

Are the Words of Scripture Universal Religious Categories?

The Case of Christian Language for the Third Millennium

Sind die Worte der Schrift universale religiöse Kategorien?

Christliche Sprache für das dritte Millennium

I. Christianity is a Religion of the Word

Christianity is neither a religion of the Earth (like so many telluric traditions) nor a religion of the Book like some other Abrahamic religions). Christianity is a religion of the Word (of the Word made flesh in Christ, and the Word incarnate in every Christian – ultimately in every Man). Sacraments and Liturgy are all events of the Word.¹

The modern West is proud of having unified the world. Even philosophy and theology claim a certain universality, beyond their traditional boundaries. Christianity since olden times seems to have an inbuilt fundamental pretence at being universal.

“*Urbi et orbi*” is an intelligent formula. In spite of its abuse, it says that in as much as the *orbis* is assimilated to the *urbs*, and only in as much, i.e. in as much as the world is an image of the City, the message is valid and meaningful. In as much as the language of the *urbs*, i.e., of Christianity is understood and spoken by the *orbis*, i.e. by the wide world of the others, our utterances may make sense. But to pretend that everybody should understand our language, be it English, Mathematics or the Christian language is still rampant colonialism – well-intentioned as it may be.

My point is not political regarding English, or cultural concerning Mathematical-scientific language. Both are not universalisable without mutilating the human heritage; My point here is theological and refers to the Christian language. I submit that if this language has to be freely spoken, i.e. creatively lived outside the West and its colonies, it needs a basic transformation. Neither the peoples of Africa nor specially of Asia speak, i.e., understand, vibrate, express themselves in Christian language. They live in other universes. There is still more. The over 200 million of Christians in Asia, for instance, begin to express the desire to speak their language when expressing their Christian faith. Until now they spoke a learned and borrowed language. Needless to say that I am not referring to grammars of English or Tamil. I am speaking of the deepest form of reenacting and expressing one's own life – a life of faith. Language is more than an instrument of communication. It is a form of human communion. This is the problem.

For the purpose of this paper, I shall limit myself to some reflections on the possible Christian language in a context outside the Western world.² I would like to insist that this is a specifically Christian paper, i.e. it uses Christian language, i.e. it is an inner-Christian reflection. One could speak another language, but this is not our concern here – nor the specific problematic regarding concreteness and universality as seen by the Christian perspective.³

II. A Nonary of Sūtras on Christian Language

1. *During two millennia the Christian language has been the Biblical language received in and interpreted within a predominantiy Hellenic matrix.*

Christian theology (or theologies) is an astounding monument of human culture. An insignificant seed, which could not be found even in an Empty Tomb, has grown into a mighty tree nourished by a double and vital sap of a *fides quaerens intellectum*, and an *intellectus quaerens fidem*. It has produced a many-faceted and extremely rich theology understood as *Logos* of God in the double sense of the genitive: our *logos* of (about) *theós*, and our listening to the *logos of ho theós*. It is one of the most extraordinary *phyla* of human history.

Concerned with its inner growth and self-understanding, and fruit also of historical circumstances, Christian thought has been rather introverted. It has developed its theology within the cultural boundaries of the Western world and its colonies. Hinduism offers another splendid example of a similar introverted growth. But the human world is wider. The Abrahamic *phylum*, together with all its enrichments, is not unique. Nor the Indic one for that matter. The question is whether the Abrahamic *phylum* offers the uniquely possible Christian language.

2. *The present-day's increasing awareness of cultural and religious pluralism radically challenges the very nature of Christian theology.*

It challenges: a) *Its Method*: The belief that God has spoken to Christians, and the conviction that God has imparted a secret to them, do not exclude the possibility that God may have disclosed the same or the other aspects of the divine Mystery to other peoples.

Even the most immediate experience of divine revelation does not weaken the dictum that *quidquid recipitur ad modum recipientis recipitur*. Unless we make of revelation a crass anthropomorphic caricature we cannot curtail divine initiative. God is free to tell a secret, and even a different secret, when and to whom He pleases – using the overall anthropomorphic character of the current concept of revelation.

In short, the method for approaching the divine Mystery in order to understand as much as possible what it means, requires knowledge of the context in which that Mystery discloses itself. Christian theology presupposes implicitly a “theology” of “religions” – whereby these two words cannot be presupposed as normative.

