

**INCULTURATION OR INTERCULTURATION?:
TOWARDS A NEW INDIAN CHRISTIAN IDENTITY IN
A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY¹**

L. Anthony Savari Raj

INTRODUCTION

Behind the search for a New Indian Christian Identity, there is a central question: How can one be attached to one's tradition and at the same time not allow this tradition to become absolutist as well as diluted? The present attempt to answer this question will take the following path: First, it will explore the nature of the Christian presence in the pluralistic Indian context and indicate an Indian assessment of the same. Second, it will elucidate contemporary Christian efforts at inculturation and the need to go beyond the incultural method of adaptation to the much needed intercultural approach of identity. Third, it will spell out some of its implications for a New Indian Christian Identity for our times.

CHRISTIAN PRESENCE AND INDIAN ASSESSMENT

One of the ways of discerning the identity of a person or an organization is by examining the image that one projects in the context in which the person or it lives. This is what we like to do as we search for the identity of the Church in India today.

A. Minority Presence

To begin with, the Church in India must situate her identity in the context of the 97% of the Indian population seeking their salvation outside the Church. Though Christianity has existed in India from Apostolic times, the Christian population in India is estimated to be only 20 million placed amidst 900 million people.

Though a minority presence, the 3% Christian population exhibits a great diversity. There are Christians belonging to the

Orthodox, Protestant and Catholic Churches with their innumerable sub-divisions and denominations, some of which, of course, exhibit fundamentalism on the one hand, and liberalism on the other. We can also see a great diversity among Christians in terms of their profession, culture, ethnicity, theology, ritual, and so on. In this context, the important question is: how does a Christian come across to the people of this country? What is the image that a Christian projects in his/her surroundings?

An Institutional Identity

It may not be an overstatement that the Church in India has exhibited more of an institutional identity than a religious or cultural identity. More often than not, Christians are considered to be outsiders, having an allegiance to a foreign institution. Significantly, this perception is also shared by the Christians themselves. The social and cultural values they seem to embody, the liturgy and worship they partake in, their symbols – all seem to be far removed from the local or home reality. Even Christian religious and priestly formation, besides the fact of being mostly inspired by and supported from abroad, has yet to come to terms with the real Indian situation – all the notable efforts of inculturation notwithstanding. This is true of Christian theology too. Ecclesial art, architecture and liturgy have still to express the soul of India. In a word, the Christian presence seems to be over-dependent on and an extension of Rome. Arun Shourie's remarks may be recalled here:

Financially, ideologically or, if you prefer, "spiritually," and organizationally too, the promotion of Indian personnel to higher posts notwithstanding, the Church has remained tied to the Churches elsewhere. The Second Vatican Council for instance, as we have seen, has turned the Church in India inside out. But the Church in India made almost no contribution to the reformulation and decisions of the Council – the Council was an almost wholly European affair, with some contributions from the U.S. and Latin America.²

Denunciation and Conversion Efforts

Another image that Christianity in India has projected to the average Indian is the denunciation theology or missiology with which Christianity has looked upon other religions, especially Hinduism.

Prompted by and imbibing within the cultural superiority of the Greeks which regarded all other people as barbarians and the religious superiority felt by the Jews for whom all the others were pagans, Christians, in the past, have considered people of other religions as ignorant and sitting in the shadows of death. Furthermore, these religions were even thought to be as works of the evil. Suffice here to recall the admonition of Benedict XV, who, in his encyclical on Catholic Missions, *Maximum illud*, defined the goal of the Church's missionary activity as "rescuing that mass of souls from the savage tyranny of the devils."³

This was by and large the common missionary stand, with of course, some exceptions. Moreover, the rulers, i.e. the colonizers, were supported by the missionaries and the Christian scholars of the times, in perpetuating colonial rule. The Church was even looked upon as "the other half of the rulers, the unofficial branch of government."⁴ Being or becoming a Christian was considered to be of foremost importance. Being an Indian was only secondary.

