

¹⁰ Nicholas of Cusa, *Cribratio alkorani* in *Nicholas of Cusa's De Pace Fidei and Cribratio Alkorani: Translation and Analysis*, 2nd ed, translated by Jasper Hopkins (Minneapolis: Arthur J. Banning, 1994), pp. 75-76.

¹¹ For more on the *adversus Judaeos* genre, see *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics Between Christians and Jews*, edited by Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa (Tübingen, Mohr, 1996), Amos Funkenstein, "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages," *Viator* Vol. 2 (1971), pp. 373-82, and the classic by A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Iudaeos*, (Cambridge, 1935).

¹² The classic text outlining the mainstream medieval theology of Islam is Norman Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh, 1964; reprint Oxford: Oneworld, 2000). A recent, excellent update is John V. Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York:, Columbia University Press, 2002).

sages—a Christian, Muslim, and Jew—as friends engaging in polite dialogue. William of Tripoli’s *Notitia* (late thirteenth century) and Nicholas of Cusa’s *Cribratio alkorani* (mid fifteenth century) both attempt to view the Qur’an in a positive light. William dwells on Qur’anic verses about Mary,¹³ while Nicholas reads the Qur’an in light of the Gospel, and even has a name for his more positive hermeneutical approach, *pia interpretatio*.¹⁴ We also have various historical accounts of Francis’s famous encounter with the Sultan; the accounts differ, but they all agree that Francis came in peace and the Sultan was impressed by the Saint. While we must be cautious not to over-romanticize this event, it is certainly the case that theirs was a remarkably peaceful encounter during middle of the Crusades.¹⁵ Furthermore, Francis himself actually wrote about Islam in his Earlier Rule (*Regula non bullata*), Ch. 16, “On Going among the Saracens and Other Infidels,” where he counsels missionaries to approach Muslims and other non-Christians with humility.¹⁶

The medieval period also includes authors who express deep ambivalence about Islam. For example, the thirteenth-century Florentine Dominican Riccoldo da Montecroce, who lived in Baghdad for over a decade and studied Arabic and Islamic literature there, wrote one of the most popular anti-Qur’anic tracts of the entire Middle Ages, such that it was still being translated over two centuries

¹³ Wilhelm von Tripolis, *Notitia de Machometo*, edited by Peter Engels (Würzburg: Echter, 1992).

¹⁴ Jasper Hopkins, “The Role of *Pia Interpretatio* in Nicholas of Cusa’s Hermeneutical Approach to the Koran,” Ch. 2 in *A Miscellany on Nicholas of Cusa* (Minneapolis: Banning Press, 1994), pp. 39-56, and Pim Valkenberg, “Sifting the Qur’an: Two Forms of Interreligious Hermeneutics in Nicholas of Cusa” in *Interreligious Hermeneutics in Pluralistic Europe: Between Texts and People*, edited David Cheetham et al. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), pp. 27-48.

¹⁵ See Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan*.

¹⁶ For a close read of *Regula non bullata*, Ch. 16, see Jan Hoerberichts, *Francis and Islam* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 1997).

later by the likes of King Ferdinand of Spain (who had an earlier Greek translation retranslated back into Latin) and Martin Luther.¹⁷ What makes Riccoldo's assessment of the Qur'an unique is its inherent ambivalence. In the midst of his many criticisms are comments which reveal a deep affection for the book and its Arabic language; Riccoldo calls the Qur'an "diabolical" in one breath and acknowledges that it contains "many useful things" in the next. In his other writings, Riccoldo praises seven Muslim "works of perfection," which he immediately follows with a six-point condemnation of the Qur'an.¹⁸

As this brief list of historical examples shows, Christian-Muslim relations in medieval Europe were extraordinarily complex. Contemporary relations are no less so.

II. Muslim-Christian Relations, Present

Many medieval Latin stereotypes about Islam linger today: e.g., that Islam is a violent, irrational, fanatical, misogynist religion. Controversial Danish cartoons published in 2005 depict Muhammad with bombs in his turban, while bus ads in the United States sponsored by an anti-Islamic organization accuse Muslims of being savages.¹⁹ Yet, vestiges of the medieval Christian respect for Muslims also remain. These vestiges are nowhere clearer than in the

¹⁷ This popular text is Riccoldo da Montecroce, *Contra legem Sarracenorum*. Latin edition by Mériçoux, Jean-Marie, *Memoire Domenicane* (Centro Riviste della Provincia Romana, 1986), pp. 60-142. There is currently no English translation of *Contra legem*.

¹⁸ Riccoldo da Montecroce, *Liber peregrinationis*. For an English translation and analysis of the text, see Rita George-Tvrtković, *A Christian Pilgrim in Medieval Iraq: Riccoldo da Montecroce's Encounter with Islam* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012).

¹⁹ One advertisement sponsored by Pamela Geller's anti-Islamic American Freedom Defense Initiative reads: "In any war between the civilized man and the savage, support the civilized man. Support the Copts. Defeat Jihad."

1965 Vatican II Council document *Nostra Aetate* (“On the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions”), the most authoritative Catholic theology of Islam to date. In *Nostra Aetate*, the church declares Muslims worthy of “esteem,” encourages interfaith dialogue, and lists shared beliefs and practices, many of which have been acknowledged by Christians since the medieval period, including: the oneness of God, divine attributes, a link to Abraham, judgment, resurrection of the body, certain aspects of Christology and Mariology, and the importance of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving:

The Church regards with esteem also the Muslims. They adore the one God, living and subsisting in Himself; merciful and all-powerful, the Creator of heaven and earth, who has spoken to men; they take pains to submit wholeheartedly to even His inscrutable decrees, just as Abraham, with whom the faith of Islam takes pleasure in linking itself, submitted to God. Though they do not acknowledge Jesus as God, they revere Him as a prophet. They also honor Mary, His virgin Mother; at times they even call on her with devotion. In addition, they await the day of judgment when God will render their deserts to all those who have been raised up from the dead. Finally, they value the moral life and worship God especially through prayer, almsgiving, and fasting.²⁰

Some of the council fathers who wrote the above section from *Nostra Aetate* were inspired by Louis Massignon (1883-1962), a French scholar of Islam and a key figure in twentieth-century

²⁰ *Nostra Aetate*, section 3.

Catholic-Muslim relations. Massignon's influence continues today, not only through *Nostra Aetate*, but also in the now-popular term he coined, "Abrahamic faiths," which connects Christians, Jews, and Muslims together through a shared spiritual patrimony.²¹

Global Relations

Since *Nostra Aetate* was promulgated in 1965, great strides have been made in Catholic-Muslim dialogue at all levels worldwide. In the 1970s and 1980s, Pope John Paul II further developed the "Abrahamic" connection between Christians and Muslims, which was mentioned only briefly and equivocally in *Nostra Aetate*.²² The pope did this through several speeches, such as the one given in 1979 to Turkish Christians, where he specifically identifies "the spiritual descendants of Abraham" as "Christians, Muslims, and Jews."²³ During a 1985 speech to participants in a Muslim-Christian colloquium at the Vatican, the pope stated unequivocally: "As I have

²¹ Massignon was one of the first to assert that Muslims, Christians, and Jews share the spiritual patrimony of Abraham: "There in Jerusalem the Christians have Arab witness of their faith and the geographical convergence of the three Abrahamic faiths in one and the same Holy Land, 'The Three Prayers of Abraham' (originally 'Les trois prières d'Abraham, père de tous les croyants,' 1949), translated by Allan Cutler in *Testimonies and Reflections*, edited by Herbert Mason (University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), p. 8. See also Neal Robinson, p. 194, "Massignon, Vatican II, and Islam as an Abrahamic Religion," *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* Vol. 2 Issue 2 (1991), pp. 182-205. The notion of "Abrahamic faiths" has recently been criticized by some scholars. See especially Jon D. Levenson, *Inheriting Abraham: The Legacy of the Patriarch in Judaism, Islam, and Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

²² *Nostra Aetate* 3: "The Church regards with esteem also the Muslims... they take pains to submit wholeheartedly to even [God's] inscrutable decrees, just as Abraham, with whom the faith of Islam takes pleasure in linking itself, submitted to God." This wording suggests a level of uncertainty regarding Islam's Abrahamic connection; while the Church wished to refer in passing to the Muslim claim of Abrahamic lineage, it seemed unwilling to affirm the connection definitively at that time.

²³ Pope John Paul II, as quoted in Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, *Recognize the Spiritual Bonds which Unite Us: Sixteen Years of Christian-Muslim Dialogue* (Vatican City, 1994), p. 23.

often said in other meetings with Muslims, your God and ours is one and the same, and *we are brothers and sisters in the faith of Abraham*.”²⁴ In addition, John Paul II became the first pope to visit a mosque in 2001, and under his tenure the Vatican began hosting an annual dialogue with Muslim scholars from Cairo’s al-Azhar University.

In 2006, Pope Benedict XVI gave a speech in Regensburg, Germany, which included reference to a medieval dialogue between Greek emperor Manuel II Paleologus and a Persian Muslim. The speech upset some Muslims because it contained the following quote from Manuel II: “‘Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached.’”²⁵ While this sentence does not reflect Benedict’s own view of Muhammad, but is instead a quotation from a medieval Christian, these words were nevertheless misread as Benedict’s by some people. In the days following the speech, there were riots throughout the Muslim world.²⁶ But what began as a controversy over this speech eventually ended up sparking a real and sustained dialogue between Christians and Muslims. One month after Regensburg, thirty-eight internationally known Muslim scholars wrote an open letter to the pope responding to specific points in the speech.²⁷ A year later, a larger group of

²⁴ Pope John Paul II, “Address to the Participants in the Colloquium on ‘Holiness in Christianity and Islam,’” 9 May 1985, section 1. Emphasis mine.

²⁵ Pope Benedict XVI, “Faith, Reason and the University: Memories and Reflections,” paragraph 3. Given on 12 September 2006, at the University of Regensburg. See <http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/september/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20060912_university-regensburg_en.html>

²⁶ For one of many news articles about worldwide reaction to the pope’s September 2006 speech, see “Pope’s Regrets Over Statement Fail to Quiet a Storm of Protests” by Ian Fisher, *The New York Times*, 19 September 2006.

²⁷ For the complete text of the Open Letter to the Pope by Muslim scholars, dated 13 October 2006, see

<http://www.bc.edu/dam/files/research_sites/cjl/texts/cjrelations/news/openletter-8238

Muslim scholars composed a more general, *Nostra Aetate*-esque statement entitled "A Common Word between Us and You" which highlights the shared values of love of God and love of neighbor. The website constructed around this document has fostered an on-going dialogue between scholars, religious leaders, and ordinary believers throughout the world.²⁸ In addition, Benedict himself extended several goodwill gestures to Muslims, including a personal visit to the Blue Mosque of Istanbul in November 2006, just two months after Regensburg. Benedict also convened the first international Catholic-Muslim Forum at the Vatican in 2008, which was a response to one of the requests made by the Muslim authors of "A Common Word."

Despite these positive steps, problems between the world's Christians and Muslims remain. Many of the most contentious issues today demonstrate the interrelatedness of religion and politics. For example, one situation universally decried by Catholic, Mainstream and Evangelical Christians alike is the precarious status of ancient Christian communities in many Muslim-majority countries: Chaldean and Syriac Christians continue to be persecuted in, and are emigrating en masse from places like war-torn Iraq and Syria; there are increased tensions between Coptic Christians and Muslims in post-Arab Spring Egypt; a tiny Christian minority in Pakistan is accusing the government of discrimination with its so-called blasphemy laws; and religious freedom is an issue for Christian domestic servants in the Gulf States.²⁹ Elsewhere, communal

DA.pdf>.

²⁸ For both the original Common Word document and five years of comments, see: <<http://www.acommonword.com/>>

²⁹ See for example "Pope Francis and the Christians of the Middle East," by Charles Chaput, OFM Cap, *First Things*, 22 March 2013; "Egypt's Christians Get Trapped in a Crossfire," by Matt Bradley, *The Wall Street Journal*, 20 August 2013; "Anti-blasphemy Law Creates a Tinderbox in Pakistan," by Affan Chowdhry, *The*

violence continues to flare up in countries with roughly equivalent populations of Christians and Muslims, such as Nigeria.³⁰ Western nations that have seen a large increase in Muslim immigration have also had problems with integration, most notably France and Germany, where Muslims now make up roughly 10% of the population of each, due mainly to North African and Turkish immigration. In 2004, France passed a law forbidding conspicuous symbols of religiosity, and in 2011 it outlawed the Muslim face veil in public. In Canada, the Parti Québécois government has recently sought to do likewise in the province of Quebec, causing much protest.³¹ But the veil has also been an issue in historically Muslim countries such as Turkey, where only recently have students been allowed to wear the veil while attending university, and are still forbidden from doing so in public-sector jobs.³²

Local Relations: United States

In an effort to avoid generalizing about contemporary Christian-Muslim relations, this section will offer a brief snapshot of local relations in a single country, the United States. What follows is a description of one example of positive Christian-Muslim relations, and one negative.

Globe and Mail, 2 June 2013; “For Outsiders in Saudi Arabia, Worship Comes with a Risk,” by Elaine Sciolino, *The New York Times*, 12 February 2002.

³⁰ See for example “Nigeria Violence: Muslim-Christian Clashes Kill Hundreds,” by Scott Baldauf, *Christian Science Monitor*, 8 March 2010.

³¹ See for example “French Assembly Votes to Ban Religious Symbols in Schools,” by Elaine Sciolino, *The New York Times*, 11 February 2004; “French Face Veil Ban Goes into Effect,” by Elizabeth Tenety, *The Washington Post*, 11 April 2011; and “Thousands Rally against PQ’s Secular Charter in Montreal,” by Benjamin Shingler, *The Globe and Mail*, 14 September 2013.

³² “Turkey Rolls Back University Scarf Ban,” by Marc Champion, *The Wall Street Journal*, 6 October 2010.

One negative example of Christian-Muslim relations in the United States has been a recent upsurge in Islamophobia. After 9/11, many professionals engaged in interfaith dialogue worked tirelessly to decrease Islamophobia among Americans. There was some improvement in attitudes in the years that followed. But more recently, in the past two years or so, there has been a resurgence of Islamophobia throughout the country. For example, a Florida pastor threatened to burn the Qur'an in 2010, an Illinois bishop gave an anti-Islamic Christmas homily in 2011, and there has been an increase in hate crimes against Muslims all over the country in the past decade. But possibly the most emblematic and widespread example of Islamophobia in the United States has been the emergence of mosque controversies; the best known was over the so-called "Ground Zero" mosque in New York City.³³ This particular dispute raged for months in the fall of 2010, with national voices joining in the local conversation about the legality and seemliness of building a mosque so close to the former site of the World Trade Center buildings. However, after such uproar, the mosque opened without fanfare as Park 51 in September of 2011.³⁴ Park 51 is not, in fact, built on Ground Zero, it is two blocks away; it is modeled after a Jewish Community Center on the Upper West Side; it has an interfaith board, including a 9/11 family member; it is open to people of all faiths; and it recently featured an exhibition by a Jewish photographer who displayed images of Sikhs, Muslims, and others.

But mosque controversies have been raging not only in New York City, but all across the country, often in suburbs which have recently been transformed from religiously homogenous to religious

³³ See "New York Mosque Went from Zero to Controversy," by Frank James, *National Public Radio*, 18 August 2010.

³⁴ See "Ground Zero Furor a Faint Memory at Park 51 Opening," by Mark Jacobson, *New York Magazine*, 22 September 2011.

diverse communities. Some of the most prominent and long-standing controversies include those in Murfreesboro, Tennessee and Dupage County, Illinois. In Willowbrook, Illinois, for example, the Muslim Educational Cultural Center of America (MECCA) sought to build a mosque. But when they brought their plans to the DuPage County Zoning Board they were rejected due to zoning, traffic congestion, and height violations—the proposed dome and minaret would have violated the 36-foot-high building limit. The DuPage County board eventually accepted a scaled-back proposal which eliminated the minaret and dome, but Muslims claimed religious discrimination, pointing to taller religious buildings in the area. DuPage County’s unease with minarets and domes calls to mind the 2009 Swiss ban on minarets.³⁵

In Murfreesboro, Tennessee, thirty miles outside of Nashville, the construction of a new mosque for area Muslims was a heated issue. Vandals repeatedly spray-painted construction signs with the words “not welcome” and set fire to construction equipment. At a public hearing in 2010, some residents claimed that Islam was not a religion and suggested that the center was part of a plot to replace the Constitution with Sharia law. The building permit was granted, then revoked, then reinstated by a federal judge in August 2012, just in time for Ramadan, the Muslim month of fasting.

A more positive example of Muslim-Christian relations in the United States has been a rise in the number of Muslim students enrolling in Catholic colleges and universities. Several news outlets have highlighted this phenomenon recently.³⁶ Why do Muslims seem

³⁵ See Nick Cumming-Bruce and Steven Erlanger, “Swiss Ban Building of Minarets on Mosques,” *The New York Times*, 29 November 2009.

³⁶ Richard Perez-Pena, “Muslims from abroad are thriving at Catholic universities,” *The New York Times*, 2 September 2012, and William Wan, “Enrollment of Muslim Students is Growing at Catholic Colleges in the U.S.,” *Washington Post*, 10 December

to prefer Catholic colleges and high schools over secular institutions? One recent article quoted a Muslim student at the University of Dayton, a Catholic institution, who stated: "Here, people are more religious, even if they're not Muslim, and I am comfortable with that...I'm more comfortable talking to a Christian than an atheist."³⁷ Many Muslims also appreciate single-gender Catholic high schools, due to the traditional Islamic separation of the sexes.

These are just a few of the reasons Muslims enroll in Catholic schools. But what are some of the reasons Catholic institutions accept so many Muslims and others into their midst? Are they doing this to be politically correct, or because interreligious diversity and cooperation is the new buzzword on college campuses? Are Catholic colleges welcoming non-Catholics *in spite of* their Catholic identity? Most theologians would argue that Catholic colleges welcome adherents of other religions not in spite of, but *because of*, their Catholic identity. They would say that to be Catholic means to welcome the other, and they would point to *Nostra Aetate* as the Catholic rationale for welcoming Muslims and others into their midst. Furthermore, Catholic universities with religious order sponsorship (Franciscan, Dominican, Jesuit, Lasallian, Vincentian, etc.) often cite particular verses from their founding order's documents and history which serve as a foundation for openness to the other. For example, at the institution where I teach, Benedictine University, we root interreligious dialogue in Chapter 53 of the *Rule of St. Benedict*, which encourages hospitality towards guests. At our institution both the *Rule* and *Nostra Aetate* serve as the theological rationale for welcoming non-Catholics to campus.

2010.

³⁷ Perez-Pena, *The New York Times*, 2 September 2012.

Although the increase of Muslim students on Catholic campuses is an opportunity to get to know each other, there are some challenges, too, and fears on both sides. Some alumni at Catholic universities with high percentages of Muslim students ask if the university is still Catholic. Some Muslim students wonder if they truly belong. The challenge for college campuses is: how to maintain a balance between fidelity to the Catholic tradition and openness to others? There is a certain tension here, but it is a tension that should not be resolved. This approach is different than secular pluralism, which often implies that everyone is the same, differences should be ignored, commonalities should be stressed, and students should focus on interfaith service, not theology. Interfaith cooperation is important, but at a Catholic Christian college this is not sufficient. We need to get comfortable with difference. The mere existence of pluralism does not guarantee that we will know or understand one another. We have to work at it, we have to be *intentional* about bringing people together, and we have to know the theological rationale why. And Muslims need to know their own theological rationale for entering into dialogue, too (some have suggested this verse from the Qur'an: "O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other").³⁸

We live in a world which is ever increasing in its religious diversity, not only in cities, but also in suburbs and rural areas. But as history shows, there is no such thing as a gradual, inevitable evolution of tolerance. So how will Christians and Muslims come to respect each other more, increase their trust in the other, and improve

³⁸ Sura 49:13.

their relationships? There is only one way: people must commit to building relationships over time. There is no dialogue between the religions of Islam and Christianity; there is only dialogue between individual Muslims and Christians. Building such relationship takes time and perseverance. It takes ordinary people, mostly. Such efforts might seem small and insignificant. Yet it is the seemingly small, insignificant encounter which makes all the difference. I will end with an anecdote which demonstrates just that. Last summer, several students from my university went on an interfaith training weekend together. In the van on the way home, one of the Catholic students tentatively mentioned how much it bothered her when certain Muslim students moved the furniture of the university chapel around during their prayer but did not move it back. The Muslim in whom the Catholic confided was horrified; she apologized to the Catholic and later rectified the situation by speaking with her fellow Muslims. It was only because the Catholic and Muslim had built up trust in one another, and had a concrete place to talk (e.g., the van) that this interchange was able to occur at all. Clearly, building personal relationships with Muslims is one of the best ways Catholics can live out the following statement from *Nostra Aetate*: "The Catholic Church regards with sincere reverence those ways of conduct and of life, those precepts and teachings which, though differing in many aspects from the ones she holds and sets forth, nonetheless often reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all."³⁹

³⁹ *Nostra Aetate* 2.

For Further Reading

Griffith, Sidney. *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque: Christians and Muslims in the World of Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

Mohammed, Ovey. *Muslim-Christian Relations: Past, Present, Future* (New York: Orbis, 1999).

Omar, Irfan, ed., *A Muslim View of Christianity: Essays on Dialogue* by Mahmoud Ayoub (New York: Orbis, 2007).

Smith, Jane. *Muslims, Christians, and the Challenge of Interfaith Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Tolan, John. *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

Waardenburg, Jacques. *Islam and Christianity: mutual perceptions since the mid-20th century* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998).

Zebiri, Kate. *Muslims and Christians Face to Face* (London: Oneworld, 1997).

[摘要] 從古到今，穆斯林和基督教之間的關係在不同景況下存在很大差異。在中世紀拉丁語世界中，基督徒經常對穆斯林教徒及伊斯蘭存有敵意，但也有互相尊重及對雙方表示興趣的時候。譬如阿西西的方濟探訪埃及蘇丹就代表了比較和平的方向，而拜占庭皇帝曼努埃爾二世對穆罕默德的抨擊則表示敵對的態度。這些敵對或尊重的態度仍塑造當今穆斯林及基督徒之間的接觸。第二次梵蒂岡大公會議對穆斯林表達尊重及提出建構正面的關係模式。教宗若望保祿二世指出猶太教徒，基督徒及穆斯林教徒之間共同享有個亞巴郎的傳承，以闡述這種思想。教宗本篤十六世曾引用曼努埃爾二世的話語，此舉引來伊斯蘭世界中廣泛爭

議，但同時也提供了一個前所未見的場合，令穆斯林教徒去接觸基督徒。透過在《我倆共同的語言》一信中，穆斯林教徒強調愛天主/真主，愛鄰人這個貫通兩宗教的共同價值。今天在各地包括中東及尼日利亞，穆斯林及基督教之間的關係受到困擾。美國在現今的穆斯林及基督徒的關係上同時提供了正面及反面的例子。伊斯蘭恐懼症正在加劇，但同時也有不同的力量去改善兩宗教之間的關係。眾多穆斯林學生在美國的基督教，尤其是天主教的學院及大學讀書，感受到對穆斯林教徒友善的氣氛。

Building Relationship with
Religious Neighbours:
Interreligious Dialogue in India –
Shades and Shores

Vincent SEKHAR

與宗教鄰舍建立關係：
宗教交談在印度 - 陰影與支柱

Vincent SEKHAR

[ABSTRACT] The universal search for the Spirit and the self has taken many distinctive forms in India's rich religious history. In India today interreligious relations are complex and varied, in some contexts conflicted and in others cordial; "communal shades" keep people in darkness while "positive shores" invite people to harmony and understanding based on the ancient principle of oneness within diversity. Despite historical efforts to building strong interreligious relationships, there are many bitter conflicts involving religion in India today. While today the Hindu nationalist movement is in strong conflict with minority religious groups over issues of such as minority rights and conversion, there are also multiple efforts

to build strong interreligious neighborhoods that can resist antagonistic pressures. Both legal and communitarian means provide invaluable resources for respecting religious freedom and shaping healthy interreligious communities.

Indian Religious Ethos

Spirituality springs from within. It gains its distinct flavor in meaning and practice in the way humans are placed and engaged in their natural environment. For instance, both Buddha and Mahavira, founders of the Buddhist and Jain religions in India in the sixth century BCE, gave shape to their spiritual discovery in a context of ethnic rivalry, class oppression and state violence. And hence there was a reason to promote compassion and non-violence, a sense of respect for congregational living, and equitable sharing. Truly, the context shaped their socio-spiritual discourse.

Spirituality in India is primarily a *search*: a search for direction and meaning of life and death, sorrow and joy, engagement and retirement, relationship and solitude, and so on. It is a search for the foundation(s) of all of these. The founders of Indian spiritual organizations¹ were primarily *seekers* and *pathfinders*.

India generally recognizes *diversity* as its basic attitude. The pathfinders of Indian religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism based their reflections on personal and social experience and discovered the *self* as the centering place and the focal point, yet reaching out to *others*. But ultimately their search for meaning brought them closer to their very self. It was primarily an inward

¹ Such as the Brahma Samaj, the Arya Samaj, the Ramakrishna Mission, the Theosophical Society, and persons like Sri Aurobindo, Sri Ramana, Sri Narayana Guru and a host of others, the so-called saints and sages of India.

quest and an interior journey, often contrasted with the material, physical, and the external. Hence to discover the self or oneself, according to the Wise in India, is like the search for the fine pearls or the field (*Gospel according to St. Matthew 13:44-46*), which contained life-treasures. It was, to the pathfinders, a passage into and a discovery of the *sacred*!

These sages also found that by discovering oneself one should be able to discover the other, as illustrated in the *Golden Rule* mentioned in almost all religions, “Do to others as you would have them do to you.” (*Gospel according to St. Luke 6:30-32*) To be personal (open to the self) is to be trans-personal (an entry into the mysterious, the *difficult* other). One needs to understand the other, the *customer*, in business terminology. It sounds paradoxical to say that self-knowledge leads one to self-transcendence!

With this background, let me briefly reflect upon a few areas that make interreligious dialogue difficult and yet significant. Or, in other words, let me answer the question “What could dialogue mean in India?” The following pages will describe the communal shades that keep the people in the *dark valley of sorrow and anxiety* and the positive shores ahead which assure confidence and hope of living together.

Diversity and Oneness

Religion in India is a “lived” reality (not an abstract concept). For instance, *religion* is a column mentioned in educational certificates and other documents. It is a *socially* situated reality, with majority Hindus (nearly 900 million), who are again hierarchically placed in the society, which affects their status and condition, rights and benefits, opportunities and availabilities. Muslims are the second

majority (nearly 200 million), who share the *minority* status along with the Christians (nearly 25 million), as well as the Jains and the Buddhists, who each number less than 10 million. There are Sikhs concentrated in the state of Punjab in the Northwest of India. A sizable number of people in India belong to the Scheduled Castes and Tribes, comprising nearly 250 million. They are given special status like those treated with 'affirmative action' in the U.S., and they have special benefits from both the public as well as private sectors.

Unfortunately, there is a large gap between the poor and the rich, illiterate and the educated, with the poor experiencing powerlessness, unemployment, segregation, discrimination, and unequal treatment. Christians and Muslims enjoy *minority rights and benefits*, and this policy has been an eyesore for the Right Wing Hindu forces from the very beginning of India's independence from the British colonial rule in 1947. Minority concerns and other issues like *conversion* have been topping the list for understanding and dialogue between Hindus, Christians and Muslims. Hindu fundamentalists and the Right Wing political parties have brought these issues to the critical forefront making dialogue difficult. In addition to these concerns, there are Right and Left wing party affiliations, where people, though diverse in their religious and cultural practices, merge into party voice and discipline.

Ordinarily, India as the largest democracy in the world has been a peace-loving country over the centuries. The ancient Hindu religious and philosophical texts endorse *oneness within diversity* as a life-dictum and life-attitude. The one and the only reality is the existence of a metaphysical, ultimate Being (the Hindu philosophy names it as *Brahman*), who/which reflects into the world of humans and the material world as manifestations. Hence, all reality is

inter-dependent and inter-connected. A vision like this has led India for centuries in the path of harmony amidst multiculturalism.

Religious Unification: Historical Attempts

Understanding and learning from the other started long ago in Indian history, in the third century BCE during the rule of Emperor Ashoka, who initiated a change in governance. On account of his conversion to Buddhism, he promulgated through his many edicts² the Buddhist values of compassion, moderation, tolerance and respect for all life – a policy of peaceful co-existence. He saw the protection of all religions and fostering harmony among them as duties of the state. It even seems that something like a Department of Religious Affairs was established with officers called *Dhamma Mahamatras* whose job it was to look after the affairs of various religious bodies and to encourage the practice of religion. (I shall reserve many quotes to the footnotes.)³

² Ashoka's edicts are to be found scattered in more than thirty places throughout India, Nepal, Pakistan and Afghanistan. These edicts, inscribed on rocks and pillars, proclaim Ashoka's reforms and policies and promulgate his advice to his subjects. They are mainly concerned with the reforms he instituted and the moral principles he recommended in his attempt to create a just and humane society. It is also very clear that Ashoka saw the reforms he instituted as being a part of his duties as a Buddhist. But, while he was an enthusiastic Buddhist, he was not partisan towards his own religion or intolerant of other religions.

<<http://www.cs.colostate.edu/~malaiya/ashoka.html>>

³ To give a few examples: “Beloved-of-the-Gods, King Piyadasi, has caused this Dhamma edict to be written. Here (in my domain) no living beings are to be slaughtered or offered in sacrifice... Formerly, in the kitchen of Beloved-of-the-Gods, King Piyadasi, hundreds of thousands of animals were killed every day to make curry. But now with the writing of this Dhamma edict only three creatures, two peacocks and a deer are killed, and the deer not always. And in time, not even these three creatures will be killed.” (Edict 1) “Everywhere has Beloved-of-the-Gods, King Piyadasi, made provision for two types of medical treatment: medical treatment for humans and medical treatment for animals...” (Edict 2) “In King Piyadasi's Dhamma practice, the sound of the drum has been replaced by the sound of the Dhamma... King Piyadasi promotes restraint in the killing and harming of living beings, proper behavior towards

In the year 1582 CE, the Muslim ruler Jalal-ud-din Muhammad Akbar (Akbar the Great) composed and promulgated the Dīn-i Ilāhī (Divine Faith) or Tauhid-i-Ilahi, a syncretic religious doctrine merging "the best elements of the religions of his empire, and thereby reconcil[ing] the differences that divided his subjects. The elements were primarily drawn from Islam and Hinduism, but some others were also taken from Christianity, Jainism, and Zoroastrianism."⁴ Dīn-i Ilāhī was, according to George Bruce Malleson, an English Officer retired with a rank of colonel in 1877, "an earnest and intense endeavour in search of a formula which would satisfy all but hurt none and contained all that was good and true and beautiful in the great faiths of the world."⁵ Akbar patronized and continued to have discussions with religious leaders of all faiths and summoned two Jesuit missionaries from Goa.

India has other great political and religious leaders such as M.K. Gandhi⁶ and Swami Vivekananda⁷ who gave a similar slant in

relatives, Brahmans and ascetics, and respect for mother, father and elders, such sightings have increased." (Edict 4) "Beloved-of-the-Gods, King Piyadasi, desires that all religions should reside everywhere, for all of them desire self-control and purity of heart..." (Edict 7) "Beloved-of-the-Gods, King Piyadasi, does not value gifts and honors as much as he values this – that there should be growth in the essentials of all religions. Growth in essentials can be done in different ways, but all of them have as their root restraint in speech, that is, not praising one's own religion, or condemning the religion of others without good cause. And if there is cause for criticism, it should be done in a mild way. But it is better to honor other religions for this reason. By so doing, one's own religion benefits, and so do other religions, while doing otherwise harms one's own religion and the religions of others. Whoever praises his own religion, due to excessive devotion, and condemns others with the thought "Let me glorify my own religion," only harms his own religion. Therefore contact (between religions) is good. One should listen to and respect the doctrines professed by others. Beloved-of-the-Gods, King Piyadasi, desires that all should be well-learned in the good doctrines of other religions." (Edict 12)

⁴ <<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Din-i-Ilahi>>

⁵ <<http://www.preservearticles.com/2012041030166/get-complete-information-on-din-i-ilahi.html>>

⁶ M.K. Gandhi too holds that all great religions spring from the same source and the fundamentals are common to them all. M.K. Gandhi, *The Way to Communal Harmony*, compiled and edited by U.R. Rao (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, 1963),

thinking and living, in understanding and harmony with religious neighbours. But we cannot deny the fact that a country that holds more than 6000 ethnic communities with over 300 languages and dialects has been experiencing communal rivalries and religious wars in history. One cannot easily stipulate reasons for these conflicts. They are complex, and some events of mass violence were designed by political operatives. Such repeated experiences of hatred and violence continue even now to create a prejudicial mind-set between believers, difficult to erase quickly.

Communal History in Recent Decades

I shall limit myself to quoting two or three events of such a sad story. While browsing through the recent decades of India's political and religious history, one comes across the blatant animosity between two factions of Indian communities, the Right Wing Hindus and the Right Wing Muslims. The partition of Bengal (Bangladesh) in 1905 and the partition of Pakistan on 14th August, 1947, took place on the basis of *religious* demography. These events involved violence and bloodshed across the country, particularly across the borders.

At the time of independence, there were heated discussions and debates in the constituent assembly between Hindus, Muslims, and Christians on several matters related to religion and the status of

pp. 54-55. He said: "I believe in absolute oneness of God and, therefore, also of humanity. What though we have many bodies? We have but one soul. The rays of the sun are many through refraction. But they have the same source." Ibid. p. 359.

⁷ Swami Vivekananda asserted that unity was the object of all religions. His analysis of religion showed that humans did not travel from fallacy to truth but from a lower truth to a higher one. *The Complete works of Swami Vivekananda* (hereafter CW-SV), 13th impression, (Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 1995), Vol. VII, p. 425. Each of us was moving towards Him (the Centre) along one of the radii and where all radii met, all differences ceased but until then the differences had to be. Ibid. pp. 384-85.

religious communities and their rights to freedom. Fortunately, contemporary visionaries objectively and genuinely saw the problems among religious communities, scheduled castes and tribes, and drew up the charters on Fundamental Rights⁸ and Minority Rights,⁹ which are still contested by the Hindu nationalist parties and cultural organizations.

⁸ Article 25 of the Indian Constitution assures to all persons the freedom of conscience and free profession, practice and propagation of religion, subject to public order, morality and health. Article 26 similarly guarantees religious denominations and their sections a right, subject to public order, morality and health, to establish and maintain religious and charitable institutions, to manage their religious affairs, to own and to acquire property and to administer it according to law. Article 27 prohibits the state from compelling any person "to pay taxes, the proceeds of which are specifically appropriated in payment of expenses for the promotion or maintenance of any particular religious denomination." The Freedom of Speech (Article 19, Clause b and c) allows citizens to assemble peaceably and without arms and to form associations or unions. But in order to avert controversies in classrooms over religion and its beliefs, the State prohibits imparting religious education in state-maintained educational institutions (government-run public schools) (Article 28.1). But Clause 2 of the same permits imparting religious instruction in an endowed educational institution administered by the state and Clause 3 permits voluntary religious instruction in an aided or recognized educational institution. There cannot be any compulsion on attendance. Articles 25 and 26 are similar to the American Free Exercise Clause and Articles 27 and 28 are counter-part to the no-Establishment Clause. Vincent Sekhar SJ, *Building Strong Neighbourhoods – Religion and Politics in Secular India* (Bangalore: Claretian Publications, 2008), pp. 148-149; see also Durga Das, *Introduction to the Constitution of India*, 19th edition (New Delhi: Wadhwa and Company Law Publishers, 2002).

⁹ Minority rights are seen as a means of ensuring equal treatment by overcoming structured patterns of discrimination, for protecting their interests, and also for enhancing cultural diversity. The Framers of the Constitution wanted to dismantle the structure of social discrimination perpetuated by the caste system and also the possibility of religious discrimination in independent India. Hence the Constitution envisaged a system of protection of smaller communities. It provided reservations and special rights to minority communities. It guarantees equality before law and equal protection of the laws within its territory (Article 14). It prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth (Article 15) and advances special protection for women and children, and for those that are socially and educationally backward classes of citizens, for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. In separate Articles, the interests of minorities are protected (Article 29, Clause 1), such as the right to conserve their language, script and culture. No citizen can be denied admission into any educational institution maintained by the state or receiving aid out of State funds on grounds only of religion, race, caste, language or any of them. (Clause 2) They have their right to establish and to administer educational institutions and the State cannot discriminate against any of them in granting aid on the ground that it is under the management of a minority, whether based on religion or language (Article 30, Clauses 1 & 2). Sekhar, *ibid*, pp. 149-150.

Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, one of the chief protagonists, spoke in terms of defining ‘Who is a Hindu?’¹⁰ According to him, India or the Hindu Nation was a *Race* connected by a common blood (of ancestors) and common culture. This affective dimension of *Hindutva* (hindu-ness) is very alive in contemporary Hindu nationalism. Hedgewar was the founding father of a powerful Hindu cultural organization called the RSS (Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh) providing the youth with a highly disciplined psycho-spiritual program of “character building” and “man-moulding” necessary to realize the original intent of being a Hindu.¹¹ M.S. Golwalkar said that race was the body of the nation and “all those not belonging to the national i. e. Hindu race, religion, Culture and Language, naturally fall out of the pale of real ‘National’ life ... unless they [the others] abandon their differences, and completely merge themselves in the National Race.”¹² Naturally, Muslims and Christians stood outside the pale.

¹⁰ As the President of the Hindu Great Assembly, Savarkar addressed the gathering in 1937, “the Hindus ... possess a common country, a common language the Sanskrit from which all their current languages are derived or are nourished and which forms even today the common language of their Scriptures and literature and which is held in esteem as the sacred reservoir of ancient scriptures and the tongue of their forefathers... Their ancient and modern history is common. They have friends and enemies common. They have faced common dangers and won victories in common... Hindus are welded together during aeons of a common life and a common habitat. Above all, the Hindus are bound together by the dearest, most sacred and most enduring bonds of a common Fatherland and a common Holy Land, and these two being identified with one and the same country our Bharathbhumi, our India, the National oneness and homogeneity of the Hindus have been doubly sure. ...the Hindus must be entitled to be recognized as a ‘nation’ par excellence. ...All tests whatsoever of a common country, race, religion and language that go to entitle a people to form a nation, entitle the Hindus with greater emphasis to that claim.” (A. Appadorai, Documents on Political Thought in Modern India, Vol. I [London: Oxford University Press, 1973], 501-502)

¹¹ W.K. Anderson & S. D. Damle, *The Brotherhood in Saffron – The Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh and Hindu Revivalism* (New Delhi: Vistaar 1987), p. 34.

¹² M.S. Golwalkar, *We, or Our Nationhood Defined* (1st ed. 1939; 2nd ed. Nagpur: Bharat Publications, 1944), pp. 45-46.

Ever since the 1960s, communal violence¹³ has been vibrant especially against the Muslim and the Christian minority communities. Madhu Kishwar synthesizes the grievances of the Hindu revivalists against the Muslims: they are 'unruly' and 'all too demanding.'¹⁴ There were other reasons for the reactive communal tone in the 1980s. One such was a large-scale conversion of the "untouchables" (a class of people known as the Dalits) to Islam in 1981 in a South Indian village *Meenakshipuram* in Tamil Nadu State. This activated the Hindu organizations' campaign against conversions to Islam (also to Christianity), and the Hindu opposition to conversion is still strong in a few States.¹⁵

¹³ Achin Vanaik, *The Furies of Indian Communalism – Religion, Modernity, and Secularization* (London: Verso, 1997). Chapter 2, "Reflections on Communalism and Nationalism in India," describes how politics and religion go hand-in-hand.

¹⁴ The Muslims are "those who severed both the arms of Mother India ... for those hypocrites there is no place here. This Hindustan is not theirs"; "Muslims should be driven out of India because they are not loyal to this country and harbor pro-Pakistan sentiments"; "refusal of Muslims to accept a common civil code"; "Muslims do not allow even reasonable criticism of Islam"; "Muslims in India are willing pawns in the games played by Pakistani rulers"; "Muslims make unreasonable and anti-national demands"; "Muslims behave like a virtual nation within a nation"; "Muslims are a people who assert their right to be above the law of the land"; "Muslims continue to honour even those rulers who persecuted Hindus"; "Special status given to Jammu and Kashmir with separate provisions in the Constitution"; "Large-scale inflow of Muslim Bangladeshi immigrants into India is jeopardizing the security of India"; "The mullas do not allow Muslims to accept birth-control measures"; "Muslim leaders try to dictate on foreign policy matters to the Indian government"; "India is surrounded by hostile and troublesome Muslim nations" and so on. But Kishwar says that a large number of these charges are based on half-truths, outright lies and paranoid fantasies. (Madhu Kishwar, *Religion at the Service of Nationalism and Other Essays* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 255-256. Yoginder Sikhand in another article summarizes the painful reality of Anti-Muslim discrimination in its various forms and at various levels, being the real cause for the plight of the Muslim community. "Behind their plight", *Frontline* 23/24 (2-15 December 2006).

¹⁵ The State of Orissa enacted the *Orissa Freedom of Religion Act* in 1967, the first of its kind. A similar Act came up in Madhya Pradesh Legislature in 1968, and the third was passed by the Arunachal Pradesh in 1978. Tamilnadu State imposed a ban on forcible conversion on October 5, 2002, and owing to the continued protest by the minorities the ordinance was repealed by the same Chief Minister in May 2004. In September 2006, the Gujarat State government cleared the proposal for an amendment to the *Freedom of Religion Act*, 2003, which made forced conversion from one religion to another illegal.

On another occasion in 1990, the communal Hindu forces protested against the economic designs proposed by the *Mandal Commission*, which supported an increase in reservations for the Backward Classes. These forces were powerful enough to topple the Government at the center. In 1992, a huge mobilization of Hindus took place to destroy a mosque and rebuild a Hindu temple that supposedly had been destroyed earlier by a Muslim ruler. The details related to this event are a good example of how politics and religion could come together.

Since mid-1997, there have been widespread and continuous attacks on Christians and their missionaries by the Hindu militant forces, especially in the States ruled by the Hindu nationalist parties. John Dayal, President of the United Christian Forum of India, blamed the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP, Indian People's Party)-governed state of Gujarat for shielding the wrong-doers and in his report he revealed that there were more than 120 cases of anti-Christian violence in 1998.¹⁶ In many of the fact-finding investigations,¹⁷ one witnesses the strange but *silent* watch of the political and governmental powers, who pampered the militant forces. This story unfortunately continues.

¹⁶ Dayal reports that 30 churches were attacked in Gujarat state since December 1998. In summer, 400 Bibles were burnt in Rajkot City, 10 churches were destroyed or damaged and more than 30 churches were attacked in Dangs District of Gujarat state. Total population of Dangs District is 146,000, and among them there were 7000 Christians according to 1991 census and mostly Tribals. He indicates that there were refusals to register complaints made by the Christian victims and also threats to withdraw the complaints and FIR reports.

¹⁷ The noted daily *Indian Express* (1 October 1998) carries the report of the 3-member team of Nishant Natya Manch and Progressive Organization of Women (POW), which visited several areas of Gujarat from August 23-30. The National Minority Commission (NMC) sent a team to tour Gujarat from August 10-12. Dr. James Massey led the team. "Report on Gujarat" by V. Venkatesan in *Frontline* 15/21 (10-23 October 1998) brings out the report of their findings, listing the communal outrages.

Christian groups did hold talks with Hindu nationalist groups on the activities of Christian missionaries.¹⁸ At first, the top leaders in both the Catholic Church and the Hindu group came together in a private meeting at the headquarters of the Catholic Bishops Conference of India in New Delhi on August 21, 1998, to clear up misconceptions, suspicion and mistrust and to discuss the modalities for starting a dialogue. Later, on December 18, a four-hour meeting took place; the details were not released to the Press except for a brief joint statement, which said: "The meeting covered a wide range of issues, including the current violence in several parts of the country against the Christian community. The discussions were frank and participants expressed their perceptions and apprehensions." It was only a preliminary meeting. Many of the issues required further discussions and deliberations. But dialogue came to a dead-end by the end of December 1998, as violence against the Christians escalated, especially in the Dang district of Gujarat state.

Perhaps the most gruesome attacks began when a Muslim mob set on fire a train called the *Sabarmathi Express* carrying Hindu devotees in a place called Godhra in Gujarat State on February 27, 2002; the atrocity took a toll of 59 people. But in the aftermath there was widespread violence against Muslims and Hindus, continuing until the end of May 2002.¹⁹ There were, according to reports, almost 150,000 people who ran away from their homes and were living in miserable conditions in more than 100 relief camps.²⁰ The pogrom was useful to achieve two objectives. The first was to ensure that the

¹⁸ *Indian Express*, 6 January 1999, "Christian groups ready for talks with VHP."

¹⁹ "Gujarat Revisited" by Dionne Bunsha, *Frontline*, 20/05 (1-14 March 2003) gives a picture of the horrific tragedy of people, the difficulties in facing their day-to-day challenges.

²⁰ "The crisis of the camps" by Dionne Bunsha & "Testimonies of terror" by T. K. Rajalakshmi, *Frontline* 19/08 (13-16 April 2002).

State's Muslim population remained confined to its ghettos, and the second to ensure that the authority of the Hindu Right remained stamped forever on Gujarat's political landscape.²¹

On the other hand, Islamic terrorism may violate Islamic ideals and ethics, but it also enjoys support from many quarters among its followers. Extreme acts include hijacking airlines, kidnapping and beheading people, suicide bombing, as well as terrorist threats including death threats and *fatwas*. These are done mostly by well known organizations like the Lashkar-e-Toiba, which has been vibrant in the Kashmiri independence movement, killing civilian Hindus, especially the Kashmiri Pandits. These groups widely engage in suicide bombing, killing soldiers and government officials, and civilians; the bombers have been hailed as *Jihadi* martyrs for the cause of Islam.

India has witnessed several terrorist attacks by the *Jihadi* militants in the last two decades.²² Islamic extremists defend their position by retaliating against whatever persons they see as anti-Muslim; they also seek to gain territorial land. In the above mentioned case, the primary objective for Islamic (especially the

²¹ It is worth noting that Narendra Modi, Gujarat's Chief Minister and a great supporter of the Right Wing Hindu forces, has been elected now three times consecutively.

²² To cite a few examples: August 25, 2007 Hyderabad Blasts: Two explosions rocked central Hyderabad, one at Lumbini amusement park and another at Koti busy area, leaving 40 people dead and 54 injured; March 7, 2006 Varanasi Bombings: It was a series of attacks in the Sankath Mochan Hanuman temple and Cantonment Railway Station in the Hindu holy city of Varanasi, an attack by Lashkar-e-Toiba in which over 28 were killed and over 100 injured; Killing of Kashmiri Pandits in Jammu and Kashmir; December 28, 2005 attack on the Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore; October 29, 2005 Delhi Bombings; August 25, 2003 Mumbai Bombings: At least 48 people were killed and 150 injured in two blasts in south Mumbai; September 24, 2002 attack on Akshardham Temple in Gandhi Nagar, Ahmedabad: Thirty people were killed and another 100 were seriously injured; December 13, 2001 Suicide attack on India's Parliament in New Delhi; February 14, 1998 Coimbatore Blasts: According to reports, nineteen bomb explosions sunned the city of Coimbatore in Tamil Nadu on February 14, killing 58 persons and injuring about 250.

youth) terrorist operations was to annex Jammu and Kashmir (for "liberating" J&K) and, secondly, to keep Indian forces in jeopardy and preoccupied with security. Dionne Bunsha²³ points out that in India, the fear and anxiety among the Muslims and their terror attacks may have been the leading reason for consolidating Muslim presence and engagement as a community politically. It can also be a defense mechanism to protect the Muslim community in India against the Hindu fundamentalists and the Hindutva onslaught. But the vast majority of the Indian Muslims are patriotic; far from associating themselves with anti-national groups, most positively favor community living and life-property-rights protection.