The corollary is clear. There can be today no convincing Christian theology, like any philosophical reflexion on any religion, without taking into consideration the wide spectrum of the different religious traditions of the world. Christian theology, *qua* Christian theology cannot legitimately be a purely internal affair of indoors speculation if it has to have any relevance to the world outside itself. The Christian presuppositions, which alone make Christian language meaningful, are not universally shared by the peoples of the world. If we use the word God, for instance, we cannot assume that this word makes sense to everybody.

It challenges b) *Its Contents*: God might have spoken a particular language. By language I understand not just grammatical idioms but the whole range of human communicable intelligibility. Now, this language has to be 1) understood, 2) transmitted, and 3) eventually translated. It is a triple mediation which prevents us from absolutizing any human statement.

We mentioned “God” and we might as well have said “History” as another example of what Christian theology called *preambula fidei*.⁴ Now, other cultures and religions have other languages, other perceptions of reality. These cultures cannot be called into question without understanding them; and they cannot be understood without somewhat sharing in the presuppositions of such cultures. Further, we cannot legitimately criticize those presuppositions from our own assumptions alone, or from a presuppositionless (inexisting) viewpoint.⁵

To assume only one valid *kosmology* is perhaps one of the most deleterious cultural blunders of Modernity – even if we call it a “scientific” cosmology.⁶ The Western culture which relativizes so easily other worldviews, should also be open to relativize its own kosmology – even its astronomy. Often I have cited the shift from Christian absolutism to the new dogma *extra scientiam nulla salus*, whereby *scientia* means obviously modern science.

In sum. Is the Christian “Revelation” tied to a single conception of the universe? Are the others wrong by virtue of a divine imperative? Should we speak of cultural pelagianism?

3. *Concreteness versus universality. This is the challenge of the third Christian millennium.*

The very affirmation that Man is a natural animal – and thus that there is a universal common human nature – is already a cultural statement. Man is a cultural animal as well, and each culture has a different self-understanding and world-consciousness. We can no longer consider the Mediterranean world as the human *oikoumene* - even if we call the-present-day worldview a “scientific” one.

The challenge is this. Is Christianity a concrete religion or does it bud forth into a more universal *Christianness*?⁷ In the first case it is one religion among many and needs to be evaluated both, according to its own intrinsic norms, and according to be agreed upon common features. In the second case, notwithstanding the fact that Christianity may continue as a concrete religion, it bursts, as it were, and liberates a meta-confessional core not confined to a particular tradition.⁸ This Christianness is the name for humanness as Christians would understand the fullness of Man.

I am not defending “Christian humanism”.⁹ I am saying that the *humanum* as the fulfillment and perfection of Man is already seen with Christian eyes. Man may have a universal common nature, but this very conception is concrete and limited – and, in our case, already tinged with Christian assumptions. In other words, the Catholicity of the Christic fact can be interpreted as a geographical and cultural category or as a quality which, like salt, enhances the taste of the food or, like light, illumines in different colours the body it touches according to the nature of those very bodies.

4. *This challenge poses a dilemma: either the circumcision of the mind is a requisite for being Christian or such a requirement is abolished.*

We can no longer hold the opinion of an *anima naturaliter christiana*, interpreting it as *anima culturaliter christiana*, in the sense of one single culture – broadly as this culture may encompass many subcultures. It has to be recognized that there are non-biblical ways of thinking, that the very patterns of intelligibility of the human race are different, sometimes mutually irreducible and often incommensurable.

Putting it briefly. The *praeparatio culturalis* and much less the *technologica* cannot be a *praeparatio evangelica* – whatever this latter may be.

As I have put it often: Does one need to be spiritually a Semite and intellectually a Greek in order to be Christian? It goes without saying that I put this question in full admiration for Abrahamic spirituality and Hellenic thinking, further recognizing that these two notions are broad enough to cover a great variety of interpretations. But they do not exhaust the *humanum*, I submit.

The dilemma should be taken in all its depth. Either circumcision of the mind according to Biblical categories or the Christic fact is liberated from one particular *forma mentis*. It is a fact that in order to understand the Biblical revelation, as it has been interpreted so, one needs a way of thinking which is alien to most Asian mentality. There is nothing wrong with circumcision, either of the body, or the mind, or both. But we should be aware of the fact that it remains circumcision, and draw the consequences. The problem is tellingly enough, not to cross the Rubicon (which is already a bad example), but who crosses it. The challenge is not another conquest, another territory, a new expansion. The problem is Julius Caesar. It is a great thing *teste* Paul, to be a *civis romanus*, but many a culture does aspire after that citizenship or even grasp what advantages it may bring.