Connected to the denunciation efforts were the acts of conversion which had not been exactly welcome among non-Christians. The missionary service or activity has been – and still is – suspect of an underlying 'motivation' – to convert the "heathens," the weak, the vulnerable, the easily "allurable" (the dalits, the tribals, those struck by a natural disaster) to the "real" religion – not of course for an inner transformation, but merely for a numerical gain. This one-point agenda – that of 'converting' – was further vitiated by the outright contempt, ridicule and sarcasm with which Hinduism was treated and sought to be rejected and destroyed.⁵

A Consequence

As we might expect, cultural alienation is an inevitable consequence of the institutional identity of the Church and of the denunciation and conversion practices. Alienation and estrangement is the natural outcome when the closely related culture and religion are separated. This was particularly so in India when Western Christianity first made its appearance.

There would have been no problem, neither alienation nor estrangement if Christianity entered into the Indian ethos joining in the search for the Ultimate Reality, instead of coming with ready-made answers, well formulated outside the Indian context. Instead

of coming with the Christian experience, Western Christianity came with Christian answers offered to people living in another context. These had no resonance in the Indian hearts and lives of many Indians. For them Christianity is more an institution engaged in good humanitarian activities rather than a God-centered community. Or we can say that Christianity as a religion did not resonate with Indian religiosity.⁶

In short, there is a general assessment that Christianity in India, by and large, has had the image of an outsider and has been an extension of Western culture.

FROM INCULTURATION TO INTERCULTURATION

Yet, notable changes are taking place today in the attitude and approach of Christianity to non-Christian religions and cultures. Presently, significant attempts are being made to overcome the lack of rootedness in the soil that characterized the Christian community from the time of the missionary expansion into India.

These attempts indeed bring to light Christianity's interest and interaction with home cultures, toward giving greater respect to other religions; there are even attempts at newly defining the term 'Christian.'⁷ Conquering and conversion are no longer the motivational force of Christians. An attitude of learning and even serving seems to be increasingly emerging. The spirit of dialogue is catching up everywhere and Christians certainly have a lot to contribute to this spirit and process. It is here that we shall situate and evaluate Christianity's recent attempts at inculturation.

Inculturation

Inculturation is a process by which Christians draw from their heritage elements which are compatible with their faith, in order to enrich Christian thought.⁸ It is an attempt by which one's faith is understood and expressed through the symbols and language of one's own home culture. Furthermore, instead of projecting an image that is heavily institutionalized, inculturation attempts to discern the spiritual dimension of the Church and integrate them with the movements of the Spirit that has been operative in India for centuries. And we already have a model of inculturation in the early Christians:

Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind by their country, speech or customs; the fact is that they nowhere settle in cities of their own, they use no peculiar language, they cultivate no strange mode of life... they conform to the customs of the country in dress, food and ways of living in general... they love all men.⁹

This shows that Christian identity need neither be opposed to nor be in isolation from one's cultural identity. Indian Christians do have a common cultural root. The baptism of Jesus in the Jordan indeed represents his integration into the Jewish community. So too the baptism of Christians in the Ganges may well symbolize their inculturation and immersion in the Indian cultural and religious traditions.

Furthermore, inculturation stands for the realization by Christians that "the Church is not a timeless idea but a concrete historical reality. This implies that the Church is subject to the vicissitudes of history and that the actual shape the Church assumed in different place and at different times was largely due to the influence of concrete historical situations."¹⁰ Reflecting on this historical dimension of Christianity, more than twenty years ago, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India solemnly declared:

The Church in India must realize her genuine Indian identity and rid herself of the slur of being foreign which clings to her because of leaning too heavily on foreign support and of the style of life adopted by some of the Christian communities. The Church will realize her Indian identity by adjusting herself to conditions prevailing in the country and developing an indigenous theology.¹¹

Responding concretely to this proposal, the Church has in fact contributed, to some extent at least, towards the appreciation and promotion of Indian culture, art, music, and so on. The recent emergence of Christian ashrams in different parts of the country, modeled on the pattern of Hindu ashrams, the usage of Hindu scriptures in Christian assemblies, prayer programmes, and so on, are instances of integrating Indian culture and art in Christian life and expression. After the second Vatican Council, the Christian liturgy is being conducted in the local language, and many Indian symbols have been accepted as part of Catholic faith expression.