Dialogue in Practice: 1. Through *Constitutional* or *Legal* Means

Speaking about religious dialogue in such mass conflicts, backed by the right wing political parties and religious organizations, one can think of a solution through *Constitutional* or *Legal* means. A nation's Constitution is its pride because it envisions the hope of its citizens. It takes into consideration the cultural and social milieu of its inhabitants and ensures the best for them as a whole. And wherever there is possible disagreement on certain vital issues related to the daily living of different religious or racial groups, based on their traditions, the Constitution provides them the necessary safeguard to live according to their traditions. Most 'personal' laws are the effect of such a process. Amendments are made to the Constitution after considerable national debate on such issues.

²³ "A State of Fear" by Dionne Bunsha, *Frontline* 23/01 (14 – 27 January 2006).

For example, the Indian Constitution Section 123 of the *Representation of People's Act*, 1951 offers a way out of *unfair and corrupt electoral practices*.²⁴ It forbids all direct appeals because one is a Hindu or a Christian, etc.²⁵ The Constitution prohibits derogatory references to other religions during election propaganda as they promote feelings of enmity and hatred among classes. Thus the Constitution provides a model to all political parties to have faith in and to adhere to the vision enshrined in them. At all cost, the political parties need to cherish and foster the Constitutional framework and what it can offer.

But in practice, the complex political structure of India provides opportunities and access points to religious groups that want to influence public life. The Supreme Court has ensured that religious denominations and institutions are not excluded from or disadvantaged in the public realm. They have been allowed to exercise the same privileges as all other groups and associations in society. Freedom of religion and politics in India supplement each other. Thus religious organizations pursue political goals through various means such as statutes, administrative procedures, and court cases. They can influence state officials, persuade NGOs, become

²⁴ “[It is] the appeal by a candidate or his agent or by any other person with the consent of a candidate or his election agent to vote or refrain from voting for any reason on the ground of his religion, race, caste, community or language or the use of, or appeal to religious symbols, or the use of, or appeal to, national symbols, such as the national flag or national emblem, for the furtherance of the prospects of the election of that candidate or for prejudicially affecting the election of any candidate: Provided that no symbol allotted under this Act to a candidate shall be deemed to be a religious symbol or a national symbol for the purpose of the clause (3A). The promotion of, or attempt to promote feelings of enmity or hatred between different classes of citizens of India on grounds of religion, race, caste, community or language, by a candidate or his election agent for the furtherance of the prospects of the election of that candidate or for prejudicially affecting the election of any candidate. Gurpreet Mahajan, *Identities & Rights – Aspects of Liberal Democracy in India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 66.

²⁵ *K. Singh v. Mukhtar Singh*, SCR 1964: 790; *Ziaddin B. Bukhari v. Brijmohan Ramdass Mehra and Others*, SCR 1975 [supp] 281; Mahajan, Gurpreet: Op. Cit. p. 67.

involved in various levels in the policy-making process, influence the content of policies, and even monitor their implementation. Now-a-days religious groups and organizations involve themselves in direct lobbying and even intrude in public/government affairs and in public action.

In principle, the legal system has the power to resolve conflicts and deliver justice, but in practice communal frenzy and mass murder remain more powerful to shut the gates of justice. In other words, the Constitutional means of dialogue are slow to deliver justice in a timely fashion. The 1984 anti-Sikh riots, with an official record of over 3000 deaths, are a good example. The system of justice virtually failed in the case of the 1984 Delhi riots. Kuldip Nayar, a noted jurist, sadly remarks that "the saga of commissions and committees set up to determine the causes, consequences, deaths, prosecutions, compensation and disciplinary action relating to the 1984 carnage began that year and continues to this day..."²⁶ The Sikh victims are looking for justice even after 29 years!²⁷

Dialogue in Practice: 2. Through Communitarian Means

While this is the experience in almost all the events of mass violence, there is the other side of the story regarding people who engage in acts of peace-building in their neighborhood. L. C. Jain describes such an experience in the state of Andhra Pradesh: "Recently, after the Gujarat upheaval, TV channels showed that some *panchayats* (village governance) in Andhra Pradesh had formed joint

²⁶ Kuldip Nayar: "Establishing the Truth," *The Hindu*, 20 April 2002.

²⁷ <<http://www.ndtv.com/article/india/1984-anti-sikh-riot-victims-seek-justice-from-pm-288051>>

peace committees comprising of representatives of all communities. This indeed should be the order of the day - each one of the 250,000 *panchayats* should be encouraged to foster harmony and non-violence in their respective areas. These people's peace committees will activate themselves in an instant, unlike the State officials and police who wait for directions from their political bosses."²⁸

Had the *panchayats* of Gujarat been properly instructed in a similar way to guard the state village by village at the time of communal violence, the scene would have been different. "Imagine, how many lives could have been saved," L.C. Jain continues, "if within minutes of communal violence surfacing in Gujarat local elected representatives in *panchayats* and *nagarpalikas* (city governance) had been summoned to mind peace and harmony in their respective locality. It could have helped the law-abiding officials and the police to accomplish more and it would have put the brakes on the black sheep in the administration.... It is our mindset which needs a change."²⁹

The *panchayats* and *nagarpalikas*, symbols of *self-governance*, suggest the idea of a *community* where people in their neighbourhood love to live in close association with one another, respect and protect each other, tackle problems together, and grow in maturity together. They do not wait for instruction until an incidence of violence, death, and destruction occurs. It is a pro-active community of believers and non-believers, transcending the narrow sense of "me" and "mine," who reach out to others with a *communitarian* sense.³⁰

²⁸ L.C. Jain, "Change the Mindset," *The Hindu*, 18 April 2002.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Janaki N. Iyer, "From 'me' to 'us'," *The Hindu*, 29 April 2003.

Such a paradigm of a *Communitarian* means of dialogue and inter-action has been practiced all along in India, but unofficially and without a formal structure. Though difficult to achieve, it is deemed effective in diffusing communal tensions on the one hand and promoting mutual trust, cooperation and harmony on the other. This is possible regardless of any religious affiliation. The ethics implied in the *Golden Rule* is common to all: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." (The Bible, Book of Leviticus 19.18)³¹ The Constitutional Model of dialogue is only one way of dealing with the problems and issues arising out of an unholy mix of State politics and religion, religious resurgence, and fundamentalism. But the Court cannot function diligently if the servants of law (lawyers and judges) are selfish in their motives or led by caste or family or religious feelings.

Dialogue in Practice

India has been engaged in promoting inter-religious and inter-cultural dialogue among diverse groups of people not merely to dispel prejudices but, more positively, to promote understanding and collaboration for achieving common objectives, based on values.³² There are any number of state-level, national, and international seminars organized to discuss critical issues pertaining to India's religious diversity and life together, such as secularism, minority

³¹ We have similar texts in other religions: "One should not behave towards others in a way which is disagreeable to oneself. This is the essence of morality. All other activities are due to selfish desire." (The Hindu text Mahabharata, Anusasana Parva 113.8) "Comparing oneself to others in such terms as 'Just as I am so are they, just as they are so am I,' he should neither kill nor cause others to kill." (The Buddhist text Sutta Nipata 705) "A man should wander about treating all creatures as he himself would be treated." (The Jain text Suttrakritanga 1.11.33)

³² For details, see the author's full article "Give away Violence, Preserve Life: Call of the Sramana Religions," *Journal of Dharma* 25/2 (April-June 2000), pp. 161-192

rights, conversion, terrorism, discrimination and inequality, multi-religious education in school/college curriculum, Dalit/tribal rights and their denial, the dangerous mix of politics and religion, etc.

Most interreligious and cultural seminars suggest in praxis *peace education* in school/college curriculum, multi-religious *immersion* experiences for the youth, engaging the youth and the NGOs in activities of neighbourhood building, formation of multi-religious, multi-cultural, and multi-ideological youth forums for awareness and training, and for achieving peace and harmony.

These activities happen in many educational institutions with interreligious prayer meetings, organized religious tours, as well as through observing *Harmony Week* and the like. Many of the youth address the problem of religious diversity and the subsequent attitudes and mind-set they need to develop to eradicate prejudice. Ross Feehan, a research student of Stanford University, USA, and a co-facilitator of one such program in the *Institute of Dialogue with Cultures and Religions* (IDCR),³³ Chennai, summarized the experiences of the student-participants in their own words: “I have become a more informed and responsible individual;” “It has changed my views about other religions;” “It has honestly changed the way I think about other religions;” the program “helped me in understanding people better;” “We learnt to respect each other for what we are;” “We have become more accepting;” The program has “made me turn to my religion as a support system;” the program “broke that wall in me of maintaining distance” from religious people.

More positively, the youth are engaged in arts for peace, through poetry, painting, music, and stage competitions, newspapers and

³³ IDCR Newsletter, October 2012; <<http://www.idcrdialogue.com/>>

journals/video clippings. Such exercises impart a great deal of interreligious awareness and a sense of responsibility as citizens and students in creating and nurturing an atmosphere of cordiality.

There are a few interreligious institutions in the country like IDCR in Chennai, *Henry Martin Institute*³⁴ in Hyderabad, and a number of pro-*interreligious* Muslim, Sikh, and Hindu associations, foundations, and organizations, all engaged in promoting understanding and peace. Interreligious prayer and meditation are important to heal the hurts of the past and to mourn with the families of victims of violence, and to ensure through prayers and charity future hope and wellbeing for those in crisis, disaster, famine, and draught. Such public gatherings are totally voluntary and successful.

Religious relationship is like a life-mate in India. One has to live with others. The general atmosphere is conducive and the mind-set tolerant and accepting. Dialogue of life and exchange are vibrant among people of all faiths – in personal, community, and family relationships, exchange of goods, expertise, business transactions; many have friends across cultures and religions; our schools are mixed in colors and creeds; and friendship is cultivated across boundaries. Anyone coming from outside India cannot miss this diversity and intermingling.

There are many popular religious shrines, syncretic in nature, and people from diverse faiths frequent these shrines for their popularity, healing potential, and hospitality.³⁵ Devotion and religious consciousness are hallmarks of the Indian people, and there

³⁴ <<http://www.hmiindia.org/>>

³⁵ The Catholic Basilica at Vailankanni and Santhome, Nagore Muslim Darga, the Hindu temples at Madurai, Rameshwaram, Tirupathy are good examples in the South and Hindu temples at Kasi (Varanasi), Buddhist temple at Bodhi Gaya, Jain temples in Mount Abu and in Bihar state, the Sikh Golden temple in Amritsar... to name a few.

abound any number of big and small temples and shrines with frequent festivals, worships, religious discourses, and celebrations. People feed one another on special occasions, especially on temple/church feasts.

Two decades ago, pictures, wall-paintings, and stickers with multi-religious symbols were hardly seen in public. But now, they abound in public places, shops, public transports, government and private offices, educational and other institutions. People generally have become aware of religious conflicts and the need for peace processes and dialogue. Newspapers and their supplements carry sacred texts and symbols, myths and stories of different religions. Public meetings with an interreligious thrust are held on national feasts, and TV channels offer special programs on religious and festive occasions. *Deepavali* (festival of lights), *Pongal* (harvest feast), Christmas (birth of Christ) and Birthdays of Gods and great leaders, New Year, and other National days are celebrated commonly with public holidays. People take part in local religious feasts and festivals for socializing and community building, and these days are declared holidays for educational and other institutions.

The four-fold dialogue of life, of action, of spiritual experience, and theological exchange take place as and when occasions suit. The dialogue of life is a common experience of believers. This form of dialogue becomes more vibrant because of interreligious marriages. The dialogue of action is seen when religious neighbors stand together to safeguard life amidst calamities, natural and otherwise. They sheltered people and property in times of war-like violence. The religious youth specially engage in social activities to subvert human rights violations and injustices. People irrespective of creed share the devotion of the public on festive occasions. They happily contribute

donations for the celebration of big events and festivals related to temples, mosques, and churches.

The theological (concerning doctrines and dogmas) fundamentalism found among the Christians and the Muslims does not easily give space to theological exchanges or to alter convictions. In this, Christianity and Islam stand apart from the majority Hindus, whose plural outlook remains a big challenge to Christians and Muslims. Prejudices of theological nature are still rampant, naming the Hindus as "idol" worshipers, their religious and spiritual aspirations as "incomplete," and their means of salvation "dubious" and "doubtful." Despite these difficulties, dialogue efforts continue among multiple religions and also between two religions, such as Hindu-Christian, Buddhist-Christian, Jain-Christian³⁶ dialogue. The Holy See of the Catholic Church encourages all forms of dialogue with all people of good-will. This has been the experience of the author in the last two decades of his ministry of interreligious dialogue. The dark *shades* of violence have always been there and they are still obvious; but the bright *shores* of peace loving and peace building are great assets to India.

³⁶ Jain-Christian dialogue is a recent phenomenon in the Catholic Church and the author, because of his qualification and expertise, was invited by the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue to present a paper on the common grounds for dialogue between Christians and the Jains. For the full paper:

<http://www.dimmid.org/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC=%7B495510C2-8BE7-4B3C-A746-4247E069D6B2%7D> This meeting of Christian-Jain dialogue was organized by the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India, the Delhi Catholic Archdiocese, and the World Fellowship of Religions in Delhi on 13 November 2011 at Acharya Sushil Kumar Muni Jain ashram <<http://cbci.in/FullNews.aspx?Id=209>>.

For Further Reading

Amaladoss, Michael, SJ. *Beyond Dialogue - Pilgrims to the Absolute*. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 2008.

_____. *Making Harmony: Living in a Pluralist World*, ISPCK (1 October 2007).

_____. *Making All Things New: Dialogue, Pluralism, and Evangelization in Asia*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1990.

Chia, Edmund ,ed. *Dialogue: Resource Manual for Catholics in Asia*. Bangkok, Thailand: FABC-OEIA, 2001.

Hibbard, Scott W. *Religious Politics and Secular States: Egypt, India, and the United States*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012

Larson, Gerald James. *Religion and Personal Law in Secular India: A Call to Judgment*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2001

Om Prakash Dwivedi. *The Other India: Narratives of Terror, Communalism and Violence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012.

Rajeev Bhargava. *The Promise of India's Secular Democracy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, USA, 2010.

Rafiq Zakaria. *Communal Rage in Secular India*. Popular Prakashan, 2005.

Shani, Ornit. *Communalism, Caste and Hindu Nationalism: The Violence in Gujarat*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Sekhar, Vincent, SJ. *Building Strong Neighbourhoods – Religion and Politics in Secular India*. Bangalore: Claretian Publications, 2008.

_____. *Practice of Interreligious Dialogue – A Formation Manual of Education and Training of Clergy and Religious*. Bangalore: Claretian Publications, 2006.

_____. *Religions in Public Life – A Practical Guide to Religious Harmony*. Bangalore: Claretian Publications, 2004.

Shiva, Vandana. *India Divided: Diversity and Democracy Under Attack*, Seven Stories Press, 2003.

[摘要] 在印度豐富宗教傳統中，尋找聖神和自我亦是多樣性。今日的印度，宗教間的關係錯綜複雜，有衝突的時候，也有友好的時候。「種族的陰影」威脅宗教對話，但「正面的支柱」亦同時存在並以求同存異的精神歡迎人與人間的和諧與相互理解。儘管在歷史上，前人曾努力爭取宗教間的和諧，但今日印度仍有不少宗教衝突。印度教中的民族主義運動派別與少數宗教群體在保障少數群體權益、傳教與改宗等方面有著嚴重的衝突，但亦有不少努力建立宗教間和諧鄰舍的關係，以抗衡敵意的壓力。法律和團體的途徑成為尊重宗教自由和塑造良好的宗教群體關係的寶貴的方法。

Buddhist-Christian Relations Today

James FREDERICKS

今日佛教與基督教的關係

James FREDERICKS

[ABSTRACT] Despite the long history of Buddhist-Christian contacts, serious Buddhist-Christian dialogue is for the most part relatively recent. Timothy Richard and Karl Ludvig Reichelt took important steps in developing Buddhist-Christian understanding in the twentieth century. In some places today there are serious tensions. Some Evangelical Christians continue to view Buddhism very critically as a form of idolatry, and in South Korea there have been attacks by Christians on Buddhist institutions. In Sri Lanka, some Buddhists have been very critical of Christians and have attacked Christian institutions. Nonetheless, in most regions relations are good, and in many areas there has been extensive dialogue as well as cooperation on humanitarian projects. Humanistic Buddhists and the Buddhist Risshokoseikai movement highly value interreligious dialogue and cooperation with Christians and other religious traditions, and many Christians share their concerns. In Japan the work of Buddhist philosopher Kitaro Nishida and Catholic novelist Shusaku Endo illustrate the profound differences between the Buddhist and Catholic worldviews and paths. Outside of Asia, there are major differences between the immigrant Buddhist communities,

who interpret their tradition in profoundly different contexts, and the convert Buddhist communities, many of whom come from a Christian background; as a result their relations with Christians differ in important ways. Some Christians have engaged in meditation practice under the guidance of Buddhists and report major benefits. Some practitioners claim to belong to both the Buddhist and Christian traditions, but the author questions the theological coherence of this dual practice.

Relations between Christians and those who follow other religious paths are shaped by multiple factors. The tensions that impact Jewish-Christian and Muslim-Christian relations arise from a long history of conflict. Christian relations with Jews and Muslims, however, are also shaped by their monotheism – even though Jewish, Christian and Muslim monotheisms are by no means identical. Hindu-Christian relations are complicated by the legacy of British colonialism and Hindu nationalism. Assessing Christian relations with Hindus, however, is simplified by the fact that these relations are mostly confined, geographically speaking, to the India sub-continent, despite the increasing importance of the Hindu diaspora in North America and Europe.

Christian relations with Buddhists, however, are not shaped by a long history of conflict as is the case with relations with Jews and Muslims, although the colonial legacy is a significant factor in some parts of the world. Moreover, relations between Christians and Buddhists are not molded by monotheism, or even theism for that matter. Neither is the relationship between Christians and Buddhists determined by a single political or social context. On the contrary, Buddhist-Christian relations differ significantly in various parts of the world today. As a result, it is impossible to generalize about the

relationship. In this essay, I aim to document how Buddhist-Christian relations differ by locale.

Let me offer three preliminary examples of how locale shapes Buddhist-Christian relations. First, in some parts of the world, tiny communities of Buddhists are surrounded by a society made up largely of Christians and shaped by Christian thinking. This means that the vast majority of Australians are unaware of the Buddha's birthday, let alone that it is an important celebration for many Buddhists. Australian Buddhists, however, cannot but be aware of the birthday of Jesus. The reverse is true in other parts of the world. Tiny minorities of Christians live in a society shaped, in part at least, by Buddhism. Few Taiwanese know when Easter comes or what this Christian feast is about. In some parts of the world, the majority community is largely unaware of the minority community. Second, determining who a Buddhist is can be difficult. This is especially true in parts of Asia where religious practice is often not a matter of a self-chosen affiliation. Being religious does not entail a decision to join one group instead of another. A Chinese person, for example, sees no difficulty in being Buddhist in some respects and Daoist in other respects without ever ceasing to be Confucian. This is not the case with Christianity. Theoretically at least, Christianity is a chosen identity. To be a Christian entails a conscious choice to affiliate with a church, at least to some degree. This being the case, identifying who is a Christian can be much easier than determining who is a Buddhist. A third problem is presented by the fact that, in different parts of the world, Buddhists and Christians live side-by-side in very different political environments. In some places, religions are controlled by the state. In other places, Christians or Buddhists have a great deal of influence in the government. The history and the politics of these societies affect Buddhist-Christian relations in significant ways.

This essay surveys Buddhist-Christian relations in various parts of the world. It is by no means complete. Moreover, the aim of the essay is to provide scope, not depth. I have chosen a wide range of locations with the hope of demonstrating how different Buddhist-Christian relations can be in different parts of the world. For the sake of organizational clarity, I separate Asian locales from locales outside of Asia. In the locales outside of Asia that I treat, I separate Christian relations with immigrant Buddhist communities from Christian relations with convert Buddhist communities. I also include some material on Buddhist-Christian dialogue.

Buddhist-Christian Relations in Asia

Mainland China

The encounter between Buddhists and Christians in Mainland China was generally superficial prior to the establishment of the People's Republic in 1949 and has been minimal afterward. The Jesuits that came to China in the 16th and 17th centuries were deeply impressed by Chinese civilization and engaged in lively debates with learned Buddhists. Missionaries, Protestant as well as Catholic, came to China in the 19th century with the view that Christianity was destined by the plan of God to replace Buddhism. However, there is a precedent for creative exchanges today. Timothy Richard (1845-1919), a Protestant missionary met and befriended Yang Wen-hui (1837-1911), a Buddhist lay-person. Together, they translated Buddhist scriptures into English. Richard attempted to "Christianize" Buddhism by interpreting it in Christian categories. In addition, Karl Ludvig Reichelt (1877-1952) became an accomplished student of Buddhism in the belief that Buddhist teachings would lead to a deepening of Christian faith. Reichelt was a visionary. He

established a “Christian monastery” where Buddhist monks were welcome to visit which anticipated Buddhist-Christian monastic exchanges today. Eventually, this center was moved to Hong Kong and continues his work today.¹

After 1949, prospects for a creative encounter between Buddhists and Christians were dimmed by the Communist Party’s attempts to keep religious organizations under the control of the state. Communication, let alone cooperation, between Buddhists and Christians was seen as a potential threat. The Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) devastated Buddhism in China. Monasteries were destroyed. Monks were either forced to marry or placed in labor camps. Christianity suffered as well and was condemned as a foreign religion associated with imperialism. On the Mainland, neither Buddhists nor Christians have been in a position to encounter one another in any depth.

Data about the attitudes of Buddhists and Christians toward one another are scarce. Preliminary findings indicate that ordinary Chinese people tend to think of the Buddha as a deity equal to or higher than the Christian God. Many see Christianity as a foreign religion in a way that Buddhism is not. Protestant Christians tend to have a low opinion of Buddhist doctrine, sometimes labeling it superstition and idolatry. However, they are on good terms with Buddhist people, which is another indication of the pragmatic approach to religion characteristic of the Chinese. The so-called “underground” Catholic Church has been largely cut off from developments since the Second Vatican Council (1963-1965)

¹ For a comprehensive discussion of these historical events, see Lai Pan-chiu, *Buddhist-Christian Encounter in Modern China* (Hong Kong: Logos & Pneuma Press, 2003). Also see Whalen Lai and Michael von Bruch, *Christianity and Buddhism: A Multicultural History of their Dialogue* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis Books, 2001), pp. 68-103.

regarding relations with other religions. This part of the Church is conservative by international standards and not affected by Catholicism's current openness to other religions. The presence of Evangelical Christians operating "house churches" that are independent of the state is beginning to be a problem for the Chinese government. Chinese people in general do not approve of the militant proselytizing.²

The liberalization of Chinese society has begun to have an impact on Buddhist-Christian relations. In November of 2003, Professor Wu Yansheng (Shaanxi Normal University), Professor Wang Xiaochao (Centre for the Study of Morality and Religion, Tsinghua University, Beijing), and Professor Lai Pan-chiu (The Chinese University of Hong Kong) succeeded in organizing the first formal interreligious dialogue between Buddhists and Christians since the establishment of the People's Republic. In order to host the conference, Shaanxi Normal University established an Institute for Buddhist Studies. Since this meeting, academic exchanges have continued.

Hong Kong

Exchanges are a relatively new development on the Mainland. This is not the case with Hong Kong. There are several organizations supported by various Christian and Buddhists groups dedicated to building bridges of understanding and cooperation between the two religions. Tao Fong Shan, a Protestant organization, continues the pioneering work of Karl Ludvig Reichelt. In addition, the Christian

² Li Xianping, "A Case Study of Interreligious Relations in Contemporary China: Buddhist-Christian Interaction in Four Southeast Cities" in *Ching Feng* Vol. 5:1 (2004), pp. 93-118.

Study Center on Chinese Religion and Culture was established in 1957 to promote interreligious dialogue. Hong Kong also has a Joint Secretariat for the Colloquium of Religious Leaders. This organization includes multiple religions, not just Christianity and Buddhism. With groups of this size and scope, dialogue regarding religious teachings and practice tends to be superficial. The Joint Secretariat, therefore, has decided to concentrate on practical matters and has been very successful in promoting interreligious cooperation. For example, the Joint Secretariat has produced a number of statements having to do with community affairs. Statements have been crafted on moral education and peace among religions. Various religious organizations came together to produce a statement critical of the United States' preparations for the invasion of Iraq. Signatories included the International Buddhist Progress Society, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong, the Hong Kong Christian Institute, and the Committee for Ecumenical and Ecclesiastical Relationship of the Hong Kong Christian Council. The declaration was published in several secular and religious newspapers in Hong Kong.³

Activities and programs such as these come from the leadership level. What can be said about Buddhist-Christian relations among ordinary people in Hong Kong? Among Buddhists, there is neither hostility toward Christianity nor a particular enthusiasm for Buddhist-Christian dialogue. Meetings for dialogues concerning doctrinal matters are almost always initiated by Christians from Mainline Protestant, Anglican and Roman Catholic organizations. This fact, however, does not mean that all Christians take a positive view of interreligious dialogue. Most Protestants believe that

³ For a comprehensive view of interreligious relations in Hong Kong, see Peter K.H. Lee, "The Way of Interreligious Dialogue: The Hong Kong Experience," in *Interreligio* Vol. 34 (Winter, 1998), pp. 2-15.

dialogue with Buddhists has no purpose aside from being a tool of evangelization. There have been occasional tensions between Buddhists and Christians in Hong Kong as well. For example, Buddhists campaigned in 1997 to have Buddha's birthday declared an official public holiday. Part of their motivation was the perception that the government of Hong Kong was favoring certain Christian groups. When the birthday was celebrated for the first time as a holiday in 1999, advertisements appeared on buses speaking of waging "spiritual warfare" against the sin of "worshiping gods and Buddhas." This incident, however, must not be allowed to overshadow the fact that there are multiple institutions in Hong Kong that are well established and respected in the community dedicated to promoting cooperation and religious exchanges between Buddhists and Christians.⁴

Taiwan

With increases in prosperity and education, Buddhism is flourishing on Taiwan. There are several Buddhist organizations, centered on a charismatic founder, that include monks, nuns and enormous numbers of disciples. These organizations have been shaped by the "humanistic Buddhism" of Dharma Master Yin Shun (1906-2005) who was inspired by the motto, "All Buddhas arise in the human world; no one achieves Buddhahood in heaven." Thus, Buddhism in Taiwan has been reformed and modernized in order to speak to ordinary people and their contemporary religious and material needs. The centrality of these great Buddhist organizations also means that Buddhism is becoming a matter of self-chosen

⁴ Lai Pan-chiu, "The Role of Hong Kong in the Buddhist-Christian Encounter in China: A Post-Conference Reflection," in *Ching Feng* Vol. 5:1 (2004), pp. 119-133.

affiliation for many Taiwanese people. Somewhere between seven and fifteen percent of Taiwanese would self-identify exclusively as Buddhists.⁵ These facts have important implications for Buddhism's relationship with Christians.

For humanistic Buddhism, interreligious dialogue and cooperation are important. For example, Dharma Master Hsing Yun, the founder of the Fo Guang Shan movement, emphasizes the importance of good relations among the various religions as a way of promoting peace. Dharma Master Shin Dao, founder of the Ling Jiao Shan movement, has built the Museum of the World's Religions in Taipei. The mission of the museum is to educate visitors about the various religious traditions of the world, and also to provide a venue for creative exchanges among religious believers.⁶ In addition, the Tzu Chi Foundation, which is focused on providing social services, has a record of cooperation with various Christian organizations. On the Christian side, the Matteo Ricci Institute and Fu Ren University are Catholic organizations which regularly sponsor exchanges between the two religions. In addition, from 2000 to 2003 an important series of exchanges took place between the Modern Chan Society and the Chinese Lutheran Seminary. Themes discussed included ultimate truth and its expression, the divine and the Buddha Nature and justification by faith. Master Li Yuansong (1957-2003), the founder of the Modern Chan Society, is a fine example of someone who recognized the spiritual dimension of interreligious dialogue. Courageous and creative in his quest for truth, he allowed his Buddhist faith to be challenged and transformed by his encounter with Christian believers. In the view of some observers, the Christian

⁵ Vermander Benoit S.J. "Religions in Taiwan: Between Mercantilism and Millenarianism," in *Inter-Religio* (Taipei Ricci Institute, winter 1998), pp. 63-75.

⁶ Maria Reis Habito, "The Taipai, Taiwan. Museum of World Religions," *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, Vol. 22 (2002), pp. 203-205.

participation was more apologetic than courageous.⁷ Perhaps a more optimistic view would be to say that this encounter serves to illustrate that interreligious dialogue is a skill that takes many years to cultivate.

Korea

In Korea, Christian behavior toward Buddhists is divided sharply into intolerance and even violence on the one hand and openness and esteem on the other. Roman Catholics and some Protestants have cordial relations with the Buddhists. Unfortunately, this is not the case with many Evangelical Protestants whose intolerance of their Buddhist neighbors is a scandal to Christian faith. This situation is an indication that the traditional religious eclecticism of the Korean people has become, for good or for ill, a matter of religious affiliation.

Evangelical Christian intolerance is rooted in their conviction that everyone outside their church dwells in darkness and is bereft of grace. There is no salvation outside the Christian faith. Some Evangelicals associate Buddhism with idolatry and demon worship. Incidents of violence and harassment against Buddhists are so numerous that they can only be sampled. In 1986, the main dharma hall of Kumsansa Temple was burned to the ground. A man active in a local church confessed to the crime, but the police did not pursue the case because there was "no evidence." The central government quickly rebuilt the structure. The hall is listed as National Treasure No. 476. In 1990, the broadcasting booth of a Buddhist radio station

⁷ He Jiang-ming, "The Modern Chan Society and the China Lutheran Seminary in Conversation: A Case Study of Buddhist-Christian Dialogue in Contemporary Taiwan," in *Ching Feng* Vol. 4:2 (2003), pp.203-239.

was vandalized. In 1996, five Buddhist temples suffered arson attacks. One of the temples, Hwagyesa, is the home monastery of one of Korea's major Buddhist leaders in interreligious dialogue, Master Seung Sahn. The culprit was widely assumed to be a Christian extremist, although no suspects were identified. Priceless and irreplaceable works of art have been vandalized or stolen. At times, Buddhist temples have been occupied by Evangelicals with the aim of exorcising them of demons. The harassment of monks and nuns is so common that it is not newsworthy.⁸

Buddhists look on Evangelical Christian influence within the government with trepidation. In the 1980s, under the auspices of President Chun Doo-hwan (in office from 1980-1988), restrictive laws were passed interfering with the religious freedom of Buddhists. Temples were forcibly converted to museums or national parks. In 1984, a government textbook identified Buddhism as “a fading religion.” Non-Christians and students in public schools were required to learn biblical passages. In 1996, President Kim Young-sam (in office from 1993-1998) attended a Protestant church service on a military base in which Buddhists and Roman Catholics were required to attend. As a “security measure,” worshipers at a nearby Buddhist temple and a Catholic Church were encircled by troops and held for several hours. The cabinet of President Lee Myung-bak (in office 2008-2013) was made up almost completely of Evangelical Christians. On one occasion, President Lee offered a public prayer that disparaged Buddhism.⁹

There are positive signs in Korea as well. The newly elected president, Park Geun-hye, has not made her Christian faith a public

⁸ Harry L. Wells, “Korean Temple Burnings and Vandalism: The Response of the Society for Buddhist-Christian Studies,” in *Buddhist-Christian Studies*, Vol. 20 (2000), pp. 239-240.

⁹ *Korea Yearbook*, (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2009), pp. 22-24.

issue. She has recently invited representatives of major religious groups to the Blue House for discussions. Arson and vandalism has slowed considerably since 2000. For many years, Dr. Pyon Son-hwan, a Protestant Christian, worked tirelessly in promoting better relations between Christians and Buddhists in Korea. His courageousness is measured by the fact that he was dismissed from his position as president of the Methodist Seminary in Seoul and lost his ministerial privileges in 1992. Cardinal Jung Jin-suk, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Seoul is often invited to speak to gatherings of Buddhists and even to give lectures in Buddhist temples. The Roman Catholic Cathedral in Seoul hosts interfaith meetings on a regular basis. The same is true of several prominent Buddhist temples. Although relations between Catholic Christians and Buddhists are cordial, there was a moment of tension in 1984. The visit of Pope John Paul II was scheduled to coincide, inadvertently or not, with the celebration of the Buddha's birthday. Some Buddhist leaders protested that the timing of the event was "disrespectful" and "in bad taste." This unpleasantness, however, is untypical. Buddhist and Catholic nuns have cooperated on an organ-donation project. The Anglicans and some Protestant churches have active programs promoting theological exchange and cooperation. In addition, the Korean Conference on Religion and Peace brings together representatives of the six major faiths in Korea on a regular basis for consultations and cooperation on joint projects. There are increasingly frequent exchanges between socially engaged Buddhists in Korea and Christian Minjung theologians. Both groups are interested in how religious cooperation can contribute to the common good in society.¹⁰ Most impressively, in 1996, 3000

¹⁰ Minjung means "the people." Minjung movements, Christian but also Buddhist, aim at speaking to the needs of ordinary people. See Pyun Sun Hwan, "Buddhist-Christian Dialogue Toward the Liberation of the Minjung," in *Dialogue* Vol. 16:1-3 (1999), pp. 59-93.

Protestant, Roman Catholic and Buddhist clergy gathered for the “Religious Leaders’ Pilgrimage for National Reunification.” Eleven cities were visited by this group, making clear that cooperation for peace on the Korean peninsula can overcome sectarian differences.

Sri Lanka

Buddhist-Christian relations in Sri Lanka are also troubled, only in this case, the roles have been reversed. Some Buddhists are intolerant of their Christian neighbors. The problem in Korea lies in a Christian theology that excludes Buddhists from salvation. In Sri Lanka, intolerance of Christians is rooted in Buddhism’s connection with nationalism. By no means are all Buddhists in Sri Lanka nationalists. Buddhism, however, has become a symbol of the Sinhala ethnic group, the majority group in the country, and its nationalist ambitions. Nationalists contrast the “true Sri Lanka,” which is Buddhist and Sinhala, with the Tamil ethnic group, which is Hindu. The association of Buddhism with the “true Sri Lanka” also means that Christians have come under unwelcome scrutiny by extremist Buddhist monks in recent decades.

Contemporary tensions reflect a long history of conflict between Christians and Buddhists. The Portuguese, often brutal in their methods, brought Roman Catholic missionaries to Sri Lanka in the 16th century. Temple lands were confiscated and, in some cases, given to the Church. The Dutch, although less violent, reserved higher positions in the colonial government for Sri Lankan Protestants. The British gained complete control over the island in 1815. Christian schools were of great influence on the elites. Like the Dutch, positions of power within the colonial bureaucracy were reserved for Christian converts. British missionaries enjoyed

privileges at the expense of the monks. A Buddhist resurgence began when the Ven. Anagarika Dharmapala (1864-1933) called for a reform of Buddhism as a first step toward resisting the humiliation of the Sinhala people under the British. In this way, Buddhism came to be associated with the national hopes of the Sinhala ethnic group. The resurgence of Buddhism has had a major impact on Buddhist-Christian relations in Sri Lanka.¹¹

In 2004, a number of Buddhist monks took the controversial step of establishing a political party, the Jathika Hela Urumaya (JHU, National Sinhala Heritage Party). Part of the background for this move was the death of a prominent monk, the Ven. Gangodawila Soma, in 2003. Allegations were made that fundamentalist Christians were involved with this death. The Ven. Soma had denounced certain NGO's alleging that their social programs were merely a cover for Christian proselytizing. This was certainly the case with some of the NGOs. He also had credited the vices of cigarette smoking and alcohol to Christian influence. A rash of arson on Christian churches broke out after the monk's funeral. Subsequently, the JHU introduced a bill in parliament making "unethical conversion" illegal. Before passage, the bill was challenged in the Supreme Court. Parts of the bill were found to be un-constitutional. Evangelical Christians have taken the matter to the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Observers expect the bill to be enacted into law sometime in 2013. Much concern centers over what constitutes an un-ethical conversion. Christian churches run orphanages in Sri Lanka. If an orphan should become a Christian, would the Christians working in the orphanage have broken the law?¹²

¹¹ Lai and von Bruch, *Christianity and Buddhism*, pp. 39-67.

¹² Reshal Serasingha, "Buddhist and Christian View on the Anti-Conversion Bill in Sri Lanka: the Results of a Survey," in *Dialogue* Vol. 32 and 33 (2005-2006), pp. 105-131.

In Sri Lanka, Buddhists and Christians are being pulled apart by two great forces. On the one hand is the modern view of religious belief and affiliation as an individual choice. Christianity is a proselytizing religion whose right to spread its beliefs must be protected by law. Evangelicals do not associate their work with the colonial abuses of the past. Neither do they see how conversions could be destabilizing in a society that no longer has a colonial bureaucracy to hold it together. On the other hand, there is the pre-colonial view of religion as the basis for social order and cultural identity. Buddhist nationalists believe that Buddhism must function as the glue that holds society together now that the island is no longer a British colony. A university student was quoted in a newspaper as saying, “[W]e must rid ourselves of all those who convert (others), priests and pastors who destroy our Buddhist-Sinhalese culture.” In the same news article, a business man noted that “there is no place for many religions, many ethnic groups or many cultures. This is the only purely Buddhist and Sinhalese country in the world.”¹³ These extremist views are not typical of Sri Lankan Buddhists, either monks or laity. In addition, Mainline Protestants, Anglicans and the Catholic Church have remained quiet and, for the most part, Buddhist nationalists have left them alone.

Japan

Somewhat like Taiwan, there are several large Buddhist organizations in Japan whose members look on their faith as an affiliation. Among these organizations are the Risshokoseikai and the Soka Gakkai. In different ways, these groups are interested in building relationships with Christians. Of course, most of the

¹³ Malani Manel Perera, news articles in Asian News dated 30 January 2009. <<http://www.asianews.it/index.php?l=en&art=14360&size=A>> [2013-04-06].

Christians in Japan look upon their Christian faith as a personally chosen affiliation. The average Japanese person, however, does not look on religion in terms of conversion and entry into a community. This has an impact on both Buddhism and Christianity. For example, Japanese people sometimes come to a Christian church for baptism with no sense of "becoming" a Christian. Often they are looking for a ritual of some sort that will help them with a personal problem. These people have no intention of joining a Christian community after their baptism, yet they often claim to be a "Christian" because of the baptismal ceremony, even though they have little idea of what this might mean. This eclectic approach to rituals applies to weddings as well. For example, many Japanese get married in Christian churches or in hotel banquet rooms by a Christian minister or priest. More often, however, these "Christian weddings" are performed by someone who is not an ordained minister in any Christian denomination. He may not even be a baptized person with a connection to any Christian community. The Roman Catholic Church participates in this practice in a way that is ordinarily not allowed by canon law. A priest can marry a couple, in a church or in a hotel, using the standard Roman Catholic ritual for a wedding complete with scriptural readings, vows and the nuptial blessing. The ceremony, however, has civil status only. There is no religious meaning to the service. Usually, neither the bride nor the groom is baptized persons. "Christian weddings" are stylish and cost far less than a Shinto wedding. In a similar way, the Japanese make use of Buddhist funeral rituals. For an enormous amount of money, a monk, who is usually married, will perform a service for a bereaved family which consists in bestowing a Buddhist name on the deceased and chanting in a Japanese version of Medieval Chinese. Usually even the monk does not understand the meaning of the words. Families sometimes have stone monuments commemorating their dead on the

grounds of Buddhist temples. Thus, most Japanese look on Buddhism and Christianity as businesses which supply rituals when needed. Buddhism supplies funerals. Christianity supplies weddings. Interreligious dialogue and cooperation is of little if any interest to an average Japanese person.

The relationship between Buddhist and Christian organizations are generally good in Japan. This was not always the case. After the arrival of the Jesuits in the 16th century, communication between Buddhists and Christians was hampered by deep misunderstandings due to difficulties of language and the sheer difference between the two religions. Better understanding led to polemics. A persecution of Christians, supervised to an extent by Buddhist monks, began in the 17th century. After Christianity was made legal again in the mid-19th century, tensions remained between Buddhists and Christians until roughly 1895, when the rise of Shinto Nationalism became a threat to both religions.¹⁴

After World War II, Roman Catholics, Anglicans and Mainline Protestants have maintained cooperative relations with Buddhist organizations. As in other parts of the world, some Evangelical Christian churches remain an exception to the rule. Conversely, Christian groups tend to be wary of dealings with Soka Gakkai, in part because this Buddhist group has used dialogue with Christians to evangelize. Soka Gakkai has often been described as a cult. Buddhist-Christian cooperation in Japan can be seen in the fact that Cardinal Peter Shirayanagi (1928-2009), as archbishop of Tokyo, served as president of the Japanese Association of Religious Organizations. He was also asked to serve as director of the World Conference of Religions for Peace, an effort largely backed by the Risshokoseikai Buddhist organization. In addition, there are several

¹⁴ Lai and von Bruch, *Christianity and Buddhism*, pp. 104-151.

research centers, sponsored by Mainline Protestant churches, which facilitate interreligious understanding and dialogue with Japanese Buddhists.

Buddhists and Christians have been involved in discussions of one sort or another since the arrival of Francis Xavier in 1549. Two great Japanese thinkers of the 20th century serve to illustrate how difficult it is to attain a mutual understanding, Kitaro Nishida (1870-1945) and Shusaku Endo (1923-1996).

Kitaro Nishida began to teach philosophy at the University of Kyoto in 1911. He had an ambitious goal: to develop a philosophy that reflects the cultural traditions of East Asia. Greek philosophy is an underlying presupposition at work in the history of the West. Nishida was searching into the philosophical presuppositions that underlie the East. What makes his work significant for understanding Buddhist-Christian relations in Japan is that he turned to Buddhism, especially Zen, in pursuit of his goal. At the heart of East Asian Civilization, according to Nishida, lies the Buddhist principle of "emptiness." In Buddhist teaching, ultimate reality does not lay beyond this world, as the Greeks taught. Ultimate reality is all of reality here and now, just as it is. There is no Creator-God that lies beyond the created world. Nishida's philosophy has been of great value in clarifying the fundamental differences which separate Buddhism and Christianity. Nishida's successors have had a major impact on academic exchanges between Buddhists and Christians.¹⁵

Shusaku Endo is one of the great novelists of the twentieth century. He was both Japanese and a Roman Catholic Christian and these two facts go to the core of his work as a novelist. He said of

¹⁵ For a general introduction to Nishida's thought and the work of his followers, see James Heisig, *Philosophers of Nothingness: An Essay on the Kyoto School* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001).

himself that his Christian faith hung on him like a ready-made suit of clothes that needed to be altered. Endo was never quite comfortable being Japanese either. He sheds light on the relationship between Christianity and Buddhism in Japan because of his inability to reconcile his Christian faith with his Japanese culture. His greatest novel, *Silence* explores Christianity's inability to set down lasting roots in Japan.¹⁶ The novel takes place during the Tokugawa persecution of Christianity. A Jesuit priest is smuggled into Japan in order to serve the religious needs of the hidden Christians. Eventually he is caught and, in horrifying circumstances, forced to step on an image of Jesus on the cross. In this moment of despair, the priest hears the voice of Christ speaking to him from what can only be called "beyond": Christ speaks from beyond this world and even beyond the priest's own Christian faith. "Trample me," the desecrated image of Christ says to the priest, "for this is why I have come." This great novel should be placed beside the work of Kitaro Nishida. The "emptiness" that lies at the heart of the Buddhist view of reality cannot be reconciled with the "beyond" of the voice of Christ calling out to the priest. In the novel's most quoted passage, Endo likens Japan to a "swamp" that will never sustain the roots of Christian faith. Taken alongside the thought of Nishida, Endo's novel would seem to imply that Christianity and Buddhism can never be reconciled to one another.

Buddhist-Christian Relations Outside of Asia

In understanding Buddhist-Christian relations outside of Asia, we need to recognize that there are two distinct kinds of Buddhist communities to be found there. Immigrant Buddhist communities

¹⁶ Shusaku Endo, *Silence* (London: Peter Owens Publishers, 2007).

consist of immigrants from Asia and their descendants. The second kind of community is made up of converts to Buddhism who are not the descendants of immigrants from Asia. To make things simple, I will refer to these two kinds of communities as "immigrant" and "convert." Referring to the first kind of community as "immigrant" is misleading however. Many of these communities have multiple generations within them. The generation that emigrated from Asia may be long gone. Japanese-American Buddhist communities in North and South America as well as Hawaii, for example, were established over a century ago.

The two kinds of communities keep remarkably separate from one another, although they are certainly not hostile. In part, this is because the communities serve different purposes for their members. The major role of immigrant communities is to preserve cultural continuity with the homeland and generate social capital for their members. Generally speaking, these communities have little interest in monastic practices such as meditation. In contrast, convert communities are more focused on meditation. Almost all convert communities have been founded by Asian teachers. Leadership of these communities has now been passed on to disciples who converted to Buddhism under the direction of the master for the most part. All these factors form a social context for understanding Buddhist-Christian relations outside Asia.

Immigrant Communities

Starting around 1900, Japanese laborers came to Hawaii, the West Coast of the United States and Canada, Peru and Brazil. Buddhist institutions, primarily Pure Land Buddhist organizations, established communities to serve these populations. Eventually other

types of Japanese Buddhist denominations came as well. Often immigrant communities have tried to reformulate their faith to make it more intelligible to Christians. For example, during the Second World War and faced with considerable prejudice, Japanese-American Buddhists adopted the name “Buddhist Churches of America.” School children were taught to say that “Buddha was a God like Jesus” in order to shield themselves from the critical judgment of their Christian classmates. During the War, Japanese-American Buddhists and Christians were interred in camps, away from the West Coast of the United States. In these camps, there was some friction between Buddhists and Christians, but for the most part, ethnicity trumped religious affiliation. Today, there is a good deal of cooperation between Buddhist temples and Christian churches in Japanese-American neighborhoods.¹⁷

In Brazil, Japanese Buddhist immigrant communities get along well with Christians. Religiously speaking, Brazil is exceptionally diverse and tolerant. Buddhists are simply part of a much larger fabric of religions which includes Catholicism, Evangelical and Pentecostal Christianity as well as Afro-Brazilian religions such as Candomble. However, Japanese immigrant communities tend to be inward looking and generally untouched by this diversity, although this is beginning to change.