5. *Either horn of the dilemma is legitimate.*

No major *theologumenon* would be lost in either answer. *Circumcision*, like baptism or any other initiation, may be a symbol either of particularity or of concreteness. The human existential way for universality is concreteness. The proper love for one's parents, children, spouse, vocation, people and religion entails neither abhorrence for the other nor even the belief that the loved ones are *objectively* the best. Reality is a fabric of relationships. Anything real concrete and it is in its concreteness that it mirrors the whole universe.

Christianity, in our case, could be Catholic, not in a geographical cultural sense, but qualitatively, as St. Augustin suggests when he translates *kath' holou* not as universal but as *secundum totum*, i.e. that religion which to its believers offers them all they need for the fulfillment and salvation. It is existentially complete – perfect, if we remember the etymology.

Non-circumcision could be a symbol either for universality or for generality. The latter is an abstraction. The former is an urge of the human soul. But urge for universality belongs to the order of the *mythos*, not of the *logos*. It is unfolded and often unspoken. It cannot be verbalized in concepts. Everybody wants to know, to quote Aristotle or to be happy, to cite Thomas Aquinas, but the notion and the contents of such knowledge or happiness vary, and, therefore, also the means to reach them or the places to find them.

Christianness, in our case, could be Catholic as universal, or rather as transcendental, i.e. as the concrete (Christian) way of embodying humanness. It would be, not a particular doctrine, but a concrete realization of what is transcendently linked to the fulfillment of the *humanum*.

In sum, each religion has a claim to concrete catholicity and to mythical universality. Seen from another angle each religion is a dimension of the other. We could speak, with all due qualifications, of a certain religious *perichoresis*. Did not Nicholas of Cusa describe all religions as “*quaedam locutiones verbi Dei sive rationis aeternae*”?

6. *But the consequences - are different: Christianity or Christianness.*

The present-day state of the question allows us to make a Vishnu stride. Hardly anybody today defends Christian exclusivity and many are worried by the claim of inclusivity. Christianity is becoming more and more open and is being rescued from the inertia of the past – in spite of understandable fundamentalist back-lashes.

But how far can the openness go? Where do we draw the line of Christian identity? What should we then understand by Christianity? Perhaps the Christian hologram?

The approach to the answer may offer us an example of different ways of thinking. I may here consider only, the Semitic and the Indic ways of thinking – provided we remain well aware of the

oversimplification. For the former, based on the primacy of the principle of non-contradiction, a Christian is not a non-Christian. The Christian has to be distinct and eventually separated (*sanctus*). For the latter, based on the primacy of the principle of identity, a Christian is anyone who does not explicitly confess to being a non-Christian; anyone who does not chose excommunicating oneself from the Christian.

We have here two different ways of self-understanding. The consequences are obviously different. On the one hand, we have a religion called Christianity, distinguishable from all others. On the other hand, we have a set of experiences (love of God and of neighbour, truthfulness, fidelity, humility, openness to, freedom, ...) which for Christians have Christian symbols and for others some different sets of *homeomorphic equivalents*. Christianness is then not a “religion” in the sociological sense of the word, but the Christian way of experiencing the religious dimension of Man in whatever cultural pattern – provided one sincerely confesses this experience to be Christian.

7. *Only a kenotic and dekerygmaticized Christ can sustain the second alternative.*

It has been said time and again, mainly from Asian sources, that Christian self-consciousness will never be able to take experience as paramount, to accept that every single being has Christ-nature (equivalent to Buddha-nature), to recognize that God is only a concrete and not universal symbol, to overcome the belief in an exclusively homogeneous evolution of dogma, that it will never apply *metanoia* to itself, not only as changing the *nous* but as transcending it.

I submit that if Asian Christians ever come to have a non-secondary place in Christian theology these issues may trigger a theological mutation.¹⁰

The *kenosis* of Christ would be here understood not only as an act of humility,¹¹ but in an ontological sense for which Christian metaphysics is little prepared. Emptiness (*sūnyatā*) is not annihilation. Nothingness is the horizon of Being ..., the *mythos* out of which the *logos* emerges.