Thus, Christian liturgy is no longer of the monolithic Roman style that it was in the past.¹²

Limits of Inculturation

Though inculturation is indeed a very positive attempt to inculcate in Christians the sense of "Indian Christianness," its limitations are also being increasingly recognized.

A common criticism of inculturation, at least in Christian circles, is that it lays an overemphasis on a particular aspect of life, namely, Liturgy, without taking into account the overall need. Moreover, it is alleged that inculturation is based on brahmanic cultures and mores, and that sufficient attention has not been paid to the cultural situation of the *dalits* (the oppressed) and the tribals. In this connection, it is asked if we could ever limit inculturation to a question of merely adapting some Hindu symbols and ways of worship, without seriously and concretely getting involved in the problems and aspirations of the brothers and sisters of our land?¹³

Beyond Inculturation: Interculturation

But a more serious criticism that we ourselves like to advance would be in the form of following questions: Is inculturation a kind of imperialistic left over? Going beyond adaptation of Hindu symbols and art forms in its liturgy, would Christianity be genuinely ready to accept the home culture and religion as its constitutive dimension and as a means to discover itself in greater depth? Despite all its attempts of adaptation, has Christianity really given up its absolutist stand?: "Truth is one and I alone have it" Or, is it only to promote this stand indirectly with the help of other cultural and religious symbols and forms? Would Christianity recognize its limitation of perspective and be genuinely ready for an interreligious enrichment? Has Christianity totally overcome its "fulfillment theology" of being at the top of a linear evolution?

It is our submission that Christianity in India is *not yet* in a position to be fully absolved from all the above apprehensions and doubts. But fortunately we are also beginning to witness some positive and encouraging signals of the next important step that Christianity is surely and already taking in its search for a new Indian identity: Interculturation – an attitude that would enable one to view oneself in relation to others and others in relation to oneself. This attitude is basically an openness to, and a willingness to learn

from, other cultures and religions. It basically stands for the abandonment of absolutism and the realization that one essentially needs the other for growth. To this emerging new phase in the history of Indian Christian Identity, we now turn our attention.

AN INTERCULTURAL FOUNDATION

As we have just hinted, interculturalism is based on the conviction that in our pluralistic human situation, no single culture, religion, tradition or person is totally sufficient to face – let alone solve – any of our human predicaments. We need an intercultural enterprise. Interculturalism implies, in the words of Raimon Panikkar – one of today's leading scholars in Cross-Cultural Studies – our efforts "towards a healthy pluralism which would allow for the conviviality and coexistence of cultures and civilizations recognizing that no single culture, religion or tradition has the right to claim to represent the universal range of human experience, nor the power to reduce the diversity of humanity to one single form, broad as this may be."¹⁴

In other words, human creativity is manifold. It may follow many paths and take forms which we cannot bring into any single frame. Consequently, the intercultural attitude aims to assist in viewing and recognizing the various religious traditions as individual dimensions of the respective other. For this, the ultimate model is the dialogical nature of reality itself. As Panikkar points out, Reality is cosmotheandric (*cosmos-theos-aner*: cosmic-divine-human). There is a distinction between these three dimensions of reality, but there can be no radical separation. All the three belong together. One does not exist without the other.¹⁵

Furthermore, we submit, it is this unified and holistic vision of reality which would accommodate the insights of different religious traditions in such a manner that each religious tradition is complemented and challenged by the other tradition.