Korean, Chinese and Vietnamese Immigrant Communities

After the reform of immigration laws in the United States in 1965, Buddhists and Christians from Korea established major communities in Los Angeles, Chicago, and the New York area. The

¹⁷ Richard Hughes Seager, *Buddhism in America* (NY: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 51–69.

connection between these communities and Korea is, therefore, much stronger than in the older Japanese-American communities. This means that the relationship between Christians and Buddhists in these communities reflects, to an extent, the situation in Korea. In recent years, there have been some examples of harassment of Buddhist monks widely attributed to Evangelicals. The opening ceremony for a major Chinese Buddhist temple in Los Angeles, Hsi Lai temple, was picketed by Korean Christians. Buddhist relations with the Roman Catholic Church and many Protestant Christian communities are untroubled. Korean Buddhists have little interest in interreligious dialogue with Christians or with proselytizing.¹⁸

Chinese workers first came to North America in the 19th century. Since the reform of immigration laws in the United States in 1965, major migration of Chinese have come from the Mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan to the USA, and Australia. Buddhist organizations from Taiwan with interest in fostering dialogue and cooperation with Christians, especially Tzu Chi and Fo Guang Shan, have established extensive networks in some of these Chinese immigrant communities. Similar to their work in Taiwan, these groups are eager to promote interreligious dialogue and cooperation with Christians. Fo Guang Shan has a major temple complex in the Los Angeles area which regularly hosts Christian groups. The building of this temple was met with years of protest from neighborhood groups and complications with zoning boards. Some of the objections were legitimate (e.g., traffic, etc.) some of the objections were based on ignorance of Buddhism. A coalition of Christian groups joined with Fo Guang Shan and other Buddhist

¹⁸ *Korean Americans and their Religions: Pilgrims and Missionaries from a Different Shore*, edited by Ho-youn Kwan, Kwang Chung Kim, R. Stephen Warner (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001).

organizations in the area to lobby successfully for the temple's construction.¹⁹

Vietnamese Buddhists and Catholics came to the United States, Canada, Australia and France especially after 1975. During the period of French colonialism, Catholicism enjoyed privileges and Buddhism suffered from discriminatory government policies. In the new immigrant communities, these old tensions have largely been forgotten. Much of this can be attributed to the fact that the openness to other religions called for by the Second Vatican Council has led Catholics to abandon their belief that there is no salvation outside the boundaries of the visible church. Also, subsequent generations of Vietnamese Catholics have grown up in places where there are no “Catholic villages” which keep them separated from Buddhists. Religious diversity is simply a fact of life, to be taken for granted. Interfaith marriages are becoming more common with each new generation born outside of Vietnam. In addition, overseas Vietnamese Buddhists tend to be much more religiously active than their counterparts in Vietnam. Buddhism has become an affiliation for them. Thus, overseas Vietnamese Buddhists organizations are in a better position to cooperate with Catholic organizations in helping victims of natural disasters like the inundation of New Orleans due to hurricane Katrina and various disasters in Vietnam itself. Vietnamese Buddhists and Christians offer a particularly good example of what is called “the dialogue of life.” There is not much theological exchange, but there is much collaboration for the common good and even the informal sharing of faith. This has become the case in Vietnam as well, where French colonial favoritism to Catholics is not a vivid

¹⁹ Carolyn Chen, *Getting Saved in America: Taiwanese Immigration and Religious Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

memory and both communities have to deal with a communist government.²⁰

Christians eager for interreligious exchanges with members of these Buddhist communities need to be aware of the fact that immigrant communities need to look inward and form tightly knit relationships within their group as a way of coping with the trials of coming to a new country. They are in the difficult process of interpreting the meaning of their faith anew, in an American context. As was the case with Irish and Italian Catholic immigrants to the United States, religious affiliation and observance increases with immigration. They have to cope with inter-generational problems which often have a religious dimension. All this indicates that immigrant Buddhists should not be expected to be particularly interested in interreligious dialogue or cooperation or even capable of such activities, given the enormity of the challenge immigration poses to them.

Convert Buddhist Communities

As remarked above, the social separation of immigrant Buddhist communities from convert communities is striking. With immigrant communities, ethnicity tends to be the governing factor shaping Buddhist-Christian relations. With convert communities, the fact that community members are not born in Asia and not descended from Asian immigrants but rather adult converts to Buddhism is what is of utmost importance.

²⁰ Charles Prebish and Kenneth Tanaka, *The Faces of Buddhism in America*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), pp. 129-146.

In various parts of the world, many convert communities trace their roots back to Japan in one way or another. Soka Gakkai is a relatively new religious organization in Japan that is now establishing centers in different parts of the world. In a way that is uncharacteristic of almost all forms of Buddhism, Soka Gakkai actively proselytizes. In the United States, the group appeals to African Americans and Hispanics as well as European Americans. Risshokoseikai is another relatively new Japanese Buddhist organization which, like Soka Gakkai, is establishing itself internationally. Both groups are lay Buddhist denominations. Risshokoseikai has a particularly strong emphasis on interreligious cooperation.

There are also multiple Zen Centers throughout the world, including Africa and Oceania. Missionary monks, mostly of Zen lineages from Japan, came to Europe and the United States after World War II. These charismatic founders attracted disciples and established centers for meditation and teaching. The Zen centers are not monasteries in the strict sense. Some of the convert-Buddhists live within the centers, some outside. Attitudes toward Christians stretch across a wide spectrum within these communities. Some converts can be hostile or indifferent to Christianity as the religion they chose to leave behind. Others practice Zen even as they continue to practice their Christian faith and self-identify as Christians. Leaders of these Zen centers have often engaged in interreligious dialogue with Christians.²¹

The Sanbo Kyodan deserves special mention. This is a very small lineage of Zen in Japan, but it has had a disproportionate influence on Christianity in the United States and Germany. The

²¹ Helen Tworlov, *Zen in America: Five Teachers and the Search for an American Buddhism* (Tokyo: Kodansha America, 1994).

Sanbo Kyodan, centered in Kamakura, trained several Catholics who have returned to the West to establish meditation centers of their own. Some of these Catholics are examples of "dual religious belonging" in that they self-identify as both Zen Buddhists and as Catholic Christians. The Catholic students of Zen in Kamakura have moved to the United States and to Europe and founded communities of practice of their own.²²

Buddhist-Christian Dialogue

Buddhist-Christian relations developed significantly after the 1960s. The Second Vatican Council of the Roman Catholic Church had produced *Nostra Aetate*, a "declaration" on its relation to other religions, including Buddhism, which called for interreligious dialogue. The Council also led to the establishment of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. In addition, the World Council of Churches established its Sub-unit on Dialogue with People of Living Faiths and Ideologies. Both organizations have been pioneering in cultivating relations between Christianity and Buddhism. Often interreligious dialogue is thought of in four different forms: the dialogue of daily life, the dialogue of cooperation for the common good, the dialogue of theological exchange and the dialogue of religious experience (exchanges between monks and nuns in regard to mysticism and prayer).

I have already made observations about the Buddhist-Christian dialogue of life both in Asia and outside of it and need not repeat myself. Around the world, Buddhists and Christians live with one

²² See, for example, the many works of Sanbo Kyodan members such as Hugo Enomiya-Lassalle S.J., Ruben and Maria Habito of the Maria-Kannon Zen Center in Dallas, Texas, Bruce Harris of the Trois Rivières Zen Center in France and Hannelore Muler of the Zendo an der Isar in Germany.

another generally with little difficulty today. As noted, Korea and Sri Lanka can be exceptions to this rule at time. Good relations are almost always the case where Buddhists are the minority and where Christians are the minority as well. The fact that these minorities are almost always tiny is significant in appraising the dialogue of life.

More and more, Buddhists and Christians are involved in the dialogue of cooperation as well. I have already given multiple examples of Buddhists and Christians working together for the common good. In addition, there are increasing exchanges between what are called “engaged Buddhists” and Christians committed to the pursuit of social justice. “Engaged Buddhism” is a term invented by the Vietnamese Buddhist exile Thich Nhat Han who was a critic of both sides during the Vietnamese civil war.²³ In Asia, Christians, like the Jesuit Aloysius Pieris in Sri Lanka, and Buddhists, like Sulak Siveraksa in Thailand, are supporting one another in efforts to address the needs of the poor and the injustices wrecked by the rise of neo-Liberal economics. In Korea, Christians continue to develop Minjung theology (the “people’s theology”) which is rooted in the needs of the poor. Minjung theology has been an impetus in stimulating exchanges between Buddhists and Christians. Exchanges between engaged Buddhists and Christians are frequent in the United States and Europe as well.²⁴

The dialogue of theological exchange is abundant today. There are official, formal dialogues supported by all major Christian organizations, including the World Council of Churches and the Vatican. In the United States, Japan and Europe, this form of dialogue is supported by the Society for Buddhist-Christian

²³ See, for example, Thich Nhat Hanh, *Interbeing: Fourteen Guidelines for Engaged Buddhism* (3rd ed.; Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1999).

²⁴ Sally King and Paul O. Ingram *The Sound of Liberating Truth: Buddhist-Christian Dialogues in Honor of Frederick Streng* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 1999).

Studies.²⁵ The Japanese philosopher of Zen, Masao Abe, spent many years in the United States and Europe articulating the standpoint of Zen by comparing it with Western philosophy and especially Christian belief in God. Abe is the last generation of a line of philosophical thinking that began in Japan with Kitaro Nishida.²⁶ There are multiple centers devoted to the support of exchanges between Buddhists and Christians in Asia. Among many others in Japan, there is the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture and the National Christian Council (NCC) Center for the Study of Japanese Religions, which have sponsored major meetings of Buddhist and Christian thinkers. There are many Christian theologians whose thinking has been shaped significantly by Buddhist thought, including Seiichi Yagi, Ruben Habito, Paul Ingram and myself.

In addition, there is a great deal of the dialogue of religious experience. In 1977, the Catholic Benedictine Order established the Monastic Interreligious Dialogue (MID).²⁷ This organization has been largely devoted to exchanges with Buddhists. In keeping with the monastic tradition (Buddhist and Christian) of hospitality, MID facilitates Buddhist monks living in Catholic monasteries. Methods of prayer and meditation as well as the social responsibility of the contemplative are matters of discussion. In 1996, the Dalai Lama called for a major meeting of Buddhist and Christian monks at Gethsemani Abbey, the monastery of Thomas Merton, whom the Dalai Lama had met decades earlier. Merton was a Catholic monk who must be seen as one of the great pioneers of spiritual exchange between Christians and Buddhists. The themes of this conference included ultimate reality and the spiritual life, prayer and meditation,

²⁵ <www.society-buddhist-christian-studies.org/>

²⁶ Masao Abe, *Zen and Western Thought* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989).

²⁷ <www.monasticdialog.com/>

growth in the spiritual life, community and guidance, spirituality and society.²⁸ In Japan, Rev. Franco Sottocornola, a Catholic, has established Seimeizan, a retreat center with the Ven. Tairyu Furukawa, a Zen Buddhist. William Johnston, a Jesuit who taught for many years in Tokyo, has published multiple books on Christian mysticism in dialogue with Buddhist tradition.

Catholic experimentation with Buddhist meditation practices was the cause of alarm in some circles in the Vatican. In 1989, an office in the Vatican concerned with doctrinal matters published a warning regarding the danger of Catholics losing the Christ-centered character of all Christian prayer.²⁹ This warning had been preceded by a ground-breaking meeting of multiple religions in Assisi in 1986. The meeting was called by Pope John Paul II and included several Buddhists. The purpose of the meeting was to come together to pray for peace. Some Catholics, especially Catholics who have rejected the Second Vatican Council, were outraged over the Assisi meeting. One group even went into schism. The Assisi meeting begs the question of what it means for a Buddhist to “pray” with a Christian. Christian prayer, of course, presumes the existence of God. Buddhists do not “pray” to a transcendent God. Many Christians with extensive experience in this matter think of Buddhist meditation practices as a kind of “gift” to Christians as they practice their own spirituality.

Another source of confusion is the new and increasing phenomenon of “dual religious belonging.” Of course, “belonging”

²⁸ *The Gethsamani Encounter: A Dialogue on the Spiritual Life by Buddhist and Christian Monastics*, edited by James Wiseman and Donald Mitchell (NY: Continuum, 1999).

²⁹ “Letter to Catholic Bishops on Some Aspects of Christian Meditation,” (Vatican website:

<http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19891015_meditazione-cristiana_en.html>.

to more than one religion is the ordinary way of being religious in China, Korea and Japan. As noted above, Chinese people have had little difficulty engaging in Buddhist, Daoist and Confucian practices. This ancient pattern has become more complicated in these areas after the introduction of Christianity. How is it possible to be a Christian and a Buddhist at the same time? Belonging to more than one religion was more or less unheard of in the West until recently. The so-called "new age spirituality" usually aims at dissolving boundaries distinguishing one religion from another. Ironically, this spirituality more often than not involves no religious belonging at all. The spiritual quest, although it may incorporate elements of Christianity, Buddhism and other religions, is strictly individual. More importantly, there is a relatively recent phenomenon associated with Buddhists and Christians who have devoted themselves to interreligious dialogue intently for a sustained period of time. These Christians and Buddhists sometimes report that they have more in common with one another than with certain (usually conservative) members of their home traditions. This double belonging is rarely total. Instead, Christians report that their faith has been deeply transformed by their Buddhist friends and that they hold Buddhist teachings in high esteem. Buddhists report the same. Both remain devoted to one another without fully identifying with the religion of the other. The most radical case of Buddhist-Christian dual belonging is seen by those who self-identify completely as both a Buddhist and as a Christian. There are devout, practicing Catholics, for example, who have embraced Buddhism completely. In my view, this kind of dual belonging cannot be supported theologically. Christian belief recognizes Christ as the unique savior of the world. Christ is the "alpha and the omega," as the Christian Bible affirms. Moreover, Christians pray to the God of Jesus Christ and await the fulfillment of God's plan in the second coming of Christ at the end of

time. Buddhism is a very different religion, at least in terms of doctrine. Perhaps the most sensible approach would be to remain puzzled about how these two religions can be so different doctrinally and so similar in terms of spiritual practices.³⁰

I have noted repeatedly that relations between Buddhists and Christians are generally good everywhere in the world. Sri Lanka and Korea offer exceptions to this rule. But even in these places, relations are so complicated that a great deal of explanation and qualification is required in order to understand relations between Buddhists and Christians correctly. In light of all that has preceded, perhaps the most useful point to be taken is that the “generally good” relations between Buddhists and Christians becomes truly interesting when we take note of all the different kinds of generally good relations there are. Buddhists and Christians get along with one another successfully in different ways in different places in the world. Korea is not Brazil. Los Angeles is not Colombo. The meditation groups in Europe which bring Buddhists and Christians together are not the same as meditation groups in Japan. What is remarkable is that Buddhists and Christians have found so many ways to show not only tolerance, but respect and even deep esteem for one another. They are learning to look on one another’s religion with reverence. Given the many problems interreligious relations pose in the world today, Buddhists and Christians can stand together and give the world something to hope for.

³⁰ Rose Drew, *Buddhist and Christian? A Study of Dual Religious Belonging* (Oxford: Routledge, 2011).

For Further Reading

Cornille, Catherine, ed. *Many Mansions? Multiple Religious Belonging and Christian Identity*. Maryknoll NY: Orbis Books, 2002.

Cornille, Catherine and Stephanie Corigliano, eds. *Interreligious Dialogue and Cultural Change*. Eugene OR: Cascade Books, 2012.

Lai, Pan-chiu. *Buddhist-Christian Encounter in Modern China*. Hong Kong: Logos & Pneuma Press, 2003.

Lai, Whalen and Michael von Bruch. *Christianity and Buddhism: A Multicultural History of their Dialogue*. Maryknoll NY: Orbis Books, 2001.

Phan, Peter, ed. *Christianities in Asia*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Prebish, Charles and Kenneth Tanaka. *The Faces of Buddhism in America*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998, pp. 129-146.

Thelle, Notto. "The Christian Encounter with Japanese Buddhism." In *Handbook of Christianity in Japan*. Leiden: Brill, 2003: 227-248.

Williams, Duncan Ryuken and Christopher S. Queen, eds. *American Buddhism: Methods and Findings in Recent Scholarship*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1999.

[摘要] 儘管佛教與基督教相遇的歷史不短，但之間的嚴肅對話卻只是近代才出現。在二十世紀李提摩太(Timothy Richard)和艾香德(Karl Ludvig Reichelt) 在這促進佛教與基督教間的相互理解做了不少工作。今日，部份福音派基督徒仍敵視佛教為迷信偶像的宗教，在韓國甚至有基督徒攻擊佛教團體，而在斯里蘭卡，佛教徒則敵視以至攻擊基督教團體。儘管如此，大部份時間彼此有著良好的關係，在不同的範疇都有廣泛的對話，及在人道工作上合作。人間佛教與及佛教立正佼成會均十分重視宗教對話，與基督宗教及其他宗教合作，不少基督徒亦贊同他們的主張。在日本，佛教哲學家西田幾多郎與天主教作家遠藤周作展示了佛教與天主教間在世界觀和修道上的差異。在亞洲以外，移民的佛教團體與來自基督教背景的改信佛教的團體間亦有著很大的差異，而他們與基督宗教的關係亦十分不同。不少基督徒亦從佛教的冥想中有所得著，其中有些更自稱同時追隨佛教和基督教的傳統，但作者亦對神學上對這種融合兩教的做法能否達至神學上的一致性表示懷疑。

Ecumenical Cooperation and Inter-religious
Dialogue in 20th Century Catholic History:
Legacies of the Past and Prospects for the Future

Richard MADSEN

二十世紀天主教史中的宗派合作與宗教對話：
過去的遺產與將來的希望

Richard MADSEN

[ABSTRACT] In the early 20th Century, China was an important birthplace of modern ecumenism and inter-faith dialogue among liberal Protestants; but because of the condemnation of modernism by Pope Pius X, Chinese Catholic theology long remained frozen in the strongly anti-modernist pre-Vatican II stance. Under Communist rule, the division between official and unofficial (or "underground") segments of the Catholic Church sapped away energies that could have gone toward more creative outreach to other communities. In the restrictive environment of the Mainland there are continuing difficulties in gaining access to the latest ecumenical theology. Catholics on the Mainland are often rural, where religion is a marker of an exclusive identity with little openness to other communities. In Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan, there have been

important Catholic initiatives, including the Matteo Ricci Institutes and the Justice and Peace Commission of Hong Kong, which has worked with activists from many different faiths to promote social justice. However, some other Chinese Catholics have vigorously protested against these initiatives. Changes in society strongly shape the level of ecumenical and interreligious openness to new ideas: Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau are urban societies with broad, mobile middle classes where members of different faiths work and study together and often become friends and marriage partners. This contact often inspires a need to learn from one another. Catholics in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau have greater possibilities for theological speculation and greater opportunities to learn from traditional Chinese religious culture. It is difficult to predict the degree of mutual future influence between Mainland China and other Chinese areas.

In the early 20th Century, China was an important birthplace of modern ecumenism and inter-faith dialogue. Many Western Protestant missionaries were inspired to develop ecumenical inter-denominational church councils because they became aware that denominational divisions weakened the credibility of Christianity and undermined the effectiveness of their work.¹ Also as Lian Xi argues in his book “The Conversion of Missionaries”, many important Protestant missionaries in the first half of the 20th century came to deeply respect the richness and profundities of Confucian, Daoist, and Buddhist traditions and began to ask serious questions about the uniqueness and universality of Christianity. Some were moved to develop theologies that combined concepts from Western

¹ Daniel H. Bays, *A New History of Christianity in China* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), pp. 92-111.

Christian and indigenous Chinese traditions. Others experimented with forms of worship that drew from practices of all traditions. Some indeed began to hold that Christianity was not the only path to salvation and to doubt that Christianity was necessarily superior to indigenous Chinese beliefs.²

But this was a Protestant rather than a Catholic phenomenon. In this article I will explain the theological, sociological, and political reasons why this was so throughout most of the 20th century. I will, however, conclude by showing how changing theological, sociological, and political contexts could lead to a greater degree of Catholic ecumenism and interfaith dialogue in the early 21st century.

Theological Context

The Protestant missionaries who took the lead in ecumenism and inter-faith dialogue were supported by liberal Protestant theology of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It was a theology that saw Jesus mainly as a great moral teacher rather than the Son of God who performed miracles and rose from the dead. Because of their experiences in China, however, some liberal Protestant China missionaries pushed the implications of the theology to new limits. Others, like Pearl Buck, who began as a conservative evangelical missionary, had conversions to theological liberalism. Indeed, some prominent missionaries pursued this view so enthusiastically and so articulately that they provoked a backlash in the American Protestant

² Lian Xi, *The Conversion of Missionaries: Liberalism in American Protestant Missions, 1907-1932* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

community, which was the origin of the modern “fundamentalist” movement.³

Catholics meanwhile were immune to such theological debates. Movements toward re-interpretations of the Catholic tradition were strongly condemned in the 19th century by Pope Pius IX and Pope Leo XIII. Finally, in 1907 Pope Pius X put decisive halt to theological development with his long encyclical against “modernism,” which he called the “synthesis of all heresies.” To fight modernism, Pius X decreed that all priests and laity who followed its theologies be purged from any institutions of Catholic education. A special commission was established to ferret out modernist heresies. Bishops were instructed to censor any books or publications and to forbid any assemblies that espoused modernist ideas. All priests and candidates for the priesthood were to swear an “oath against modernism”, which declared in part: “I sincerely hold that the doctrine of faith was handed down from the apostles through the orthodox Fathers in exactly the same meaning and always in the same purport. Therefore I entirely reject the heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church held previously.”⁴

The condemnation of modernism and the ecclesiastical apparatus constructed to root it out ensured that Catholic missionaries to China were trained to avoid anything that suggested theological or moral relativism. The Catholic missionary encounter produced its own kind of soul searching and accompanying ecclesiastical controversies, but they were about control rather than

³ Lian Xi, pp. 25-128; 207-228.

⁴ Pope Pius X, “*Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, Encyclical on the Doctrines of the Modernists, 8 September 1907,” *Acta Apostolica Sedis*.

doctrine. The Belgian Vincentian Vincent Lebbe was in the forefront of missionaries criticizing the domination of the Chinese Catholic Church by foreigners, who all too often worked hand in hand with the political powers of their home countries. Lebbe was indeed ostracized by members of his own congregation and forced by ecclesiastical authorities to leave China in 1920 (returning in the 1927 to establish his own congregation of Chinese priests), but a letter of his to Pope Benedict XV had prompted the 1919 apostolic letter *Maximum Illud* calling for the establishment of a native clergy and hierarchy.⁵ Over intense active and passive resistance from foreign missionaries, especially the French, a first group of six Chinese bishops were ordained by Pope Pius XI himself in 1926.

To promote an indigenous clergy and hierarchy, Pope Benedict XV had called for educating Chinese clergy up to the same level as foreign clergy. This meant among other things a Chinese seminary education that would condemn theological modernism as rigorously as European seminaries. For their part, Chinese bishops were eager to prove that they were every bit as orthodox as their Western counterparts. While calling for the establishment of an indigenous Church, Pope Benedict XV defined the missionary calling as one to save the souls of "the numberless heathen still sitting in the shadows of death."⁶ This meant that there would be no movements for inter-religious dialogue or even ecumenical dialogue within the Chinese Catholic Church.

In a way, the struggles within the Chinese Catholic church over indigenous versus foreign control were more relevant to the

⁵ Jean-Paul Wiest, "The Legacy of Vincent Lebbe," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* Vol. 23:1 (January, 1999), pp. 33-37.

⁶ Pope Benedict XV, "Maximum Illud, Apostolic Letter on the Proclamation of the Faith throughout the World, 30 November 1919."

contemporary May Fourth historical moment in China than were the struggles among Protestant churches over ecumenical theology. The popes who strongly criticized the alignment of missionary work with imperial power and called for the establishment of an indigenous Chinese clergy and hierarchy placed themselves on the side of modern Chinese nationalism. In embracing the wisdom of Daoism, Buddhism, and Confucianism, liberal Protestant missionaries were affirming traditions that nationalistic Chinese modernizers considered remnants of a past culture, which had to be superseded if China was to gain modern wealth and power.

Sociological Context

But while the papal determination to indigenize the Chinese Church's leadership helped to align the Church hierarchy with nationalistic modernizing elites (eventually leading to a very close association between Nanjing Archbishop, later Cardinal, Yu Bin and Chiang Kai-shek), the social circumstances of most Catholics aligned the Church with conservative elements of traditional culture. After the debacle of the Rites Controversy in the 17th century, Church focused on developing communities of poor rural peasants rather than educated elites. Life in rural communities was intertwined with a diffuse polytheistic religiosity punctuated by festivals that gave the communities meaning and solidarity. Catholic converts were forbidden to take part in these festivals, forbidden to possess images or symbols of the traditional pantheon, and forbidden from conducting the traditional funeral rites for their deceased family members. However, rural Catholics maintained the social structures that had sustained the traditional practices. Typically their faith was embedded in large extended patrilineal families and the faith was passed down from parent to child through the generations. The forms

of life in these communities mimicked that of non-Christian communities – family centered worship, community centered festivals. It was just the content that was different: instead of local gods, the Catholics were under the protection of Mary and the saints. Instead of worshipping the ancestors through Confucian ritual, the Catholics prayed to them on All Saints and All Souls day. Catholic families brought in brides from other Catholic villages, but followed the same procedures as non-Catholics in selecting mates and brokering marriages. Since the actual lifestyles of Catholics and non-Catholics were so similar, it was all the more important that Catholics maintain formal markers of their particular identity – and that meant rejecting Daoist, Buddhist, and Confucian beliefs and rituals. It was indeed their clinging to distinctive markers of identity that enabled local Catholic communities to withstand tumultuous social change and persecution.⁷

Political Context

In the 1920s, the efforts by the Vatican to indigenize the Chinese Catholic Church did indeed lead it to align its native hierarchy with nationalist political leaders. But this was coupled with the Vatican's definitive condemnation of Communism in the 1930s.⁸ Thus the Church became firmly committed to the KMT regime, which led to militant suppression of the Church by the victorious Communists after 1949. This had important consequences for ecumenical cooperation and inter-faith dialogue. Domination by

⁷ Richard Madsen, *China's Catholics: Tragedy and Hope in an Emerging Civil Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), pp. 50-75.

⁸ The definitive condemnation came from Pope Pius XI in his 1937 encyclical "Divini Redemptoris."

the Communist regime kept the Church from participating in the Second Vatican Council. As a result, Chinese Catholic theology remained frozen in the strongly anti-modernist pre-Vatican stance. At the same time, in its effort to control and contain and eventually strangle religion, the Communist regime linked the five recognized religions (Buddhism, Daoism, Islam, Protestant Christianity, and Catholicism) to bureaucratically organized “patriotic associations”, supervised by the Party’s United Front Department.

As is well known, a few bishops cooperated with this arrangement, but most Catholics did not because the Vatican strongly rejected it. The bishops who did join the Catholic Patriotic Association became alienated from the great majority of Catholic believers. But one role imposed on those Patriotic Bishops was a kind of ecumenism. Under government control, they were supposed to cooperate with the patriotic leaders of the other religions in issuing statements of support for government policies. This politicized ecumenism-from-above by bishops who had lost their legitimacy must have been deeply offensive to most Chinese Catholics. Meanwhile, it was rural Catholics’ strong identification with distinctive doctrines that gave them an indelible identity that maintained and even strengthened itself under political persecution. The political context during the Maoist era thus thoroughly inoculated most Chinese Catholics from any inclination to engage in ecumenism or inter-religious dialogue.⁹

Beginning in 1979, Deng Xiaoping’s Reform Era opened new opportunities for partial religious freedom. Under the overall supervision and control of the Religious Affairs Bureau (now called the State Administration for Religious Affairs), clergy were returned to service, seminaries were re-opened, religious communities were

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-49.

enabled to function publically. But as is well known, millions of other believers who found these arrangements inadequate have developed their own "underground" communities. The division between official and unofficial (or "underground") segments of the Catholic Church has been particularly vexing and has sapped away energies that could have gone toward more creative outreach. There are continuing difficulties in a restrictive environment of getting access to the latest ecumenical theology, and the sheer pressure of rebuilding basic seminary education in such a challenging environment leaves little time and energy for potentially controversial modern theological initiatives. Furthermore, insofar as underground portions of the Church rightly or wrongly want to differentiate themselves from the government supervised portions of the Church, they would reject what passes for ecumenism now – the top-down state-directed efforts to bring religious leaders to promote a "harmonious society."

Ecumenical Outreach in Greater China

This is by no means to say that creative outreach to Protestants and dialogue with other religions cannot take place within Chinese Catholic culture. Such ecumenism has indeed developed outside of Mainland China, in Taiwan and Hong Kong-Macau, on both theological and pastoral levels. This is because of differences in the theological, sociological, and political contexts of these societies.

Study of and dialogue with non-Christian religions has been carried out most notably by Jesuits (and associated lay scholars) in the Matteo Ricci Institutes in Taipei and Macau. From the time of its establishment by Fr. Yves Raguin in 1966, the Ricci Institute in Taipei has supported ground breaking studies of Chinese popular

religion. The tradition has continued with successor Jesuits at the Ricci Institutes in Taipei and Macau, fostering first-rate research on both Confucianism and Buddhism.¹⁰ Very important work has also been done by SVD scholars in Taiwan's Fu Jen University on Catholic efforts to engage with Confucianism. The Jesuit Fr. Gerald Martinson has carried out widely watched dialogues on Taiwan's Kuangchi television station with Buddhist leaders like the late Venerable Sheng Yen.

Such scholarly research and public dialogue can provide the material for deep theological reflection. This work has enriched theological studies in seminaries and divinity schools around the world, from Berkeley to Leuven. It has influenced training in Taiwan and Hong Kong seminaries, although due to a relative lack of resources, not as much as might have been expected.

On a pastoral level, clergy, religious, and lay Catholics in Taiwan and Hong Kong-Macau have engaged in wide-spread cooperative networks with both Protestants and non-Christians to promote social justice and charity. Since the 1970s, members of the Justice and Peace Commission of Hong Kong have worked with activists from many different faiths to promote social justice.¹¹ Throughout the past decade, Cardinal Zen has usually marched at the head of the annual parade on July 1 to advocate for greater freedom, transparency, inclusivity, and equity in Hong Kong.

Although Catholics have long had their own hospitals and social welfare services, they also engage in regular cooperation with Protestant and Buddhist groups to carry out works of mercy. Catholic nuns have been especially active in this regard, but the Catholic

¹⁰ <www.riccibase.com>

¹¹ <www.hkjp.org>

hierarchy has demonstrated respect and encouragement to all major efforts to feed the poor and comfort the afflicted. In 2009, the late Cardinal Shen of Kaohsiung was one of the first signatories (together with President Ma Ying-jeou and the president of Indonesia – a Buddhist and Muslim respectively) of the nomination of Venerable Master Cheng Yen of Tzu-chi for the Nobel Peace Prize.¹²

Such active ecumenical engagement has not always developed smoothly. From the 1970s until now, there have been theological debates and different approaches to resolving pastoral dilemmas over such issues as inter-faith marriage. As for cooperation over Justice and Peace issues, there have been predictable controversies as to how far Catholic clergy and religious should ally with “leftist” Christian and secular activists in challenging the government. Often this has been exacerbated by differences in perspective between a younger generation of foreign missionaries and an older generation of Chinese clergy and religious. When three Maryknoll priests joined with Presbyterians in Taiwan in 1978, attending an ecumenical prayer service to pray for the protection of human rights, they provoked a letter of denunciation signed by 215 local Chinese priests: “You are destroying the work of the Church. We ask you to leave our country and go to anywhere else where you could make your ideals come true.”¹³ Yet the result in Chinese Catholic areas outside of the mainland has been a great churning of ideas and practices that has enabled Catholics to engage actively in a religiously pluralistic society.

¹² Personal communication. I signed the letter too.

¹³ Richard Madsen, “The Spectacular Growth and Precipitous Decline of the Catholic Church in Taiwan”, published in Chinese in *Taiwan Xuezhì* 6 (October, 2012), pp. 53-76. Quotation is from p. 71.

Theological and Sociological Contexts of Ecumenism

A first condition enabling Catholic ecumenical and interreligious outreach in Taiwan and Hong Kong was the access both societies enjoyed to the vision of the Second Vatican Council, especially in the Declaration on Religious Freedom and the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. This was facilitated by the ability of Catholics to travel abroad and also by the influx of a younger, “Vatican II generation” of priests and nuns in the 1960s and 1970s. There are of course ongoing controversies over the meaning and relevance of the Vatican II documents. Some Catholics think the documents allow them to leave behind the restrictive orthodoxy imposed by Pius X’s denunciation of modernism. Others, concerned about moral and ontological relativism, see Vatican II as maintaining continuity with the earlier papal pronouncements, while simply making the absolute truth more accessible. Although these controversies have been strongest in Europe and North America, they do find echoes in Asia.

Openness to new ideas, as well as controversy over them, is grounded in changing sociological realities. Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau are urban societies with broad, mobile middle classes. Members of different faiths work and study together and often become friends and marriage partners. This mixing not only exposes them to a wide variety of religious ideas and practices, but also often inspires a need to learn from one another. At the same time, life in such cities presents new ethical dilemmas and new searches for the meaning of life. Religiously sensitive persons who are concerned about the materialism and competitive individualism of hyper-developed world cities are inclined to look for allies broadly

among the serious heirs to all of the spiritual traditions of the world, and they seek out religious leaders who share such concerns.

There are of course opposing tendencies in the modern city. To escape isolation, individuals can seek out exclusive enclaves of the like-minded who see themselves pitted against the outside world. One does find such enclaves in the more open cities outside Mainland China, for example among some evangelical Christians and among sectarian religious societies like Falungong. Yet there are few such quasi-sectarian enclaves among Catholics, a tribute perhaps to the leadership of the Church in this part of Asia eager to make their relatively small Catholic communities be seen as good citizens of a wider pluralistic society.

The potential sectarian forces can however be exacerbated by political manipulation. The Hong Kong SAR government gives each of the major officially defined religions – Catholicism, Protestant Christianity, Buddhism, Daoism, and Islam a particular voice in the political process. For example, they can each select electors to the commission that elects the Chief Executive (but never enough to overturn the preferences of the majority of the electors promoted by Beijing). In return for such recognition, the designated leaders of the major religions have been relatively compliant with the Hong Kong government – with the notable exception of Cardinal Zen who has led protests against policies that would for example diminish church control over its Catholic schools. The effect of government attempts to subsume the various religious communities under a politically constructed civic framework is to divide religious communities from one another when they perceive different costs and benefits from cooperation with the government. This may indeed be the intention of the Hong Kong government.

Urbanized Asian societies thus provide fertile soil for the growth of ecumenism as well as some potential for sectarian religious conflict. Whether the more ecumenical or more conflictual tendencies will predominate is largely dependent on religious and political leadership. Catholic Church leadership takes its cues from the Vatican, of course. But even though Pope Benedict XVI was somewhat cooler than his immediate predecessors about ecumenism, Asian Catholic leaders have remained ecumenically active. Now, Pope Francis brings with him a reputation from Argentina for being relatively open about inter-faith dialogue, and one might predict a continuation, even a deepening of such tendencies in Taiwan and Hong Kong-Macau. Uncertainty comes from the role that may be played by the governments of Hong Kong and Macau, which combine external promises to maintain civic freedoms with a tendency to suppress religious as well as political pluralism through subtle suppression and the divide and rule tactics that they like to use on the Mainland.

Conclusion and Prognosis for Mainland China

The context of urban Chinese Catholic societies on the periphery of Greater China bears some similarities to the context that pushed liberal Chinese Protestant Christians in the early 20th century to undertake inter-religious dialogue and ecumenical cooperation. For Catholics in Taiwan and Hong Kong-Macau there are now greater possibilities for theological speculation and greater opportunities to learn from traditional Chinese religious culture. There is a need to band together with other people of faith against the materialism and social injustices of a globalized capitalist economy. There is the need for people uprooted from older forms of religious community to find new affiliations. There is enough of an analogy to

suggest that there will be movement within some portion of the Catholic Church toward similar forms of theological and pastoral ecumenism – and to predict counter-reactions similar to earlier fundamentalist reactions to liberal Protestantism.

But the analogies to the earlier period are only partial. Catholics are still more constrained by a centralized doctrinal discipline. Meanwhile the global Catholic Church is facing internal struggles that keep it on the defensive and push many Catholics to turn inward. Finally, the pressures of an uncertain political context sometimes produce more division than cooperation. Nonetheless we can predict modest moves forward in Chinese Catholic ecumenism in Taiwan and Hong Kong-Macau.

Will the more open posture of Catholics on the periphery of Greater China transform the ways that Catholics on the Mainland live their faith? This partly depends on large geopolitical factors that cannot be predicted. It is entirely possible that the Mainland could transform Hong Kong-Macau and Taiwan rather than vice versa. But even if the religious atmosphere of these peripheral societies does influence the Mainland, the process will be slow. Much of the Chinese Catholic church is still embedded in local rural communities for whom their faith is a marker of an exclusive identity. Even in the big cities like Shanghai, old Catholic communities consist of something like urban villages that take some pride in staying aloof from the larger society.¹⁴ Such sociological conditions will change gradually and for now they are still inhibited by a government that prefers to keep Catholics divided and isolated.

¹⁴ The sociological composition of the "old Catholics" of Shanghai and the legacy of persecution from the 1950s is detailed in Paul P. Mariani, *Church Militant: Bishop Kung and Catholic Resistance in Communist Shanghai* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), pp. 172; 206-227.

[摘要]二十世紀初期，在豁達的基督新教徒間中國是一個重要的現代大公主義及跨宗教對話的誕生地。但由於教宗庇護十世對現代主義的譴責，中國天主教神學仍維持在反現代主義及梵二會議前的立場。在共產主義管治下，官方及非官方(或地下)天主教會，兩者的分野加重以致元氣大傷，令教會無法更有建設性地伸展到其他社群。而在內地嚴格管制下，信眾很難獲得最新的大公神學理論。在中國內地，天主教在鄉郊地區比較流行。宗教在這些地方有標籤身份的作用，以致對其他社群抱持不開放態度。香港、澳門及台灣有重要的天主教倡動者，包括利氏學社及香港天主教正義和平委員會。他們聯同來自其他宗教的活動家推動社會公義，但也有其他在中國的天主教徒對這些倡動者有激烈抗議的情緒。社會變遷令人對不同層次的大公及跨宗教新的思想更開放。台灣、香港及澳門都是以城市為主的社會，有流動性的中層階級。不同信仰的人士經一起工作及互相學習，也結交為朋友或結成夫婦。這類接觸經常啟發人們互相學習。在台灣、香港及澳門的天主教徒有較大機會作神學的探究及學習中國傳統宗教文化。現時難以估計中國內地與其他中華地區之間的相互影響能去到什麼境界。

香港六宗教領袖座談會：與周景勳神父訪談

周景勳

Colloquium of Six Religious Leaders of Hong Kong: Interview with Fr. Edward Chau

CHAU King Fun Edward

[摘要] 在訪談中，周景勳神父回顧了香港六宗教領袖座談會的歷史，透過宗教間互相的尊重為基礎，實現了彼此間交流、欣賞和共融。宗教間在社會上以至政治上亦互相影響。周神父也分析了由於教義上各宗教間存在根本的分別，及現實的環境如經費等因素等，都導至交談的內容往往不能深化，亦無法形成一個相互深入研究的組織。儘管如此，站在天主教方面的參與者而言，梵二精神認為其他宗教當中亦有真理，因此交流、對話、接納其他宗教是有意義的，儘管亦因為天主教傳統及教會當局的限制，在參與其他宗教的禮儀上有所限制，但亦能在對話和學習中理解其他宗教的精神，也有助天主教反省自身的精神，以及在天主教本位化的過程中有所得益。

周：周景勳神父

夏：夏其龍神父

譚：譚永亮神父

1. 夏：六宗教領袖座談會在這三十五年來產生了甚麼成果？

周：最顯著的成果就是六宗教彼此間的交誼，使宗教間的隔膜逐漸消除。因為如果彼此間有隔膜，就不能交談了。在宗教交談裡重要的是：要主動地參與其他宗教所有的活動，繼而進行較深入的交談。一兩次的交談是不能知道有什麼成果的，時間越長便越能感受到彼此的真誠與尊重，否則，只是為了應酬而臨在，便是沒有誠意。六宗教領袖座談會的成功在於各宗教領袖的支持，縱然一代一代的領袖有更替，但每一代的領袖都樂意交談，亦樂意支持，這是我們感到很成功的。成功的基礎使我們看到：「大家那一份互相尊重的精神」。說實在一些，要交談便先要彼此認識，要彼此認識需要大家打開自己心胸，讓別人認識自己；有了認識，便有交誼。為我們天主教來說，我們就做得比較實在一些，早於四十年前，徐誠斌主教成立「教區非基督宗教聯絡委員會」（現稱「天主教教區宗教聯絡委員會」），由冼梓林校長出任主席，便開始有計劃的安排前往拜訪其他宗教團體；在拜訪中，不但可以讓其他宗教認識天主教，更讓我們認識其他宗教。六宗教領袖座談會成立後，除了六宗教領袖座談會舉辦的活動外，我會帶學生、教友探訪和認識其他宗教，如探訪道教、佛教、伊斯蘭教等。探訪過程中曾邀請道教的道長分享、法師的講解、教長的介紹，使我們認識不同的宗教思想，還接觸到他們的文物，我們常探訪的有圓玄學院、蓬瀛仙館、省善真堂、西方寺、觀宗寺和

愛群道清真寺等，他們都很熱誠的接待我們。在課堂上，我會鼓勵學生們、修生們多研究不同宗教的思想，撰寫不同宗教的論文。

其次，三十五年來產生的效果就是：六宗教領袖座談會越來越被整個香港社會認識，亦得到政府深切的承認，更肯定座談會的存在價值。我們在 78 年開始六宗教領袖座談會時，規模很簡單，大家一起做些事，舉辦一些活動，後來才逐漸讓香港人認識。可見，六宗教起初因著小小的交誼而聚在一起，領袖們向香港市民發表新春文告、向特首和政府提意見，例如教育方面、家庭方面、社會正義、政改方面的事等等，雖然提出的只是一些基本性的建議，卻也獲得政府的關注。其實，六宗教領袖座談會成立的時候，完全是基於宗教界的情誼活動而已，根本沒有註冊，當時夏神父也有參與。那時，六宗教領袖根本沒想到，三十五年來，六宗教領袖座談會居然獲得政府的認同，肯定六宗教領袖座談會的存在價值。

再說，在 1997 年，香港特區政府計劃與宗教界的人士接觸時，鑑於六宗教領袖座談會在社會上已有十九年的交誼，在社會上已建立了良好的認受性，香港特區政府便直接和六宗教領袖座談會聯繫，直到現在，香港的宗教發展都是以六宗教為基礎，例如：在特首的選舉中，宗教界的代表，由六宗教安排；又如機場的祈禱室，都邀請六宗教領袖座談會提出意見和協助。為甚麼會有這樣的結果呢？這就是因為有了最初的交誼，才會帶動整個香港社會對六宗教領袖座談會的認可。六宗教的互相維繫是很實實在在的，這就是座談會的成果了。

2. 夏：三十五年內出了好幾代的宗教領袖，他們間的接替有沒有造成什麼改變？

周：第一個特別的地方就是：每一代的領袖都很注重傳承，有傳承才能拓展，這個傳承就是大家那種互相尊重，互相願意交談。除了佛教九十多歲的覺光法師之外，其他宗教都換了領袖，比如天主教已經換了好幾位領袖；伊斯蘭教又換了幾位；道教又換了，今年道教已經是第三位了，先是湯國華，到湯偉奇，現在是梁德華，剛好三代，也算是少了；孔教學院於早期換了幾位院長，近二十年左右的院長由湯恩佳博士出任；另外，還有基督教協進會換得更多了，因為他們是二年選一次的。然而，大家都很尊重傳承、願意傳承，繼續下去，而且沒有人出來說「我不願意做的」，大家都很着意去做，甚至越來越積極。例如覺光法師，他雖然在任，但一直培育年輕的接班人，如寬運法師，宏明法師等，在座談會中，都很積極和主動的參與，他們都已經是副會長了。至於思想交談會，大家都發覺現在的交流內容越來越豐富，所出版的小冊子內容也越充實；各宗教的代表在宗教思想交談會中有精彩的演講，在生活上有好榜樣。事實上，傳承的思想沒有變，改變的是思想上要多交流，更投向社會。

近年來，六宗教有不斷的拓展和改變之處。我們在拓展社會的影響力上也改變了很多，比如道教在傳統上是以派米、派福包等類型的慈善事業為主，然而，他們覺得這是不足夠的，於是聯合各宮觀道堂的力量，推動道教節，十二年的努力，終於在六宗教領袖座談會的支持下，更獲特區政府的認同，建立了道教日。道教一直渴望自己的宗教也能有個公眾假期，像天主教、基督教和佛教一樣。事實上，道教節的背後有著重要的意義，因為可以透過這個節日向香港市民宣傳，特別是一些具宗教意識的宣傳。正如佛教能取得佛誕為公眾假期，他們每一年都會辦大型的活動，這些大活動能幫助推廣佛教的信仰。再者每年的佛誕和道祖誕等宗教活動都會邀請各宗教人士參與，實現宗教間共融和諧的關係。

這些年來，大家都在改變，在發展中，除了道教、佛教外，孔教也在拓展，比如孔教已開始舉辦一年兩祭：春祭和秋祭的活動；推動孔聖誕為教師日；又計劃籌建孔廟或孔教中心等等。

伊斯蘭教則選擇在交誼上作更主動的發展。剛逝世的脫志賢主席，很積極參加六宗教的活動，甚至常與六宗教領袖座談會的秘書處在一起，不是以高高在上的姿態，而是跟秘書處的成員在一起策劃，一起交談，一起吃東西。其後，薩智生主席，雖比較年長，卻是一位謙謙君子，很斯文、很客氣，也很支持秘書處所做的事，常鼓勵伊斯蘭教的秘書多跟六宗教領袖座談會的秘書處接觸和交往；他們會主動邀請六宗教領袖座談會秘書參加他們的活動，比如他們曾經邀請秘書處成員到廣州，參加伊斯蘭教的慶節等。

至於基督教，一直都很積極參與六宗教領袖座談會的事務。協進會在國內推展很多福利服務的事工，正因為這樣，也推動和鼓勵我們更加積極作出互動。基督教甚至將六宗教當作他們的研究對象。相反的，天主教則沒有過往般的積極。天主教過往是很積極的，如在基督君王瞻禮會邀請六宗教領袖一起參與，現在卻因為禮儀的問題而不能參加。此外，我們還有其他活動計劃與六宗教一起推動研討，如關於安樂死的講座等，最後卻被認為不適宜而停止討論等，天主教由過往的主動變得現時的被動參與，實在有點可惜。

談起研究，我們要了解六宗教領袖座談會是一個交誼的團體，也舉辦思想交流會，但不是一個研究單位。一個研究單位面對的問題範圍廣大，可以選擇與大學合作，比如天主教研究中心就與中文大學的宗教研究聯繫。先後也出現基督教研究、道教、佛教等研究。伊斯蘭教雖然沒有設立研究中心，但楊興本教長十分積極表示也願意參與研究與活動。天主教聖神修院神哲學院曾邀請楊教

長作演講，聘請衍空法師、法忍法師、湯偉俠道長在學院教授佛學和道教概論。還有一些宗教團體舉辦講座，六宗教領袖座談會都會參與。甚至學術團體如中文大學、教育學院等舉辦有關心靈環保的論壇，六宗教領袖座談會都會支持。

總的說，六宗教領袖座談會的發展跟宗教領袖個人的性格有直接關係，也有很大的影響；如果一位領袖很積極邀請其他宗教領袖，禮貌上也會合作和出席。今日的佛教很積極，不單佛教聯合會，連寶蓮寺也很積極邀請宗教領袖出席佛教的盛會。天主教教區宗教聯絡委員會主席常代表主教出席各宗教的活動，這也表示主教重視不同宗教的活動，有些特別的活動，天主教教區會送上花牌祝賀，表示天主教教區的支持和尊重。

3. 譚：我想問支持交誼的動力在哪裡？座談會本身的動力在那裡？

周：天主教方面，支持的動力就是梵二的精神。教會很清晰要求與別的宗教互相交流。我自己講課的也是教授中西宗教和宗教交談。其實除了梵二精神外，香港教區還有一個我們常忽略了會議；這就是徐主教召開的第一屆教區會議。徐主教很注重宗教交談，本著梵二精神，在香港推動宗教交談和宗教互訪。