Similarly, dekerygmaticization does not mean that the injunction to chant, witness, proclaim is no longer valid. It means, however, that we do not confuse the vital attitude of sharing joy and life with the intellectual contents with which we also need to express that deeper motion of the Spirit.

In sum, the *kenosis* of Christ rescues Christian theology from failing into the danger of christomonism. The dekerygmaticization of the Christian experience saves it from falling into being just an ideology. The work of the Spirit cannot be subordinated to the Logos.

8. *This second alternative demands passing from a tribal christology to a polymorphic christophany.*

Christian scholars do not find it abusive language to speak of Jahweh as a tribal God prior to the purification of its notion effected mainly by the Prophets of Israel. One may as well foresee that to the Christians of the third Christian millennium is reserved the task of overcoming a tribal christology by a *christophany* which allows Christians to see the work of Christ everywhere without assuming that they have a better grasp on or a monopoly of that Mystery which has many names and which has been revealed to them in a unique way.

In other words, the *mystical Christ* is not identical with the *cosmic Christ*. The cosmic Christ is a cosmological belief. The mystical Christ belongs to the Christian belief in the Resurrection which allows the Christian to experience a christophany in any manifestation of Reality, although, as any belief, it has also kosmological assumptions. *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism* is not the Christ known to Christians and unknown to Hindus, but that Mystery unknown to Christians and known to Hindus by many other names, but in which Christians cannot but recognize the presence of Christ.¹² The same light illumines different bodies polychromatically.

This does not imply that everybody is a member of Christianity, but, at the same time, it does not split human ultimate consciousness into incommunicable compartments. On the doctrinal and even intellectual level systems may be incompatible, religions may be incommensurable, but not by bread alone, not by *logos* alone does Man live. There is also the Spirit enlivening Man – and the universe.

I have said that for a Christian mystical theology every being is a *christophany*.¹³ But this is only a particular language. It is the language in which the epiphany of Reality discloses itself to the Christian. The christophany is apophatic. Epiphanies are epiphenomena, but the phenomena are real.

Another example may clarify this point. There is much talk about inculturation today. I am not entering here into the discussion.¹⁴ I am saying only that one cannot dismiss too quickly the assertion that the Christian dogma of the incarnation is already a sort of inculturation.

In fact it has a coherent and plausible meaning only within a certain cultural framework. This means

that in spite of the urge to universality any human thought and act is concrete, contingent, limited and ultimately a scandal to any pretention to universality without concreteness. From Paul to Hegel and cardinal von Balthasar Christian consciousness has struggled with the question. Neither we can solve it once and for all, nor “we” alone. This is already my last *sûtra*.

9. *The problematic calls for a Second Council of Jerusalem - held at Rājagrha, if need be.*

The two options are legitimate we said. The deepening of the first will purify Christianity. The striving for the second will liberate Christians and establish trans-religious fellowships without necessarily breaking religious affiliations.

The history of humanity is *also* left to human initiative. In this decisive moment of the world the urgent problems of present-day civilization are also religious issues. Peace, justice, freedom, ecology, hunger, military and technocratic depletion, ... are all theological problems as well. To be exclusively concerned with intra-ecclesiastical matters is shortsighted and may distract the Church from its mission as traditionally understood since the Greek Fathers. Religions, for all the benefits they have brought, have also been cause of strife and war.

The great problems of our present time cannot be evaluated, let alone solved, within one single religious or cultural matrix. We need one another. No religion or culture is self-sufficient to alleviate the human predicament. Private opinions and prophetic attitudes are necessary, but not sufficient. Divine interventions are always human events as well.

All this leads me to call not for an exclusively Christian Council, say Vatican III, Geneva N, or Chicago I, but a Council, a *Concilium*, a Calling to *Reconciliation* of the human races. For far too long now we have been fighting each other under all types of pretenses, often with religious justifications. For far too long we have built private empires of sorts, religious as well as political and economic. War today is no longer a sport or a ritual. It is simply a criminal act. Wars do not only begin in Man's mind, they mature in the religious heart of humanity. Religious re-conciliation is the paramount mission of the religious bodies on earth.