七零與七一年徐誠斌主教召開教區會議；當時我只是一位中學生，當我讀神學時，我翻查教區會議的紀錄，發現該會議講了很多宗教交談的內容。為天主教來說，宗教交談的動力就在於教區和教會的要求和重視，且組成委員會進行宗教訪問的交談。但最主要的動力，就是基於聖經說要接納所有人，我時常記得〈若望書信〉中，特別是若望一書的第四章，強調「天主是愛」後，便說：「凡有愛的地方就有天主」。大家都很熟悉這一句：「凡有

愛的地方就有天主」，若能在心中重覆又重覆，細心咀嚼和誦讀，便會體驗到天主無私的愛和愛的無限。事實上，宗教界裡的愛心實在很大，我相信天主在人人心中興起不同的偉大事工。在天主的特殊啟示與普遍啟示裡，天主必定賜予教會與其他宗教很大的力量。梵蒂岡第二屆大公會議的〈教會對非基督宗教的態度宣言〉中強調：其他宗教的信仰中有真理的內容，我們要接納他們。所以在這個動力下，我們跟別人交往時，必須突顯整個教會的博愛心，教會教導我們要有博愛的心包容別人，這是必然而重要的。

至於六宗教領袖座談會的動力，確定宗教交談的意義在於宗教界要向整個社會，甚至整個國家、整個世界展示人類的共融精神。六宗教領袖座談會在仁愛、正義、和平的氛圍下對話，讓社會上所有人看到不同宗教間的和諧。六宗教要和諧，就是要讓整個香港的人都看到六個不同的宗教團體的不同之處，但也經驗到六宗教領袖同在尊重和博愛中對話，這便是六宗教強調的「同舟共濟，求同存異」；當然，不同宗教間的矛盾依然存在，但我們的焦點不是注意矛盾，我們注意的是大家的核心精神，在相同的核心精神上發揮正能量的善力，讓這個世界、社會看到正能量的和諧共融。六宗教領袖座談能在香港產生大的動力，就在每次的活動中，能凝聚六宗教間的和諧共融。

4. 夏：六宗教領袖座談會是否由領袖間之交誼變成社會共融的象徵？

周：宗教領袖參與座談會和活動時都兌現了社會的共融。每位領袖都是一個個體，着重的也是個體的參與。如果不同的個體能共融，尤其是因為他們是領袖，便能影響教派內的人；如果教派內的人看到自己的領袖能做到與其他不同宗教的領袖友善的交流，他們也很自然願意包容、接納。然而，或許我們現在仍是脆

弱，只要大家能齊心，就不會脆弱了；反之，如果大家不齊心，說話不實際，那就真是脆弱了。《易經繫辭上》說：「二人同心，其利斷金；同心之言，其臭如蘭」；「二人」相合便是仁愛的「仁」字，兩個人同心帶出的意義就是要人保有仁愛的心，如果能有同心的力量，就能「切鐵如泥」般，可以解決問題。同心的言語、真誠的言語，「其臭如蘭」，是能打動人心，激發人靈。如果六個宗教團體不同心，就會很脆弱；如果六宗教團體能同心，合在一起，力量就會變大。

5. 夏：六宗教領袖發表文告的內容是否通常關於教育、家庭、政制等？

周：新年文告關注整個社會的走向，六宗教領袖看看社會的現況現象，發表文告。三十五年來，早期的時候傳媒很注意文告，會整篇完整地免費刊登；漸漸的，傳媒只會選擇性的刊登，不但不會刊登整篇，有時還會斷章取義。我記得有一次，文告批評傳媒的報導不實，傳媒的反應很大，特別反擊和針對文告中所說的「傳媒的報導不實」的這一點。六宗教領袖每次寫文告，是寫該年大家們整體性關注的話題，譬如教育方面，青年方面，社會正義的問題、文化道德的修煉等等。

6. 夏：座談會始終維持在只是一個聚會而不是一個註冊機構，原因是甚麼？

周：六宗教領袖座談會一直都是一個交誼的聚會，不是「公司」或「機構」組織，這是因為一個註冊機構，需要有法制上的義務，和要負責任的問題太多。六宗教領袖座談會若要註冊，就要有一個六宗教領袖座談會的辦公室，必須製訂座談會的章則，在組織

上也必須按組織法行事。由是，六宗教領袖座談會各領袖至今還沒有要註冊的想法。組織化可能會有衝突，不論是人事上還是教義上，都要有專責的職員跟進；其次是經費、資源分配的問題，大家都希望取得平衡，實踐上是有困難的。加上各宗教都有各自向社會推動的慶祝活動，同時可作宣傳與介紹，如果要共融地互相發展，在組織上來說這是挺難的。但在交誼上來說，就容易多了，不必組織成一個團體。所以，六宗教領袖座談會的事務只由六宗教領袖座談會的秘書處負責-----六宗教領袖座談會秘書處由每一個宗教團體推薦一至二位成員組成的，負責策劃座談會所有的事務，和執行領袖們的決定事務。

7. 夏：在事務性問題的背後是否存在六宗教團體本身不能聚在一起，成為一個大家共同參與的組織？現在維持在表面上的共融是沒問題的，但如果要深入，變成一個由六個宗教支持的聯合組織，就做不到了？座談會是否流於表面化的工作？

周：能不能做到更深入的聯合組織，為六宗教領袖座談會來說，真的完全沒想過，而且大家都很少想這類事情。你提的原因都很重要，是不是內部不能共融？或許不是不共融，而是教義上有衝突。我們一方面受到別人尊重，另一方面也不能踐踏別人的「根」或者「地雷」；我們不能埋下地雷讓自己踩或要別人來踩。我們有方向，為社會推動共融的事務，這是首要的工作。剛才我也提到，每個領袖都是不同的，有些贊同多做，有些未必贊同多做。六宗教團體的合作傳統是：如果有一個宗教不贊成，其他五位領袖就會放棄自己的意見，這種方式已成為六宗教領袖座談會的共識了。因為這個理由，我們可以看到，如果要推出一個新架構，無論願意或不願意，都是有困難和阻擾的。

三十五年來，或許令人覺得六宗教領袖座談會沒有怎樣的發展。但在實際行動上，六宗教領袖座談會的確發展了一些東西，如在思想交談上，以前只是簡單的交談，沒有講稿，沒有向外宣傳；其後，經過六宗教領袖座談會的秘書處作深入的檢討後，覺得如果保持現狀是行不通的，於是決定要有講稿，並將講稿綜合，編印成小冊子；印成小冊子可以將資料保存。

8. 夏：座談會還有沒有發展的空間呢？

周：發展空間要看領袖了，如果領袖願意，就會有空間。我們一直在維持一個平台。如果積極去看待我們的工作，其實就是大家透過這個平台（座談會）去擴展自己宗教對社會的服務。大家互相影響，我不想用「利用」這個詞，因為這個詞很功利化。其實座談會就是大家宗教間的互助平台、互相分享和影響。譬如：道教、佛教、孔教，他們開始在平台上積極地以西方宗教的傳道方式拓展。以前他們比較低調的，獨自地做，現在很積極的邀請六宗教一起參與，而且很敬重六宗教友好的參與者，這能顯示大家彼此幫助和互相支持的友好關係。如果我們天主教再積極一點，我們更加可以跟其他宗教的思想做擴展的研究。這樣自己可以在整個宗教交談的平台裡擴展出來，可以幫助我們研究本位化的神學，其他宗教也可以吸納西方的宗教思想，轉化他們跟外面的交往，這便能產生互相影響的作用，基本上我們是在互相學習中，大家已經在共融思想上起作用。

9. 夏：我想問宗教層面的問題，你剛才說現在我們天主教的禮儀不會邀請其他宗教，是不是表示了經過這麼多年的發展，就是想把宗教層面跟交誼層面分開，交誼歸交誼，宗教層面就不要介入，所以才演變成這樣的情況？

周：只有我們天主教是這樣做，我不知道是不是這個原因，這是領導層的決定，譬如：我們的主教晉升樞機時，其他宗教希望參

與禮儀慶典，我們上層認為不好，除了基督教兄弟姐妹可參與外，其他宗教只邀請出席慶祝酒會。至於其他宗教有慶典或甚麼的慶賀，都會邀請我們去的，至於去與不去就由我們自己決定。其他宗教通常每年都舉辦多項慶典，而且在慶典後，都會宴請客人，譬如道教舉辦的羅天大醮，很隆重，開埠以來第一次，也邀請了我們。他們的邀請，沒有強迫性的，大家可自由參與，由我們主動選擇去與不去；那活動為期一星期。有些反而是我自己主動去的，譬如道教的蓬瀛仙館，他們每年的中元節（有稱鬼節或盂蘭節）都有追悼先人的禮儀，整個禮儀安排共需四天，其中有破鬼門關等追悼儀式。我很想了解，跟道長商量，就讓我在旁參禮。在學習認知上，我們要主動，如果你不主動，就算別人邀請你，你也未必會去，所以交誼上，也必須主動，如果我們自己不願意，只是為了禮貌上的應付，實在沒有意義。其他宗教常常以歡悅的心歡迎我們的參與，譬如法師、方丈的陞座，宏明法師（覺光法師的接班人），他陞座為方丈的時候也邀請了我們出席參與。以前我們升主教也有邀請其他宗教出席參與，如徐主教，胡主教晉升主教的彌撒，大球場慶祝基督君王節都有邀請其他宗教領袖的參與。

10. 夏：「六宗教領袖座談會」怎樣由「六宗教思想交談會」演變出來的呢？

當我還在讀神學一年級時（1976年），因為我剛從台灣輔仁大學完成哲學學士學位回修院升讀神學。當時教區非基督宗教聯絡委員會，在多次的拜訪其他宗教後，與其他五宗教取得共識，開始策劃六宗教思想交談會；教區當局便將這個重要的任務交給教區非基督宗教聯絡委員會主席冼梓林校長，和聖神修院神哲學院神學部主任湯漢神父負責出席，與其他五宗教代表策劃思想交談會。當時，在1976年12月初，湯神父對我說：有一個宗教思想交談的會議，因為你在輔仁大學修讀中國哲學，也修讀西方士林

哲學及宗教哲學，可以在宗教思想交談上給些意見，他說：「你代替我去開會」。於是，1977年的年初我代替湯神父，在公教進行社參加六宗教的第一次「宗教思想交談會」的會議。那時候我正式與教區非基督宗教聯絡委員會的主席冼梓林見面和開會，這是在宗教界中開始的學習和服侍的日子，一直到現在。

為甚麼會有宗教領袖座談會呢？這是因為在六宗教思想交談會中，每次要決定舉辦大活動，或訂定主題時，都必須詢問宗教領袖，領袖沒有決定，我們就不能做，使大家感到焦急，加上要由六位宗教領袖通過，需時太長，而且領袖們又沒有見面相討，只靠代表們各自跟領袖們報告，實在不便；當代表們發現有這些缺陷時，也認為這樣的思想交談會實在沒有意思，便一致提出：必須六宗教領袖親自出來見面和商討，才能容易有具體的實效。於是，六宗教思想交談會的代表一致通過要鼓勵六宗教領袖出來，坐下起討論，另設立「六宗教領袖」會議。由是，獲得領袖們一致認同，便於1978年的年初，另派代表組成「策劃小組」，商議成立「六宗教領袖座談會」。

11. 譚：你很多次提到政府的方面，在香港的政治上宗教團體有甚麼參與？

周：過去英政府時代的政治和現在中國時代的政治確實不同的。所謂政治，其實就是指「管理眾人之事」的意思；管治方法不同就大大不同了；當管治方法不同，我們和政府交往方式亦不同。自然地，英政府時代對宗教是很看重的，很清楚的也很明顯，對英國國教-----聖公會和天主教特別優待，在政府禮賓排名上基督教、天主教是最先的，而且比其他宗教前很多的，那是很自然的。天主教、基督教，特別是聖公會的主教和天主教的主教，他們在政府的地位很高，屬第三高位。

1997年政治體制轉變時，香港特區的政府參考六宗教的共融關係一致性的排位，所以其他宗教領袖在中國政府一國兩制下，六宗教領袖一起進入第十八的禮賓排名位置。這對基督教和天主教的主教來說是低了很多，對那些以前沒有排名宗教領袖來說，現在有了排名，就很不同了。由此可見，港英政府時期，其他宗教與港政府的聯繫不特別多。特區政府時代，宗教界就有很多機會與政府來往，而且每一個慶典都邀請特區政府和中聯辦的官員作主禮嘉賓和參與。特別是現在，除了天主教外，其他五宗教都跟政府、中聯辦和大陸政府有密切的聯繫。因為現在是一國兩制的時代，宗教界在選舉特首上有一定的票數。其他宗教如佛教、道教的領袖都被中央政府應邀為政協，其他宗教都受中央政府特別邀請，各宗教都會主動地跟特區政府、中聯辦和中央政府聯繫。至於天主教就沒有直接聯絡，因為天主教的不主動，自然沒有多接觸與來往；其他宗教願意主動地、積極地和實惠地與中聯辦、中央政府聯繫和交往，而且越來越多越密，自然有幫助和被肯定。天主教較被動，從不會邀請中聯辦做任何活動的嘉賓；和中央政府的關係也是平平的。

12 譚：讓我們談一談：六宗教領袖座談會在教義、禮儀、宗教教育上有何貢獻吧。

周：其實每個宗教都有自己的教義，自己的禮儀。教義是宗教的思想核心，禮儀是實踐宗教信仰的行動和生活表達；每個宗教都有其獨特性，如果要在不同宗教上作比較，在教義和禮儀上是不可能的，因為獨特性是需要尊重的，不是要來被批評的，其存在意義是不受質疑的。在宗教教育上，尚可談共通性的內容，因為宗教教育對全人類的教育而言，其共通性較強。不同宗教的禮儀則是各宗教自我的表達，特別在教義上，每個宗教都有自己的立場，所以在教義或在禮儀上又是有其獨特性和分別性的，所以不是說共通性。

每個宗教的獨特性與分別性在於各自在思想和做法上是完全不同的；在教義方面，肯定自己的思想，自己的那套神觀。我們稱之為神觀，是因為每一個宗教有各自對「神」的表達和稱號，在教義上或者禮儀上我們只能是尊重的。尊重有一個好處，因為在宗教界中，不是我想怎樣做就可以怎樣做，我要明白：你被邀請來參與，就只能夠參與，參與時可以發表意見，但意見不等於你認為自己對、別人就是錯，你不能因為不明瞭這宗教的「神觀」或禮儀表達，便以自己的「神觀」或禮儀作評價，而認定其他宗教是迷信或是假的。

又譬如：從教義方面說，在一些不同宗教的講座或研討會中，我們專心的聽，可以吸納思想、吸納知識，得到新的知識之後，我們可以運用新的知識發展本位化的神學思想，這是我們可以做的事情。發展神學本位化的時候，我們可以落實在文化和宗教的融通上，為中國教會來說，不同宗教對我們來說是很重要的，尤其是中國本土文化、儒、道、佛等思想對我們來說是一個很深邃的啟示，這是一個在普遍啟示中的特殊啟導。

為何這樣做？為何這樣說？我們要怎麼回應呢？

假設一個信仰上簡單的思想，由創造到救贖，我們如何認識天主的創造工程；其中，人如何犯罪離開天主，天主懲罰人要面對「生、老、病、死」，卻又慈悲的與人訂立盟約，許下救贖世界的計劃。我反思後，發現中國人傳統上，民間宗教、道教、佛教都談及輪迴的信仰；但天主教不談輪迴，那我們要怎麼用我們的思想作為融通呢？在深入的反思後，有一個啟導性的想法：讓我們想一想，為什麼會有輪迴，如何才沒有輪迴？那麼，我便想一

想，這跟本位化有沒有關係？找出一些原因作融通。比如救恩與此岸的關聯，我嘗試稱：此岸的救恩，此時此地的救恩，不是將來的救恩，也不是過去的救恩，是此時此刻的。然後我再想一想此岸、彼岸的問題。佛教中此岸、彼岸的思想，若二字對換時我們會怎樣看呢？我們說此岸的救恩是除罪的救恩。他們在這方面未必會說「除罪」，反之要強調「離罪脫苦」，這是人的努力，潛修八正道以滅苦滅罪，或在正覺正悟下見性成佛，好能脫離輪迴，這是「自力」的成果。天主教的「除罪」思想，應該是由「除免世罪的天主羔羊」引發出來的，復活的基督是「除免世罪」者，這是很重要的字眼；天主教教友一直在祈禱和祭獻中都不斷的誦唸「除免世罪的天主羔羊」，誦唸多了，不是不注意，而是沒那麼注意；現在我發現這字句原來是那麼的重要，重要點在「除罪」，為什麼要除罪呢？因為除罪才可以免去輪迴，這是我自己的想法。民間宗教、道教、佛教的思想有很好的空間讓我們擴闊自己的看法。這是民間宗教、道教、佛教在教義上的思想，我們不能排斥和批評。六道輪迴不對嗎？不，民間宗教、道教、佛教的思想有這說法；「六道輪迴」是存在的，且有三善道，三惡道的分法。那麼在賞善罰惡中，人人不要惡道，而要善道，這也是輪迴。我認為：除罪的救恩，是連六道輪迴也除掉。因為輪迴是現世的輪迴，若將來在死後也有輪迴，便不能到彼岸去，彼岸不會輪迴。

又如民間宗教、道教、佛教的思想提及成佛成仙，天主教不談成仙成佛，卻有成聖的思想，更有基督，在成聖上必須靠基督的此岸救恩，我們自己不能「除罪」，只有身為天主的基督可以除免人的罪，因為基督是「除免世罪的天主羔羊」，我們在「此岸的救恩」中完全脫離罪惡的束縛，在「無罪」中也脫離「輪迴」，六道輪迴也就沒有了。天主給我們的是新天、新地、新人，這是「彼岸的永生」，所以「此岸的救恩」，將人引進「彼岸的永生」。上面所說的，可以幫助我反省本位化的內容，在教義上可以反思的內容更多。如道教有破地獄，天主教怎樣去破地獄呢？其實這

就是拯救的思想，天主將人從罪惡中拯救出來。在教義上可以想一想，再把這些思想融通。

從不同的宗教與文化中，我們更能看到：需要更多的研究，不止是交談，不止是交誼，而更需要進行研究，這更鼓勵我們要為教會培育更多研究的人才。禮儀方面也是這樣，譬如不同宗教邀請我們參與的春祭、秋祭，或是破地獄，或是浴佛等，這些都是禮儀；能認識不同宗教的禮儀，可以了解更多的禮儀內涵和禮儀空間，其實我覺得禮儀空間是指一些外在的事物，與內在的內涵是不同的，我們要認識其禮儀內在的精髓，以及禮儀空間的佈置等等。

宗教教育方面，我為什麼說大家可以互相交融呢？宗教教育的內容，不同宗教有自己不同的內容，我們的方法便可以溝通，溝通就是如何把事物傳輸給他人，或者把事物具體化、系統化地作互相參考，以擴寬我們的思想空間，且能做到擇其善者而用之，擇其不善者而改之。

現在香港的通識教育開始有宗教的味道，佛教有佛教的做法，道教有道教的做法，他們已經出版了一些小冊子。在教育上，怎樣使學生能夠找到真我，這就是宗教的貢獻了。在貢獻上，教育的貢獻，正正是對下一代人的培育。六宗教團體都在努力策劃中，好能有系統地給下一代人編撰宗教書籍。

香港教育學院舉辦「宗教的心靈環保」的對話和研討會，邀請六宗教互相合作，藉此可以推動社會的關注。在各宗教的教義上，互相參與、互相欣賞、互相接納。還有，在出版書籍上，道教和佛教不會說：「這是我的專利」或「不得翻印」。宗教應當是

沒有甚麼專權的，在印書上，應當歡迎翻印，對吧？天主教的聖經是不歡迎翻印的呢！天主教會不會因應社會的需要舉辦宗教對話或研究呢？能不能主動地、積極地、實惠地落實與各宗教交談，也與社會中各階級的人溝通呢？天主教重視對神職人員或教友的神哲學的培育嗎？又如何推動信仰和神學本位化呢？

[ABSTRACT] During the interview Fr Edward Chau King Fun reviewed the history of the Colloquium of Six Religious Leaders of Hong Kong, through the basis of mutual respect among the religions, it realized mutual exchange, appreciation and integration. The religions mutually influenced each other in the social and even political areas. Fr Chau also pointed out that because of the religions' fundamental doctrinal differences and the present circumstances with factors such as financial resources, etc, the contents of the dialogue could not be further deepened and it was also impossible to set up a mutual and in-depth research organization.

Nevertheless, from the point of view of a Catholic participant in the Colloquium, the spirit of Vatican II opines that in other religions there is also truth, hence interaction, dialogue and acceptance of other religions is meaningful. Because of the Catholic tradition and the limitations of Church authorities, there are limits in participating in the rituals/liturgy of other religions. But one can -- through dialogue and study -- also understand other religions' spirit. This is also helpful to reflect on one's own Catholic spirit and is beneficial to the Catholic Church's process of inculturation.

利他主義與儒耶比較

賴品超

Altruism and Confucian-Christian Comparison

LAI Pan-chiu

[摘要]本文嘗試分析及評估近期在漢語學界對基督宗教與儒家的利他主義及相關觀念的比較研究，指出這些研究在方法論上的一些特點及局限，包括對研究對象加以定型化(stereotyped)，忽視比較對象在各自的傳統內的多元性，並藉此而突出比較對象之間的分歧。這種定型化的討論，往往傾向於強化多過批判對比較對象的一些先入為主的成見或前理解(pre-understanding)。這些在研究方法上的問題，並非單純出於個別學者的喜好或限制，而是也反映了漢語學界在整體上所受到的一些歷史與文化上的影響。如能避免這些在方法論上的不必要的制肘，利他主義可以是一個十分有用的概念，有助促進基督宗教與儒家的比較及對話，並且也有助二者與其他學科就利他主義的問題進行跨科際的對話。關鍵詞：利他主義、儒家、基督宗教、比較宗教學

導言

利他主義是當代跨學科對話與研究的一個重要課題，¹近年也成為宗教比較的一個熱點。不單在英語學界有討論世界宗教中的利他主義的專論，²在漢語學界最近也有比較儒家與基督宗教（以下簡稱基督教）的利他主義的專論。本文的目的，不是要直接對儒家與基督教的利他主義進行比較，而是嘗試從比較宗教學的視野，分析一些現有的對儒家與基督教的比較或對話研究，從而反思當中的方法論問題。

本文將集中討論林濱的《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》（以下簡稱林書），³因為這本書不僅比較了儒家與基督教的利他主義，並且是相當清楚地表達所採用的研究方法、前設與進路。本文的目的，並非在於全面評論林書的得失，而是以林書作為切入點，反思漢語學界在這方面的相關研究的一些可能是頗為普遍的問題。

研究方法與預設

按照林書的說明，此書是將“利他主義”理解為與利己相對立的道德原則，“是指不計較個人的利益，無私地為他人服務，能夠為他人利益而犧牲自己的利益的一種道德原則”。⁴ 按照這種對利他主義的定義，本書的研究範圍，是集中在作為一種

¹ 對相關討論的一個概覽可參：Stephen G. Post, Byron Johnson, Michael E. McCullough and Jeffrey P. Schloss, *Research on Altruism & Love: An Annotated Bibliography of Major Studies in Psychology, Sociology, Evolutionary Biology & Theology* (Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press, 2003).

² Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton (eds.), *Altruism in World Religions* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2005)；對此書的評論，見：賴品超，〈利他主義與比較宗教學：宗教研究的方法論反思〉，《安徽大學學報（哲學社會科學版）》2012年卷第4期（2012.07.05），頁47-54。

³ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》（北京：人民出版社，2011）。

⁴ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁20。

道德原則的利他主義，而有別於生物學上所講的、作為一種現象或行為的利他主義，因為生物學所講的利他行為，是指向具有利他的後果的行為，而毋須涉及動機上的利他。⁵ 本文不會對林書的研究進路作一個全面的討論，而只會集中討論以下四方面：

首先，林書選擇基督教與儒家作為研究對象，基本上是因為假設“儒家文化與基督教文化是中西文化中最具典型的兩大體系”，對二者的利他主義的比較研究，“也就具有比較文化與道德研究的典型意義”。⁶ 與此相應的是，林書這種傾向於對比較對象作一種定型化的論述，除了假設基督教在一定程度上是代表了西方文化外，也會相對地忽視比較對象各自的內部分歧，或假設這些分歧是屬於細微、甚至可以忽略的內部變異(variations)。

其次，順著這種以“典型”為重點的研究路向，林書透過一些看似互相對立的概念，包括：此岸與彼岸、性善與性惡、血緣與契約、人本與神本、政治化與宗教化、世俗性與神聖性，來概括基督教與儒家的對比。按照這種論述的重點，在實際操作上往往在於突顯二者之間的分別或說對比，而不是二者之間有何相似或相通之處，是否有對話、合作以至結合的可能。

第三，林書的比較研究，既不採取儒家或基督教的立場，也沒有假裝採用某種客觀中立的觀點，而是開宗明義坦然承認的說：“本書的理論基礎是以馬克思主義理論作為指導思想”，而當中包括三方面：首先，“從馬克思主義歷史唯物論的基本立場、觀點和方法出發，以社會存在與社會意識的辯證關係原理，分析把握儒家與基督教兩種利他主義的歷史與文化預制的探討”；其次，“以馬克思的關於宗教的理論，把握基督教的本質

⁵ 劉鶴齡，《所羅門王的魔戒：動物利他行為與人類利他主義》（北京：科學出版社，2008），頁 vi。

⁶ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 1。

與社會的功能分析”；最後，“以馬克思對於利他主義與利己主義的理論，作為評價利他主義的基本尺度。”⁷

最後，林書的比較研究，並非脫離現實的抽象比較，而是連結於當下的處境，尤其是要把這種比較研究的意義放在當代的全球化、包括文化全球化的語境中來考慮。⁸

對基督宗教的定型

林書的研究的一個基本假設是，基督教在很大程度上代表了西方文化。此一假設，可能會低估甚或忽視基督教思想的來源的多元性，就是基督教的思想不單吸納了一些來自希羅文化、尤其希羅哲學的元素，也包括了一些源自希伯來以及埃及文化的思想。⁹ 正因如此，基督教信仰與西方文化、尤其希羅哲學之間是有一定的張力。正如林書也承認，儒家與基督教文化中皆有“漫長而動態變化的過程”，但林書的比較研究仍然是集中在“儒家與基督教文化中最具基本特徵與占主導地位與最具影響的內容”。¹⁰ 林書這種進路似乎是假設相關傳統的高度統一性，而忽視它們各自的內部多樣性。這種做法應用在儒家身上已有一定的困難，如應用在基督教身上，問題可能更為嚴重，因會忽視基督教內部的重大分歧。

舉例說，林書之傾向於將儒家及基督教分別定型為性善論及性惡論，這不僅忽視了儒家中的荀子，更重要的是，這將性惡論及相關的原罪論，列入“基督教文化中最具基本特徵與占主導地位與最具影響的內容”。這種對基督教的詮釋，基本上已排除

⁷ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 13。

⁸ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 2-8。

⁹ 詳參 Karl W. Luckert, *Egyptian Light and Hebrew Fire: Theological and Philosophical Roots of Christendom in Evolutionary Perspective* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

¹⁰ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 8。

了作為基督教內三大流派之一的基督正教（Orthodox Church，俗稱東正教），這是因為基督正教所傳承的神學傳統，是有別於羅馬公教（Roman Catholicism，一般稱天主教）及基督新教（Protestantism，一般稱基督教）所傳承、以拉丁語作為主要語言的神學傳統；基督正教的神學傳統，不僅未有採納原罪論作為正式的教義的一部份，反而主張一種以成神（deification, theosis）的拯救論為基礎的性善論。¹¹ 換言之，林書所講的基督教，似乎是指作為狹義的“西方文化”的一部份的“西方”基督教多過是基督教作為一個整體。值得注意的是，從歷史的角度言，林書這種對基督教的討論，是十分值得質疑的。這是因為，在十四世紀中葉之前，歐洲基督徒在數量上從未占優，而自二十世紀七十年代開始，歐美的基督徒人數也落後於其他地區信徒的總和，將基督教視為純屬西方文化的宗教，基本上是某些學者或教科書的一種“宏大敘事”（grand narrative）；¹² 而當代不少基督教史學者提出“普世基督教”（World Christianity）的概念，正是要抗衡或糾正這種對基督教的片面、甚至帶有西方中心主義色彩的詮釋。¹³ 依此，實在使人懷疑，究竟林書對基督教文化的詮釋，是否恰當地反映“基督教文化中最具基本特徵與占主導地位與最具影響的內容”。

當然，由於林書的最終目的是比較中西文化，因此集中在作為（狹義的）“西方文化”一部份的基督教，並非毫無道理。然而，若以奧古斯丁（Augustine, 354-430）及阿奎那（Thomas of Aquinas, 1225-1274）作為那種將基督教信仰與“西方文化”高度結合的“西方基督教”的代表，並以此對比林書中對基督教立場

¹¹ 賴品超，〈基督正教之神學復興及其對漢語神學的意義〉，《道風》32（2010春），頁247-272。

¹² 詳參 Dale T. Irvin, *Christian Histories, Christian Traditioning* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1998), esp. pp. 86-99。

¹³ 詳參 Lamin Sanneh, *Disciples of All Nations: Pillars of World Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Dale T. Irvin & Scott W. Sunquist, *History of the World Christian Movement, Volume I: Earliest Christianity to 1453* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2001).

的描述，我們將會發現，林書中不少對基督教立場的詮釋，基本上是與奧古斯丁或阿奎那的學說大異其趣。

例如林書提出，有別於儒家之由人性之善去闡明利他主義的可能性，“西方的基督教則從人性之惡闡述了利他主義之必要”。¹⁴ 林書甚至提出，基督教那種以“愛”為核心的利他主義，“是從對人性的否定的向度提出了為救贖而聽上帝的誠命的結果”；又說，“基督教正是因為人性惡就必須使之通過對上帝頒布的道德律法的遵從，使之由惡變善，利他主義就成為必要”。¹⁵ 值得注意的是，林書這種以性惡為出發點的闡述，只集中在利他主義為何是必須的，而不是利他主義為何是可能的。若果稍為查考一下原罪論的始作俑者奧古斯丁的觀點，便會發現當中的原罪論與利他主義的關係，與林書所說的很不一樣。

奧古斯丁相信，愛是人本性的一部份，人本質上就是愛者 (lover)；¹⁶ 人是自然地有自愛，更會自然地愛父母、子女、配偶、朋友甚至同胞；這是一般人、無論是否基督徒、甚至動物也有的愛。¹⁷ 所以對於奧古斯丁來說，這些利他行為根本是十分自然的事，甚至用不著要去“命令”人，使人出於害怕而遵行。至於對上帝的愛，奧古斯丁相信人能夠愛上帝，是因為上帝先愛了人（約翰一書 4:19）；上帝不單在道成肉身中彰顯愛，更是藉聖靈將愛注入人心，正如奧古斯丁最喜歡引用的經文所說，“因為所賜給我們的聖靈，將上帝的愛澆灌在我們心裡”（羅馬書 5:5）。¹⁸ 換言之，在奧古斯丁的思想中，愛是上帝賜予人的禮物，根本不需要用原罪論或性惡論去說明利他主義的可能性或必需性。¹⁹ 對奧古斯丁來說，人的問題不在沒有愛或利他行為，而

¹⁴ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 124。

¹⁵ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 134。

¹⁶ Bernard V. Brady, *Christian Love: How Christians through the Ages Have Understood Love* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2003), p.83.

¹⁷ Bernard V. Brady, *Christian Love*, p.115.

¹⁸ 奧古斯丁引用此經文不下二百次，參 Carol Harrison, *Augustine: Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 96.

¹⁹ 奧古斯丁在何意義主張性惡也是值得商榷的，因為他也相信人性的可臻完美

在於偏離了出於愛上帝而愛萬物的原則，出現愛的失序 (disorder)，包括愛所不當愛的，將弄錯了愛的對象的優次排序，又或用錯了方法去愛；例如愛父母過於愛上帝，又或是愛身體多於靈魂，甚或愛自己而不愛上帝。²⁰

至於林書所提出的，“基督教倫理邏輯先構的建構方法是對此在世界的否定”，²¹ 若查考阿奎那的基本立場，可見是與此剛好相反。阿奎那的神學的一個根本原理是，神恩並不抹煞自然，而是要成全自然；在倫理學上，肯定上帝的聖愛不是否定、而是成全人的慾愛。²² 換言之，阿奎那的基督教倫理邏輯的建構方法，是先肯定此在世界是上帝所創造和愛的自然，再繼而指出上帝的超自然的恩典如何成全此自然。與奧古斯丁相似，阿奎那也嘗試建立一種愛的秩序 (order of love)，這種愛的秩序中，不僅肯定人的自愛，也肯定父母子女間的愛、以至對親屬、對一般人以至對萬物的愛，而這些不同的愛卻又是有優次的，當然這不等於說純粹由生物上的聯繫的親疏去決定一個普遍的高下排序，但人是很自然地會愛自己的家人多過其他人，而聖愛 (caritas) 是包含而不是否定人本性／自然的愛 (natural love) 的傾向和需要。²³ 正如吉爾松 (Etienne Gilson, 1884-1978) 在他的《中世紀哲學精神》中指出，中世紀的哲學家是正視人的欲望，相信人是先愛自己，然後為了純自愛而去愛其他一切；²⁴ 此外，由於相信上帝的愛已在人之內，問題不在於如何獲得上帝的愛，而是如何圓

(perfectibility)。參：賴品超，〈以道與靈塑造人性：一個不東不西的拯救論與儒耶對話〉，許志偉編，《基督教思想評論·第11輯》(上海：上海人民出版社，2010)，頁232-248，尤242-247。

²⁰ 詳參 Bernard V. Brady, *Christian Love*, pp.99-117.

²¹ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁116。

²² 參：Stephen J. Pope, *The Ethics of Aquinas* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2001)；賴品超、王濤，〈再思聖多瑪斯的生態倫理〉，《哲學與文化》37卷11期(2010.11)，頁155-173。

²³ Stephen Pope, *The Evolution of Altruism and the Ordering of Love* (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1994), pp.50-76.

²⁴ 吉爾松 (Etienne Gilson) 著，沈清松譯，《中世紀哲學精神》(台北市：臺灣商務，2001)，頁247-248。

滿地知覺到這愛，認識自己所愛的對象，以及應該如何對待愛的對象。²⁵

由林書對基督教的詮釋與奧古斯丁或阿奎那的立場的強烈反差，不禁使人質疑，林書所表達的基督教，是否能恰當地反映“西方基督教”的立場也成疑問。例如林書認為，基督教視“為他”為獲得救贖的條件。²⁶ 對於這種對基督教的詮釋，基督新教、尤其信義宗(Lutheran)教會一定會表示異議。這是因為按照新教神學所高舉的唯獨恩典(*sola gratia*)、唯獨信心(*sola fide*)、因信稱義(*justification by faith*)等基本原則，人無論作出多少利他的好行為都不能使人獲得救贖，而信徒的善行不是獲得救贖的條件，而是出自感恩、對所蒙的救恩作出回應。²⁷

林書中對基督教的詮釋，令人想起沈清松在為吉爾松的《中世紀哲學精神》的中譯本所寫的〈譯序〉中提及：

“中國哲學界對於士林哲學的誤解有以下數端：首先是把士林哲學當作是以宗教價值為中心，而貶抑人文價值是思想體系，．．．認為中世紀無論形上學、知識論、倫理學、宇宙論，主旨都在於崇神抑人。表現在個人與社會生活上，則輕視此生，專務來世，鄙視肉體，致修靈魂；以人生為塵埃，唯敬神得救援。人人皆污染於罪惡之中，唯信徒能得救等等。”²⁸

林書對基督教的詮釋，不僅隱約反映了中國哲學界對士林哲學的誤解，並且也可以說是折射出馬克思主義對基督教或中世紀文化的批判的所造成的影響。正如劉小楓指出，“稍為回顧一

²⁵ 吉爾松，《中世紀哲學精神》，頁 255。

²⁶ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 43, 281, 306。

²⁷ 更準確的講法是“因恩藉信稱義”(justification by grace through faith)，參：賴品超，〈猶太人的不信：《羅馬書》中的處境神學反省〉，徐以驊、張慶熊編，《基督教學術·第4輯》(上海：上海古籍出版社，2006)，頁 39-57。

²⁸ 沈清松，〈譯序：“中世紀哲學精神與中國哲學精神的會通”〉，吉爾松著，沈清松譯，《中世紀哲學精神》，頁 viii。

下現代中國思想文化史，就可以知道，中國知識人貶損歐洲中古時代的觀念，是在學舌法國啟蒙時代的知識人及其思想後裔馬克思主義的觀點。”²⁹

馬克思主義作為理論基礎

對於利他主義的研究來說，林書之採取馬克思主義的觀點，似乎是有一定的好處。這是因為利他主義不僅涉及理念上的問題，而是也涉及文化的，包括具體行為、生活習慣以至社會制度。對不同宗教的利他主義的研究，是不應停留在某宗教傳統中的學說或教理，而應該進一步探討與具體的社會環境以至經濟生產模式的關係。然而，由馬克思主義對宗教的態度，也很容易會使人懷疑，一種以馬克思主義作為理論基礎的對基督教與儒家的比較研究，究竟有多少的合法性、可行性、必要性以至可欲性。換言之，最為值得商榷的是，不僅是此書有否及如何貫徹落實這種研究取向，而更根本的問題是，究竟採取馬克思主義作為指導思想，此舉在理論或學術有何依據，對於此書所要進行的比較研究，帶來更多的幫助還是障礙。以下嘗試檢視，林書以馬克思主義作為理論基礎所提出的三方面的研究。

首先，林書建議“以社會存在與社會意識的辯證關係原理，分析把握儒家與基督教兩種利他主義的歷史與文化預制的探討”，並據此而提出，儒家的是以“血緣”為基礎，基督教則以“契約”為基礎，而這是與中西方文化各自的自然環境、以至經濟生產模式有關。林書的基本推理是，對比儒家的以血緣為基礎反映了中國的以農業生產為主要經濟活動，基督教利他主義反映的是一種契約關係，而此種契約關係是反映了商業及商品經濟中的關係，而古希臘的地理等因素，有助解釋了商業契約的盛行。

²⁹ 劉小楓，〈中譯本導言〉，阿貝拉爾等著，施皮茨萊編，李承言譯，《親吻神學——中世紀修道院情書選》（香港：漢語基督教文化研究所，1996），頁 xii。

對於林書這種解釋，值得提出的一點質疑是，西方基督教並非只繼承古希臘的思想，而是也繼承古代西亞、尤其古希伯來的思想，當中“約”(covenant)是一個十分重要的觀念，但《希伯來聖典》(Hebrew Scripture)或稱《舊約聖經》所指向的是神與人的立約，而這是相似於政治上君王與人民的不平等地位者之間的立約，多過是商業上的平等關係上的契約。³⁰ 此外，更不可忽視的是，在古代希伯來社會、以至中世紀的歐洲，最主要的經濟生產活動很可能仍是農耕多於商業。³¹ 林書從地理上的分別所作解釋，雖然很有想像力，但也需要更多的證據才有可能有說服力。

其次，林書雖說是“以馬克思的關於宗教的理論，把握基督教的本質與社會的功能分析”，但卻很少討論基督教對利他主義的理念有否以及如何在實際生活、尤其在社會制度或功能中表現出來。事實上，早在上世紀三十年代已有國人研究中世紀的基督教對社會的貢獻，包括如何減少窮人及病人的痛苦、如何保護遠人、奴隸、農奴、婦女、嬰孩等。³² 近年也有國內學者研究教會法典(canon law)如何體現基督教的愛。³³ 如果林書是要貫徹對社會功能的分析，應更著實地研究基督教在具體社會中的實際作用，而不是只停留在一些大而化的概括性論述，例如將基督教的宗教化與彼岸性，來對比儒家的政治化與此岸性。

第三，對於林書之提倡“以馬克思對於利他主義與利己主義的理論，作為評價利他主義的基本尺度”，一個需要考慮的問題是，馬克思主義對於利他主義與利己主義的理論有何獨到之處，為何可以作為評價利他主義的基本尺度。值得注意的是，至少對於國際學術界來說，馬克思主義在利他主義的問題上，並不是一項公認的權威可以用來作為批判不同的利他主義的判準。筆

³⁰ 詳參 Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, vols. 1 & 2, translated by J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961).

³¹ 王亞平，《西歐中世紀社會中的基督教教會》(北京：中央編譯出版社，2011)，頁 12-24。

³² 楊昌棟，《基督教在中古歐洲的貢獻》(北京：社會科學文獻出版社，2000)。

³³ 彭小瑜，《教會法研究》(北京：商務印書館，2003)。

者曾搜尋“藝術與人文科學引文索引”(Arts & Humanities Citation Index, 2012年3月17日登入),若輸入“馬克思主義”(Marxism)及“利他主義”(Altruism)作為主題(topic),發覺同一篇出版物中出現此二主題的就只有一篇期刊論文,並且在內容上是討論美國西南部的哭喪與葬禮,只在摘要中提及馬克思主義,而在實際研究中與馬克思主義關係並不深。³⁴ 反而,若改為輸入“儒家”(Confucianism)及“利他主義”則有3篇;若改為“基督教”(Christianity)及“利他主義”則共有16篇論文;若改為“演化”(evolution)與“利他主義”,則有1535項出版物。由此可見,就在國際學術界對利他主義的討論的重要性而論,馬克思主義是遠遠及不上演化論。此外,演化生物學中有關親緣選擇(kin selection)的理論,嘗試以利他行為的行動者與接受者之間在基因上的相似性與差異性,來解釋甚至預測利他主義的出現;³⁵ 這也許比馬克思主義之集中在經濟及社會階級,更易理解為何儒家的利他主義為何在實踐上容易局限在親族之內。那麼,馬克思主義對於利他主義與利己主義的理論又有何優越性,以至可以作為評價其他、尤其儒家與基督教的利他主義的基本尺度?這恐怕不是一項不證自明的真理,而基督教及儒家的人士更肯定會提出質疑、甚至抗議。

除了為何要採用這個尺度的理論問題外,更有一個相連的應用問題,就是這種尺度是如何運用的。林書說,

“儒家思想在現實中歸根到底是指向封建統治集團的利益,基督教則是指向基督教會,而當代中國社會主義的集體原則的價值觀則真正指向代表廣大人民群眾的根本利益。”³⁶

³⁴ Douglas H. MacDonald, “Grief and Burial in the American Southwest: The Role of Evolutionary Theory in the Interpretation of Mortuary Remains,” *American Antiquity* 66.4 (2001), pp.704-714.

³⁵ 詳參 Lee Alan Dugatkin, *The Altruism Equation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp.86-106.

³⁶ 林濱,《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》,頁206。

值得注意的是，這種尺度的運用，基本上是以當代中國社會主義的集體原則的價值觀，去衡量基督教與儒家的“現實”。這既不是以當代中國社會主義的集體原則的價值觀，去衡量基督教與儒家的集體原則的價值觀；也不是以當代中國社會主義的“現實”，去衡量基督教與儒家的“現實”。它更沒有反過來用基督教與儒家的“集體原則的價值觀”，來衡量當代中國社會主義的“現實”。

這種以某一方的價值觀去衡量以至批判另一方的現實，本身是有其合法性；正如從某一種對理想社會的想像來批判某一社會的理想及／或現實，這也可以說是無可厚非的。³⁷ 然而，作為一種比較研究來說，就顯得未夠恰當。更為恰當的比較研究，應是在理想與理想之間作比較，或在現實與現實之間作比較；用某一傳統的理想去批判另一傳統中的現實，卻是有違公平比較或平等對話的精神或原則。正如曾參與基督教與馬克思主義對話的史威德勒(Leonard Swidler)，也提出宗教、信仰及意識形態間的對話的一些基本原則，其中第四條基本原則就是：“在宗教間或意識形態間的對話，我們不應將我們的理想(ideals)與對方的實踐(practice)作比較，而是將我們的理想與對方的理想作比較，將我們的實踐與對方的實踐作比較”。³⁸

由以上的討論可見，林書之採取馬克思主義作為理論基礎或指導思想，對於促進基督教與儒家的比較研究，又或對利他主義的跨學科的討論，皆並不見得有何重要的貢獻。

³⁷ 例如可以用基督教對天國的想像，去批判當代中國社會的理想與現實。參：賴品超，〈田立克對上帝國的詮釋與漢語基督教終末論〉，《道風》9 (1998 秋)，頁 43-73；重刊於：賴品超，《邊緣上的神學反思——徘徊在大學、教會與社會之間》（香港：基督教文藝出版社，2001），頁 135-166。

³⁸ Leonard Swidler, *After Absolute: The Dialogical Future of Religious Reflection* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), p.43.

儒家與基督教的對比

在近年的耶儒比較或對話的研究中，不少學者也是傾向於採用某種類型學(typological)的區分，對儒家的仁與基督教的愛作出本質上的截然二分；例如以基督教的愛為“平等之愛”而儒家的仁是“差等之愛”，又或以儒家的“血親倫理”而基督教的是“超血親倫理”，又或以儒家的“利己(族)之愛”對比基督教的“利他之愛”，甚或以儒家的仁指向人與人之間的關係，以對比於基督教的愛則是出於上帝、是上帝的屬性。³⁹ 這些簡單的對立二分，基本上集中在儒家的仁與基督教的聖愛(agape)的對比。⁴⁰ 相似的是，林書中也認為，儒家的是“差等利他主義，是愛有差等的利他主義”，而基督教的是“同等利他主義，亦即愛無差等的利他主義”。⁴¹

這種對比表面上似乎頗能明確地突出這兩個傳統的各自特點，但也有一些明顯的局限。就儒家來說，它是否及以至在何意義下是一種血親倫理，在中國哲學界已有不少的爭論，不必在此贅述；⁴² 此外，儒家的仁，除了講人的德性以及人與人之間的倫理外，也不排除可以指向具創生性的形上實在或原理。⁴³ 對於基

³⁹ 類似的類型學區分，可見於：黃勇，〈儒家仁愛觀與全球倫理：兼論基督教對儒家的批評〉，郭齊勇編，《儒家倫理爭鳴集——以“親親互隱”為中心》（武漢：湖北教育出版社，2004），頁 803-810；尤西林，〈基督教超血親倫理及其起源——從《舊約》到《新約》〉，《江蘇社會科學》第二期（2007），頁 8-13；戴立勇，〈仁愛與神愛：中西慈善精神對比〉，《漢語基督教學術論評》第七期（2009），頁 111-138；陳建明，〈平等之愛與差等之愛〉，陳聲柏編，《對話：中國傳統文化與和諧社會》（北京：中國社會科學出版社，2011），頁 159-170；張錦青，〈孟學仁愛的本質〉，羅秉祥、謝文郁編，《耶儒對談：問題在哪裡？（上）》（桂林：廣西師範大學出版社，2011），頁 113-131。

⁴⁰ 例如：Yao Xinzong, *Confucianism and Christianity: A Comparative Study of Jen and Agape* (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 1996)；中譯：姚新中著，趙麗霞譯，《儒教與基督教：仁與愛的比較研究》（北京：中國社會科學出版社，2002）。

⁴¹ 林濱：《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁 277。

⁴² 較近期的討論可參：郭齊勇編，《〈儒家倫理新批判〉之批判》（武漢：武漢大學出版社，2011）。

⁴³ 牟宗三，《中國哲學的特質》（香港：學生書局，1963），頁 37-38；Wing-tsit Chan, "The Evolution of the Confucian Concept Jen," in: *Neo-Confucianism, etc.: essays, by Wing-tsit Chan* (Hanover, N.H., Oriental Society, 1969), pp.15-18；另參同書中文部

督教來說，問題可能更為複雜。這是因為，基督教所講的愛，不僅是在神學上講上帝的愛，也是在倫理學上講人的愛，當中除了涉及多種不同的對象外，也使用了多個不同的對於愛的概念；⁴⁴此外，在基督教思想發展史上，對愛有不同、甚至互相衝突的詮釋。

在愛的對象上，基督教在“愛鄰如己”的誠命中，除了“愛鄰”中肯定對鄰人的愛外，其實也早已在“如己”中預設了自愛。此外，正如林書中也有列出，基督教也有講夫妻之愛、兄弟之愛、孝敬父母、長幼之愛等。⁴⁵另外，基督教也有談對朋友以至仇敵之愛，並且十分強調對相同信仰的“弟兄（姊妹）”之間的超越種族及社會階層的愛。在概念上，基督教神學除了講聖愛外，也有用情愛／友愛(*philia*)的概念，也有對欲愛(*eros*)的討論，較少講的是家人或親人之間的親愛(*storge*)。⁴⁶然而，這些區分卻很少在基督教與儒家的比較中談及。⁴⁷此外，一個可能更為相關但也更為備受忽視的觀念是新約聖經中的“慈悲憐憫”(*splagchnizomai*)；這不單見於著名的好撒瑪利亞人的比喻中的“動了慈心”(路 10:33)，也見於耶穌對“困苦流離”的人的“憐憫”(太 9:36)；⁴⁸而同字根的“心腸”(*splagchnon*)除了偶然用來指作為身體器官(徒 1:18)外，更多是用來指慈悲憐憫的心腸，例如使徒保羅講的“我體會基督耶穌的心腸”(腓 1:8)及“心中有甚麼慈悲憐憫”(腓 2:1)等都是用了此字。

份，〈仁的概念之開展與歐美之詮釋〉，頁 7-10, 16-17。

⁴⁴ Thomas Jay Oord, *Defining Love: A Philosophical, Scientific and Theological Engagement* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2010), pp.31-63.

⁴⁵ 林濱，〈儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究〉，頁 33。

⁴⁶ 對這些概念的一個解釋，可參：路易斯著，汪詠梅譯，〈四種愛〉(上海：華東師範大學出版社，2007)。

⁴⁷ 例如在《耶儒對談：問題在哪裡？》一書中，似乎就只在陳立勝對范瑞平的評論的回應才提及，基督教在神愛(*agape*)之外，也有忠愛、愛慾、友愛等不同的觀念。參：陳立勝，〈敬畏生命：朱熹與史懷哲動物觀互參〉，羅秉祥、謝文郁編，《耶儒對談：問題在哪裡？(上)》，頁 63。

⁴⁸ 另出現於太 14:14, 15:32, 18:27, 20:34; 可 1:41, 6:34, 8:2, 9:22, 路 7:13, 15:20.

在利他主義的脈絡中，上帝的愛只是了解人的愛的思想背景，而真正要進行比較的應該是人的愛。若果所要比較的是基督教與儒家的利他主義，也許最應當拿來跟儒家比較的，不是基督教如何看上帝的愛，而是基督教如何看人的多種不同的愛。如果只將儒家的“仁”與基督教的“聖愛”這兩個概念作抽空的比較，忽視基督教中這些多種不同概念與對象的愛，更會忽視了在實際的人際關係中可以有不同種類的愛。在這些不同的愛，即使是有聖愛在其中，也難免涉及（親人之間的）親愛、甚至（夫妻間的）慾愛。依此而言，若果將對基督教與儒家的利他主義的比較，還原為基督教的聖愛與儒家的仁在概念上比較，可能會變相犯了懷德海(A. N. Whitehead, 1861-1947)所說的“具體性誤置的謬誤”(fallacy of misplaced concreteness)。⁴⁹

在對愛的本質、以至利他主義的詮釋上，基督教是有著十分重要的內部分歧。作為西方文化的重要代表的希臘哲學、尤其柏拉圖(Plato, 424/3-348/7 BCE)對慾愛(eros)的觀念或亞里士多德(Aristotle, 384-322 BCE)對自愛的肯定以至將愛理解為完美的友誼等，至少在表面上看，是與基督教承接《希伯來聖典》或《舊約聖經》的傳統而以自我犧牲為特徵的聖愛觀，呈現出一種分歧或張力的關係。⁵⁰ 慾愛與聖愛之間有何關係，是對立矛盾或分離、還是可以互融或結合，正是基督教思史中一個重要而富爭論性的問題。有些神學家、例如虞格仁(Andres Nygren, 1890-1977)，認為聖愛不僅是基督教倫理學的核心，更是基督教的獨特之處，而聖愛的特徵是自發的、無條件的、不計較的、自我犧牲的、以上帝為中心而非以自我中心，並與反映人自然天性的索取式的、自我中心的慾愛，不僅有所區別，更是相互對立並且更應互相分

⁴⁹ A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (Glasgow: Collins, 1975), p.68.

⁵⁰ 參：Carter Lindberg, *Love: A Brief History through Western Christianity* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), pp.1-10; Simon May, *Love: A History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2011), pp.14-118; 並比較：Bruce Chilton, “Altruism in Christianity,” in: *Altruism in World Religions*, pp.53-66; Robert M. Berchman, “Altruism in Greco-Roman Philosophy,” in: *Altruism in World Religions*, pp.1-30.

離。⁵¹ 然而，在基督教、尤其中世紀的靈修傳統中，慾愛的觀念扮演了重要的角色，並且與聖愛並不互相排斥。承接此一傳統，教宗本篤十六(Benedict XVI)的通諭《天主是愛》(Deus Caritas Est)更提出聖愛與慾愛是雖有分別卻不分離。⁵² 在基督新教內也有神學家、例如蒂利希(Paul Tillich, 1886-1965)，認為聖愛與欲愛之間雖有分別卻不分離，是可以並且應該予以統合。⁵³ 基督教在這問題上的內部分歧，與儒家的對話是有著十分明顯而重要的關係。

54

這種在聖愛與欲愛的關係的立場上的分歧，也反映在當代神學家在基督教倫理與利他主義的關係的立場上的對立。例如當代天主教神學家蒲柏(Stephen Pope)，按照阿奎那所展示的進路、尤其有關愛的秩序的觀點，認為基督教的愛是肯定並接受、而不是排斥現代生物學、尤其演化論所解釋的利他主義，他甚至進而提出一種相似於儒家的“差等之愛”的倫理學。⁵⁵ 但葛蘭特(Colin Grant)，則以依照聖愛的純正嚴謹的觀點，對蒲柏的觀點提出異議及批評。⁵⁶ 由此已反映出，基督教在不同的時代或處境，對於“愛”或利他主義是有不同的實踐甚至是互相衝突的詮釋，不容易被還原為某一既定的基本立場。相對來說，那種肯定聖愛包容而不是排斥其他形式的愛的神學傳統，更能肯定人的欲愛、友愛以及親愛，也更能突顯上帝的愛並不同於人的愛，就

⁵¹ 虞格仁著，薛耕南等譯，《歷代基督教愛觀的研究：愛佳泊與愛樂實》(香港：中華信義會書報部，第一冊 1950，第二冊 1952)。

⁵² 王濤，《聖愛與慾愛：靈修傳統中的天主教愛觀》(香港：香港中文大學天主教研究中心，2009)。

⁵³ 王濤，《聖愛與慾愛：保羅·蒂利希的愛觀》(北京：宗教文化出版社，2009)。

⁵⁴ 詳參：Lo Ping-cheung, “Ren as a Fundamental Motif and the Promise and Problem of a Contextual Theology of an Agape-Ren Synthesis: A Dialogue with Anders Nygren,” in: *Christianity and Chinese Culture*, edited by Miikka Ruokanen & Paulos Huang (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), pp. 102-119.

⁵⁵ Stephen J. Pope, *The Evolution of Altruism & the Ordering of Love; Human Evolution and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp.214-249.

⁵⁶ Colin Grant, *Altruism & Christian Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.xv.

是即使上帝的聖愛是如何的無條件、普遍，基督徒的或說基督教的並非如此，因為基督徒是人不是神。⁵⁷ 這種立場也許更為接近儒家，並且也更能配合自然科學對利他主義的討論。

全球化的視野

林書對基督教與儒家的所作的種種對比，雖然能夠予人清晰明確的感覺，但問題是，這也會使人懷疑二者之間是否真的如此能夠截然二分甚至對立，還是二者的相同或相通之處可能比二者的分歧更為重要。

首先，從生物學對利他主義的研究看，雖然人類文化會對人的行為、包括利他的行為，有一定的影響，但如果這些行為也有生物上、尤其基因上的基礎，不同文化中的利他主義，理應也有一定的相似或相通之處，而不應是截然相反對立。正如奧利納(Samuel P. Oliner)按照生物學對利他主義的觀點而提出，雖然不同的宗教在語言或概念上有不同的表達，但都對利他主義有所支持，甚至不同文化之中也有對利他主義的支持。⁵⁸

其次，從基督教的觀點看，正如不少基督教神學家也肯定，由於上帝普遍的恩典或人受造的本性，一般人也會有利他的行為、甚至高尚的道德情操及倫理。依此觀點，在基督教以外的倫理傳統中的利他主義，與基督教的利他主義有某種的一致性或相似性，實在也不足為奇。正如阿奎那的倫理學也與儒家的有某些相通之處。⁵⁹

再從儒家的角度看，這種將中西方文化、尤其在利他主義問題上的對立二分，也是值得懷疑。因為若果相信怵惕惻隱之心

⁵⁷ Simon May, *Love: A History*, pp.95-118.

⁵⁸ Samuel P. Oliner, *Altruism, Intergroup Apology, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation*, assisted by Piotr Olaf Zylicz (St. Paul, MN: Paragon House, 2008), pp.35-62.

⁵⁹ 賴品超、王濤，〈再思聖多瑪斯的生態倫理〉，頁 168-170。

人皆有之，乍見孺子將入於井，中國人與西方人的反應，理應不會截然相反；既人人同此心、心同此理，無論是出自東海還是西海，也會有儒家所講的利他主義的行為、甚至相近的思想。

最後，也許是最為重要的是，林書這種突顯差異與對比的方法，對於林書所要採取的全球化的視野也許難以配合。正如林書也考慮到，在全球化時代文化融合是文化發展的重要方式，當代中國文化需要“對其他文化兼收並蓄，融合揚棄，從而豐富自身、壯大發展自己”。⁶⁰ 這種立場，放在有關文化全球化的三大範式的理論框架來分析，它不應屬於以杭亭頓(Samuel Huntington, 1927-2008)為代表的文明衝突論，也不是主張一種“麥當勞化”(McDonaldization)，而是傾向於文化雜交化(hybridization)的範式。⁶¹ 依此，如果林書真的要正視文化全球化、尤其文化雜交化，也許就更不應該停留在將基督教與儒家作定型化的論述、甚至將二者作截然的對立二分，因為這只會強化文明衝突論中那種突顯不同文明之間有不可調和的衝突的論調，並不有利於文化間的融合。

薩義德(Edward Said, 1935 - 2003)曾提出，近現代西方、尤其在十九世紀盛行的對東方的學術研究，其實並非只是一種研究或學問（東方學）而已，它也是一種學術建制，並且也是帶有一定的權力關係的意識形態（東方主義），它透過詮釋一些古代的文本來重構出一個對東方的形象，並以此作為與西方的形象的簡化二分對比，繼而突出西方文化的優越性，最終是強化西方殖民主義的心態和權力。⁶² 利查·金(Richard King)曾沿著後殖民主義對東方主義的批判去追溯，指出一些西方人對“東方宗教”的研究，也出現相關的流弊，包括：“文本主義”（將某一宗教等同於一套古代文獻，忽視其在當代的活生生的、在文獻以外的

⁶⁰ 林濱，《儒家與基督教利他主義比較研究》，頁7。

⁶¹ 對此三範式的說明，可參：Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *Globalization & Culture* (Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004), pp.41-58.

⁶² 薩義德對東方學／東方主義的分析與批評，詳參：Edward W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995), pp.1-28.

呈現)、“本質主義”(將某宗教在某時某地的表現等同為其本質,抹煞某宗教在不時代、不同地方的差異)、以及“將東西方文化作簡化的二元對立”等。⁶³ 相對於這種在西方社會中出現的東方主義(Orientalism),在非西方社會中,也有一種“西方主義”(Occidentalism);這種西方主義雖然也有它在西方文化中的根源,但它卻是反對西方文化的,並且正如東方主義對東方文化的種種歪曲的再現(representation),西方主義也是對西方文化進行種種扭曲性的醜化,並且也是將西方與非西方的文化,作截然對立的二分、片面地強調二者之間的絕對分歧、無法調和的矛盾甚至是無可避免的衝突。⁶⁴

如果林書真的要肯定在全球化時代的文化融合,也許應避免東方主義或西方主義的偏頗、尤其在研究方法上的局限,不應是先入為主地假定中西方化、以至儒家與基督教為截然對立,然後極力說明二者的相異,反而應更多留意二者之間的相通之處。

結語

本文嘗試指出,在現行的對基督教及儒家的一些比較研究中,出現了一些方法論上的問題。其中包括:對比較研究的對象、尤其基督教的立場,提出一種大而化之的定型論述,而這些定型往往未能準確地反映相關傳統的立場、尤其當中的內部的豐富性或多樣性,也忽視了由這些內部分歧的立場、尤其那些與天主教有關的神學傳統,所提供的進一步對話的可能性。此外,在對基督教與儒家的比較中,往往透過對相關概念作一一對應的比較,傾向於片面地誇大二者在立場上的分歧,而無視二者之間的相似或相同之處。當中反映出一種將“中西”或“東西”文化,作高

⁶³ 詳參:Richard King, *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial theory, India and 'the mystical East'* (London: Routledge, 1999).

⁶⁴ 伊恩·布魯瑪、阿維賽·馬格利特著,林錚顛譯,《西方主義:敵人眼中的西方》(台北:博雅書屋有限公司,2010)。

度簡化、甚至誤導的對立二分，而這是不利於尋求文化間融合與各自發展。這種研究取向在漢語學界的流行，似乎反映出這並非純由個別學者的個人傾向，而是也折射出在漢語學界中某種頗為根深蒂固的範式(paradigm)、甚至是某種社會文化的風尚(ethos)。然而，若果在這種比較研究中，能夠留意個別傳統中的內部分歧，將可看見一些似乎是不同的宗教間(inter-religious)的分歧，其實也可以是個別宗教內(intra-religious)的分歧；兩個看似絕對地差異、對立甚或矛盾的宗教傳統，其實也有對話甚或融合的可能。

此外，在儒家與基督教的比較研究中，如能採用一個潛在地可供跨學科對話的概念、例如利他主義，也許會優勝於過往之集中直接將儒家的仁與基督教的聖愛作平面的一一對應的比較。這是因為，採用利他主義的概念作為比較或對話的焦點，也許更能擺脫那種因集中在“聖愛”與“仁”這種純粹在概念上的比較，避免片面地、甚至誤導地突顯前者為出於上帝的而後者出於人，繼而否定有任何對話或融合的可能。相反地，若果採用利他主義作為比較的焦點，則更能肯定所要談的是人的愛，而不是上帝的愛，由此更能正視人的愛在現象上複雜性，當中不僅可能有聖愛，而是也有欲愛、友愛以及親愛，而這些既是儒家所重視的，也是其他學科、包括生物學所致力研究的。可以說，以利他主義作為比較及／或對話的焦點，除了有助促進儒家與基督教之間的相互了解及對話，也會促進中國哲學、基督教神學與自然科學界之間的跨科際對話。依此而言，林濱對基督教及儒家的利他主義的比較研究，作為一個答案，雖然是難以令人滿意或苟同，但作為一個問題，卻可以說是提出了重要的問題或說指向了正確的發展方向。在學術上、尤其在哲學上，提出好的問題比提出好的答案更為重要。

在對利他主義的比較研究，如能減少大而化之的概括性定型，更多正視相關宗教傳統內部的多元性，並且更多考慮在宗教傳統以外的相關觀點，進行不單是跨宗教、更是跨學科的探討，這不僅有助深化相關宗教傳統間的比較與對話，也有助推展宗教

研究與其他學科的互動與整合，長遠而言也將有助利他主義在社會上的開展。

[ABSTRACT] This article attempts to analyze and evaluate some of the recently published comparative / dialogical studies in Chinese concerning the Christian and Confucian views of altruism and the related concepts such as *ren* and *agape*. It endeavors to point out the methodological characteristics and limitations of these studies, including: stereotyping the objects of comparative studies, neglecting the plurality of positions in a particular religious tradition, and then highlighting the diversity rather than similarity between the religious traditions to be compared. This kind of stereotyped discussion tends to strengthen rather than challenge or criticize some of the pre-understandings of related traditions. These methodological problems are not particular to a few individual scholars, but may reflect the historical and social influences on the Chinese academia as a whole. If these methodological barriers can be overcome, altruism can be a very useful concept, making significant contribution to the comparative studies and dialogue between Christianity and Confucianism as well as the inter-disciplinary studies of altruism.

保羅與親鸞信心觀之比較研究： 從「信心和行為的關係」出發¹

陳曦

A Comparative Study of the Theories of Faith of Paul and Shinran: The Relationship between Faith and Work

CHEN Xi

[摘要]對於保羅和親鸞來說，信心是個人達致拯救的重要因素。然而，兩人在闡述各自的信心理論時，都重點談到了信心和行為的關係問題，這也是個人在實踐信心過程中所必須面對的問題。因此，本文在對於保羅和親鸞信心觀進行比較研究時，重點探討了信心和行為的關係問題。文章首先通過文本分析的方法分別論述了保羅和親鸞各自對於這一問題的看法（選取的文本以“保羅書信”和親鸞所著《顯淨土真實教行證文類》為主），在此基礎上，文章嘗試進行比較分析。由此發現，保羅和親鸞雖然

¹ 本文主要取自本人博士論文第二章第二節中的部分內容。作者之博士論文題目為《保羅與親鸞拯救思想之比較研究》，第二章主要論述拯救的途徑——信心，其中第二節對於信心的內容進行分析之時，重點闡述了保羅和親鸞對於信心和行為的關係問題的不同看法。

對於信心和行為有著不同的理解和表達，但是都認為信心和行為是統一於拯救之內的。

如何獲得拯救是世界各大宗教一直以來不停思考和探索的問題。基本上，拯救的途徑不外乎依靠自己，依靠他人抑或依靠超越的神聖力量。保羅和親鸞在論述他們的拯救思想時，都重點談到了信心的概念，他們的信心觀是拯救思想的一個重要方面。² 一般說來，保羅所說的信心是對於基督教所宣講的信息的一種認可和接受，信心並非拯救本身，而是通過信心，人可以獲得來自上帝的義，並最終使得上帝神聖的拯救得以實現。³ 對於親鸞來說，在當下的末法時代，世人也是通過信心達致拯救。

既然通過信心可以獲得拯救，那麼這是否意味著拯救不需要任何個體的行為？在保羅和親鸞的信心觀中，兩人都重點闡述了信心和行為的關係問題，而這也是理解信心概念的一個尤為重要的方面。在保羅和親鸞的時代，兩人各自的宗教傳統都十分重視行為的作用，甚至將行為與拯救聯繫起來。在這種情況下，保羅和親鸞卻強調信心的重要性，並將其作為獲得拯救的途徑。那麼，信心和行為之間的關係究竟如何，這正是本文所要探討的問題。本文主要通過文本分析的方法來論述保羅和親鸞各自對於信心和行為的關係問題的看法，並在此基礎上對於兩人的思想進行比較。

² 之所以選取保羅和親鸞兩人的信心觀進行比較研究，有以下幾個原因：首先，保羅和親鸞可謂基督教和佛教中兩位具有代表性的思想家。儘管親鸞對於佛教的影響與保羅對於基督教的影響不可同日而語，但是兩人都是富有創新精神的改革家，在基督教和佛教的發展過程中，兩人都是改革式的重要人物。其次，從信心觀的內容上看，保羅和親鸞的思想存在諸多相似之處可供比較研究，這一點在文章內容中將具體展開。

³ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol.1, trans. Kendrick Grobel (New York: Scribner, 1952), p. 314.

保羅

在保羅的時代，與拯救相關聯的行為主要表現為律法的行為，和信心一樣，律法也是保羅拯救思想中非常重要的一個概念。⁴ 在保羅書信中，常常出現“因信稱義”和“因律法的行為稱義”的表達，而保羅對於信心和律法的使用又是十分多樣的，以下的兩段經文可以讓我們對此有一個大致的瞭解。⁵ 我們先看一節經文：“並且得以在他（此處指基督耶穌）裏面，不是有自己因律法而得的義，而是有信基督的義，就是基於信，從上帝而來的義。”（腓 3:9）

在這裏，信心一詞出現兩次：*πίστεως* 和 *πίστει*。第一次出現在“信基督的義”（*πίστεως Χριστοῦ*），在這裏，*Χριστοῦ* 作為一個所有格的形式，除了賓格所有格（objective genitive）的形式——信基督的義（NRSV/NIV: faith in Christ），也可理解為主格所有格（subjective genitive）——基督的信（faith/faithfulness of Christ）。然而，儘管目前的聖經翻譯中保留的是前一種解釋，但也有許多學者認為主格所有格的解釋更為恰當，*πίστεως Χριστοῦ* 應該是指“基督的信心/信實”。⁶ 但是，從整節經文來

⁴律法（νόμος; law）一詞是保羅書信作品中經常使用的辭彙，大概有 119 次。其分佈情況是：《羅馬書》75 次，《哥林多前書》9 次，《加拉太書》32 次，《腓立比書》3 次。參 *Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece of Nestle-Aland, 26th Edition, and to the Greek New Testament, 3rd Edition*, ed. The Institute for New Testament Textual Research and the Computer Center of Münster University (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Berlin, 1987), pp. 1300-303.

⁵ “稱義”是根據 justification 翻譯而來，在天主教傳統中常常被譯為“成義”。本文未對此不同翻譯做出區分，而是依據中文聖經和合本的翻譯統稱為“稱義”。

⁶何蒙娜(Morna D. Hooker)指出，*πίστεως Χριστοῦ* 同樣出現在其他保羅書信中（羅 3:22, 26; 加 2:16, 20; 3:22）。在此處經文中，保羅在這節經文最後指出“是基於信，從上帝而來的義”，如果前面也是指世人對於基督的信心，那麼保羅完全沒有必要在此處做無謂的重複和強調。更加可信的理解是，*πίστεως Χριστοῦ* 是指基督的信。基督通過信心獲得了從上帝而來的義，同時將這種義與在基督裏的世人

看，這種翻譯上的差別對於我們理解此節經文並無太大障礙，因為這兩種對於信心的理解並不是互相排斥的。聖經文本的確教導我們，耶穌的信心對於世人的拯救是十分重要的（羅 5:18-19），而人類也需要通過信心的回應才能獲得這種拯救。保羅認為，正因為耶穌基督所做的一切，當然包括他的信心，才使得這種義對於相信他的人來說是有效的，是可以獲取的。⁷ 可見，基督的信心和世人對於基督的信心在拯救論這一點上看來並無衝突之處。

在這節經文中，保羅將“因律法而得的義”和“基於信，從上帝而來的義”形成一個鮮明的對比，捨棄“因律法而得的義”，而選擇“基於信，從上帝而來的義”。事實上，這種對比式的表達在保羅書信中也是經常使用的。再看另一段經文：“既是這樣，哪裡可誇口呢？沒有可誇的。是藉什麼法（νόμου）呢？功德嗎？不是！是藉信主之法（νόμου πίστεως）。所以我們認定，人稱義是因著信，不在於律法的行為（ἔργων νόμου）”（羅 3:27-28）

律法一詞在這裏連續出現三次，保羅甚至使用 νόμου πίστεως 的表達，將律法與信心融合在一起。根據整段經文的意思，保羅在此處多次使用 νόμου，要表達的卻是不同的含義。很明顯，保羅所說的“信主之法”中的“法”與其後所指的與信心形成對比的“律法的行為”是不同的。從表面上看來，νόμου 一

分享。義是來自上帝的，但是通過基督的信而獲得。並且，此種解釋也正好符合了《腓立比書》前文（腓 2:6-11）所提到的基督虛己和順服的形象（作為這種信心的結果）。參 Morna D. Hooker, “The Letter to the Philippians: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections” in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol.11 (Nashville: Abingdon, 2000), p. 528. 同樣的觀點可見於 Tan Kim Huat, *A guide to Galatians and Philippians* (London: SPCK, 2009) 190. 而巴里 (Matlock R. Barry) 通過修辭學和語言結構上的分析，將此節經文與羅 3:22; 加 2:16; 3:22 綜合對比分析，認為 πίστεως Χριστοῦ 更合理的解釋應該是賓格所有格形式，而非主格所有格。參 Matlock R. Barry, “The Rhetoric of Pistis in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9” in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Vol. 30 no 2 (2007), pp. 173-203. 關於這一問題的討論，可參 George Howard, “Faith of Christ” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.2, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 758-60.

⁷ Tan Kim Huat, *A guide to Galatians and Philippians*, p. 190.

詞在此段經文中的確是個互相矛盾的表達，但是，這也表現出保羅在其書信作品中使用 νόμου 一詞的靈活性和其思想的跳躍性。因此，“信主之法”中的“法”應該是指一種原則（principle）和方法（method）。⁸ “信主之法”就是前文所指的因信稱義的方法，是對羅 3: 21-26 的一個總結。⁹

從羅 3: 28 可以看出，律法的行為與信心形成對比。律法的行為（νόμου; The works of the law）指向的是人應該怎樣做，而信心反映的是上帝的作為，是人對於上帝這種作為的回應。行為強調和宣揚的是人自我的能力，而信心要捨棄的恰恰是人的這種自我肯定，因為人所做的任何行為都不能使自己在上帝面前稱義。保羅在此處是有所指的，他所要批判的正是以順服律法為傲的一群猶太人。正如其在羅 3: 29-30 節經文中所指出的，上帝稱猶太人和外邦人為義的基礎是相同的，即是信心。¹⁰ 然而，律法對於傳統猶太人來說卻有著特殊的宗教意義。

1.1 律法 (νόμος; law)

律法是一種維持群體生活的手段。在舊約中，用來表示律法的最基本的辭彙就是妥拉（Torah），妥拉通常用來指上帝的

⁸ 在聖經翻譯中，NIV 使用的是“principle”，而 NRSV 卻是直接採用了“law”的翻譯。關於這一點，學者之間也有不同的意見。以克蘭菲爾德（C. E. B. Cranfield）和鄧雅各（James D. G. Dunn）為代表的學者認為，保羅在此處使用的 νόμου 和上下文是一致的，指的是摩西律法（Mosaic law）。保羅要區分的是對待摩西律法的兩種不同方式，一種關注的只是律法所要求的行為，而另一種是認識到在律法中，也同樣需要信心。莫爾（Douglas J. Moo）卻指出，保羅通常避免將信心和摩西律法放在一起使用，而是將兩者看成是對比的關係。因此，此處譯為“principle”是更為恰當的。布特曼也贊同“principle”的用法。參 Douglas J. Moo, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000), pp. 138-41. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1951), p. 259.

⁹ John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, vol.1 (Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub., 1968), p. 123. 莫爾（Douglas J. Moo）認為，羅 3:27-31 與羅 4 更為相關，而非羅 3:21-26。參 Douglas J. Moo, *Romans*, pp. 137-40.

¹⁰ John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, vol.1, pp. 122-23. Douglas J. Moo, *Romans*, pp. 137-39.

誡命 (commandments)，猶太人也將舊約最開始的五卷稱為妥拉。而事實上，妥拉更確切的含義並非律法，而是一些命令 (instruction)，引導 (guidance) 和指示 (direction)，妥拉就是向有信心以色列人以及以色列群體指明道路。¹¹

以色列人的群體是一個與上帝相關的約的群體，而律法就是他們維持這種與上帝的約的關係的方式。上帝和以色列人在西乃山上所立的約 (出 19-24)，即摩西律法就是整個以色列民族律法的基礎。¹² 因此，以色列的律法就是約的律法 (covenant law)。甚至在遭遇耶路撒冷聖殿被毀，以色列民族被流放之時，都沒有摧毀以色列群體的生活和對律法的信心。相反，這種種的災難被認為是沒有遵守律法的結果，因為律法是上帝的旨意，是上帝與以色列民族所立之約。這樣，律法在整個以色列民族中被作為最基本並且佔統治地位的一種實在，需要被嚴格遵守。直到第一世紀的猶太思想中，妥拉作為律法的表達，它的含義十分廣泛，從最基本的教導和命令到整個神聖的啟示 (包括書面的和口傳的)。因此，律法不僅包括了上帝與人之間的關係，也指涉人與人之間的關係 (人在群體中的生活方式，這也暗含了人與神聖之間的聯繫)。同時，律法被作為上帝拯救的手段，需要人完全的順服。¹³

保羅在使用律法一詞時，通常都是指上帝在舊約中的律法。有時使用的是上帝的律法 (羅 7:22; 25: 8:7)，有時也使用摩

¹¹ 需要注意的是，並非只有五經的律法能提供嚮導，上帝和以色列民族以及整個人類互動的整個歷史都可以成為一種道路，都屬於妥拉的範圍，同時，妥拉也被認為是來自上帝的禮物，是上帝的拯救行為。參 W. J. Harrelson, "Law in the OT" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Voll. 3, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), pp. 77-88.

¹² 在這個約的律法關係中，摩西在以色列民中被尊為律法的頒佈者 (lawgiver)。因此，妥拉也常指摩西律法，摩西律法就是上帝的旨意通過摩西在西乃山上向以色列人的啟示。參 Tan Kim Huat, *A guide to Galatians and Philippians*, p. 62.

¹³ 第一世紀的猶太人也意識到僅僅從形式上遵從和順服律法是危險的，而堅持一種從心靈上的純粹的順服。參 W. J. Harrelson, "Law in the OT" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol.3, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), pp. 77-95. E. P. Sanders, "Law in Judaism of the NT Period" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.4, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 254-65.

西的律法（林前 9:9）。然而，在保羅書信中，律法一詞從來沒有以複數形式出現過，也許在保羅看來，所有的律法就是一個統一的整體。作為一個法利賽人，保羅深知律法在猶太傳統中的重要性，是上帝旨意的完美表達。他也指出，律法是聖潔、公義，良善和靈性的（羅 7:12; 14），然而表現出來卻是與上帝為仇的（羅 8:7）。律法不能給予人生命，並不是指它的要求是惡的，而是因為沒有人能夠真正遵守，所有人都是罪的，不能在律法之下稱義（羅 3:20; 23）。不僅如此，律法還帶來了忿怒（羅 4:15）和死亡（林前 15:56），並與罪聯繫在一起（羅 6:14）。從人類的拯救歷史來看，罪的權勢就是律法，使人立自己的義，不服上帝的義（羅 10:3），並最終導致死亡（林前 15:56）。¹⁴ 保羅認為通過律法稱義，達致拯救是不可能的，因為基督已經為世人開啟了一條更加光明的道路。¹⁵ 因此，保羅認為，律法的終極（τέλος）就是基督（羅 10:4）。¹⁶

可見，律法最初是和舊約傳統以及以色列民族緊密相連的辭彙，到了保羅這裏卻有了更加豐富的詮釋。正如上文所指出的，保羅常常將信心和律法/律法的行為兩者對照使用。保羅對於信心的重視是毋庸置疑的，這一點也直接影響到他對待信心和律法之間的關係問題。

¹⁴ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol.1, pp. 263-68.

¹⁵ W. D. Wavies. "Law in the NT" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol.3, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), pp. 95-102.

¹⁶ τέλος 一詞既有終結，終點的意思，也有結果，目標，實現的意思。這樣，此句既可以理解為“基督使得律法到了盡頭”，也可以理解為“基督已經獲得律法所要達到的目的”。結合上下文分析可知，保羅緊接著指出，“所有信他的人都得著義”，這也正是對於“律法的總結就是基督”這句話的一個限制條件。在《羅馬書》中，以律法的行為稱義和以在基督裏的信心稱義之間的取捨關係是整篇書信的一個重要主題，保羅想要指出的是，對於有信心的人來說，基督就是律法的終結，人們不再靠著律法的行為稱義，而是通過信心得著義。也有學者認為，τέλος 一詞綜合了終點和目標這兩種含義。正因為基督已經獲得律法所要達到的目的，所以才帶來了律法時代的終結。參《新約希漢簡明字典》（香港：聯合聖經公會，1994），頁 170。John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 122-23. Douglas J. Moo, *Romans*, Vol. 2, pp. 49-51; 330-31.

1.2 信心和律法的關係

要分析信心和律法的關係問題，關鍵在於認清保羅對於律法的理解和態度。¹⁷ 韋雷德 (William Wrede) 曾指出，保羅所說的律法是一種敵對的勢力，世人需要從中被解放出來，他對於律法的否定是十分激進和完全的。而這種片面的詮釋也遭到許多反對，學者們基本上都認為保羅對於律法的態度不是單向的，而應從不同的方面具體分析。布特曼區分“上帝的義”和“人因律法而得的義” (羅 10:3; 腓 3:9)，認為上帝的義是完全的恩典，而律法和人自己的義表現的是一種驕傲自大的態度，期望通過個人自己的努力達到拯救。¹⁸

桑德士對於早期猶太教的研究成果，大大促進了這一課題的發展。他指出，在耶路撒冷聖殿被毀之前，巴勒斯坦地區的猶太主義是一種恩約守法主義 (covenantal nomism)，上帝揀選以色列人，以色列人順服與上帝所立的律法，是為了維持和上帝在約中的關係，而不是為了進入聖約，得到拯救，上帝的揀選和拯救都是上帝的恩典，而不是人類自己的成就。¹⁹ 這樣，認為保羅攻擊猶太教是律法條文主義和以行為稱義的宗教的說法就不攻自破。因此，桑德士認為，保羅否定以色列人律法的義在於它不是以在基督裏的信心為基礎，從而阻礙了外邦人站在和猶太人平等的位置上。²⁰ 在桑德士的基礎之上，鄧雅各進一步發展，認為

¹⁷ 詳參 Veronica Koperski, *What Are They Saying About Paul and the Law?* (New York: Paulist, 2001). Stephen Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1988).

¹⁸ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol.1, p. 285.

¹⁹ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977), p. 422.

²⁰ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, p. 551. The statement of E. P. Sanders is: "What is wrong with Israel's righteousness by law...is that it is not based on faith in Christ...and that it prevents Gentiles from being on equal footing with Jews." 參 Veronica Koperski, *What Are They Saying About Paul and the Law?* (New York: Paulist, 2001), p. 19.

律法本身是好的，保羅批判的是猶太人對待律法的態度，將律法當作一種“身份標記”和特權，這樣就將外邦人排除在外，從而使拯救的範圍受到限制。²¹

事實上，保羅在不同的場景中對於律法的描述是不盡相同的，但這並不表示保羅的敘述是完全沒有原則的，而是為了與他所要敘述的主要內容保持一致。因此，保羅關於律法的神學是多樣的，而不是單一的。²² 在其書信作品中，尤其是《加拉太書》和《羅馬書》中，保羅對於律法的否定決不是指整個舊約傳統中所理解的律法概念。²³ 保羅要反對的是猶太人對於律法的理解，而他最有意義的貢獻就在於詮釋了律法的功用，認為律法必須服務於上帝與人的關係，而不是主導。同時，他也認為律法是上帝旨意的一種啟示，如果不是從信心出發的律法的行為就是對神的義的不服從，因為律法本是要以對上帝的信心為本，信心是律法最為基本的要求。²⁴

因此，保羅將以律法的行為稱義和以在基督裏的信心稱義對照使用，認為只有通過對耶穌基督的信心才能稱義，但是，當時一世紀的猶太人雖然遵從律法，但也沒有否認靠信心稱義的合理性。可見，保羅就是要人做出選擇，而將兩者互相對立。²⁵ 要理解這一點，就必須結合保羅當時所處的時代處境。根據保羅新觀學者的研究，猶太基督徒和外邦基督徒的關係問題是存在於早期基督教群體的一個主要問題，也是保羅十分關注並且亟待解決的問題。

²¹ James D. G. Dunn, *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge; New York: CUP, 2003) 10.

²² “He did not have, however, one single theology of the law.” E. P. Sanders, *Paul* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 84.

²³ W. J. Harrelson, “Law in the OT” in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol.3, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), p. 77.

²⁴ Stephen Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1988), p. 105.

²⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Pub Co., 2008), p. 112.

猶太基督徒認為，外邦人應該接受基督，接受割禮，接受律法，而保羅意識到，要外邦人接受律法對於他們來說是不公平的，這樣也是將外邦人看成是“二等公民（second-class citizens）”。²⁶ 在當時的猶太群體中，律法被以色列人看成是民族身份的標記，從而滋生了自私和狹隘的民族熱情，被罪惡所利用，耶穌基督使得這一切都得以終止。²⁷ 基督的到來以及他為我們的罪而死相當於一個神聖的宣告，即任何依靠行為來追求律法的義的可能性都將結束。²⁸

那麼，原本是聖潔，公義的律法為什麼會成為罪的奴僕呢？保羅認為，律法因肉體而軟弱（羅 8:3），律法外在的特點使人憑著字句去理解它，而忽略了律法的內在（林後 3:6-7）。²⁹ 這也正是猶太人從律法的外在去理解它，將律法作為一個與上帝立約的民族身份的標記，而忽略了與上帝之間真正的聯繫。而如今上帝向世人展現了一條更好的拯救道路，通過對基督的信心稱義，相比較而言，律法的行為在對基督的信心面前就顯得無用。這樣，通過基督的信心稱義，猶太人不再享有特權身份，外邦人也被納入了上帝通過耶穌基督拯救的計劃當中。

然而，雖然保羅堅持律法對於稱義是無用的，卻並不表示律法是完全無用的，也並不代表律法與拯救毫無關聯。因為律法本身是屬乎靈的，律法的完全描述了一種和上帝的關係，問題不在於律法本身而在於行律法的人。³⁰ 通過保羅書信的記載可以看出，律法在上帝拯救的計劃中佔據了重要地位：律法是福音的證明（羅 4）；³¹ 律法使人認識到罪（羅 3:19-20），人試圖通過自

²⁶ E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (London: SCM, 1985), pp. 153-54.

²⁷ James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul*, p. 467.

²⁸ James D. G. Dunn, *Paul and The Mosaic Law* (Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), p. 233.

²⁹ W. D. Davies, “Law in the NT” in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol.3, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1962), p. 99.

³⁰ C. K. Barrett, *Paul: An Introduction to His Thought* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox, 1994), p. 83.

³¹ Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, translated and edited by Geoffrey W.

己的努力，遵行律法的行為來獲得拯救，這最終只會導致罪，因為這種努力本身就是一種罪；³² 律法為基督徒在基督裏的新生活提供了指導（羅 12-13:10）；律法體現了上帝所要求的義，這種義如今在基督裏實現了（羅 8:1-4）。³³ 律法的要求是公義的，上帝要求世人有好的行為，並且也充當了審判者的角色（羅 1:18-3:20），而信心卻也並沒有否定上帝對律法的要求。基督徒雖然藉著信心，而不是律法的行為稱義，卻仍然要依據律法的行為接受上帝的審判（林後 5:10）。³⁴ 因此，儘管從某種程度上來說，基督徒已經不再處於律法之下（加 5:18），卻並不意味著律法的要求對於世人是無效的。正如保羅常常指出，愛成全了律法（羅 13:8-10；加 5:14）。事實上，律法也可以作為上帝旨意和智慧的表達，而不僅僅局限於以色列民族中，這樣，律法即是信心的表達，是對上帝絕對的信靠。³⁵

《羅馬書》中記載，亞伯拉罕在接受律法之先已經有了信心，是藉著信心稱義，而割禮只是作為他因信稱義的一個記號（羅 4:11）。可見，對於上帝最初的信心，是在律法之外的。儘管保羅一再主張信心和律法之間的差別，但兩者之間依然存在著不可分割的聯繫。他在書信中指出，“這樣，我們藉著信廢了律法嗎？”（羅 3:31a）“絕對不是！更是鞏固律法”（羅 3:31b）因為在信心之前，沒有真正對於律法真諦的理解。人不能通過律法稱義，獲得生命，恰恰是由於人成為了律法的違背者，因而在上帝面前成為罪的。³⁶

不可否認的是，保羅對於律法的態度與他信仰的轉變也是相關的。在保羅看來，猶太人的律法遮蓋了上帝的兒子耶穌基督

Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1980), p.105.

³² Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament.*, Vol.1, p. 264-65.

³³ Douglas J. Moo, *Romans*, p.139.

³⁴ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, p. 543.

³⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul*, p. 467.

³⁶ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol.1, p. 263.

（加 3:13；林後 3:14-15），這使得他對於律法重新檢視。“律法的終極就是基督，使所有信他的人都得著義（羅 10:4）”。因此，對於有信心的人來說，基督就是律法的終點，人不再因為律法稱義，而是通過對基督的信心稱義，從而建立與上帝之間的拯救關係。

親鸞

親鸞在其代表著作《顯淨土真實教行證文類》中，集中闡述了他對於信心和行為以及兩者之間關係的看法。³⁷ 概括說來，在《顯淨土真實信》這一卷中，親鸞主要是從以下六個主題來闡述信心的概念，這六個主題也是從各自不同的角度來表達信心。

“三心和一心”表明了至心信樂欲生這三心與信心之間合三為一的關係；“菩提心”包含自力菩提心和他力菩提心，只有橫超的他力菩提心才是真實信心；“一念”表達了信心生起之時的迅速；“橫超段四流”說明了信心的功用，能夠斷絕一切生老病死之苦；“真佛弟子”才有真宗所說的真實信心；“五逆謗法”之人最終也能依靠彌陀的回向本願往生淨土。事實上，除了以上所說的這幾個方面，親鸞在《教行信證》另外幾卷以及他的其他作品中都有論及信心。對於親鸞來說，信心是多方面的，可以有許多不同的表達，但都是由阿彌陀佛的無量光所生起，根源於彌陀的慈悲本願。

同時，在《教行信證》中，親鸞同樣花費了一整卷的篇幅來論述“淨土真實行”。“大行者，則稱無礙光如來名。斯行即

³⁷ 儘管此書全稱為《顯淨土真實教行證文類》，當中並未提及信心。然而從內容上看，關於信心的卷三是六卷中篇幅最長，內容最為詳盡的。由此可見親鸞對於信心的重視。事實上，親鸞雖然在標題上沒有提及信心，但是在其手稿的開篇處寫到“教行信證”。一般認為，親鸞在標題中只提及教行證，是為了跟從傳統佛教對於教行證三者的並稱。“教，佛所說之教理；行，眾生從教所為之修行；證，由行所得之證悟。依如來之教法而起修行，依修行之功而證悟聖果。”《佛光大辭典》〈<http://www.ebud.net/fgdick/dick.asp?no=7855&dict=fordict1&key=教行證>〉。Gutoku Shaku Shinran, *The Kyōgyōshinshō: The Collection of Passages Expounding the True Teaching, Living, Faith, and Realizing of the Pure Land*, trans. Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki (Kyoto: Shinshūōtaniha, 1973), p. 203.