The Christian symbol is *Jerusalem II* (after *Jerûsâlâyim I*, where circumcision was discussed and dismissed). Circumcision was no longer valid for Christians, but it remained valid for Jews. Baptism may not be the only sign of salvation. Nor baptism was meant to be a substitution for circumcision. Jerusalem is only a symbol. This is why “if need be” has been added to the *sûtrâ*. This Council could equally be called at Rājagrha where the first Buddhist Council took place.¹⁵ It should simply take place somewhere. I would make space in it for all living beings, for all is alive and every being has a function to perform, a cosmotheandric council, as the Gāthas, Vedas, and Bible, ... suggest.

The actual gathering is still an utopia, but not the actual calling for it, the preparation of peoples, the awakening to the need. Not United Nations States, but *Concilium* of Peoples, *harmonia mundi*.

III. Religious language is not synonymous with sacred scripture

Before Luther and up to the present day in the Roman Catholic liturgies, after the reading of the Sacred Scriptures, the reader proclaims: “This is the Word of God”. It is not said this is the Scripture of God. Not only God does not write, not even Christ did ever write – nor Pythagoras and Socrates, for that matter as Thomas Aquinas reminds us. The “letter killeth”, said St. Paul. Religious language is Word, not Scripture. It is also sound and not only meaning. It is dialogue and not just monologue. It is spoken and not only written.

A modern remark is here needed. *Scripta manent* said the ancients. *Habent sua fata libella*. But sounds can be recorded – today. *Voces perdurant* we could add. Religious language cannot be a recorded sound either. John of the Cross sustains that we should annihilate our memory. Even if we had a video-tape of the events in Bethlehem, Nazareth and Jerualem we could not say “The Voice of God” as we cannot say “The Scripture of God”. We say instead the “Word of God”. The Word is spoken, heard, accepted or rejected, understood or misunderstood, but at any event, on the one level, it passes away, it does not last. It needs to be spoken, reenacted again and again. The living word of religion is always a spoken word. On the other level, it is by passing away, by the sacrifice of the word how it is effective. Presence is paramount. “*Non propter tuam loquelam credimus*”, said the Samaritans to the woman at the well. *Fides ex auditu* learnt Paul. Not by reading a script, but by hearing a word. In sum, without the mystical dimension religions remain without soul.

Now, we are told that the mystic does not speak. This is what the very word suggests. This is why mysticism alone is not enough. Out of the Silence of the Father comes the Word of the Son, knew

already the Greek Fathers of the Church. But we need the Spirit to allow the Word to become incarnated in us.

The burden of my tale is this. It is not for us to say what the Christian language in the coming millennium shall be. We only wanted to say that it shall not be a mere echo, but a living and surprising Word: *Qui habet aures audiendi, audiat!*

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Das Christentum als eine Religion des Wortes, sowohl des geschriebenen als auch des abrahamitisch verkündeten und gelebten, hat eine eigene Sprache entwickelt, die in der hellenistischen Tradition verwurzelt ist. Man kann aber nicht zwangsläufig davon ausgehen, dass diese Sprache auch für andere Religionen und Kulturkreise verständlich und verbindlich ist. Das dritte christliche Jahrtausend ist sich immer mehr eines kulturellen und religiösen Pluralismus bewusst und muss sich dieser Herausforderung stellen. Der Glaube, dass Gott sich den Christen offenbart hat, darf nicht ausschliessen, dass er sich auch in anderen Kulturen offenbart hat. Das christliche Weltbild und die christliche Vorstellung des Universums sind nicht allein gültig. Allerdings bringt das Christentum, wie jede Religion, eine gewisse Festlegung, eine "Beschneidung des Denkens", mit sich. Glaube bedeutet immer Festlegung und Konkretion. Das Problem ist, in dieser Konkretion Universalität zu bewahren und Beliebigkeit zu vermeiden.

Panikkar mahnt die Christen des dritten Jahrtausends, die Werke Gottes wahrzunehmen ohne den Anspruch, allein im Besitz des Mysteriums zu sein. Er erhofft ein "Zweites Jerusalem Konzil" – notfalls in Rājagṛha (wo das erste buddhistische Konzil stattfand), bei dem alle brennenden Probleme der Welt unter theologischen Aspekten behandelt werden, aber nicht nur unter denen eines einzigen Kulturkreises.