是攝諸善法，具諸德本，極速圓滿，真如一實功德寶海，故名大行。”³⁸ 親鸞認為，淨土真實行就是稱念阿彌陀如來的名號，這種真實行包含了一切善法和功德，是最為圓滿的。同時，他還進一步指出，“爾者，稱名能破眾生一切無明，能滿眾生一切志願。稱名則是最勝真妙正業，正業則是念佛，念佛則是南無阿彌陀佛，南無阿彌陀佛即是正念也，可知。”³⁹ 由此，稱名念佛能夠破除世人的無明，也是拯救過程中十分重要的一個方面。事實上，念佛實踐的彌陀本願在第十七願中也表現出來：“設我得佛。十方世界無量諸佛。不悉諮嗟稱我名者。不取正覺。”⁴⁰

在具體論述到稱名念佛對於世人拯救的重要作用時，親鸞引用了善導的《往生禮贊》加以說明：

若稱阿彌陀佛一聲，即能除滅八十億劫生死重罪，禮念已下亦如是。《十往生經》雲，若有眾生，念阿彌陀佛，願往生者，彼佛即遣二十五菩薩擁護行者，若行，若坐，若住，若臥，若晝，若夜，一切時，一切處，不令惡鬼，惡神得其便也……又如《無量壽經》雲，若我成佛，十方眾生，稱我名號，下至十聲，若不生者，不取正覺。彼佛今現在成佛，當知本誓，重願不虛，眾生稱念，必得往生。⁴¹

此處明確表達了眾生稱名念佛即可往生淨土的意涵，而念佛的具體內容是稱念“南無阿彌陀佛”的六字名號。善導指出：

“言無量壽者，乃是此地漢音。言南無阿彌陀佛者，又是西國正音。又南者是歸，無者是命，阿者是無，彌者是量，陀者是壽，佛者是覺，故言歸命無量壽覺。”⁴² 對此，親鸞具體解釋道：

³⁸ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，載《大正新脩大藏經（第八十三卷）》，頁 590 上。

³⁹ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 590 下至 591 上。

⁴⁰ 〈佛說無量壽經〉，載《大正新脩大藏經（第十二卷）》，頁 268 上。

⁴¹ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 594 上至中。

⁴² 善導，〈觀無量壽經疏玄義分卷第一〉，載《大正新脩大藏經（第三十七卷）》，

爾者南無之言歸命，歸言至也，又歸說也，說字（悅音）又歸說也，說字（稅音。悅稅二音。告也，述也，宣述人意也。）命言（業也，招引也，使也，教也，道也，信也，計也，召也。）是以歸命者，本願招喚之救命也。言發願回向者，如來已發願回施眾生行之心也。言即是其行者，即選擇本願是也。言必得往生者，彰獲至不退位也。《經》言，即得，釋雲，必定。即言，由聞願力，光闡報土真因，決定時克之極促也。必言（審也，然也，分極也。）金剛心成就之貌也。⁴³

“南無阿彌陀佛”這個六字名號中，包含了阿彌陀如來的回向發願心。眾生稱念這個名號，也即是選擇了如來的本願，由此必能往生淨土。覺如在其《教行信證大意》中指出：“名號者，攝諸善法，具諸德本。眾行之根本，萬善之總體。行此者得西方之往生。”⁴⁴ 可見，稱念彌陀名號是一切行為中最根本的，與往生淨土密切相關。在各種經論中，對於念佛有“一念”和“十念”的說法。⁴⁵ 親鸞重點解釋了一念的含義，認為行之一念與信之一念是相一致的。“凡就往相回向行信，行則有一念，亦信有一念。言行之一念者，謂就稱名遍數，顯開選擇易行至極。”⁴⁶ 此

頁 246 中至下。

⁴³ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 594 下。

⁴⁴ 覺如，〈教行信證大意〉，載《真宗聖典全書（和文之部）》（東京：文會堂，1907），頁 670。覺如為親鸞的曾孫，也是淨土真宗本願寺第三代主持，主張與親鸞血統者為淨土真宗教團的中心。《日本歷史文化詞典》（南京：南京大學出版社，2010），頁 341。

⁴⁵ 親鸞引用了眾多經論加以說明。關於一念：“大本（《大經》）言：佛語彌勒：‘其有得聞，彼佛名號，歡喜踴躍，乃至一念，當知此人，為得大利，則是具足，無上功德。’光明寺和尚雲：下至一念。又雲：一聲一念。又雲：專心專念。智升師《集諸經禮懺儀》下卷雲：深心即是真實信心。信知‘自身是具足煩惱凡夫，善根薄少，流轉三界，不出火宅’；今信知‘彌陀本弘誓願，及稱名號，下至十聲一聲等，定得往生’。乃至一念，無有疑心，故名‘深心’。”關於十念：“《安樂集》雲：‘十念相續’者：是聖者一數之名耳。即能積念凝思，不緣他事，使業道成辦便罷！亦不勞記之頭數也。又雲：若久行人念多應依此，若始行人念者記數亦好，此亦依聖教。”親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 597 中至下。

⁴⁶ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 597 中。

處的一念表明了稱名念佛對於世人來說是十分容易做到的。“一念即是一聲。一聲即是一念。一念即是一行。一行即是正行。正行即是正業。正業即是正念。正念即是念佛，則是南無阿彌陀佛也。”⁴⁷ 親鸞最終將正行直接概括為稱念“南無阿彌陀佛”。

對於淨土真實行，親鸞總結道：“斯乃顯真實行明證。誠知，選擇攝取之本願，超世稀有之勝行，圓融真妙之正法，至極無礙之大行也，可知。”⁴⁸ 親鸞將念佛的正行讚歎為世間少有的殊勝的行為，並稱之為“大行”，這也與他常說的“大信”相一致。

2.1 個人的修行實踐

事實上，佛教傳統在界定“行”的概念時，並不僅限於念佛的實踐。“廣義的修行，相當於‘信解行證’中的行；狹義的修行指依照各個宗派的法門而修習。就難易程度而言，修行有難行道與易行道之分。就正直、方便來分，有中道正行與方便道之異。就修行內容言，有修福、修慧之別。如依宗派分類，又有修密、修禪、修淨土、修華嚴、修天臺……等多種。此外，同一宗派之內，所修法門也有種種殊異。”⁴⁹ 而實行修行功夫者，一般稱為行者，修行含有實習、修養、實踐的含義。佛教中的行者為了實現佛陀體驗的境界，而專心精研修養，因此特別重視修行方面，同時也發展出各種詳細的戒律條文、生活規範與精神之修養

⁴⁷ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 597 下。

⁴⁸ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 597 下。

⁴⁹ 新譯《華嚴經》卷五十八敘述菩薩的十種修行法，即恭敬尊重諸善知識修行法、常為諸天之所覺悟修行法、於諸佛所常懷慚愧修行法、哀憐眾生不舍生死修行法、事必究竟心無變動修行法、專念隨逐發大乘心諸菩薩眾精勤修學修行法、遠離邪見勤求正道修行法、摧破眾魔及煩惱業修行法、知諸眾生根性勝劣而為說法住佛地修行法、安住無邊廣大法界除滅煩惱令身清淨修行法。參引自《中華佛教百科全書》〈<http://www.ebud.net/fgdick/dick.asp?no=3973&dict=fordict3&key=修行>〉。

方法。佛教中有“八萬法門”的說法，可見修行方法之紛繁複雜。⁵⁰

淨土修行與其他宗派修行方法也有所不同，修行佛道有四修之說，即恭敬修、無餘修、無間修、長時修。世親《俱舍論》中對四修的理解與善導《往生禮贊》對於四修的理解截然不同，分別被稱為聖道門之四修與淨土門之四修。⁵¹

	聖道門四修	淨土門四修
恭敬修	恭敬尊重所學三寶	恭敬禮拜阿彌陀佛及一切聖眾
無餘修	修一切行業無遺餘	專稱彼佛名號，專念、專想、專禮、專贊彼佛及一切聖眾
無間修	修行相續無間斷	相續恭敬禮拜、稱名讚歎、憶念觀察、回向發願，心心相續，不以餘業間斷，又不以貪嗔煩惱致令間斷，隨念隨懺，不令隔念隔時隔日，常令清淨。
長時修	修三無數劫，了無倦怠	畢命為期，誓不終止

⁵⁰ “八萬法門”中，主要以三學、八正道、四諦等為主。《佛光大辭典》<<http://www.ebud.net/fgdick/dick.asp?no=12556&dict=fordict1&key=修行>>。

⁵¹ 此表的內容參照《中華佛教百科全書》而來。

<<http://www.ebud.net/fgdick/dick.asp?no=3973&dict=fordict3&key=修行>>。

可見，與聖道門的修行強調修一切行業不同的是，淨土信仰只主張念佛的修行。念佛包括觀想念佛與稱名念佛，具體指在心裏稱念法身佛（理念上的佛），觀想具體存在的佛相，或佛陀的功德，又或者是口中稱念佛的名號。⁵² 同時，念佛也有正、助二行之分。源信《往生要集》中提到往生之行有正修念佛與助念方法的分別：“助念方法者，一日之羅不能得鳥，萬術助觀念成往生大事，今以七事略示方法：(一)方處供具，(二)修行相貌，(三)對治懈怠，(四)止惡修善，(五)懺悔眾罪，(六)對治魔事，(七)總結行要。”⁵³ 同時，善導在其《觀無量壽經疏》〈散善義〉中在五種正行中又分別出正助二業：“又就此正中複有二種，一者一心專念彌陀名號，行住坐臥不問時節久近，念念不舍者，是名正定之業，順彼佛願故，若依禮誦等，即名為助業。”⁵⁴ 五種正行包括讀誦、觀察、禮拜、稱名、讚歎供養。善導認為第四稱名為本願行，所以是正定業，其餘四種非本願行，所以是助業。⁵⁵ 而對於親鸞來說，淨土真實行就是稱念阿彌陀佛的名號，這種正念即是正行。

一般的修行者在修行過程中通常將宗教的修行實踐作為獲得功德的手段，並以此為基礎達致拯救。親鸞指出這種理解是完全錯誤的，他們沒有認識到人本身的全然敗壞和罪惡，也沒有理解阿彌陀佛在整個拯救行為當中的真正意義和作用。在這個末法時代，有限的個體是完全墮落的，他們並沒有能力做出任何好的行為，即使人們做出一些從表面上來看是好的行為，但實質上是人們工於心計，期望為自身獲取功德利益而產生的行為。因此，個體所表現出來的好行為都是以自我為中心，依然處於個人情感的控制中，從根本上來說，依舊是惡的。另一方面，與阿彌陀佛

⁵² 參《佛光大詞典》

<<http://www.ebud.net/fgdick/dick.asp?no=13780&dict=fordict1&key=念佛>>。

⁵³ 源信，〈往生要集〉，載《大正新脩大藏經（第八十四卷）》，頁 57 中。

⁵⁴ 善導，〈觀無量壽經疏散善義卷第四〉，載《大正新脩大藏經（第三十七卷）》，頁 272 中。

⁵⁵ 參《中華佛教百科全書》

<<http://www.ebud.net/fgdick/dick.asp?no=3973&dict=fordict3&key=修行>>。

相比較而言，人們更不能做出任何所謂好的行為。阿彌陀佛經歷無數劫的修行才使得人們往生淨土成為可能，他擁有完全的，不可比擬的好和善。因此，在阿彌陀佛善的本性與世人惡的本性之間，有著不可逾越的鴻溝，人們也就不可能有任何稱之為完全好的行為。⁵⁶ 可見，在親鸞的思想中，人靠自身的能力根本不能做出任何好的行為，這樣，通過好的行為獲取功德達致拯救的方式也就行不通了，認識到自身本性的罪惡才是拯救的起點。

因此，他將所有個體的行為和努力從宗教的最終拯救中剔除出去，主張拯救只能通過信心才能達到，世人能夠做到的只是對自我罪的本性的認識，以及對彌陀拯救的感激。⁵⁷ 除了信心是完全他力的之外，親鸞將個人的具體修行實踐也詮釋為他力的作用。“言他力者，如來本願力也。”⁵⁸ 這種他力主要是指阿彌陀如來的本願力。

親鸞繼承了傳統淨土信仰中對於稱名念佛實踐的重視，肯定稱名念佛對於往生淨土的有效性。不同的是，他將重點轉向對於修行者的態度以及修行實踐本身的考察。在傳統淨土信仰中，念佛實踐雖然被認為是往生淨土的有效方式，但都是作為一種修行者獲取功德，從而往生淨土的手段。然而，親鸞給予這種傳統的往生淨土方式一種新的詮釋。他指出，這種念佛的實踐雖然是由個體自我所發出的行為，卻依然是他力行為作用的結果，因為最終是否往生淨土完全依賴於阿彌陀佛的願力及其名稱不可思議之能力，念佛的實踐只是修行者對於彌陀拯救的一種自然的感激的行為表達。甚至可以認為，人的整個宗教生活都是對於阿彌陀佛慈悲精神的感激的表達，念佛也只是其中一種具體的方式。⁵⁹ 因此，親鸞雖然和其他淨土思想一樣接受稱名念佛的修行實

⁵⁶ Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace* (Tucson: University of Arizona, 1965), p. 30.

⁵⁷ Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*, 31, 36.

⁵⁸ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 597 下至 598 上。

⁵⁹ Paul S. Chung, "Martin Luther and Shinran: The Presence of Christ in Justification and Salvation in a Buddhist-Christian Context", in *Asia Journal of Theology*, Vol. 18 no. 2, (2004), p. 302.

踐，但是他最大的不同之處在於否定了“人可以通過念佛的實踐獲取功德”這個原則。對於親鸞來說，人不能通過任何的方式來獲取功德，從而直接達致個人的拯救。⁶⁰ 也就是說，人不能通過自己的努力獲得拯救。念佛也不是個人獲取功德的自力行為，而是從彌陀而來，是人對於彌陀他力救度的感激的自然表達。

事實上，對於稱名念佛實踐本身，親鸞也認為是一種他力行為的體現。念佛的實踐，也是信心的一種表達。他指出：

念佛ハ行者ノタメニ非行非善ナリ。ワカハカラヒニテ行スルニアラサレハ。非行トイフ。ワカハカラヒニテツクル善ニモアラサレハ。非善トイフ。ヒトヘニ他力ニシテ・自力ヲハナレタルユヘニ。行者ノタメニハ非行非善ナリト云云（譯文：念佛者，於行者而言，非行非善也。非我計之行，故言非行；亦非我計而作之善，故言非善。全依他力，離自力故，於行者，非行非善也。）⁶¹

在念佛的實踐中，彌陀的名號本身就能夠去除人的罪和惡業，並使人往生淨土成為可能。⁶² 在親鸞看來，彌陀的名號包含了其自身完全的美德和善，修行者通過口念，聽到彌陀的名，從而能夠意識到彌陀拯救有情眾生的慈悲之心。⁶³ 因此，稱名念佛的實踐雖然不能為修行者獲取個人功德，卻使得修行者在這個過程中進一步受到彌陀他力的恩典，從而最終獲得往生淨土的保證。

⁶⁰ Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*, p. viii.

⁶¹ <嘆異鈔>，載《大正新脩大藏經（第八十三卷）》，頁 729 中。

⁶² Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*, p. 31.

⁶³ Alfred Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*, p. 54.

2.2 大信與大行

正如上文所述，信心和行為都是多樣化的，而親鸞將淨土真實信與淨土真實行稱為大信和大行。“謹按往相回向，有大行有大信。”⁶⁴ 往相回向指阿彌陀佛將自己的功德回向給眾生，發願與眾生一同往生阿彌陀如來淨土。因此，大信與大行是統一於彌陀的本願力當中。二者的具體關係主要表現在以下二個方面：

1. 大信和大行是內因和外緣的關係。

良知，無德號慈父，能生因闕。無光明悲母，所生緣乖。能所因緣雖可和合，非信心業識，無到光明土。真實信業識，斯則為內因。光明名父母，斯則為外緣。內外因緣和合，得證報土真身。故宗師（善導《往生禮贊》）言，以光明名號攝化十方，但使信心求念。又云（法照《五會法事贊》），念佛成佛是真宗。⁶⁵

親鸞的這一觀點也正符合了傳統佛教關於萬物因緣和合而生的理念。他將信心作為往生淨土的內因，念佛的行為作為外緣，內外因緣和合，才能最終往生淨土。“依《涅槃經》，佛言，若人但能至心，常修念佛三昧者，十方諸佛，恒見此人，如現在前。”⁶⁶ 雖然兩者對於往生淨土來說缺一不可，但對於親鸞來說，作為內因的信心顯然是更為重要的。因而他指出：“真實信心必具名號，名號未必具願力信心也。”⁶⁷ 可見，真實信心是最為根本的，有了信心，自然會有稱名念佛的行為，但是單純的念佛行為卻並不一定包含彌陀本願的真實信心。

⁶⁴ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 590 上。

⁶⁵ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第二（行卷）〉，頁 597 中。

⁶⁶ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第三（信卷）〉，載《大正新脩大藏經（第八十三卷）》，頁 608 中。

⁶⁷ 親鸞，〈教行信證卷第三（信卷）〉，頁 606 中。

2. 信心和行為都來源於阿彌陀佛本願力的回向，都是他力的。

親鸞將信心表達為“至心信樂之願”，而將行為表達為“選擇稱名之願”，同時，他又將信心和行為論述為“往相信心之願”和“往相回向之願”。可見，信心和行為都與彌陀的往相回向密不可分。由此親鸞再一次強調：“爾者，若行若信，無有一事非阿彌陀如來清淨願心之所回向成就，非無因他因有也，應知。”⁶⁸ 儘管信心和行為對於世人往生淨土十分重要，然而這一切都根源於彌陀本願力的回向，信心和行為都是彌陀他力作用的結果。

小結

儘管在各自宗教傳統中，保羅和親鸞對於行為具體內容的表述有所不同，但基本上都包含了日常的宗教行為和道德行為這些方面。通過以上的論述可知，保羅和親鸞並沒有因為肯定信心的重要性而完全否定行為的作用，而是強調了行為本身的重要性，並且依據各自生活處境的改變對於信心和行為給予了全新的詮釋。

作為一個猶太人和基督徒，信心和律法都是保羅思想中的重要概念。對於保羅來說，信心和律法都表達了人和上帝之間的關係，都內在於上帝拯救計劃之中。然而，當其面對早期信仰群體中出現的猶太基督徒和外邦基督徒的身份問題時，保羅將信心和律法的概念對照使用，淡化律法作為猶太人身份標記的重要性，而強調上帝通過基督向世人展現了一種更加完全的拯救方式。作為外邦人的使徒，保羅強調信心在稱義和拯救行為中的作用，從而把外邦人帶入了早期基督教的信仰群體，並將上帝的拯救從一個民族擴大到普世的範圍。可見，保羅對於信心和律法的

⁶⁸ 親鸞，〈淨土文類聚鈔〉，頁 644 下。

詮釋與其歷史處境息息相關。雖然在稱義的過程中，保羅將信心和律法區分開來，但是摩西的律法，基督的信心在上帝的拯救計劃中卻是統一的。可以說，行律法，信基督都是人信心的外在表現，真正重要的是內在的，對於上帝拯救行為的回應，對於上帝的絕對信賴以及由此建立的與上帝之間的關係。

親鸞所繼承的淨土信仰以念佛的宗教行為取代了各種紛繁複雜的聖道門修行方式，親鸞在此基礎上進一步強調了稱名念佛行為的重要性。事實上，親鸞個人的宗教修行也經歷了由聖道門到淨土門的轉變，而這種轉變與他對於當時的宗教社會處境的判斷密切相關。親鸞意識到在末法時代中，世人的罪惡使其無法依靠自身的努力往生淨土，獲得拯救，因而他放棄通過自力修行往生淨土，轉而尋求阿彌陀佛他力的拯救，念佛的行為正是對於彌陀拯救的一種自然的感激。從這個角度來說，親鸞不僅沒有否定念佛行為的作用，反而認為這是拯救過程中必不可少的。由此，他將信心和稱名念佛的行為統一於彌陀的本願力中，並認為兩者的因緣和合才能促成最終的往生淨土。

由此可以看出，保羅和親鸞都認為僅僅通過個人的行為難以達致最終的拯救，然而行為也是拯救過程中的重要方面。信心和律法，信心和修行，都是統一於拯救之中，只不過這種拯救對於保羅來說是上帝的恩典，對於親鸞來說是彌陀本願的慈悲。可見，雖然在不同的宗教傳統中對於同一個問題有著不同的表達方式，但是也存在諸多相通之處。至少在這些相似的方面，不同的宗教之間可以進行有效的溝通和理解。

參考書目

Barrett, C. K. *Paul: An Introduction to His Thought*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/ John Knox, 1994.

Barry, Matlock R. “The Rhetoric of Pistis in Paul: Galatians 2:16, 3:22, Romans 3:22, and Philippians 3:9” in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 30 no 2 D 2007, 173-203.

Bloom, Alfred. *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*. Tucson: University of Arizona, 1965.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol.1, trans. Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner, 1952.

Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece of Nestle-Aland, 26th Edition, and to the Greek New Testament, 3rd Edition, ed. The institute for New Testament Textual Research and the Computer Center of Münster University. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Berlin, 1987.

Dunn, James D. G. *Paul and The Mosaic Law*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

------. *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Cambridge; New York: CUP, 2003.

------. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Pub Co. 2008.

Harrelson, W. J. “Law in the OT” in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol.3, ed. George Arthur Buttrick. New York: Abingdon, 1962, 77-88.

Hooker, Morna D. “The Letter to the Philippians: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol.11. Nashville: Abingdon, 2000.

Howard, George. “Faith of Christ” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.2, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 758-60.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1980.

Koperski, Veronica. *What Are They Saying About Paul and the Law?* New York: Paulist, 2001.

Moo, Douglas J. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000.

Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*, vol.1. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub., 1968.

Sanders, E. P. “Law in Judaism of the NT Period” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.4, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 254-65.

----- *Paul*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University, 1991.

----- *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM, 1977.

----- *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. London: SCM, 1985.

Shinran, Gutoku Shaku. *The Kyōgyōshinshō: The Collection of Passages Expounding the True Teaching, Living, Faith, and Realizing of the Pure Land*, trans. Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki. Kyoto: Shinshūōtaniha, 1973.

Tan, Kim Huat. *A Guide to Galatians and Philippians*. London: SPCK, 2009.

Wavies, W. D. "Law in the NT" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol.3, ed. George Arthur Buttrick. New York: Abingdon, 1962, 95-102.

Westerholm, Stephen. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1988.

大正新脩大藏經刊行會編，〈大正新脩大藏經〉。

佛光大辭典編修委員會編，〈佛光大辭典〉，臺北：佛光出版社，1988。

《日本歷史文化詞典》，南京：南京大學出版社，2010。

《真宗聖典全書》，東京：文會堂，1907。

[ABSTRACT] Faith is regarded as the way of Salvation for an individual according to Paul and Shinran. Both of them mainly demonstrate the relationship between faith and work in their faith theory, and it is also an issue to be solved for the faith practice. Therefore, this article focuses on the relationship between faith and work when conducting the comparative studies on the faith theory of Paul and Shinran. In the first two parts, the author expounds the theory of Paul and Shinran respectively by the textual analysis. The selected texts are Pauline letters and Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō*. Based on the text, this comparative study find that Paul and Shinran have different understandings and expressions of faith and work, but both of them consider that faith and virtuous work are unified in Salvation.

The Rectification of Names and Comparative Theology

Peter FELDMEIERS

「正名」與比較神學

Peter FELDMEIERS

[ABSTRACT] A name or title does not only designate a person's position but also frames mutual relations. Thus there is a profound intrinsic relationship between language and the truth it intends to convey. Followers of Confucius have long valued Zhengming or the rectification of names as an indispensable quality for living the good life. In interreligious relationships, names can heal or harm; they can express and shape healthy relationships or distorted ones. The traditional Confucian virtue of naming persons rightly offers helpful guidance for one of the crucial concerns in interreligious dialogue, speaking to and about others in terms that acknowledge and respect their perspectives.

The Power of Language

Forty years ago Bernard Lonergan wrote that it was language, above all, that allows for the development of understanding.¹ Sixty years earlier, Martin Heidegger spoke more boldly about the power of language. It is language that speaks, he argued, not human beings.² Nineteen hundred years earlier the evangelist John would write with seemingly even greater brashness, In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God (Jn 1:1). Yet it was over a thousand years prior to John that the greatest claim would be made about the power of words. The Rig Vedas are believed to have emerged from eternal Sanskrit hymns whose time had now ripened to be revealed. These words not only conveyed truth, they literally were truth, corresponding to eternal reality, and whose power could be experienced even in their very vocalization. While one need not embrace all of these claims, they highlight the perduring value of an authentic relationship between language and the truth it intends to convey.

Some religious traditions are hesitant with words and their correlation to reality. According to Laozi's Dao De Jing the dao is nameless (1; 25), and the introduction of names is a perilous venture, even if necessary (32). For the Buddha, Nirvana is *avisayasmim*, beyond any real naming as it is beyond conceptual range. While appreciating the fact that utterly transcendent reality would never correspond exactly to concepts or names that are grounded in the human condition, other religious traditions find words and thoughts

¹ Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 70. Interestingly, as this article is about the rectification of names, Lonergan writes, "Prizing names is prizing the human achievement of bringing conscious intentionality into sharp focus and, thereby, setting about the double task of ordering one's world and orientating oneself within it."

² Timothy Clark, *Martin Heidegger*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 74-75.

critical to understanding transcendent truth. We might consider this associated to the analogy of being, that while God transcends concepts and qualities as we would know them, God also corresponds to those concepts and qualities rightly named. Grace builds on nature, Thomas Aquinas taught, and there is a correspondence between the two.³

The Rectification of Names

Naming turns out to be crucial in the Bible, for names reflected something of the very nature of the person. Jacob was renamed by God as Israel, literally “he who wrestles with God” (Gen 32:28). This new name reflected something of Jacob’s very nature. Jesus also renamed his disciple Simon as Peter (rock): “And I tell you, you are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church” (Matt 16:18). The new name Jesus gave to Peter here corresponded not to Peter’s nature, but his crucial role in the community of believers. Perhaps most astounding is the account of God giving Moses God’s own proper name:

But Moses said to God, “If I come to the Israelites and say to them, the God of your ancestors has sent me to you, and they ask me, ‘What is his name?’ What shall I say to them?” God said to Moses, “I AM WHO I AM.” He said further, “Thus you shall say to the Israelites, ‘I AM has sent me to you’” (Ex 3:13-14).

This name in Hebrew, Yahweh, is so important and personal that God later reminds Moses, “I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as God Almighty, but my name ‘Yahweh’ I did not make myself known to them.” (Ex 5:2-3)

³ *Summa Theologiae*, Ia2ae.62.1.

Naming things rightly is an important quality in a Confucian worldview. This is known as *zhengming* or the rectification of names. In the Analects (Lunyu) XIII.3 we read:

Were the Lord of Wei to turn the administration of his estate over to you, what would be your first priority?" asked Zilu. "Without question it would be to insure that names are used properly (*zhengming*)," replied the Master. "Would you be as impractical as that?" responded Zilu. "What is it for names to be used properly anyway?" "How can you be so dense!" replied Confucius. "An exemplary person defers on matters he does not understand. When names are not used properly, language will not be used effectively; when language is not used effectively, matters will not be taken care of; when matters are not taken care of, the observance of ritual propriety and playing of music will not flourish; when the observance of ritual propriety and the playing of music do not flourish, the application of laws and punishments will not be on the mark; when the application of laws and punishments are not on the mark, the people will not know what to do with themselves. Thus, when the exemplary person puts a name to something, it can certainly be spoken, and when spoken it can certainly be acted upon. There is nothing careless in the attitude of the exemplary person toward what is said."⁴

On one level, this important text tells us that knowing the right names of things and then labeling them correctly is crucial for political and social order. Xunzi understood *zhengming* exactly, perhaps exclusively, in this manner. In his essay on *zhengming*, Xunzi was primarily concerned with proper language and how clarity both in titles and the roles they reflected was critical to a

⁴ The translation I am using is Roger Ames and Henry Rosemont, Jr., *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998).

well-functioning society. He was also interested in investigating how one might skillfully invent new names as a changing culture required them. It was a question of precision and order.⁵

It is doubtful that by the rectification of names Confucius only meant naming titles accurately. It seems he had something deeper in mind, that is, living authentically according to one's name or title. For Confucius, the rectification of names required an authentic alignment between what the name or title meant and the behavior that corresponded to that title. This being the case, to the English ear the "rectification of names" may sound like a misnomer. We might ask, "Aren't you really referring to the rectification of behavior?" Such a question would reflect Western language sensibilities rather than a more nuanced understanding of Chinese or Chinese culture. English tends to be a language of substance or essence. If one is a father, for example, then this designates something substantive about the individual. Whether one is a good father or a bad father is another issue; regardless of the quality of acting as a father, one is still a father.

In the Chinese ethos, reality is less understood as referring to concrete essences and more about fluid events within relationships.⁶ Confucius, for example, thought that humans express their unique personhood not by individuation—how one is different from others—but by the creative ways they interact with others. Persons are not agents who stand independently from others; they are primarily considered according to their relationships. These relationships ought to be infused with Confucian virtues, such as sympathy or consideration (*ren*), propriety (*li*), reciprocity (*shu*),

⁵ See Book XXII of *Xunzi*, trans. Burton Watson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003).

⁶ Roger Ames and David Hall, *Daodejing—Making this Life Significant: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2003), pp. 15-19.

devotion to family and ancestors (*xiao*), and aesthetics (*wen*). In a Confucian worldview, one learns the art of becoming a morally, relationally cultured person. Of course, the status of someone is not lost on the Oriental mind, nor is proper behavior ignored as if unimportant in the Occidental mind. Still, in the West you *are* a father, regardless of how you behave. In Confucianism, however, behavior is primary. This is deeply important in what determines the true name of things.

Confucius saw the political and social institutions of his day in a morass. Those who wielded power were often not only unworthy of these positions, they also simply did not have the appropriate understanding of what such positions required of them in order to discharge their duties in the most beneficial way. They failed both morally and practically. In the chapter just before the discussion of the rectification of names, we find: "Duke Jing of Qi asked Confucius about governing effectively. Confucius replied, 'The ruler must rule, the minister minister, the father father, and the son son'" (12:11). The transliterated text reads: *jun jun, chen chen, fu fu, zi zi*, thus literally "ruler ruling, minister ministering, father fathering, son soning." Unless this would be a tedious tautology, one ought to include after each clause "properly;" a ruler must rule *properly*.

What we might conclude here is that if a ruler is not ruling well then not only will society flounder, but the name "ruler" does not match the person holding the title. To rectify the name would be for the ruler to rule skillfully, justly and be in appropriate relationships to those relevant to his reign. Without such a rectification, it is not merely that a bad ruler is guilty of poor ruling, he fails to be a ruler at all. In an interesting parallel, Mencius writes about a king who fails to show compassion: "Therefore, that king is not a true king because

he does not do it.”⁷ Does Mencius merely mean the king was not a good king? No, the very failure of a king to perform his duties justly revokes the very term “king.” On the event of the slaying of the tyrant ruler Zhou by one of his ministers, Mencius was asked if a minister is ever justified in killing his ruler. Mencius replied, “One who offends against humanness is called a brigand; one who offends against righteousness is called an outlaw. Someone who is a brigand and an outlaw is called a mere fellow. I have heard of the punishment [slaying] of the mere fellow Zhou, but never of the slaying of a ruler.”⁸

The Rectification of Names in Interreligious Dialogue

If we may sum up the discussion above, the Confucian idea of the rectification of names includes three dynamics. The first is that what we name things ought to correspond accurately to the reality they signify. Second, names are not merely titles but relationships; names refer to a dynamic interdependence among those relevant to the name or title. Finally, rectifying names ought to act as a constant challenge or encouragement to be aligned with what the name or title represents. Can the Confucian concept of rectifying names assist us in interreligious matters? Can Christianity also apply this Confucian concept in order to more fully express its own truth? As we will see below, the rectification of names becomes very useful on both counts.

One of the crucial concerns in interreligious dialogue is speaking to or about the religious other in terms that reflect the religious other’s own perspective. Consider this value aligned with

⁷ Irene Bloom, trans., ed. Philip Ivanhoe, *Mencius* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), p. 9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

Xunzi's understanding of *zhengming* as striving for respectful accuracy. Take, for example, even the term "religion." Some Western scholars still ask whether Confucianism or Daoism ought to even be considered a religion. There is no God, they point out, no clear spiritual path, no ultimate horizon to strive for, and so on. Some Asian traditions do, of course, provide a sense of the divine, paths to the divine, and a kind of ultimate endgame for the soul. In some Hindu traditions, for example, the ultimate is called Brahman and the religious quest is to escape the wanderings of rebirth and attain the union of Brahman. Compared to the great three Western traditions and even the Asian Hindu tradition, Confucianism and Daoism seem to be missing important pieces. Perhaps they are, and this can be addressed in a respectful dialogue. The point, however, is that the very question presumes a Western understanding of religion, and thus a Western assessment that does not engage these Chinese traditions from their own perspective.

While many Chinese do not embrace an exclusive religious community with specific notions of God and revelation, most of the Chinese population thinks of itself as very religious.⁹ In the Chinese culture, life is an aesthetic act. Living richly and artfully in ways that elevate the soul and give it meaning is being profoundly religious. Chinese people are grounded in tradition, community, family, and history, all of which are sacred.¹⁰ Chinese religiosity addresses questions such as: How does the universe work? What is the nature

⁹ Torri Gunn, *Defining Religion with Chinese Characters: Interrogating the Criticism of the Freedom of Religion in China* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa, 2011), 17-50. See also Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, "Religion in China on the Eve of the 2008 Beijing Olympics" 1 May, 2008 <<http://www.pewforum.org/Importance-of-Religion/Religion-in-China-on-the-Eve-of-the-2008-Beijing-Olympics.aspx>> [2013-05-17]

¹⁰ Ames and Hall, p. 11.

of a human being? What does human flourishing mean? These are religious questions indeed.

True appreciation of these venerable Chinese traditions requires a Western self-critical rectification of names. The *Dao De Jing* and *Zhuangzi* offer a metaphysics that does not correspond to traditional Western metaphysics. Western thinkers often assume God (*theos*), from whom comes an underlying creative principle (*logos*) that reflects the divine order and law (*nomos*). Plato believed that morality, natural law, and aesthetics transcended cultural customs. Rather, they are grounded in universal, divinely ordered truths. In contrast, the Chinese Daoist point of view is virtually *acosmic*; that is, there is no concept of a coherent, single-ordered universe. The closest Chinese word for *cosmos* is *yuzhou*, which expresses the interdependence between time and space. And instead of a permanent, changeless, transcendental reality behind appearances, Daoism imagines the ceaseless flow of life. To imagine this tradition as merely a philosophy and not a religion is to ignore the religious reality behind such Chinese perspectives in favor of an imposed metaphysics it wouldn't embrace.¹¹

In Leonard Swidler's classic essay, "The Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious Dialogue," his fifth commandment insists that each participant must be allowed to define one's tradition on its own terms. Swidler goes on to explain that not only must the religious insider be allowed to express his own tradition, it is also the case that when that tradition is being discussed by the religious other or "outsider" it is recognized as authentically accurate by the adherent or "insider."¹² Without embracing this rule, dialogue is bound to fail. Robert Florida reports on a Zen practitioner in a

¹¹ Ames and Hall, pp. 13-15.

¹² Leonard Swidler, "The Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious Dialogue," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 20:1 (1983), pp. 1-4.

dialogue stating that he never felt so far from Zen as when Christians were describing it.¹³

An example in taking one's own religious sensibilities and applying it to the religious other can be seen in Pope John Paul II's *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*. Here John Paul makes an unfortunate statement that "Buddhism is in large measure an *atheistic system*."¹⁴ This is a broad brush stroke that doesn't attend to the many variations among the schools of Buddhism. Many Mahayana traditions understand the universe as essentially theistic, with bodhisattvas who advocate and care for the human race. Pure Land Buddhism, for instance, focuses much of its energy on devotion to and reliance on the grace of Amitabha Buddha. My point is not to now claim Buddhism as actually theistic, but rather to highlight that naming or characterizing a religious tradition from outside its conceptual paradigm is already creating an error in procedure.

Here in the West, we regularly use names that the religious other does not recognize as accurate. In my college days Muslims were referred to as Mohammedans, a term no Muslim would ever endorse.¹⁵ Are they not followers of Muhammad? They would surely retort something like, "I am a follower of God and believe Muhammad (peace be upon him) is his greatest prophet and sits alongside of many other prophets God has sent."

Even among co-religionists many designations would be inappropriate because they simply do not correspond to how those members understand themselves. Take, for example, the term

¹³ Robert Florida, "What Does Comparative Religion Compare? The Buddhist-Christian Example," in *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* Vol. 19:2 (1990): pp. 163-171 at p. 165.

¹⁴ John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, ed. Vittorio Messori, trans. Jenny McPhee and Martha McPhee (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), p. 86.

¹⁵ This term is sadly still used in some vitriolic political conservative publications, e.g., the online journal *Red State*.

“fundamentalist.” This term originally referred to a theological position started among conservative theologians at Princeton Theological Seminary in the late nineteenth century. As the movement developed, it broadly embraced five fundamentals: the inerrancy of scripture, the virgin birth of Christ, Christ’s atonement on the cross, Christ’s bodily resurrection, and the historicity of Christ’s miracles.¹⁶ While the vast majority of Christians embrace all but the first of these fundamentals, and while the first fundamental involves a rather complex critique of a liberal Protestant biblical deconstruction project, today the term is used to designate people who are religiously closed-minded. The rectification of names challenges us to reconsider them, their movement, and the values that generated this theological tradition from its own perspective.

Another example within the Muslim community is that of “Wahhabi.” This term is used to designate “Islamic fundamentalism” in Saudi Arabia, even by other Muslims. Saudis do not use this term for themselves, nor would they embrace the idea that they are “Islamic fundamentalists.” Rather, they might argue that their expression of Islam follows the theological sensibilities of Salaf and the further conviction that Islamic society ought to be modeled on and in some sense mimic the historic expressions of the sayings of the Prophet (*hadith*). They might refer to themselves as *Salafi* or *ahl al-hadith* (people of hadith). The issue here is not simply replacing one name for another as if non-Saudis ought to simply stop calling them “Wahhabi” and now call them “Salafi.” Rather, the issue is using names that reflect the religious other in ways that are accurate, respectful, aligned with the intuitions of the religious other, and, most importantly, draw one to engage the religious other without the prejudice of one’s own perspectives. Such a rectification of names

¹⁶ See Mark Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), pp. 373-385.

does not mean, of course, that this form of Islam ought not to be questioned or even critiqued. After all, to dialogue with essential openness includes the possibility that one may find the other's perspective troubling.¹⁷ It does, however, keep us from dismissing the religious other before our engagement even begins. Interestingly, Swidler's tenth and final commandment is that each participant eventually must attempt to experience the partner's religion or ideology *from within*.

The Rectification of Names in Intrareligious Discourse

As we have seen, one of the central issues in the Confucian understanding of the rectification of names involves the Chinese assumption of inter-relationships. A name or title does not merely designate a person's position; it frames mutual expressions of relationality. Such an understanding can help Catholics understand our own faith and the relationship we have with one another. Happily, the Second Vatican Council regularly references the mutually informing relationships within the church, and this is quite a contrast with earlier styles of magisterial teachings. Take, for example, Vatican I's document on the Church (*De Ecclesia*). It is dominated by the pope's jurisdiction over the whole church and this jurisdiction as expressed in terms of primacy and power. Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*) refocuses our attention on how the church interrelates to itself. At the time, Cardinal Montini (soon to become Pope Paul VI) discussed this difference:

Yesterday the theme of the Church seemed to be confined to the power of the pope. Today, it is

¹⁷ I discuss this in my book *Christianity Looks East: Comparing the Spiritualities of John of the Cross and Buddhaghosa* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2006), pp. 10-11.

extended to the episcopate, the religious, the laity, and the whole body of the Church. Yesterday, we spoke of the rights of the Church by transferring the elements of civil society to the definition of the Church as a perfect society. Today, we have discovered other realities in the Church—the spiritual gifts of grace and holiness, for example—which cannot be defined by purely juridical ideas.¹⁸

Another example from Vatican II comes from its Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation (*Dei Verbum*). Here we read, “There is growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. And it comes from the preaching of those who have received, along with their right of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth” (DV 8).¹⁹ While bishops are authentic interpreters of the Word of God (DV 10), this interpretation can only come from intimate knowledge of and engagement with the faithful who all receive it the Word of God. In fact, in the document on the church, the receiver of revelation is the whole church. This is the people of God who have a supernatural sense of the faith (*sensus fidei*) given to them by the Holy Spirit, and thus the sense of the faithful (*sensus fidelium*) can be trusted. All are instruments of the Holy Spirit, mutually infusing each other with insight (LG 12).

¹⁸ Cardinal Giovanni Montini, “Il mistero della chiesa nella luce di S. Ambrogio,” in *L'Osservatore Romano* (December 10-11, 1962), p. 6.

¹⁹ I am using here *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* (revised), ed. Austin Flannery (Northport: Costello Publishing, 1975).

Following Confucius' genius, the rectification of names in the church regarding "bishops" and "laity" would mean at the core a respectful mutual engagement. Such an engagement would recognize that the name "bishop" involves the role as authoritative successor to the apostles (LG 20, 25). This authority, however, can only be understood in light of the fact that the hierarchical priesthood is derived from and ordered to the primary priesthood of baptism (LG 10, 32-35). It is understood in light of respecting the radical equality and dignity of all the members of the church (LG 32) where a diversity of gifts and insights are to be respected and celebrated (LG 12, 31; PO 2, 9),²⁰ where all are called to the same sanctity and share an equal privilege of faith (LG 32, 39-41) and all collectively share the spiritual gift of infallibility (LG 11-12).

Vatican II's understanding of the church is one of communion and mutuality where there is an ongoing conversation between the laity and magisterium as well as a respectful conversation between theologians and both the magisterium and the people of God. All of these conversations mutually inform each other.²¹ In contrast to this vision, this kind of rectification of names in light of Confucian virtues and the ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council, we are experiencing a time in the Catholic Church where dialogue and full, mutual consultation tends to be lacking and magisterial interventions are increasingly without dialogue and often quickly punitive.²²

The rectification of names also includes, as we have seen, a challenge to strive toward the ideal designated by that name. What

²⁰ PO here stands for Vatican II's *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, The Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests.

²¹ See Richard Gaillardetz, *By What Authority? A Primer on Scripture, the Magisterium, and the Sense of the Faithful* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2003), pp. 138-145.

²² Richard Gaillardetz, ed., *When the Magisterium Intervenes: The Magisterium and Theologians in Today's Church*.

does it mean to be called “Christian?” According to the scriptures and tradition of the church, being a baptized member of the church ought to be realized as a daunting reality. The way of Jesus is the way of the cross: “Whoever does not take up the cross and follow me is not worthy of me. Those who find their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will find it” (Matt 10:38-39, see also Mk 8:34; Lk 17:33; Jn 12:25). Jesus’ way is also the way of extraordinary service. In Jesus’ parable about the last judgment, he divides the sheep from the goats, those who will enter paradise from those condemned. On what criterion does the Jesus decide? It is on whether we fed, welcomed, clothed, visited, and so on, Jesus in those in need. Service to the least of our brothers and sisters is service to him (Mt 25:31-46). Finally, Christian discipleship is infused with a spirituality of compassion; this dominated Jesus’ ministry and his demands on his disciples (Mt 5:6-7, 9:13, 23:23; Mk 6:34; Lk 10:37).²³

While it is the case that Christians and indeed other religious believers are more generous, tolerant, and moral than non-religious, they are not dramatically so.²⁴ Robert Wuthnow, in his analysis of Christian spiritual trends in America from 1950-2000, demonstrates that the popularity in each of the trends includes seeking spiritual comfort with little cost demanded.²⁵ Even more striking is Christian Smith’s book *Soul Searching* whereby he concludes that Christians operatively have the following faith: *moralistic, therapeutic deism*. This term he devised reflects the following five assumptions: God

²³ Paul likewise challenges Christians to embody the compassion of Christ (Phil 1:8; Col 3:12).

²⁴ This is certainly true in the United States. See Robert Putman and David Campbell, *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010). A case can also be made for Muslims world-wide. See John Esposito and Dalia Mogahed, *Who Speaks for Islam?: What a Billion Muslims Really Think* (New York: Gallup Press, 2007).

²⁵ Robert Wuthnow, *After Heaven: Spirituality in America Since the 1950s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

exists; God wants people to be nice and fair; the goal of life is to be happy and feel good about oneself; God is not involved much in our lives unless we need him to resolve a problem; and nice, non-evil people go to heaven when they die.²⁶ The rectification of names challenges us to realign ourselves with the very ideals that the name "Christian" really means; perhaps a Confucian "Christians Christianing."

Confucian rectification of names is a profound framing of proper order and harmony. It represents using language rightly so as to ensure clarity and order. It challenges us to speak well and accurately with and about others in ways that are respectful and sympathetic. Finally, it invites us to reconsider the necessary interrelationships that any name or title implies, and the daunting task to operate skillfully in those relationships. It helps us understand more deeply the responsibilities that go with interreligious dialogue and how to ensure what we say about ourselves represents what is truly the case.

For Further Reading

Ames, Roger and Henry Rosemont, Jr., trans. *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation* (New York: Ballentine Books, 1998).

Bloom, Irene, trans., ed. Philip Ivanhoe, *Mencius* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).

Burgess, Joseph. "Purpose, Problems, and Possibilities of Interreligious Dialogue." *Drew Gateway* 58:3 (1989): 16-21.

²⁶ See Christian Smith with Melinda Lundquist Denton, *Soul Searching: The Religious Lives of American Teenagers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Ingram, Paul. "Two Western Models of Interreligious Dialogue." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 26:1 (1989): 8-28.

Swidler, Leonard. "What Does Comparative Religion Compare? The Buddhist-Christian Example." *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* 19:2 (1990): 163-171.

Waley, Arthur, trans. *Confucius: The Analects* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000).

Watson, Burton, trans. *Xunzi* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003)

[摘要]名字或稱銜不但劃定一個人的位置但也築構一個人的
人際關係，因此語言和它所帶出的真實之間存在著深刻而內在的
關係。孔子的追隨者一著重「正名」，即是名謂正確與否；他
們認為正確的名謂對一個人如何活出好生命不可或缺。在跨宗教
關係中，名字能益能損；它可表達及塑造健康或扭曲關係。跨宗
教對話中的其中一個重要議題是在與他人談話或談及他人時如
何認同及尊重他的角度，而正確稱謂他人這個傳統儒家美德就能
在這議題上給予啟導。

Hospitality as a Condition for Dialogue: The Monastic Interreligious Experience

Fabrice BLÉE

包容作為對話的基礎： 隱修群體宗教交流經驗

Fabrice BLÉE

[ABSTRACT] Monastic Interreligious Dialogue (MID) plays a crucial and unique role in bridging the gap between Catholics and other religions by focusing particularly on the interreligious dialogue of spiritual experience. The mission of MID has evolved from the original goal of developing Catholic monastic life in Asia to the concern for shaping a global culture of peace and more recently to articulating a new way of being Christian in an interreligious environment. At the core of the movement is hospitality as an interreligious virtue. While some have questioned the interest of Catholic monks in the spiritual practices of other traditions, extensive monastic experience bears witness to the positive fruits of interreligious exploration. The dialogues of monastics from different traditions have repeatedly shown that differences need not be obstacles but can be occasions for enrichment and reconciliation. The condition for dialogue is not flattening out the differences between religions but creating a space that allows them to be fully received. Hospitality is the space where this meeting takes place.

Monastic Interreligious Dialogue (MID) plays a crucial and unique role in the bridging of gaps among religions as encouraged by the Roman Catholic Church since Vatican II. In his statement to the Secretariat for non-Christian Religions in 1984, John Paul II gave this reference: “All Christians are called to dialogue. While it is important that certain individuals have specialized training in this area, others also have an important contribution to make. I am thinking in particular of the intermonastic dialogue and that of other movements, groups, and institutions.”¹ MID is essentially a sharing of religious paths and experiences. It gathers persons who, in spite of their differences, recognize one another in the fact that they are on a journey towards one and the same mystery, towards one and the same transcendence. Hence, the encounters among Christian, Buddhist and Hindu monks and, to a lesser extent, spiritual Muslims and Jews, have inspired the Vatican to make of the “dialogue on religious experience” the fourth type of dialogue after the dialogues of life, action and theological exchange.

Many Christians, whether they are priests, religious or laity, currently adopt this dialogical approach. While this new type of dialogue is not reserved solely to them, monks have however shown the way in an unequalled manner; they are the principal promoters for a new ecclesial consciousness. They open up channels by inviting all the baptized to engage in it. It is from this perspective that MID ended their international news bulletin that had centered essentially on monastic initiatives, to give birth in 2011 to *Dilatato Corde*, a

¹ “Dialogue is part of the mission of the church,” in *Documentation catholique* Vol. 10 (20 May 1984), p. 522.

multilingual review open to all on the dialogue of religious experience.²

In order to do justice to this promising interreligious movement, I will limit myself to a few historical and spiritual considerations. The first three parts of the text each present an important moment in its development as well as in its form and direction. From its beginnings, the monks' dialogue has responded to the missional call to implant the contemplative tradition beyond the West, especially in Asia. In the late 1970s, this central objective was superseded by the concern to contribute to the development of a culture of peace on a global scale. Then, in the 1990s, with the creation of a structure independent of missionary intentions, the emphasis was placed on the will to articulate, at the heart of the Church, a new way of being Christian in the world. The fourth part of the text presents some elements to understand the nature of hospitality, which is at the core of this movement and which the monks propose as a primary condition for dialogue.³

² See <<http://dimmid.org/index.asp?>>

³ For a more exhaustive study see Fabrice Blée, *The Third Desert. The Story of Monastic Interreligious Dialogue* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011); idem, "Shaping a New Ecological Consciousness. Insights from the Spirituality of Interreligious Dialogue," in Donald Mitchell and William Skudlarek, eds., *Green Monasticism. A Buddhist-Catholic Response to an Environmental Calamity* (New York: Lantern Books, 2010), pp. 167-179; "Die Wüste der Alterität. Spirituelle Erfahrung im intermonastischen Dialog," in Karl Baier, ed., *Spiritualität. Zugänge, Traditionen, Dialog* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006), pp. 249-266; "Podwójna przynależność religijna i dialog miedzymonastyczny," in *Anales Missiologici Posnaniensis* Vol. 14 (2004), pp. 7-28; "Double appartenance religieuse et dialogue interreligieux monastique," in *Mission* Vol. 10 (2003), pp. 9-32; "Aux frontières du silence. Exploration du dialogue interreligieux monastique," in *Théologiques* Vol. 7/2 (Fall 1999), pp. 79-94; "Dialogue et renouveau monastique," in *La Vie spirituelle* Vol. 731 (June 1999), pp. 257-270.

A Missionary Requirement

The world was no longer the same after the Second World War. With the decline in European power and the successive waves of decolonisation the Roman Catholic Church found itself in a “post-colonial” world whose boundaries had been redrawn and had thus opened up to other lines of thought. Christian missions would begin to face the growing realities of atheism and religious pluralism. It is in this context that Pius XII launched his general call to mission with the 1957 publication of the encyclical *Fidei Donum*. For the first time, a pope called the whole assembly of believers to engage in the spread of the faith; an action which testified to a Church whose presence was challenged by a new global condition. The monastic orders of St. Benedict (Benedictines, Cistercians, Trappists) heard the Sovereign Pontiff’s call. The response came from the Dutch Benedictine, Cornelius Tholens, for whom, “before anything else, abbots must recognize that monks of the Benedictine order have the duty to go out in the name of the order to encounter other peoples, other races, other religions.”⁴ This newly adopted perspective broke with the traditional one; the motivation would no longer be to convert by rejecting *a priori* other beliefs, but primarily to value listening and dialoguing. It is on this principle that the Alliance for International Monasticism (AIM) has created in 1960 an organization grouping all the sons and daughters of St. Benedict around a common cause, that of implanting Christian monasticism in the so-called mission countries.

⁴ Blé, *The Third Desert*, p. 17.

This new movement brought with it the need for a renewal of mission in the Church, thus anticipating the revolutionary measures that would be put forward at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). In this, the inspiring pioneers were Henri Le Saux, Bede Griffiths and Thomas Merton. Le Saux, more than the others, demonstrated by his life and message the need for the Church to welcome religious difference if it intended to be heard. In leaving his monastery in Brittany, the French Benedictine went to India in 1948 in order to found the first Catholic ashram with Jules Monchanin, with the view of making known the great Christian contemplative tradition. In order to achieve this he knew the importance of getting to know his new culture. He was therefore put into contact with Hinduism by the intermediary Ramana Maharshi and the sacred mountain of Arunâchala where the Hindu holy man resided. This meeting undid his plans as he came to be attracted by the experience of non-duality (advaita), moving him to enter ever more deeply into the abyss of the Self. This made him an apostle of interreligious dialogue, a new avenue which he laid out for the entire Church, and primarily for the members of AIM. Knowing in order to be known was the motto at play here, to which Vatican II gave its support. The decree on mission in fact invites the institutes of perfection "to found houses in mission areas, as not a few of them have already done, so that there, living out their lives in a way accommodated to the truly religious traditions of the people, they can bear excellent witness among non-Christians to the majesty and love of God, as well as to our union in Christ."⁵

Note that the contemplative vocation of the monks was an advantage in this initiative, especially in the Asian context. In

⁵ Vatican II, *Ad Gentes: On the Mission Activity of the Church* 40. See <http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_ad-gentes_en.html>

countries of Hindu or Buddhist majority, monastic life is often an important, sometimes a central dimension in the society. At the heart of this monastic life are found practices of meditation offering many similarities with the diverse forms of contemplative prayer known among Christian monks. This became evident for many during the pan-Asian congresses in Bangkok (1968) and in Bangalore (1973). Organised by AIM, these encounters permitted Christian monks from the West and Asia to face together the challenges that accompany monastic implantation in Asian countries. Many realized, at these occasions, how much culture and religion were closely bound and how necessary it would be to enter into dialogue with the movements of Hinduism and Buddhism. This is an effort made more urgent since Christianity is often in the minority in these countries and largely considered as a foreign religion of colonisation, to which is given very little spiritual value. On this last point, Patrick D'Souza, Bishop of Varanasi, spoke at the congress in Bangalore: "We have been for the inhabitants of this country a sign of love for our neighbor, but we have not succeeded in being signs of the presence of God in us and around us."⁶ Hence, the Christian monks awoke to the need to recapture the essential in the monastic life away from Western cultural elements, the essential which, according to Merton, "is not embedded in buildings, . . . in clothing . . . even in a rule."⁷ He actually refers to something deeper than a rule, a full interior transformation, the ultimate objective which all else serves. This explains why the missionary effort will not be sustained unless Christian monks and laypersons better manifest the contemplative depths of their own tradition while being involved into a dialogue of religious experience.

⁶ Blée, *The Third Desert*, p. 26.

⁷ Thomas Merton, *The Asian Journal of Thomas Merton* (New Directions: New York, 1975), p. 340.

For World Peace

Faced with the urgency of developing a dialogue with Buddhist monks and Hindu renunciates, AIM founded two commissions in 1978, one in the United States, the other in Europe. These created an opportunity to gather persons who, at the heart of the family of St Benedict, felt called to this cause. They were few but their commitment was such that it allowed a dialogical awareness to develop among the monks in a relatively short time and with great creativity, in spite of some opposition and limited logistical and financial resources.

Moreover, in establishing itself in this way, the dialogue developed as an activity in service of the human community, progressively releasing itself from its missionary objective. A distance has thus grown between the emerging vocation of the dialogue and that of AIM to help monasteries establish themselves in Asia. This is all the more so as Western monks confronted early on the Asians' desire to emancipate themselves from Western missionary directives, realizing finally that planting Christian monasticism in Asia is a bet that only the Asians can win. The Abbot Primate officially acknowledged this reality at the occasion of the pan-Asiatic congress of Kandy (1980): "It is up to you, monks and sisters of Asia, to engage in dialogue and to determine what Benedictine life in the monasteries of Asia today should be like. The monasteries of other continents cannot assume this responsibility because, even with the best of intentions, they are not fully aware of the problems you face. In order to continue the necessary

acculturation of Benedictine monasticism in Asia, you have to live in an Asian milieu day in and day out. Even more, you have to be Asian.”⁸ In the West, priorities changed; monks awakened slowly to the importance of the unique role they are called to play in the effort to create spiritual bonds in a world evermore global and in rapid evolution. Tholens contributed by adopting the perspective on the conciliar declaration *Nostra Aetate* (1965): “as we move away from apologetics and missionary activity as it is commonly understood, new possibilities are open to us—not those of a new way of doing mission, but those of living together with the members of other religions and sharing what we have in common!”⁹ Western monks knew they could contribute greatly to this task.

Already, at the congresses in Bangkok and Bangalore, Catholic monks had discovered the ease with which they were able to get along with their Buddhist and Hindu peers. They succeeded in dialoguing with them in the area of religious experience whereas discussions based on doctrine often led to dead-ends. This was the realisation of Cardinal Sergio Pignedoli, then president of the Secretariat for non-Christians. He gave his official support to the monks in a letter addressed to the Abbot Primate on June 12, 1974, in which he encouraged them to pursue their efforts in the matter of dialogue, a dialogue which he situated not so much in the missionary context but rather within that of understanding and mutual enrichment. The priority became less to convince the other believer to align him- or herself with the Christian message but rather to develop a way of moving forward together towards the divine mystery around which all find themselves to be co-pilgrims.

⁸ Blée, *The Third Desert*, p. 66.

⁹ Blée, *The Third Desert*, p. 50.

Thus, the interreligious monastic dialogue came to assume as a main objective the contribution to peace in the world. The first founding meetings of Petersham (USA) and Loppem (Belgium), held in 1977 at the origin of the creation of interreligious commissions, witness to this will. The monks in dialogue also found a way to incarnate the monastic pledge, taken from Psalm 33:15 and carried in the Rule of St. Benedict: "Seek peace and pursue it." (Prologue, 17) Since reconciliation is the vocation of his disciples, St. Benedict, the father of western Christian monasticism, shows that the monk has still a place today. In 1994, Jerome Theisen, then Abbot Primate of the Benedictines, confirmed this when he underlined his commitment towards peace: "It is our task to stress the spiritual values of the various world religions in the hope that through knowledge and dialogue we who belong to monastic institutes may contribute to the creation of peace in the world. Pax is Saint Benedict's gift to us and our gift to the interreligious dialogue."¹⁰ Conversation with Asia and its religions remained the axis of monastic dialogue. It would no longer, however, aim at implanting Christian monasticism, but rather at integrating two worlds whose future, the monks believe, depends on their capacity to listen and dialogue. The interaction between these two spiritual regions, the spiritual East and West, represents a challenge for the current generation that must be highlighted with great attention. Thomas Keating, Trappist monk and the second president of the North American Commission notes that "it is at just this present moment that the world is on the threshold of a great spiritual confrontation between the East and Christianity. This confrontation could be one of the greatest moments in history. Never before have the Vedic and Buddhist traditions confronted the Christian tradition on so broad a scale."¹¹ Here, Jean Leclercq, a

¹⁰ Blée, *The Third Desert*, p. 55.

¹¹ Thomas Keating, *The Heart of the World* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), p. 60.

Benedictine of Clervaux Abbey in Luxembourg, recognized the unique contribution of monks to this purpose. “Throughout its history the church has encountered strong currents that at first were foreign to it; little by little these confluences brought about great advances in faith and sanctity. Is it not fitting that monks should be, in the way that is proper to them, the artisans of this historic encounter?”¹²

Towards a New Consciousness

The gap between mission and dialogue finally ended with the creation in 1994 of a new interreligious structure which is still known today and which rests on two major elements. First, it consists of a General Secretariat (DIM/MID) which is both independent of and complementary to AIM and represents all of the initiatives and the interreligious players – in monastic milieus – vis-à-vis both Benedictine and Cistercian authorities. Second, the new structure allows adherence from other continental commissions with the General Secretariat alongside North-American (MID) and European (DIM) Commissions which already exist, ensuring that the international character of the monastic movement for dialogue and the freedom for each body to choose its activities according to local situations.

Over time, Indo-Sri-Lankan and Australian commissions have been added. If the Indian Commission, the “Benedictine Interfaith Dialogue”(BID), officially came to light early in 1995, it had nonetheless begun to structure itself in 1993 following an intermonastic exchange where Tai Situ Rinpoche, Tibetan authority, invited a group of European Christian monks to his monastery

¹² Blée, *The Third Desert*, p. 77.

(Sherab Ling). The Camaldolese monk Bede Griffiths gave his last public conference on this occasion.

The Australian Commission was created in 1991 and took the name "Australian Monastic Encounter" (AME) in May 1994. Its uniqueness is that its members are not only Benedictine and Cistercian monks but also Buddhists and Hindus. After having undergone some difficulties, it gained new life in 1995 under the name "East-West Meditation Foundation." Beyond these four commissions, two others were called to develop themselves, one covering South-East Asia and the other, South America.

The new interreligious structure is the fruit of a sustained effort to have dialogue accepted at the heart of the great family of St. Benedict. Many in fact looked with suspicion on this unspoken attitude of welcoming the other with their beliefs and with their forms of prayer. Suspicion was also nursed by certain theologians of renown like Louis Bouyer and Hans Urs von Balthasar who participated in a collective work published in 1983 regarding, in particular, the dangers of Eastern meditation (Zen, Yoga, Transcendental Meditation, etc.) when applied to the context of Christian prayer life. In light of the great success of these foreign influences, the authors lamented the fact that they do not seem to raise any question or issue. Here the monks were directly targeted. In introducing the book in question they state that in "certain monasteries, Buddhist monks have come to introduce the entire community to Zen. There is one such abbey in Holland which has a Zen garden-room, more spacious than the Church, and the monks are free to come and substitute the office hour by a time of meditation. Countless are the convents where such techniques pose no problem whatsoever, even including at Segovia where the body of St. John of

the Cross lies!”¹³ Bouyer saw this as an evil situation and Balthasar viewed it as a betrayal. The criticism was so strong that Cardinal Ratzinger was inspired to publish, a few years later on October 15, 1989, a letter to the bishops regarding Christian meditation. It was a way of recalling to them the elements of an authentic Christian prayer while discouraging dialogue with religions from Asia, mainly Hinduism and Buddhism, as well as adoption of their meditative practices.

In reaction to this text, under the initiative of the Benedictine Pierre-François de Béthune and with the encouragement of Cardinal Arinze to pursue a debate with the Vatican, the monks in dialogue shared their interreligious experiences of contact with Asia and demonstrated how their Christian faith had been enriched. This led to the publication in 1993 of the document *Contemplation and Interreligious Dialogue. References and Perspectives Drawn from the Experiences of Monastics*¹⁴ which is a synthesis of fifty testimonies. It was the opportunity to articulate and theorize the rich experience of DIM and to give it a theological and pastoral orientation. It speaks of a dialogue where welcoming the other is an act of charity and faith. It is in one's relationship with God, in the Spirit of Christ, that one draws the strength to open oneself, in the loving divine presence, to the other who prays and believes differently, the one who, for centuries, was considered as the ultimate enemy of the Church, a heretic internally, a pagan externally. Hence, the monks in dialogue made of themselves artisans of a new way of being Christian in the world, not for themselves alone but also on behalf of the whole Church. The monk aims at a transformation of the ecclesial mindset, founded on the idea that a

¹³ Hans Urs von Balthasar et al., *Des bords du Gange aux rives du Jourdain* (Paris: Saint Paul, 1983), p. 8.

¹⁴ See <<http://monasticdialog.com/a.php?id=363>>

connection to the religious other is not a threat to faith but is today the privileged place of its very expression. A new awareness is inaugurated where hospitality becomes the centre of gravity.

Sacred Hospitality

The dialogue often consists of finding similarities among religions in order to overcome differences which have often been seen as a source of division. Thus, any hope of understanding must rest on a common ethic, cause or theology. In the case of DIM, the approach is otherwise. This monastic experience shows, on the contrary, that the differences are not an obstacle to dialogue but are precisely the place where reconciliation is possible. Otherness is clearly assumed. The monks succeed more easily where theological or doctrinal dialogues often lead to a deadlock. This is made clear by the fact that they meet together not in the name of the dogma of one Church but because of a shared experience of God. If they exchange ideas and insights as in all dialogues, it is especially on the basis of an inner drive that they gather together, a pull that invites each one, in their particular way, to turn towards the divine mystery that is both at the heart as well as beyond all religious traditions. This is what characterises the dialogue of religious experience, listed by the Vatican as the fourth type of dialogue, together with the dialogues of life, action and theological exchange. It defines this dialogue as one "where persons, rooted in their own religious traditions, share their spiritual riches, for instance with regard to prayer and contemplation, faith and ways of searching for God or the Absolute."¹⁵ For DIM,

¹⁵ See Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, *Dialogue and Proclamation: Reflection and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, ch. 3, par. 42: <http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/documents/rc_pc_interelg_doc_19051991_dialogue-and-proclamatio_en.html>

the condition for dialogue is not in flattening out the differences between religions but in creating a space that allows them to be fully received. This joining is understood here as an acknowledgement of a partnership, a fraternity in God within, and not in spite of, differences. Hospitality is thus the space where this meeting takes place.

Saint Benedict makes of hospitality a typically monastic vocation; hence Kevin Hunt, an American Trappist, urges monks to make of it the foundation of all dialogue: “That’s something we are good at; it is second nature for those who live according to the Benedictine rule.”¹⁶ If the monks made the effort at all times to practice this, they were nonetheless generally disinclined to receive the other with his faith and his beliefs, beginning with Saint Anthony of Egypt who had harsh words for Arians and Gnostics. This then is where today’s newness resides: the stranger is not received without his most intimate religious desires, even if they are contrary to ours. To love your neighbour is also to love what defines him or her within his/her relationship with the transcendent. Hence, the monks of DIM allow themselves to be received by others before receiving them.

Le Saux as much as Merton encouraged his peers to become familiar with Eastern religions by immersing themselves in those traditional contexts in order to get beyond mere superficial meetings.¹⁷ At the end of the monastic congress of Bangkok (1968), two Christian monks spent an entire day in a Buddhist temple, an initiative that was again encouraged at the congress in Bangalore (1973) by the Camaldolese monk David Steindl-Rast. Two years later, on the eve of the creation of the interreligious commissions

¹⁶ M. Freeman, “Monastic Interreligious Dialogue. Contact Persons Workshop. Christian-Hindu,” 13–16 June 1994; report of the Abbey of Saint Procopius, Lisle, Illinois.

¹⁷ See Merton, *The Asian Journal of Thomas Merton*, p. 313.

within AIM, the monks, questioned during an investigation run by Tholens, agreed on the necessity of an exchange that would be not only intellectual: "It may be that monks from one civilization will spend some time in a monastery of another, or perhaps small groups of monks from different cultures will work together without any particular end in mind other than to live together as equals and in mutual respect."¹⁸ This became a reality with the establishment of a hospitality program in Europe in 1979 and in the United States in 1982. The Europeans developed their ties with Japanese Zen monks while the Americans made exchanges with Tibetan monks who were refugees in India even before opening themselves to all of the sangha (Buddhist community) with the organisation of interreligious meetings at the Abbey of Gethsemani (1996, 2002, 2008).

During these exchanges, Christian monks came to understand another religion from the inside which, when added to bookish knowledge, allowed them to familiarise themselves with otherness, to grasp its consistency and to lay foundations for mutual understanding. Hospitality certainly offered an opening to others but, as well, a chance to sink deeper into one's own faith. In fact, the effort that is required consists in putting one's self in pursuit of Jesus by going towards the one who is different, outside the accustomed norms, in a free act, expecting nothing in return, if only that one might be touched by the divine mystery that marks the encounter. The Spirit that Jesus left us as an inheritance invites us, today more than ever, to follow the steps of the Master on a road that is rarely travelled. The love which surrounds us grants such an internal freedom that it becomes possible to meet genuinely with the one who is usually perceived as a threat to our physical, psychological or spiritual integrity. It is therefore precisely this Spirit who, letting the

¹⁸ Blée, *The Third Desert*, pp. 81-82.

Spirit be sought and discovered within religious otherness, gives hospitality its sacred character. Faith within this mystery of unity, in imitation of Jesus, carries the encounter and allows us to welcome both the questioning and the suffering which are inherent to it.

If receiving the other believer is born within such an act of faith, it also leads to its deepening by engaging the host as well as the guest in a process of stripping away where priorities are redefined. This relational space is similar to a desert towards which the Spirit leads us, the same as the desert to which he led Jesus (Luke 4:1-13) in order to be tempted and to rededicate himself to God. If Christian monasticism was born in Egypt's desert, the monks of DIM show us the way again. However, this time the desert is no longer made of sand but is the relationship with the traditional enemy, the one who prays and believes differently. In this "desert of otherness" the Christian may reconnect with the divine in a most significant and relevant-to-our-times way, in solitude and interior silence without having to opt for a total and permanent retreat from the world. It is here that the Christian must choose between the will to power hidden in the pretension of being the sole owner of truth, and humility before the mystery which can never be won by works but is given with the greatest of generosity. This is why, even before speaking of mutual enrichment, Béthune, above all, sees in the dialogue an occasion for a "mutual impoverishment."¹⁹

In this, at a time of crisis where the survival of humankind is at stake, the monks of DIM invite the Church and humanity to a heart-to-heart meeting, emptied of false identities, capable of releasing a creative energy for a renewed coexistence which respects differences.

¹⁹ Pierre-François de Béthune, *Par la foi et l'hospitalité* (Clerlande: Publications de Saint-André/ Cahier de Clerlande 4, 1997), p. 68.

For Further Reading

Béthune, Pierre-François de. *Interreligious Hospitality: The Fullfilment of Dialogue*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2010.

Béthune, Pierre-François de. "Contemplation and Interreligious Dialogue: References and Perspectives Drawn from the Experiences of Monastics," *Monastic Interreligious Dialogue Bulletin* Vol. 49 (January 1994). <<http://www.monasticdialog.com/a.php?id=363>>

Blée, Fabrice. *The Third Desert: The Story of Monastic Interreligious Dialogue*. Collegeville, Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 2011.

Blée, Fabrice. "The Spirituality of interreligious Dialogue: Shaping a New Ecological Consciousness." In *Green Monasticism: A Buddhist-Catholic Response to an Environmental Calamity*, edited by Donald Mitchell and William Skudlarek. New York: Lantern Books, 2010, pp. 167-179.

Mitchell, Donald W. and James Wiseman (ed.). *Transforming Suffering: Reflections on Finding Peace in Troubled Times*. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

Mitchell, Donald W. and James Wiseman (ed.). *The Gethsemani Encounter: A Dialogue on the Spiritual Life by Buddhist and Christian Monastics*. New York, Continuum, 1997.

[摘要] 隱修群體宗教對話協會(Monastic Interreligious Dialogue (MID))作為天主教和其他宗教之間的橋樑,扮演了重要及獨特的角色。MID協會特別著重跨宗教在靈修體驗上的對話。協會的主要任務,從早期如何發展在亞州區內的天主教修道/僧侶生活,演變至關注如何塑造全球的和平文化,以至近期探討作為一名基督徒如何在跨宗教環境下的新處世方式。在這思潮的核心中,包容被視為一種跨宗教的美德。雖然有人對天主教僧侶對其他宗教的靈修實踐持有興趣作出質疑,但豐富的僧侶體驗證實能對跨宗教的探究有正面的影響。在來自不同宗教傳統的僧侶間的多次對話中,我們可以看到宗教間的不同並非障礙;而是豐富彼此間的認識及消除分歧的機會。對話並不存在要移除宗教間各異之處這個條件,而是要創做出一個令各宗教都得以被接納的空間。包容就是這個對話的空間。

The Parliaments of the World's Religions: Assemblies of Hope

Leo D. LEFEBURE

世界宗教議會：希望的聚會

Leo D. LEFEBURE

[ABSTRACT] The first World's Parliament of Religions met in Chicago in 1893, drawing religious leaders from around the world and launching the modern interreligious movement. From 1993 to 2009, there have been four Parliaments of the World's Religions, in Chicago, Capetown, Barcelona, and Melbourne. These are international, interreligious, inter-spiritual assemblies that invite leaders of a wide variety of religious and spiritual traditions to overcome interreligious animosity, foster more harmonious relations and work for a sustainable future. While the focus of the Parliaments has changed over time, the concern to foster conversation, mutual understanding, acceptance, and cooperation has remained constant.

From September 11 to 27, 1893, The World's Parliament of Religions met in Chicago, Illinois, as part of The World's Columbian Exposition, which celebrated the 400th anniversary of Columbus's

voyage across the Atlantic Ocean. While there had been countless interreligious conversations in earlier periods, in recorded history there had never been an interreligious gathering exactly like it on the same global scale; thus this assembly is commonly taken as the starting point of the modern interreligious movement.¹ A century passed before the second such Parliament was held in 1993, once again in Chicago. For the 1993 assembly, the name was changed to “A Parliament of the World’s Religions.” Since then there have been Parliaments of the World’s Religions in Capetown, South Africa in 1999, in Barcelona, Spain in 2004, and in Melbourne, Australia in 2009. At the time of writing, tentative plans are underway for future Parliaments of the World’s Religions at various locations yet to be decided.

The World’s Parliament of Religions: Chicago 1893

The late nineteenth century was an age of globalization, with new means of technology making travel and communication around the globe faster and easier than ever before; but it was globalization done largely under European colonial domination. The new discipline of comparative religious study (then commonly called the history of religions or *Religionswissenschaft*, or *sciences religieuses*) was being developed in Europe, and the English language was becoming more of a lingua franca internationally. In a climate of hope for the future, Chicago prepared to host The World’s Columbian Exposition both to commemorate the coming of Europeans to the Americas and also to showcase to the world the

¹ Diana L. Eck, “Foreword,” in *The Dawn of Religious Pluralism: Voices from the World’s Parliament of Religions, 1893*, ed. Richard Hughes Seager with the assistance of Ronald R. Kidd (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1993), p. xv; Katherine Marshall, *Global Institutions of Religion: Ancient Movers, Modern Shakers* (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), p. 133.

rebirth of Chicago after the Great Fire of 1871. As plans were being made for the Exposition, a Presbyterian leader, John Henry Barrows, and a Swedenborgian lawyer, Charles Bonney, thought it should include The World's Parliament of Religions, presenting a vision of a tolerant embrace of religious diversity.

The Parliament was convened on September 11, 1893 in the building that later became the Art Institute of Chicago. On the opening day, Barrows set forth a ringing challenge in his "Words of Welcome," proposing "that whoever would advance the cause of his own faith must first discover and gratefully acknowledge the truths contained in other faiths... Why should not Christians be glad to learn what God has wrought through Buddha and Zoroaster — through the sage of China, and the prophets of India and the prophet of Islam?"² Charles Bonney hoped that the Parliament would foster "the coming unity of mankind, in the service of God and of man."³ Barrows later looked back upon the opening ceremony and recalled:

"With the great peace-bell at the fair, tolling, as many hoped, the death-knell to intolerance; with the rabbis of Israel praying at that hour in all lands that the name of Jehovah might be revered over all the earth; with representatives of ten religions gathered beneath one roof; and with a Catholic Cardinal repeating the universal prayer of the world's savior, the parliament opened on the 11th of September, 1893. It was indeed a meeting of brotherhood, where 'the Brahmin forgot his caste and the Catholic was chiefly conscious of his catholicity'; and where, in the

² John Henry Barrows, "Words of Welcome," in *Dawn of Religious Pluralism*, p. 26.

³ Richard Hughes Seager, "General Introduction," in *Dawn of Religious Pluralism*, p. 5.

audience, ‘the variety of interests, faiths, ranks, and races was as great as that found on the platform.’”⁴

Though he was aware of the new developments in religious scholarship, Barrows explained that “the purpose was not to call together the specialists in comparative religion, to produce learned and critical essays.”⁵ Instead, the goal was

“to bring the different faiths into contact and conference; to deepen the spirit of brotherhood; to emphasize the distinctive truths of each religion; to show why men believe in God and the future life; to bridge the chasm of separation between Christians of different names and religious men of all names; to induce good men to work together for common ends; and to promote the cause of international peace.”⁶

The Parliament was significant in introducing intelligent and articulate Hindu, Buddhist, Muslim, Zoroastrian, Parsee, Daoist, Shinto, and Confucian leaders to Americans who had for the most part never encountered such persons before. Newspaper reporters sent home stories of how surprisingly reasonable and persuasive the unfamiliar religious leaders were. The *Chicago Tribune* found the significance of the assembly “in the fact that those whom we have been accustomed to call heathens are not so much heathens as we imagined. Under some of the religions lies the clear idea of divinity. Under all lies the clear idea of morality.”⁷ The newspaper expressed

⁴ John Henry Barrows, “Results of the Parliament of Religions,” in *A Museum of Faiths: Histories and Legacies of the 1893 World’s Parliament of Religions*, edited by Eric J. Ziolkowski (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), p. 133.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 136.

⁷ *Chicago Tribune*, 24 September 1893; quoted in *Dawn of Religious Pluralism*, p. 353.

its hope that the Parliament would lead to greater understanding and toleration, as well as the end of religious fanaticism. In Paris, *Le Temps* described the Parliament as the most innovative and astounding display America has presented to the world.

However, the tolerance of the organizers was limited, as they largely assumed that Western Protestant Christianity would emerge as the world's dominant faith tradition. The overwhelming majority of the speakers were Christian. Some religious bodies were either absent or notably under-represented. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (informally known as the Mormon Church) was not invited. At a time of increasing racism in late nineteenth-century America, African Americans and Native Americans were not generally welcomed at the Columbian Exposition or at the World's Parliament of Religions. From the African American community, only Frederick Douglass and Benjamin William Arnett spoke at the Parliament. An academic anthropologist presented a paper on the religions of the First Nations (Native Americans) in North America. The organizers of the Parliament invited the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid II to send an Islamic delegation, but the sultan refused to join in the planning or to send representatives. As a result, Islam was underrepresented.⁸ Representing the Islamic tradition was an American former diplomat, Mohammad (Alexander Russell) Webb, who had served as the U.S. Consul to the Philippines and had converted to Islam five years earlier in 1888.⁹

The most brilliant star of the Parliament was the young (thirty-year-old), charismatic Swami Vivekananda from India. On the

⁸ *Dawn of Religious Pluralism*, p. 9.

⁹ Mohammed (Alexander Russell) Webb, "The Spirit of Islam," in *The Dawn of Religious Pluralism: Voices from the World's Parliament of Religions, 1893*, edited by Richard Hughes Seager with the assistance of Ronald R. Kidd (La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1993), pp. 270-78.

first day of the Parliament, he went to the podium, threw open his arms, and exclaimed, “Sisters and Brothers of America!” He expressed the hope “that the bell that tolled this morning in honor of this convention may be the death-knell of all fanaticism, of all persecutions with the sword or with the pen, and of all uncharitable feelings between persons wending their way to the same goal.”¹⁰ As a Hindu, he welcomed the Parliament as a vindication of the teaching of Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita: “Whosoever comes to Me, through whatsoever form, I reach him; all men are struggling through paths which in the end lead to Me.”¹¹ The crowd went wild, and he quickly became a favorite of the audience in attendance.

With Vivekananda, two other young Asian leaders made a significant impact in Chicago. Thirty-four-year-old Zen master Shaku Soyen of Japan and twenty-nine-year-old Theravada Buddhist leader Anagarika Dharmapala of Sri Lanka found in Chicago an international platform on which to present a reformed understanding of their respective traditions to the world, hoping to spread knowledge of and interest in Buddhism to Americans and Europeans. Dharmapala stressed that “Buddhism is a scientific religion, inasmuch as it earnestly enjoins that nothing whatever be accepted on faith.”¹² Shaku Soyen appealed for unity among different religions: “Let us, the true followers of Buddha, the true followers of Jesus Christ, the true followers of Confucius and the followers of truth, unite ourselves for the sake of helping the helpless and living glorious lives of brotherhood under the control of truth.”¹³

¹⁰ Swami Vivekananda, *Chicago Addresses* (Calcutta, India: Advaita Ashrama Publication Department, 1992), p. 4.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹² H. Dharmapala, “The World’s Debt to Buddha,” in *The World’s Parliament of Religions*, ed. John Henry Barrows, 2 vols. (Chicago: Parliament Publishing Co., 1893), 2:878.

¹³ Shaku Soyen, “Arbitration instead of War,” in *The World’s Parliament of Religions*, ed. John Henry Barrows, 2 vols. (Chicago: Parliament Publishing Co., 1893),

Dharmapala and Soyen shared the confidence that their respective Buddhist traditions constituted a rational religion that could withstand Christian criticisms and would be persuasive to modern Westerners.¹⁴

Pung Kwang Yu, the First Secretary of the Chinese Legation in Washington, DC, represented the Confucian tradition, which he described as embracing a variety of religious traditions: He described Buddha, Lao-tze, and Jesus Christ as having "practically the same end in view, though each points out a different road to reach it."¹⁵ He also accepted the Christian practice of calling God "Father": "[T]o call the pure creative power of nature, Father, and the pure consciousness of man, child, is by no means contrary to the principles set forth in the Book of Changes."¹⁶ The presence and the addresses of the Asian speakers marked a significant development in increasing American awareness of Asian religious traditions.

The Parliament was also a major moment symbolizing the acceptance of Catholics and Jews in American culture alongside of Protestants. Because the liberal Protestant organizers were concerned about being opposed and even ridiculed by more conservative Protestants, they were very interested in gaining Catholic participation. The leading American Catholic churchman of the day,

2:1285.

¹⁴ John S. Harding, *Mahayana Phoenix; Japan's Buddhists at the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions* (New York: Peter Lang), pp. 65-74; Tessa Bartholomew, "Dharmapala at Chicago: Mahayana Buddhist or Sinhala Chauvinist?" in *A Museum of Faiths: Histories and Legacies of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions*, ed. Eric J. Ziolkowski (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), pp. 235-50. See also Judith Snodgrass, *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West: Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition* (Chapel Hill, NC, and London: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

¹⁵ Quoted in Richard Hughes Seager, *The World's Parliament of Religions: The East/West Encounter, Chicago, 1893* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 2009), p. 80.

¹⁶ Quoted in Seager, *World's Parliament of Religions*, p. 80.

James Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, decided to attend, as did Chicago's Archbishop Patrick Feehan. In recognition of Catholic support, Cardinal Gibbons was given a prominent place on the first day of the program. In his address he confidently asserted that he was not involved in a search for religious truth because he had already found it. But he went on to say: "Though we differ in faith, thank God there is one platform on which we stand united, and that is the platform of charity and benevolence. . . . [N]ever do we approach nearer to our Heavenly Father than when we alleviate the sorrows of others." And he concluded his remarks in a similar vein by quoting "the pagan Cicero": "There is no way by which men can approach nearer to the gods than by contributing to the welfare of their fellow-creatures."¹⁷

A Catholic speaker who had converted from Congregationalism, Merwin-Marie Snell, boldly forecast:

"It appears, then, that the religion of the future will have no fences; perhaps I had better say, it will have no blinds. It will be open on every side towards every vehicle of truth, every embodiment of beauty, every instrument of goodness; that is to say, toward all expressions of thought, all manifestation of feeling, all standards of conduct. Since love is the father of all the gods, the root and essence of the spiritual sense, it is especially by love and in love that this breaking down of the old barriers will be realized. The fundamental characteristic of the religious future will

¹⁷ James Cardinal Gibbons, "The Needs of Humanity Supplied by the Catholic Religion," in *Dawn of Religious Pluralism*, p. 164.

be a universal union in love. . . . Truth is one, but the aspects of truth are infinite.”¹⁸

However, not all Catholics shared this enthusiasm and openness. The Apostolic Legate of the Pope, Archbishop Francesco Satolli, observed these events from a distance and was concerned that Catholic participation gave the impression that the one true Church appeared to be simply one among many religions. He wrote a negative report to Pope Leo XIII. Pope Leo, in turn, ordered that if there should be another such event that was not organized by the Catholic Church, Catholics were not allowed to participate. Pope Leo did allow that Catholics could hold their own assemblies and invite “dissenters” to attend.¹⁹ Many others were critical as well; Barrows records hostile reactions to the parliament: “It has been stigmatized as ‘Bedlam,’ ‘Babel,’ and ‘a booth in Vanity Fair’; and its promoters have been likened to Balaam and Judas Iscariot! All this shows that the parliament has important work yet to do in the world.”²⁰

The organizers tacitly assumed that Anglo-American Protestantism could provide a unifying framework for the world’s religious diversity. Looking back on this Parliament a century later, historian Richard Hughes Seager argues: “The Parliament was a liberal, western, and American quest for world religious unity that failed. . . . The Parliament, however noble its goals and aspirations, was tainted by the same parochialism, ethnocentrism, imperial pretensions, and hegemonic intentions as the entire [Columbian] Exposition.”²¹ As this project failed, another effect, unintended by

¹⁸ Merwin-Marie Snell, “Future of Religion,” in *Dawn of Religious Pluralism*, p. 173.

¹⁹ James F. Cleary, “Catholic Participation in the World’s Parliament of Religions, Chicago, 1893,” in *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 55 (1970), p. 605.

²⁰ Barrows, “Results of the Parliament,” in *A Museum of Faiths*, p. 137.

²¹ Richard Hughes Seager, *The World’s Parliament of Religions: The East/West Encounter, Chicago, 1893* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University

the planners, emerged. Seager continues: “Having failed as a liberal quest for religious unity, the Parliament unintentionally turned out to be a revelation of the plurality of forces on the American and world scenes. As a result, it was a harbinger of the rise of the idea of religious pluralism that is alternatively celebrated, studied, decried, and in various ways struggled over in many different quarters today.”²²

The failure of the quest for unity lurks in the background of Parliament activities today, in 2013. The current Council for a Parliament of the World’s Religions does not seek to achieve unity of religions and instead seeks to promote harmony among religions. The Mission statement proclaims: “The Council for a Parliament of the World’s Religions was created to cultivate harmony among the world’s religious and spiritual communities and foster their engagement with the world and its guiding institutions in order to achieve a just, peaceful and sustainable world.”²³

The Parliament had a significant impact on many areas of the United States because a number of the visitors from Asia prolonged their stays and fostered a wider awareness of Buddhism and Hinduism in North America. Anagarika Dharmapala and Shaku Soyen traveled around the United States, explaining the teachings of the Buddha. Even more important in the long run, publisher Paul Carus invited the young companion of Shaku Soyen, D.T. Suzuki, to stay in the United States after the Parliament had ended and work for him at his publishing house in Lassalle, Illinois, southwest of Chicago. Suzuki began an influential career introducing Mahayana Buddhism, especially the Rinzai tradition of Zen Buddhism, to

Press, 2009), pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

²² Seager, *World’s Parliament*, p. xxxix.

²³ <<http://www.parliamentofreligions.org/index.cfm?n=1>>

Americans. Followers of Vivekananda established the Vedanta Society, which would be a major forum for the presence of Hinduism in American culture in the decades to come. Many North Americans in the twentieth century came to know Zen through the work of D.T. Suzuki and Hinduism through Vivekananda and the Vedanta Society.

The late historian of religions Joseph Kitagawa observed that the planners of the first Parliament assumed that either Western Christianity or Judaism was superior and did not treat all religions equally. Nonetheless, he argued that there was a very significant development in 1893 because the Parliament marked a turning point in interreligious relations, as religious leaders began to present their own perspectives with an awareness of how they would be heard and responded to by members of other religious traditions. "In retrospect, it becomes evident that it was a new experience for many of the Parliament's planners to be self-conscious about the distinction between the 'inner meaning' and 'outer meaning' of religions."²⁴ Kitagawa also noted appreciatively the strong impetus that the Parliament gave to the study of comparative religion in America.²⁵ He noted an important unintended consequence. Shaku Soyen, Vivekananda, and Dharmapala learned at the Parliament that many Christians believed that other religions were "fulfilled" in Christianity; these Asian leaders appropriated this perspective and developed their own "fulfillment" theories in which other traditions would lead up to their own.²⁶

²⁴ Joseph Mitsuo Kitagawa, *The Quest for Human Unity: A Religious History* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 208.

²⁵ Joseph Mitsuo Kitagawa, "The 1893 World's Parliament of Religions and Its Legacy," in *A Museum of Faiths: Histories and Legacies of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions*, edited by Eric J. Ziolkowski (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), pp. 185-87.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

The first Parliament has been hailed as “The Dawn of Religious Pluralism” and the beginning of the modern interreligious movement. It inspired the creation of some new organizations, including the International Association for Religious Freedom, which was founded in Boston in 1900, and the World Congress of Faiths, which was organized in London in 1936. Kyoto, Japan, hosted a Great Religious Exposition in 1930, which was inspired by the Parliament. However, after the 1893 Parliament there was no sustained organization to hold further Parliaments on a regular basis. In the early twentieth century, American attitudes to other nations hardened, and by the 1920s tight immigration restrictions were established, limiting the number of immigrants from Asian countries with Muslim, Buddhist, Confucian, or Hindu backgrounds. Theologically, many Christians became more conservative and less interested in interreligious explorations.

A Parliament of the World’s Religions: Chicago 1993

A century passed, and the world continued to change. The United States modified its immigration laws in 1965, allowing larger numbers of immigrants from around the world. This led to increasing numbers of Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Jains, and followers of virtually every other religion coming to the United States. During the 1980s a number of religious leaders in the Chicago area, especially the Hindus of the Vedanta Society, were mindful that the centenary of the first Parliament was approaching, and took the initiative of exploring the possibility having a second Parliament. In 1988, the Council for a Parliament of the World’s Religions was established to organize this event. In 1893, most Chicagoans had never seen a Buddhist or a Hindu or a Muslim; in the 1980s and 90s,

there were host communities in Chicago from virtually all of the world's religious traditions who organized the new Parliament.

The second Parliament, this time called a Parliament of the World's Religions, met in Chicago from August 28 to September 5, 1993. About 8,000 people came from all over the world to the Palmer House Hotel for a week of discussions. The centennial Parliament of 1993 included many, many groups, large and small, long established and newly formed, well known and new to the scene. Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, the Archbishop of Chicago, represented the Catholic Church. The Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, quietly violating Pope Leo's order of a century earlier, sent Archbishop Francesco Gioia to speak on "The Catholic Church and Other Religions."²⁷ Numerous Catholics were involved in the planning and the activities of the Parliament.

One of the keynote addresses was given by Gerald Barney, a physicist who had earlier been commissioned by U.S. President Jimmy Carter to do projections of future global population growth, availability and use of resource, and environmental impact for the United States government. In 1993 he presented to the Parliament a series of graphs and charts on projected expectations "in the lifetime of a child born today." Many of the figures were extremely worrisome regarding the impact of human technology on the environment and the effects of population increase on land and water use, crops, and the availability of food. He noted the danger of resulting struggles leading to violence and all-out wars. Then he challenged the world's religious leaders to address the situation. He noted that almost all organizations are geared for the short term and

²⁷ Francesco Gioia, "The Catholic Church and Other Religions," in *The Community of Religions: Voices and Images of The Parliament of the World's Religions*, edited by Wayne Teasdale and George F. Cairns (New York: Continuum, 1996), pp. 83-90.

proposed that religious leaders have responsibility to think about the coming generations and have a history of challenging people to do what is not in their short-term interest but to make sacrifices for the sake of a greater good. After Barney finished his remarks, Rabbi Herman Schaalman, who was chairing the session, said, “Now we know why we are here.” This concern was one of the most important shifts from 1893, and it became a central theme for the 1993 Parliament and has continued to be among the most important concerns of later Parliaments.

Eco-theologian Thomas Berry saw this attention to ecological awareness as the central realization of the 1993 Parliament: “If the finest consequence of the First Parliament of Religions, held in 1893, was the recovery of a profound sense of the divine in the human soul through the leadership of Swami Vivekananda, the finest consequence of the second Parliament of Religions, held in 1993, should be the recovery of an exalted sense of the divine in the grandeur of the natural world.”²⁸ Berry warned of the dire consequences of a scientific-industrial worldview that views nature simply as resources to be exploited and plundered. Berry saw the 1993 Parliament as contributing to the awareness “that the natural world has from its beginning been a mystical as well as a physical reality. As the primary manifestation of the divine, the natural world is the primary sacred scripture and the primary sacred community.”²⁹ Today countless interreligious discussions around the world include concern for ecology.

²⁸ Thomas Berry, “The Role of Religions in the Twenty-first Century,” in *The Community of Religions: Voices and Images of The Parliament of the World's Religions*, edited by Wayne Teasdale and George F. Cairns (New York: Continuum, 1996), p. 182.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

The 1993 Parliament included a dialogue organized by Monastic Interreligious Dialogue, bringing together Catholic and Buddhist monastics to discuss "Kenosis and Shunyata," exploring the meanings of emptiness and emptying in their respective traditions. This discussion led to the later Gethsemani Encounters, week-long meetings of Buddhist and Catholic monastics at Gethsemani Abbey in Kentucky in 1996, 2002, and 2008. The 2008 dialogue focused on "Green Monasticism," i.e., the role that monastic interreligious dialogue can play in fostering respect for ecology.³⁰

In addition to the public sessions, there were closed meetings of The Council of Spiritual and Religious Leaders, which discussed and endorsed a statement, "Toward a Global Ethic: An Initial Declaration," which had been prepared by Hans Küng and his colleagues.³¹ This declaration sets forth basic moral principles which the religious and spiritual leaders in the Council accepted. The core of the declaration is based on the Golden Rule and its implications for cherishing life, respecting religious diversity, and honoring freedom of conscience. Representing the Catholic Church, Cardinal Bernardin, who was a member of The Council of Spiritual and Religious Leaders, signed the declaration, "Toward a Global Ethic."

Not all discussions were harmonious, and significant conflicts arose. The delegation of First Nations (Native Americans) presented a "Declaration of Vision" to the Council of Spiritual and Religious

³⁰ Donald W. Mitchell and William Skudlarek, eds., *Green Monasticism: A Buddhist-Catholic Response to an Environmental Calamity* (New York: Lantern Books, 2010).

³¹ Hans Küng and Karl-Josef Kuschel, *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions* (New York: Continuum, 1993). For a discussion of the complex process leading up to the statement, see Thomas A. Baima, "Toward a Global Ethic: An Initial Declaration: Its Making and Its Future," in *The Community of Religions: Voices and Images of The Parliament of the World's Religions*, edited by Wayne Teasdale and George F. Cairns (New York: Continuum, 1996), pp. 143-149.

Leaders, condemning the Papal Bull, *Inter Caetera*, issued by Pope Alexander VI in 1493, which granted lands in the Americas to Spain. The chair of the Council, David Ramage, ruled the Declaration of Vision out of order because the Council was convened to discuss only the topic of the declaration regarding a Global Ethic, not to adjudicate particular historic grievances. Some Jewish attendees left the Parliament in public protest because Louis Farrakhan was allowed to speak. Farrakhan is the African-American leader of the Nation of Islam and had made earlier statements that were deemed anti-Semitic. One of the most heated moments of this Parliament came during the session on “Voices of the Oppressed,” when a Sikh speaker was recounting the ways in which Hindus had mistreated Sikhs in India, never mentioning any offences that Sikhs had done to Hindus. A number of Hindu men ominously approached the stage. Security personnel emerged to restrain them. The speaker was interrupted by the program managers, and there was a long, awkward pause in the program. Some people began chanting a soothing refrain; and finally, a Native American leader, Burton Pretty on Top, took the podium and gave a more conciliatory message. It was a sign of the real-life tensions that surround interreligious relations. As the chair of the organizing committee, Jim Kenney, commented, “The Parliament is not tarnished when the real world shows up.”³²

The Parliament in Capetown 1999

The third Parliament met in Capetown, South Africa, from December 1 to 8, 1999. This was a very significant moment in time,

³² George Cairns and Wayne Teasdale, “Introduction: Harmony in the Midst of Great Diversity,” in *The Community of Religions: Voices and Images of The Parliament of the World's Religions*, edited by Wayne Teasdale and George F. Cairns (New York: Continuum, 1996), p. 11.

coming just a few years after the end of apartheid, in the midst of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and on the eve of the new Millennium. On the Opening Day, the international AIDS Quilt was unveiled, with hundreds of hand-stitched panels, each commemorating a victim of the AIDS epidemic. Cleve Jones, the founder of the Quilt project, led a discussion of how religious traditions can respond to the challenge of HIV/AIDS. Over 10,000 participants then marched to District Six, an area that had been designated "white-only" under the earlier apartheid government, when non-white residents had been forced to move to under-resourced locations. Participants then proceeded to the Good Hope Center for the Opening Plenary Assembly.

The most prominent speaker at this event was Nelson Mandela, who told the assembly of the ambivalent role of religion in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa. He noted that religion can legitimate terrible oppression; but he also recalled that in the jails of the apartheid system, "it was religious institutions, Hindus, Moslems, leaders of the Jewish faith, Christians, it was them that gave us hope that one day we would come out. We would return."³³ This gave a concrete and powerful example of how interreligious collaboration can have a concrete impact in addressing situations of injustice. This has been another major focus of the Parliaments—collaboration on issues of social justice. A multitude of other sessions in Capetown focused on issues of religious identity, interreligious dialogue, and the role of religions in addressing the critical issues of the present day.

Building on the Declaration, "Towards a Global Ethic," the Assembly of the Parliament issued "A Call to Our Guiding Institution," addressing leaders of religion, government, business,

³³ <<http://www.teosofia.com/mandela.html>> [2013-01-31]

education, arts and media, science and medicine, international intergovernmental organizations, and organizations of civil society. The Call invites leaders to a process of creative engagement to apply the moral and ethical values shared by major religious and spiritual traditions to the pressing challenges of today. A number of communities and groups offered “Gifts of Service,” which were described as “projects undertaken to relieve suffering, promote harmony, and build a better world.”³⁴ Among the many gifts were the Earth Charter, Project Shalom, World Movement for Nonviolence, and the Children’s Peace Museum.

The Parliament in Barcelona 2004

The fourth Parliament met in Barcelona, Spain, from July 7 to 13, 2004, with the overarching theme: “Pathways to Peace: The Wisdom of Listening, the Power of Commitment.” The Parliament called attention to four international issues of pressing concern: overcoming religiously-motivated violence, eliminating international debt in poor countries, supporting refugees worldwide, and increasing access to clean water. There were three main tracks focusing on intrareligious identity, interreligious dialogue, and engagement with contemporary issues.

The Parliament included a three-day consultation on Interfaith Education, which explored how interfaith education can contribute to conflict transformation, living with differences, and shaping the next generation. There were symposia on interfaith peace-building skills, science and religion, human rights, and responding to HIV/AIDS.

³⁴ “1999 Parliament of the World’s Religions Summary Report,” p. 11, <http://www.parliamentofreligions.org/_includes/FCKcontent/File/1999report.pdf>[2013-08-06]

The Sikh community exemplified the spirit of hospitality by hosting lunch for all each day in a large tent near the Mediterranean.

One panel discussion focused on "Finding the Brother in the Other: Overcoming Negative Images of Other Faiths as We Build Our Religious Identities and Seek Common Ground." At one point in the question period, Mufti Habimana Saleh, a Muslim imam from Rwanda, took the microphone and expressed his appreciation for this type of "free zone" where people from different faiths and backgrounds could come together amicably to discuss difference. "I am from Rwanda," he said, "where one million people were slaughtered in a hundred days because people did not find a brother or sister in the other." Then he addressed directly Rabbi Brad Hirschfield, an American Orthodox Jewish leader: "I am getting to know Jews here. I really appreciate what you have been saying about Judaism not being just a way to be Jewish, but a way to be human—and so it must be with all other religions, too. I want to shake your hand!" As the Rwandan mufti approached the American rabbi, Hirschfield came to meet him and the two men spontaneously hugged each other. Everyone in the room was moved by the power of the moment and burst into spontaneous and prolonged applause. It was one image that expressed the hopes of the Parliament in a violent world.