ICH GING ALS CHRIST FORT
ICH FAND MICH SELBST ALS HINDU,
UND ICH KEHRE ZURÜCK ALS BUDDHIST,
OHNE AUFGEHÖRT ZU HABEN,
EIN CHRIST ZU SEIN.

Anmerkungen / notes

Zuerst erschienen/ first published in: *Metanoia*, vol.7, no. 3 (autumn/ Herbst 1997), p. 105-117

1. Part of this contribution has been published as a response to Cardinal Tomko in P. MOJZES and L. SWIDLER: *Christian Mission and Interreligious Dialogue*. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen 1990.
2. Cf. my article *L'interpellació de l'Àsia al cristianisme*, in: *Teologia i Vida* (Collective work), Barcelona: Claret 1984, pp. 81-93.
3. Cf. my study, *The Crux of Christian Ecumenism: Can Universality and Chosenness be held simultaneously?*. In: *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 26, 1 [Winter 1989], pp. 82-99.
4. Cf. my assertion that *Fundamental Theology* should not assume fixed *preambula fidei* but study the possibility of using any cultural *preambula* as basis for an incarnated theology, in: *Metatheology as Fundamental Theology*, in: *Concilium* VI, 5 (June 1969), reprinted in my book: *Myths, Faiths, and Hermeneutics*. New York: Paulist 1979, pp. 321-334.
5. An assumption is something we set at the start of our thinking about something. A presupposition (*prae-subpositio*) is something we uncritically or unreflectively take for granted. It belongs to the *mythos*. Cf. my cited *Metatheology*, p. 324.
6. By *kosmology* I understand not a different view of the world (cosmology) but a different world; not a different discourse about the universe but a different universe (also of discourse).
7. Cf. my notion of *Christianness* as different from *Christendom* and *Christianity* in HICK, John / KNITTER, Paul (eds.): *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis 1987, pp. 104-107. (In his contribution to this volume, *The Jordan, the Tiber, and the Ganges*, Panikkar states that "Christianness" which in German ... might be called *Christlichkeit* – or *crístianía* in Spanish ... differentiates itself from *Christianity* as *Christianity* extricated itself from *Christendom*." For example: "the South and Central American grassroots communities ... have spontaneously developed a *Christianness* that does not reflect existing *Christianity*." On the other hand, "if we look back to history we find a score of *Christians* who believed they had reached *Christianness* after overcoming, not rejecting *Christendom* and *Christianity*." – Note of the Editor).
8. While Kierkegaard believed that *Christendom* is distorted *Christianity*, I am not saying that this latter is the distortion of *Christianness*. I affirm that the *Christic* seed carried by *Christians* is growing now outside the boundaries of *Christianity* like centuries ago it grew outside the walls of *Christendom*. I speak here of the three *kairological* moments.
9. Cf. my book: *Humanismo y Cruz*. Madrid: Rialp 1963.
10. Cf. R. PANIKKAR: *Indian Theology: A Theological Mutation*, in: AMALADOSS / G. SAUCH / T. K. JOHN (eds.): *Theologizing in India*. Bangalore: TPI 1981, pp. 23-42; and in general the entire volume.
11. The King James Authorized Version goes up to the extend of translating the *heauton ekenósen* = *exinanivit semetipsum*: Phil. 2, 7) as "made by himself of no reputation".
12. Cf. the second edition of my: *Unknown Christ of Hinduism*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis 1981, spelling out what was

cryptically written in the first.

13. Already in my Preface of 1959 to my work: *Mâyâ e Apocalisse*. Roma: Abete 1996, p. X.

14. Cf. my paper at the Annual Meeting of the "Indian Theological Association" (1989): The Perspective of Inculturation in an Indic Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism, in: *Religious Pluralism. An Indian Christian Perspective*. Delhi: ISPCK 1991.

15. Many indologists have doubts about the first Buddhist Council (*samgîtî*) near Rājagrha around 480 BC soon after the Buddha's *mahāparanirvāna*. The second Council at *Vaisali* some hundred or hundred and ten years later is historically certain.

Zuerst erschienen in: Reinhard Kirste / Paul Schwarzenau / Udo Tworuschka (Hg.): *Neue Herausforderungen für den interreligiösen Dialog. Religionen im Gespräch*, Bd. 7 (RIG 7). Balve: Zimmermann 2002, S. 198–220

RIG7-Panikkar-Scripture, 29.06.02