The Parliament in Melbourne 2009

The fifth Parliament met in Melbourne, Australia, from December 3 to 9, 2009. The agenda again included an extremely wide range of topics, ranging from healing the earth, ecology, peace building, human rights, and overcoming poverty, to interreligious education, women in leadership, and local and global interreligious

movements. In the context of Australia, there was a special focus on the heritage of indigenous peoples. Most sessions began with a respectful recognition of the role of the First Nations in caring for the land; and there were many discussions of indigenous religious life and culture, especially in Australia and North America. Many sessions focused on the challenge of ecological sustainability; the title of one session pointedly warned: “Mother Nature Doesn’t Do Bailouts.” Another major theme was the relation of Islam and the West, as numerous discussions explored various aspects of the Islamic tradition and its relation to “the West,” a term that was strongly criticized but nonetheless employed.

Each day, the Parliament began with a variety of religious rituals and meditation practices, some of which involved more than one tradition. For example, Rev. William Skudlarek, OSB, and Mahayana Buddhist leader Rev. Heng Sure collaborated in reflecting on the significance of breath in meditation in the Catholic and Buddhist traditions. Other sessions involved a single tradition, such as Ven. Jinwol leading Zen meditation, or the Shinto rite of the Konko-kyo tradition involving the harmonious collaboration of kami (divine being) and humans. There were also numerous musical performances, and a moving performance of the one-person play, “Simone,” presenting the life of Simone Weil.

Many sessions focused on the experiences, the suffering, and the resources for healing of the indigenous peoples of Australia and the Americas. One session led by representatives of the Ngarinyin Australians began with a smoking, a tradition of Australian aboriginal peoples when they go to another region of the country or when they share their sacred images with others. They had come to Melbourne, some distance from their home, and they were preparing to show us the sacred rock paintings that are an important part of their heritage. A fire was lit in the corner of the conference room, and

leaves were placed on it to create smoke. Participants were then invited to come forward and stand before the fire to receive the beneficial effect of being smoked. With this protection, the Ngarinyin people then discussed the "Mamaa" taboo, which guards their sacred images from use or abuse by outsiders. In the 1950s this people had been forcibly removed from their traditional land where the paintings are found, but more recently the Australian High Court upheld their property rights to their traditional area. The problem remains, however, that surrounding lands are owned or leased by others, and so access is often difficult. In the discussion, a number of Australians debated the best way to lobby government officials regarding this situation.

A number of sessions presented the impressive history of interfaith collaboration in Australia itself. This was already underway before the year 2000 and has increased dramatically in the wake of the attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001 and the bombing in Bali in 2002, which killed 89 Australians. Many local Australian communities and metropolitan areas such as Melbourne have energetic interreligious forums underway at the present time. Attendance in Melbourne was less than at the 2004 Parliament in Barcelona, possibly due to the distance required for many people to travel to reach Melbourne and also due to the worldwide economic downturn. Nonetheless, the spirit of enthusiasm was strong.

In comparison with the historic Parliament of 1893, it is more difficult to assess the cumulative impact of the recent Parliaments, both because we are closer to these events in time and also because the international field has a much larger number of interreligious organizations than in 1893. Today there are numerous organizations with analogous concerns, including Religions for Peace, United Religions Initiative, and Sant Egidio's annual Prayer for Peace, as

well as the commissions for interreligious religions of many religious bodies, including the Catholic Church. There are countless grass-roots initiatives for interreligious and inter-spiritual understanding and collaboration, and so the recent Parliaments take their place in an environment filled with similar discussions and activities.

The recent Parliaments have certainly contributed to the widespread discussion of ecology, poverty, conflict transformation, and human rights in interreligious and inter-spiritual discourses. They have helped to network the interreligious community worldwide, offering a forum for traditions and organizations to present their activities and aspirations. Recent Parliaments have sought to widen their appeal beyond organized religious traditions. In 1893, Catholics and Jews found a new public platform in the United States; the recent Parliaments have provided a space where new and smaller religious and spiritual movements can share their perspectives and values. The recent Parliaments have offered a forum to a wide variety of religious traditions that have often been neglected or marginalized. Katherine Marshall comments, “The world’s smaller faith traditions have tended to see the parliament as a rare opportunity to find a forum and voice and the principle of inclusion extends to atheists and Pagan groups, as well as a growing commitment to including indigenous traditions.”³⁵ CPWR invites all persons and communities, including humanists and spiritual seekers who are not involved in a particular religious tradition to be involved in its activities.

³⁵ Marshall, p. 137.

The Future

Today, the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions (CPWR), based in Chicago, offers webinars on a variety of topics³⁶ and sponsors PeaceNext, an online forum for "creating spaces where people can work together for a more just, peaceful, and sustainable world."³⁷ As Katherine Marshall observes, "In practice, the parliament has operated as a small interfaith organization for most of the time, necessarily gearing up to a far larger organization as five-year parliament events (which are large and complex) approach."³⁸ In addition to organizing Parliaments, CPWR is seeking to establish a network of Partner Cities throughout the world, bringing together persons seeking harmony and understanding.

At the time of writing, plans are underway for future Parliaments of the World's Religions to be held in places around the globe. One of the goals of the CPWR is to increase the level of activities in between the Parliaments. As part of these preparations, the Council will invite people in cities around the world to host pre-Parliament events. These would connect in some way with the themes and concerns of the Parliament, fostering harmony and cooperation among different religious traditions in addressing the challenges that all humans face. Cities with a developed program of interreligious cooperation are welcome to become Partner Cities.

³⁶ <<https://www.parliamentofreligions.org/>>

³⁷ <<https://www.peacenext.org>>.

³⁸ Marshall, p. 137.

For Further Reading

Seager, Richard Hughes. *The World's Parliament of Religions: The East/West Encounter Chicago, 1893*. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 2009.

Seager, Richard Hughes and Ronald R. Kidd, ed. *The Dawn of Religious Pluralism: Voices from the World's Parliament of Religions 1893*. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1993.

Teasdale, Wayne, and George F. Cairns, eds. *The Community of Religions: Voices and Images of the Parliament of the World's Religions*. New York: Continuum, 1996.

Tobias, Michael, Jane Morrison, and Bettina Gray, eds. *A Parliament of Souls: In Search of Global Spirituality*. San Francisco: KQED Books, 1995.

Ziolkowski, Eric J., ed. *A Museum of Faiths: Histories and Legacies of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993.

Website of the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions: <https://www.parliamentofreligions.org>

[摘要]1893年的第一屆世界宗教議會集合了全球各地的宗教領袖，亦開展了現代跨宗教運動。在1993年至2009年間分別在芝加哥、好望角、巴塞隆拿及墨爾本舉行了四次會議。這幾次會議都是國際性、跨宗教、跨靈性的會議，邀請了多方面的宗教及精神傳統領袖，一同去克服宗教間的負面情緒，去培育和諧的關係及持續性的將來。雖然會議的焦點隨時間有所變更，但在關注保育、互相了解、接納及合作這些議題上維持不變。

Fifty Years after Vatican II: The Catholic Church and Interreligious Dialogue

Peter C. PHAN

梵二後五十年： 天主教會與宗教對話

Peter C. PHAN

[ABSTRACT] There has been vigorous debate over the degree of continuity and discontinuity between Vatican II and the earlier Catholic tradition. In the area of interreligious relations, the Council undoubtedly brought about a radical change from the exclusivism taught by Pope Eugenius IV and the Council of Florence. Though *Nostra Aetate* is very short, it has had a profound and positive impact on Catholic relations with other religious traditions. The post-conciliar path toward better relations has been complex and tortuous but is nonetheless irreversible. The dramatic gestures and journeys of Popes Paul VI, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI powerfully expressed unprecedented respect for other religions and their followers. As Catholic relations with followers of other religions, especially with Jews, dramatically improved, there has been vigorous debate over the various models in competing theologies of religions. At times a restorationist agenda for the church has had a chilling effect on efforts at interreligious dialogue;

various papal missteps have complicated the quest for interreligious understanding.

A theology of the Holy Spirit can contribute to understanding the universal reach of God's grace. A recognition of the finite humanity of Jesus can allow for other manifestations of God's presence to other peoples. The debate over the mission of the church can be informed by recognition of the Jewishness of Jesus and his earliest followers, by recognizing the presence of the Holy Spirit in other religions, and by attention to the importance of the church's mission among and with non-Christians. Pope Francis has offered an example of respectful, heartfelt, receptive dialogue in his published conversations with Rabbi Skorka. Like his patron, Saint Francis of Assisi, the pope offers a simple, humble approach to Christian life that inspires trust and hope.

Since the end of Vatican II, there has been a veritable avalanche of publications, in practically all the main languages of the world, on the council as a whole and in particular on its Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions, known by its first two Latin words *Nostra Aetate* [In Our Day] (*NA*). Commentaries upon commentaries on the sixteen documents of the council have been published, as single-authored monographs or as multi-volume edited collections, of which the five-volume *Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil* deserves special notice.¹ In addition, detailed histories of the council have been written, the most notable among which is the five-volume, equally of door-stopper size, *History of Vatican II*, directed by Giuseppe

¹ *Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, 5 vols., ed. Peter Hünermann and Bernd Jochen Hilberath (Freiburg: Herder, 2004-6).

Alberigo, of the famed Istituto per le Scienze Religiose in Bologna, Italy.² In its recent issues, the premier English-language journal *Theological Studies* hosted a number of first-rate studies on the history, interpretation, and reception of Vatican II. Even the most dedicated specialists on Vatican II, let alone an amateur historian like me, would be lying were they to claim to have read all of the most important publications on the council, even in a single European language.

In spite of this plethora of publications on Vatican II, it remains true that, to use a cliché, we have barely scratched its surface. Fifty years is a long period in a person's life span and may provide sufficient perspective to assess his or her legacy, but within the history of a two-thousand-year-old institution whose reforms often move at glacial pace, five decades is but a blip on the screen. It normally takes a lapse of several centuries before we can gauge the impact, especially worldwide, of an event as transformative and complex as Vatican II, which, according to Karl Rahner, ended the nearly two-millennia-long Hellenistic-Roman or Constantinian era of Christianity and ushered in what he terms the "world church." Indeed, just as scholars are still debating today the meaning of what is referred to as the "post-Tridentine church," nearly five hundred years after the council of Trent (1545-1563), it will no doubt take hundreds of years before we can fully grasp the global impact of Vatican II.

The intent of this presentation is not to assess the theological and practical impact of *NA*, much less of Vatican II. Its scope is much more modest and limited, that is, to survey the theology and practice of interreligious dialogue in the Roman Catholic Church

² *History of Vatican II*, 5 vols., ed. Giuseppe Alberigo; English version, ed., Joseph A. Komonchak (Louvain: Peeters, 1995-2006; Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995-2006).

since the end of Vatican II in 1965 and to project its future directions. It leaves out of consideration other Christian bodies such as the World Council of Churches, whose activities in interreligious dialogue have been extensive. My essay on interreligious dialogue in the Roman Catholic Church is structured around three questions: Where did we come from? Where are we now? and, Where will we be going? In other words, the three issues we will examine are: First, how did the Catholic Church see other religions in relation to itself before the 1960s? Second, what are the most notable events in the relations of the Catholic Church vis-à-vis non-Christian religions and have there been any significant changes in its theology of religions in the last fifty years? Third, what will the directions and trajectories for interreligious dialogue be in the first decades of the third Christian millennium? What can and must we do to build up a harmonious common life among believers of different religions, a fruitful collaboration among them to achieve a more just and peaceful world, a mutually enriched understanding of theological matters, and a deeper sharing of religious experiences?

Where Did We Come From?

Ever since Pope Benedict XVI's address to the Roman Curia on December 22, 2005,³ there has been a widespread debate whether, to echo the title of a popular book, "anything happened" at all at Vatican II.⁴ According to Benedict, there are two opposite hermeneutical approaches to Vatican II—the "hermeneutics of discontinuity and rupture" and the "hermeneutics of reform." The

³ Benedict XVI, Christmas address to the Roman Curia, December 22, 2005, in *Insegnamento di Benedetto XVI*, vol. 1 (2005) (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006), pp. 1018-32.

⁴ See John O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).

pope rejects the former in favor of the latter, with its "combination of continuity and discontinuity," and consequently opposes the popular disjunction between the "pre-conciliar" and "post-conciliar" church. Whichever side one comes down on this question with regard to the council as a whole, there is no doubt whatsoever that there was, at least with regard to the Catholic Church's attitude toward other religions, a 180-degree turnabout, or to put it mildly, there is a "discontinuity," a caesura between "before-Vatican" and "after-Vatican II." No clever hermeneutical prestidigitation can bridge the gulf separating the official teachings on non-Christian religions of the two ecumenical or general councils, Florence (1438-45) and Vatican II (1962-65).

With regard to Judaism, in his bull of union with the Copts, Pope Eugenius IV declares "in the name of the Lord in this solemn session, with the approval of this sacred ecumenical council of Florence, the following true and necessary doctrine":

(The Holy Roman Church) firmly believes, professes and teaches that the legal (statutes) of the Old Testament or Mosaic Law, divided into ceremonies, holy sacrifices and sacraments, were instituted to signify something to come, and therefore, although in that age they were fitting for divine worship, they have ceased with the advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom they signified. (With Him) the sacraments of the New Testament have begun. Whoever puts his hope in these legal (statutes) even after the passion (of Christ) and submits himself to them as though faith in Christ was unable to save without them, sins mortally. Yet (the Church) does not deny that between the passion of Christ and the promulgation of the Gospel they could be observed,

provided one in no way believed that they were necessary for salvation. But she asserts that after the promulgation of the Gospel they cannot be observed without the loss of eternal salvation. Therefore she denounces as foreign to the faith of Christ all those who after that time observe circumcision, the Sabbath and other laws, and she asserts that they can in no way be sharers of eternal salvation, unless they sometime turn away from these errors. She therefore commands to all who glory themselves in the Christian name that they must, sometime or other, give up circumcision fully, either before or after baptism, because, whether one puts one's hope in it or not, it cannot in any way be observed without the loss of eternal salvation.⁵

The papal bull goes on to affirm the impossibility of being saved outside the Holy Roman Church, a doctrine tersely summarized in the oft-quoted axiom *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*:

(The Holy Roman Church) firmly believes, professes and preaches that “no one remaining outside the Catholic Church, not only pagans,” but also Jews, heretics or schismatics, can become partakers of eternal life; but they will go to the “eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels” (Mt 25:41), unless before the end of their life they are received into it. For union with the body of the Church is of so great importance that the sacraments of the Church

⁵ English text in *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*, revised edition, ed. J. Neuner and J. Dupuis (New York: Alba House, 1982), pp. 277-78.

are helpful to salvation only for those remaining in it; and fasts, almsgiving, other works of piety, and the exercises of a militant Christian life bear eternal rewards for them alone. "And no one can be saved, no matter how much alms he has given, even if he sheds his blood for the name of Christ, unless he remains in the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church."⁶

Between February 4, 1442, when Pope Eugenius's bull was promulgated in the council of Florence, and October 28, 1965, when *NA* was solemnly promulgated at Vatican II, with only 88 of the 2,312 voting bishops dissenting, oceans have flowed under the ecclesiastical bridge, with the wine of the council of Florence's rigorist exclusivism much watered down. Theologians and the official church magisterium, while professing that Christ is the unique and universal savior and the church the sacrament of salvation, have tried, especially after the discovery of America, Asia, and Africa, to find ways to explain the possibility of salvation for their huge unbaptized populations. Numerous theories have been put forward in defense of the possibility of eternal salvation for the non-baptized, from the patristic era through the early modern period to the twentieth century of the Christian era, by postulating the existence of such realities as the seeds of the Word (*logoi spermatikoi*) disseminated throughout human history, a special interior revelation by God to individuals at the moment of or shortly after their deaths, general and universal revelation, implicit faith, baptism of desire, invincible ignorance, and anonymous Christianity, to cite the well-known ones.

⁶ Ibid., p. 279.

Even if one subscribes to the hermeneutics of reform and argues that there has only been a “development” of doctrine, a process of doctrinal evolution characterized by continuity-in-discontinuity, and not a volte-face or a rupture, from Florence to Vatican II, in the Catholic Church’s teaching on its relation to non-Christian religions, still there is no mistaking the novelty of Vatican II’s teaching on this subject. Ironically, it is Catholic traditionalists such as the followers of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (1905-91), rather than theological liberals, who have most clearly perceived the radical change between the traditional teaching that there is no salvation outside the church and Vatican II’s statement on non-Christian religions in *NA*. In their view, Vatican II contradicts the teaching of the council of Florence, the infallibility of which is unmistakably signaled by the solemn introductory phrase: “(The Holy Roman Church) firmly believes, professes and teaches.” It is highly likely that in opting for the hermeneutics of reform Pope Benedict was attempting to convince—in vain so far—the Lefebvrists that they should accept the teaching of Vatican II because, contrary to their interpretation, the council has made no doctrinal changes.

To assess whether Vatican II has made a change, as a thought experiment, let us compare and contrast the above-quoted text of the council of Florence affirming that “no one remaining outside the Catholic Church, not only pagans,” but also Jews, heretics or schismatics, can become partakers of eternal life; but they will go to the “eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels” with the following three statements of Vatican II.

The first text is from the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*), no. 16:

Finally, those who have not yet accepted the Gospel are related to the people of God in various ways. There is, first, that people to whom the covenants and promises were made, and from whom Christ was born on the flesh (see Rom 9:4-5), a people in virtue of their election beloved for the sake of the fathers, for God never regrets his gifts or his call (see Rom 11:28-29). But the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator, first among whom are the Moslems: they profess to hold the faith of Abraham, and together with us they adore the one, merciful God, who will judge humanity on the last day. Nor is God remote from those who in shadows and images seek the unknown God, since he gives to everyone life and breath and all things (see Acts 17:25-28) and since the Savior wills everyone to be saved (see 1 Tim 2:4). Those who, through no fault of their own, do not know the Gospel of Christ or his church, but who nevertheless seek God with a sincere heart and, moved by grace, try in their actions to do his will as they know it through the dictates of their conscience—these too may attain eternal salvation. Nor will divine providence deny the assistance necessary for salvation to those who, without any fault of theirs, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God, and who, not without grace, strive to lead a good life. Whatever of good or truth is found amongst them is considered by the church to be a preparation for the Gospel and given by him who enlightens all men and women that they may at length have life.

The second text is from the Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity (*Ad Gentes*), no. 9:

Through preaching and the celebration of the sacraments, of which the holy Eucharist is the center and summit, missionary activity makes Christ present, who is the author of salvation. It purges of evil associations those elements of truth and grace which are found among people, and which are, as it were, a secret presence of God, and it restores them to Christ their source who overthrows the rule of the devil and limits the manifold malice of evil. So, whatever goodness is found in people's minds and hearts, or in the particular customs and cultures of peoples, far from being lost is purified, raised to a higher level and reaches its perfection, for the glory of God, the confusion of the demon, and the happiness of humankind.

The third text is from *NA*, no. 2:

The Catholic Church rejects nothing of what is true and holy in these religions [primal religions, Hinduism, and Buddhism]. It has a high regard for the manner of life and conduct, the precepts and doctrines which, although differing in many ways from its own teaching, nevertheless often reflect a ray of that truth which enlightens all men and women.... The church, therefore, urges its sons and daughters to enter with prudence and charity into discussion and

collaboration with members of other religions. Let Christians, while witnessing to their own faith and way of life, acknowledge, preserve and encourage the spiritual and moral truths found among non-Christians, together with their social life and culture.⁷

By any standard, there has been—to use an expression that is overwrought but exquisitely accurate in this case—a “paradigm shift” between Florence and Vatican II. Call it “evolution” or “revolution,” as you please. But there is no doubt that Florence was where we came from, and Vatican II is where we came to. It was a journey of over five hundred years, not a straight but zigzagging one, with lots of detours and side roads. As a destination, Vatican II represents not just a new place but also an “event,” one marked by a deep intellectual and spiritual conversion and transformation, quite unexpected for the thousands of conciliar Fathers who had been schooled in the old Florentine exclusivistic theology of religions. The significance of Vatican II cannot be measured simply by its literary corpus of 16 documents, a total of over 100,000 words, but also as an event brought about by the Holy Spirit who breathed new life into the old bones of blindness and arrogance that had prevented Christians from recognizing the “seeds of the Word,” “elements of truth and grace” and the “ray of that truth which enlightens all” in those whom they called “pagans” and condemned to the “eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.”

⁷ The English text of *NA* is taken from *Vatican Council II: Constitutions Decrees Declarations*, general editor Austin Flannery (Northport: Costello, 2007), pp. 569-74.

Where Are We Now?

Lest it is thought that the church's new attitude of respect and its encouragement to "acknowledge, preserve and encourage the spiritual and moral truths found among non-Christians, together with their social life and culture" is the result of an easy and well-planned agenda of the council, we must remember that *NA*, in the words of Cardinal Franz König, who knew what he was talking about, "almost did not happen" and that it was "almost a miracle that it was ever passed."⁸ There is no need to rehearse here the troubled five-year long history of *NA*, from its inception September 1960 to its approval in October 1965, which has been well told by Thomas Stransky, a staff member of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, the organization that was responsible for not only ecumenical unity but also the so-called "Jewish Question."⁹

Suffice it to recall that the first draft of the Secretariat on the Jews was not even received by the Theological Commission for consideration on the ground that it was purely "pastoral." Its second draft, entitled *De Judaeis*, was withdrawn from the council agenda in 1961 because of the pressure of the Arab states. In 1964, a revised, weakened text, with the statement that the Jews are not guilty of deicide removed, reached the council floor for general comments. Three different groups, each with its own reason, objected to the text. The first, the conservative group *Coetus Internationalis Patrum* rejected it because of its failure to affirm that God's old covenant with the Jews has been superseded by the New Covenant. The second group, made up of the patriarchs and bishops of the Eastern Catholic Churches in the Middle East, vigorously objected to the text

⁸ Franz König, "It Must Be the Holy Spirit," *The Tablet* 21/28 (2002), p. 6.

⁹ Thomas Stransky, "The Genesis of *Nostra Aetate*," *America* (October 24, 2005), pp. 1-4.

perceived as favoring the State of Israel. The third group, the Asian and African bishops, argued that it was unsatisfactory because it failed to mention religions other than Judaism. There was also a strong pressure to discard the text as a self-standing document and to merge its contents into other conciliar documents.

To meet these objections, another revised text was produced, now titled "The Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions." It is by far Vatican II's shortest document, composed of only 41 sentences in five paragraphs. Despite its brevity, *NA*, or more precisely, its teaching on non-Christian religions, has become, quite improbably, one of Vatican II's most influential documents and has had an extraordinary impact even beyond the confines of the Catholic Church itself. Its five paragraphs can be quickly summarized. The first provides the theological ground for interreligious dialogue, namely, the one and same origin and destiny of humankind in God. The second speaks of primal religions, Hinduism, and Buddhism. The third discusses Islam. The fourth, the longest, expounds Judaism. The fifth reproves (the word "condemn" is removed) any form of discrimination against any individual or group. The rest, as they say, is history.

But the post-*Nostra Aetate* history, where we are now, has been far from straightforward. It is impossible to trace within a brief space the tortuous, yet irreversible path of interreligious dialogue in the last fifty years. It runs through the very different pontificates of Paul VI, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI. In what follows, to describe the place where we currently are in interreligious dialogue, I first recall some of the dramatic gestures on the part of the three aforementioned popes that eloquently express their concerns for interreligious dialogue. Second, I mention some of the significant magisterial documents on this theme. Third, I examine one area where interreligious dialogue has been greatly successful. Fourth, I

outline recent Catholic theologies of religions and interreligious dialogue. Fifth, I point to some key problematic areas where interreligious dialogue needs a breakthrough.

Gestures speak louder than words, and this is especially true where relationships have been marked by suspicion, contempt, and even war and violence. A handshake, a smile, a kiss, or simply a friendly visit can erase centuries of mutual hostility and hatred. Pope Paul VI is the first pope to visit India and to cite a prayer from the Upanishad *Brihad-Aranyaka* I, 3, 28, which he says is “so full of the spirit of Advent”: “From the unreal lead me to the real; from darkness lead me to light; from death lead me to immortality.” He also established the Secretariat for Non-Christians, later named as the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue. Perhaps, of the three popes, John Paul II understood the power of symbolic gestures best and made an extremely skillful use of them, and indeed he has done for interreligious dialogue more than all the previous popes combined. Of his many prophetic gestures one can single out his visit to the synagogue in Rome, his convocation of the World Day of Prayer for Peace in Assisi, his many meetings with Buddhists and Muslims, his visit to the Holy Land, and his placing of a prayer in a crack in the Western Wall in Jerusalem begging God to forgive Christians for their sins against the Jews. Pope Benedict XVI, admittedly more reserved than his immediate predecessor, was nevertheless not without symbolic gestures of his own, especially with Jews and Muslims, as witnessed by his visits to the Western Wall and to Auschwitz, and to the Blue Mosque in Turkey, the Dome of the Rock and the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem.

Supporting these dramatic gestures is a host of magisterial documents on interreligious dialogue, more numerous in the last five decades than in the entire previous history of the church. Of Paul VI's writings on dialogue, the most significant is his encyclical

Ecclesiam Suam (1964). John Paul's prolific writings that have an enormous bearing on interreligious dialogue include his encyclicals *Redemptor Hominis* (1979), *Dominum et Vivificantem* (1986), and *Redemptoris Missio* (1990). Benedict has written extensively on interreligious dialogue before his election to the papacy. The Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue has been very active, and among its many documents the most notable is *Dialogue and Proclamation: Reflections and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, which the council issued jointly with the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples in May 1991. Of episcopal conferences, no doubt the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences, because of the multi-religious situation of Asia, has been the most actively engaged in interfaith dialogue, especially through its Office of Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, and has issued innumerable statements on this theme.

Among the dialogues that the Catholic Church has undertaken with various religions in the last five decades, the Jewish-Catholic dialogue is beyond a shadow of doubt the most extensive and the most successful. After his meeting with the French Jewish historian Jules Isaac in June 1960, Pope John XXIII was determined to end the "teaching of contempt" that had been embedded in the Christian tradition, and *Nostra Aetate* is essentially his legacy. In 1974 Pope Paul VI established the Pontifical Commission for the Relations with the Jews, which now functions within the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. This Commission issued *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate, no. 4* (1974). Under Pope John Paul II, a series of documents was issued, the most notable among which are *Notes on the Correct Way to Present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis* (1985), *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah* (1998), and *The*

Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible (2001). In response to Catholic initiatives for dialogue, various Jewish organizations and leaders have participated in a great number of biblical and theological conversations with Catholics. In 2002, a document entitled *Dabru Emet—Speak the Truth: A Jewish Statement on Christians and Christianity* was issued and signed by over 220 rabbis and intellectuals from all branches of Judaism. A response to it by a number of Christian scholars issued in the same year entitled *A Sacred Obligation: Rethinking Christian Faith in Relation to Judaism and the Jewish People*.

Theologians, too, many of whom are Catholics, have also been extremely productive in elaborating a Christian theology of religions responsive to the situation of religious pluralism of our time and conducive to a fruitful dialogue among religions. Perhaps the most helpful summary of these theologies has been offered by the Catholic theologian Paul Knitter. Knitter expands the common threefold typology of exclusivism, inclusivism of contemporary theologies of religions into four basic types, which he terms “replacement,” “fulfillment,” “mutuality,” and “acceptance” models. The first affirms that Christianity is the only true religion and that it will replace, totally or partially, all other religions, which are considered basically humanity’s sinful attempts at self-salvation. The second, while affirming that Christianity possesses the fullness of truth, acknowledges the presence of elements of truth and grace in other religions and advocates a mutual, though not equal, complementarity between Christianity and other religions through dialogue. The third holds that there are many true religions, none necessarily superior to the others, which are all called to dialogue and collaboration with one another, especially in projects of liberation, in order to realize their true nature. The fourth stresses the diversity of religions and refuses to seek a common ground among them; rather it urges each

religion to foster its own aims and practices.¹⁰ This is not the place to adjudicate among these four models, except to say that they are models, which is to say, they are helpful heuristic devices, not mutually exclusive paradigms, to distinguish various theological tendencies and to locate where an individual theologian or a church stands.

This account thus far of interreligious dialogue in the Catholic Church during the last fifty years may suggest that there has been nothing but a forward progress and sweetness and light. Nothing is further from the truth. One need not be a theological curmudgeon to say that in interreligious dialogue, and in its cousin, ecumenical dialogue, as well, there seems to have been, especially in recent years, a one-step-forward-and-two-steps-backward dance, a kind of "reform of the reforms," a restorationist agenda for the church as a whole. This is especially true in interreligious dialogue, where the danger of the "dictatorship of relativism" is most acutely perceived and frequently denounced.

Again, it is not feasible to list all the events smacking a doctrinal retrenchment. Let me mention only some of the most obvious ones. First, nothing attracts the careful scrutiny by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith more than works that contain the expressions "religious pluralism" and "interreligious" in their titles, and there have recently been several disciplinings of theologians, big and small, who attempt to expand the theological boundaries in this field. Second, there is the Declaration of the CDF entitled *Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church* (2000), whose affirmation that objectively speaking, non-Christians are in a gravely deficient

¹⁰ See Paul Knitter, *Introducing Theologies of Religions* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2002).

situation has provoked a storm of protests. Third, there is Pope Benedict's lecture at Regensburg University in September 2006. The pope's quotation of the statement by the Byzantine emperor Manuel II Paleologos: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached" has provoked violent acts of retaliation on the part of some Muslims. Fourth, there is the lifting of excommunication in 2009 of the Holocaust-denier bishop Richard Williamson, a follower of Archbishop Lefebvre. Fifth, in 2008 Pope Benedict amended the prayer for the Jews in the Tridentine Mass on Good Friday to read: "Let us also pray for the Jews. That our God and Lord may illuminate their hearts, that they acknowledge Jesus Christ is the Savior of all men. (Let us pray. Kneel. Rise.) Almighty and eternal God, who want that all men be saved and come to the recognition of the truth, propitiously grant that even as the fullness of the peoples enters Thy Church, all Israel be saved. Through Christ Our Lord. Amen." It is understandable that this prayer for the conversion of the Jews, however well-intentioned, causes anxiety among the Jews and has occasioned the protest of the Anti-Defamation League.

These documents and actions on the part of the magisterium have no doubt had a chilling effect on efforts at interreligious dialogue. On the other hand, they have also served to highlight areas and issues in which interreligious dialogue requires a deeper reflection to go forward, and to this I turn in my final part of my essay.

Where Do We Go from Here?

My focus will be primarily theological, and not pastoral and organizational. Yet, it is a natural curiosity to ask which the directions and trajectories interreligious dialogue will take under the papacy of Pope Francis. I will first mention three theological issues that I think require further explorations to break the current impasse in interreligious dialogue and to propel forward and end with some crystal-gazing on its future under Pope Francis.

The first theological issue to be considered is the theology of the Spirit (pneumatology). Contrary to many theologians, I have suggested long ago that interreligious dialogue not begin with Jesus the Christ but with the Spirit.¹¹ In this respect I fully concur with the Irish theologian Dermot Lane who in his recent book, *Stepping Stones to Other Religions: A Christian Theology of Inter-Religious Dialogue*, urges that we construct a theology of the Holy Spirit as the foundation for interreligious dialogue.¹² His argument is mainly biblical, that is, he shows how the First and Second Testaments witness to the pervasive presence of the Holy Spirit before, in and after Jesus, outside of Jesus, though not in opposition to him. While in full agreement with Lane, my argument is more interreligious than biblical. That is, instead of starting from the particular, spatially and temporally conditioned and situated fact of Jesus and then moving on to argue for his spatial and temporal universality—an ultimately unconvincing logical move—I suggest we start from a universal reality that is witnessed to in all the breadth, depth and height of

¹¹ See my most recent article, "L'Esprit Saint comme fondement du dialogue interreligieux," in *Le Dialogue Interreligieux: Interpellations théologiques contemporaines*, ed. Fabrice Blée and Achiel Peelman (Montréal: Novalis, 2013), pp. 21-41.

¹² Dermot A. Lane, *Stepping Stones to Other Religions: A Christian Theology of Inter-Religious Dialogue* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011).

human history (and not only religious traditions). This universal reality is everywhere called “Spirit” or any other cognate term, whom/which of course Christians are justified to particularize and historicize as the “Spirit of Christ” and as the “Third Person” of the Trinity. This “Spirit” is not just another “name” or “modes” for God, divinity, the divine, the Absolute, the Transcendent, the Real, but also for the concrete yet spatially and temporally universal manifestations, in personal and impersonal ways, of “God” in creation and history, and therefore distinct from “God.”

The second area is Christology, and in any genuine interreligious dialogue, Christians must bear witness to Jesus. However, one of the stumbling-blocks in conversations with non-Christians is what *Dominus Iesus* terms the “unicity” and “salvific universality” of Jesus as savior. As a profession of faith, a claim of uniqueness and universality for one’s savior (Jesus) and even for one’s religion (Christianity) should not cause difficulty and scandal, as long as it is clear that it is a claim of faith, with an equal emphasis on “claim” and “faith,” and not a rational argument for an empirical, scientifically verifiable fact. Muslims and Buddhists, and any other believer for that matter, would have the same right to make the same claim of faith for their founders and religions. The issue is not whether such a claim could and should be made, but whether it is exclusive. In response, one could say with Jacques Dupuis that Jesus, because he is fully human, had a necessarily limited and in this sense incomplete and uncompleted, consciousness of the Absolute Mystery that is God. As a result, Jesus could manifest God only in a human, that is, limited and incomplete and uncompleted way. This then leaves open the possibility for other people to manifest God in ways different from that of Jesus. To strengthen this argument one could point to the fact that recent biblical scholarship has emphasized the Jewishness of Jesus. Needless to say, that Jesus was and ever remains

a Jew serves as an indispensable and fruitful common ground for the Christian-Jewish dialogue.

The third area for further theological reflection is the church and its mission. Much discussion has recently focused on whether there should be mission to the Jews if the covenant that God has made with them was, as Pope John Paul II has forcefully reminded us, never revoked and remains eternally valid. Another way of framing the issue is whether there is only one covenant or many covenants, or at least two, with the Jews and with Jesus. Again, it is useful to recall that recent biblical scholarship has shown that the Jesus movement started out as a reform movement within Second Temple Judaism, and that it was only gradually, for various reasons, most of which are not theological, that there was a parting of the ways, until both became separate, and for long time, mutually hostile "religions." Perhaps, by rediscovering the Jewishness of Jesus and the origin and character of Christianity as a Jewish reform movement, the issue of mission to the Jews will lose its edge. But the same thing must be said of other religions, analogously of course, if the Spirit (and not just the Spirit of Christ) is already present and active in all human history before, after, and beyond Jesus and the church. Then, the goal of mission is not to proclaim, convert, baptize, and incorporate the so-called unbelievers into the church but to work with them in and with the Spirit for the coming of the God's reign. There is no longer *missio ad gentes* (mission to non-Christians), but *missio inter gentes* (mission among non-Christians) and *cum gentibus* (with non-Christians).

I am deeply aware that I have broached broad and controversial theological issues, and lack of time does not permit a detailed argumentation in support of my views. Nevertheless, I am persuaded that the current logjam in interreligious dialogue cannot be broken

through unless some theological orientations akin to the ones I have sketched are undertaken.

Let me then end with a bit of crystal-gazing on the future of interreligious dialogue under the pontificate of Pope Francis. First of all, fortunately or unfortunately, Pope Francis, unlike his immediate predecessor, has not left a long paper trail. As far as I know, his only notable theological work is a book he co-authored with Rabbi Abraham Skorka, entitled *Sobre el Cielo y la Tierra* (Buenos Aires: Sudamericana, 2011), to which I will return. Nor does he, I think, pretend to be a theologian or philosopher. Most likely he will not spend much time penning learned theological tomes. So far his sermons and speeches are blessedly free of scholarly references. Perhaps the current situation of the church calls for a different charism than theological scholarship.

But what we have read and heard about Cardinal Jorge Bergoglio and now Pope Francis is refreshingly encouraging for interreligious dialogue. In the above-mentioned book, Cardinal Bergoglio wrote: “Dialogue is born from an attitude of respect for the other person, from a conviction that the other person has something good to say. It assumes that there is room in the heart for the other person’s point of view, opinion, and proposal. To dialogue entails a cordial reception, not a prior condemnation. In order to dialogue it is necessary to know how to lower the defenses, open the doors of the house, and offer human warmth.”¹³ Respect, heart, reception, openness, warmth—all the things that make dialogue possible and fruitful.

¹³ Jorge Mario Bergoglio and Abraham Skorka, *On Heaven and Earth*, trans. Alejandro Bermudez and Howard Goodman (New York: Image, 2013), p. xix. See also Sergio Rubin and Francesca Ambrogetti, *Pope Francis: His Life in His Own Words* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 2013), pp. 135-45 on what Bergoglio calls the “Culture of Cooperation.”

In his first conversation with the media, Pope Francis recognized that there were in the audience people who do not share the Catholic and Christian faith or have no faith at all. He did not want to impose his blessing upon them but chose instead to pray for them in the silence of his heart. Again, respect, heart, reception, openness, warmth.

There is another tidbit in the life of the former archbishop of Buenos Aires that I will mention with fear and trembling because I cannot independently confirm its veracity and because if it is true, it is truly explosive. It was reported by Alasdair Baverstock in the *Telegraph* (March 15, 2013) that then-Cardinal Bergoglio was unhappy with Pope Benedict's Regensburg speech and said to Newsweek Argentina: "Pope Benedict's statement don't [sic] reflect my opinions. These statements will serve to destroy in 20 seconds the careful construction of a relationship with Islam that Pope John Paul II built over the last twenty years."

What we are absolutely certain of, however, is how Bergoglio chose the name of Francis. Speaking to the media, he said that when he got 77 votes, the number required to be elected pope, his friend Cardinal Claudio Hummes, archbishop emeritus of Sao Paulo, Brazil, leaned over to congratulate him and said to him: "Remember the poor." Bergoglio chose the name Francis because he wants to follow Il Poverello to be poor and serve the poor.

But there is another story in Saint Francis's life that bodes well for interreligious dialogue. In 1219 St. Francis and Brother Illuminato accompanied the armies of western Europe to Damietta, Egypt, during the Fifth Crusade. Francis tried to stop the Crusaders from attacking the Muslims at the Battle of Damietta, but failed. After the defeat of the western armies, he crossed the battle line with Brother Illuminato, was arrested and was taken to the sultan Malek

al-Kamil. After an initial attempt by Francis and the sultan to convert the other, both quickly realized that the other already knew and loved God. Francis and Illuminato remained with al-Kamil and his Sufi teacher Fakhr ad-din al-Farisi for as many as twenty days, discussing prayer and the mystical life. When Francis left, al-Kamil gave him an ivory trumpet, which is still preserved in the crypt of the Basilica of San Francesco in Assisi.

This encounter between Francis and Malek al-Kamil is a paradigm for interfaith dialogue in our time. Despite differences in religion, people can find common ground in their experiences of God. Dialogue demands that we truly listen to the other; but, to be able to do so, we must first see the other as a human being, loved by God and to be respected by us. There is no other path to peace in the twelfth as well as in the twenty-first century. It is of course vastly premature to judge Pope Francis's achievements in interreligious dialogue, but from the little he has said so far about how we should view the religious Other, and above all, from his simple and humble lifestyle, as symbolized by his choice of a common residence in Rome and his renunciation of papal accoutrements, it is reasonable to assume that he will follow the example of his namesake in dealing with people of other faiths. If so, interreligious dialogue will flourish once again as an intrinsic dimension of the church's mission, as envisaged, albeit dimly, by Vatican II.¹⁴

¹⁴ This essay originates as The *Nostra Aetate* Lecture on April 3, 2013. I am deeply grateful to Saint Edward's University for the invitation to deliver this lecture which, according to the publicity, "explores the interreligious values reflected in the groundbreaking Vatican II (1965) document of the same name, which expressed a commitment to dialogue and understanding among diverse faith traditions."

For Further Reading

Barnes, Michael. *Interreligious Learning: Dialogue, Spirituality, and the Christian Imagination*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Dupuis, Jacques. *Christianity and the Religions: From Confrontation to Dialogue*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2002.

Knitter, Paul. *Introducing Theologies of Religions*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2002.

Lane, Dermot. *Stepping Stones to Other Religions: A Christian Theology of Inter-Religious Dialogue*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011.

Lefebure, Leo D. and Peter Feldmeier. *The Path of Wisdom: A Christian Commentary on the Dhammapada*. Peeters: Leuven and Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2011.

O'Collins, Gerald. *Salvation for All: God's Other Peoples*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Phan, Peter C. *Being Religious Interreligiously*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004.

[摘要] 自梵蒂岡第二屆大公會議以來，一直都有關於梵二會議與梵二前的天主教傳統的傳承性及斷裂性的激烈討論。在跨宗教關係這領域上，梵二會議無容置疑地為教宗猶金四世及佛羅倫斯大公會議以來所提倡的排外主義帶來了沖激性的改變。雖然 *Nostra Aetate* - <教會對非基督宗教態度宣言>非常精簡，但這文件對天主教與其他宗教之間的關係有深刻及正面的影響。梵二強調友好宗教關係，但這條道路不但複雜及荊棘滿途，同時亦是無法逆轉的。從教宗保祿六世、若望保祿二世及本篤十六世的經歷及其姿態，我們可以看到他們強烈地對其他宗教及其信徒表示前

所未有的尊重。每當天主教與其他宗教信仰者之間，尤其是猶太教徒間的關係有所改善之際，均會有就各宗教理論模式之優劣進行激烈的討論。復辟主義偶而會對跨宗教對話帶來可怕的影響。某幾個教宗的失誤亦令到對跨宗教認知及探求變得複雜。

聖神神學可以令人認識到天主恩賜的普遍性。承認耶穌基督中有限的人性也能彰顯天主的存在。透過認知耶穌基督及他早期的追隨者的猶太特質，承認其他宗教出現聖靈，以及關注教會在基督及非基督徒間的使命的重要性這些議題，可以令教會使命的爭辯上有所得益。在已出版的教宗與思科卡(Skorka)拉比對話中，教宗方濟各提供了可作出尊重、由衷及包容性對話的一個例子。如同他的主保聖人亞西西的聖方濟一樣，他提出一個簡單謙虛但又可活出啟發信任及希望的基督徒的生活方式。

約稿

為鞏固中國與國際間在研究香港、中國及海外華人團體這方面的學術工作，雙語性質的「天主教研究學報」將接受以中文或英文的投稿，並附以相對語文的摘要。間中或包括書評及有關本中心活動的簡訊。我們鼓勵讀者及作者以本刊作互動討論的平台，並歡迎對本刊批評及提出建議。

「天主教研究學報」以同儕匿名審稿方式選稿以維持特定的學術水準。本刊的性質可大體屬於人文科，以科學方法研究天主教與中國及華人社團，同時著重文本及考察的研究。本刊歡迎個別投稿及建議期刊專題。本刊下期專題為「現代歷史中的基督宗教」

投稿章程

請進入網址：

http://catholic.crs.cuhk.edu.hk/downloads/guideline_c.doc

稿件請電郵至：catholic@cuhk.edu.hk

Call for Papers

To enhance academic exchange and bridge the worlds of China and international scholarship, in a domain concerning Catholicism in Hong Kong, China and the worldwide Chinese-speaking community,

the *Hong Kong Journal of Catholic Studies* is a bilingual publication that welcomes contributions in Chinese as well as in English. Each issue has articles in both languages, with abstracts in the other language. Occasional book reviews and news on the activities of the centre will also be included. We encourage our readers and authors to regard our journal as a forum of interactive debate and welcome all comments and suggestions.

Submissions will be reviewed by external referees on a double-blind basis aiming at the highest professional standards. Evaluation is based on scholarly quality and originality. The scope of the journal is broadly defined as humanities as well as scientific approaches to Catholicism and the Chinese world, with an emphasis on research based on documentary sources and field study. Both individual submissions and projects for guest-edited issues are welcome. Our next guest-edited issue will be on Chinese Christianity in Modern History.

Submission Guidelines

Please visit our website for details:

http://catholic.crs.cuhk.edu.hk/downloads/guideline_c.doc

All submissions should be sent to: catholic@cuhk.edu.hk

香港中文大學天主教研究叢書主編

蔡惠民教授 (聖神修院神哲學院)
黎志添教授 (香港中文大學)
賴品超教授 (香港中文大學)
譚永亮教授 (召集人) (香港中文大學)

學術顧問團

包智光博士
張學明教授 (香港中文大學)
房志榮教授 (台灣輔仁大學)
夏其龍教授 (香港中文大學)
關俊棠教授 (香港中文大學)
Prof. Leo D. LEFEBURE (Georgetown University, Washington D.C.)
勞伯堦教授 (聖神修院神哲學院)
陸鴻基教授 (多倫多約克大學)
Prof. Roman MALEK, SVD (Monumenta Serica Institute, Sankt Augustin)
Prof. Peter C. PHAN (Georgetown University, Washington D.C.)
鐘鳴旦教授 (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium)
Prof. Leonard SWIDLER (Temple University, Philadelphia)
譚偉倫教授 (香港中文大學)
田英傑神父 (宗座外方傳教會)
楊秀珠教授 (香港中文大學)

General Editors of the Series

CHOY, Wai Man (Holy Spirit Seminary College of Theology and Philosophy)
LAI, Chi Tim (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
LAI, Pan Chiu (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
TAVEIRNE, Patrick, CICM (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
(Coordinator)

Advisory Committee

BARRIQUAND, François
CHEUNG, Hok Ming (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
FANG, Chih Jung Mark, SJ (Fujen University, Taipei)
HA, Keloon Louis (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
KWAN, Tsun Tong Thomas (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
LEFEBURE, Leo D. (Georgetown University, Washington D.C.)
LO, William, SJ (Holy Spirit Seminary College of Theology and Philosophy)
LUK, Hung Kay Bernard (York University, Toronto)
MALEK, Roman, SVD (Monumenta Serica Institute, Sankt Augustin)
PHAN, Peter C. (Georgetown University, Washington D.C.)
STANDAERT, Nicolas (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium)
SWIDLER, Leonard (Temple University, Philadelphia)
TAM, Wai Lun (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)
TICOZZI, Sergio, PIME (Pontifical Foreign Missions Institute)
YEUNG, Sau Chu Alison (The Chinese University of Hong Kong)

香港中文大學 天主教研究中心

《天主教研究學報》〈宗教交談〉

主任： 譚永亮 夏其龍
主編： LEFEBURE, Leo
出版： 香港中文大學天主教研究中心
香港·新界·沙田·香港中文大學
電話： (852) 3943 4277
傳真： (852) 3943 4451
網址： www.cuhk.edu.hk/crs/catholic
電郵： catholic@cuhk.edu.hk
承印： 明愛印刷訓練中心
二零一三年十二月初版
ISSN： 2219-7664

**Centre for Catholic Studies,
the Chinese University of Hong Kong
“Hong Kong Journal of Catholic Studies”
Issue no. 4 ‘Religious Dialogue’**

Directors: TAVEIRNE Patrick, HA Louis
Chief Editor: LEFEBURE, Leo
Publisher: Centre for Catholic Studies, the Chinese University of
Hong Kong, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong.
Tel.: (852) 3943 4277
Fax.: (852) 3943 4451
Website: www.cuhk.edu.hk/crs/catholic/
Email: catholic@cuhk.edu.hk
Printer: Caritas Printing Training Centre
First Edition: Dec 2013
ISSN: 2219-7664

All Rights Reserved © 2013 by Centre for Catholic Studies,
the Chinese University of Hong Kong