All this of course implies a proper method. It is here we would like to refer to and profit from the rich insights of Panikkar's Cross-Cultural Hermeneutics.

For Panikkar, the dialogue between religious traditions has to be dialogical in nature – which he calls the "Dialogical Dialogue"¹⁶ (*dia-logos*: piercing through the *logos* – thus reaching the *mythos*). In other words, it means that one has to go through and thus go beyond and behind the rational or dialectical aspect. Arguments and reasoning are the chief ingredients of dialectical dialogue. But *mythos* is the operating principle of dialogical dialogue. Here there

will be arguments, but they will not exhaust the entire dialogic enterprise. Dialogical dialogue will allow space also for experience and non-understanding, besides the element of understanding and rationality. Humility and openness will be the natural outcome of this dialogical enterprise. It implies the readiness to be open to the correction and contribution that our neighbour could make in our way of looking at things. We can make the same contribution to our neighbour, the result being a fusion of horizons.¹⁷ Hence, it is all a question of not absolutizing one's insight, without at the same time, diluting it. It ultimately stands for a pluralism which would overcome exclusivism on the one hand, and inclusivism on the other. Without elaborating further, let us now only indicate briefly two dimensions of this dialogical dialogue.

Dialogue with Oneself

Before we try to understand or dialogue with the other person or religious tradition, it is important that we gain insight into our own tradition. Panikkar calls this "the harmony from within." If we gain this insight into our own tradition, we will be able to experience what he calls the *pars pro toto* effect¹⁸ (that is, the part standing for the whole, the concrete standing for the universal – e.g. my parents representing parentage as such).

This implies that each one of us may be aware of the whole reality under one particular aspect, and this does not mean that we see only a part of reality or truth. Through our religious tradition we see the whole truth, but under only one aspect. We *see* all that we *can* see.

The realization of this limitation in our very selves is essential to opening ourselves up to and to being embraced by others. In this sense, for Panikkar, an interreligious dialogue has to be preceded by an intrareligious dialogue. This dialogue 'within,' or internal scrutiny, changes not only our opinion about our own tradition (leading to a realization of our limitation) but also makes us realize that we *essentially* need the other (person, tradition, religion, culture, or whatever) even to understand our very selves.

Dialogue with the Other

Once the internal dialogue begins, once we are engaged in a genuine intra-religious scrutiny, we will be ready for what Panikkar calls the imperative method.¹⁹ The real focus of this method is the ability

and willingness to learn from the other and get enriched in the process. It means, further, to search together standing within our own tradition.

In Panikkar's view, this mutual learning and enrichment is an open process. In this, we are open and broad minded enough to allow our dialogue partner to discover our own presuppositions and also criticize our convictions, and vice versa. This only implies that at no point in time can we claim absolute self sufficiency in the endeavor of grasping and shaping reality.

IMPLICATIONS FOR A NEW INDIAN CHRISTIAN IDENTITY

Having shown the need to go beyond inculturation to intercultural, and having also discerned a foundation for such an intercultural, we now venture to spell out some of its implications for a new Indian Christian Identity for our times. It is hoped that the emerging new identity will be marked by characteristics which will indeed underscore a shift in emphasis from: Mission to Dialogue, Christology to Christophany, and Option to Cosmic Confidence.

From Mission to Dialogue

One obvious implication of intercultural for a new Indian Christian Identity is that the traditional Christian sense of "Mission" will be seen more in terms of "Dialogue." The basis of such a shift, as we have already indicated, is the realization that no one is self-sufficient and that we need the other to discover ourselves in greater depth. It means, further, that absolutism will be abandoned and intercultural dialogue fostered. It is expected that this will indeed result in a better appreciation, tolerance, and respect for other religions, which will in turn promote a mutual understanding and an enrichment to a joint-action for the wholeness of reality.

In this intercultural atmosphere, the future of Christian mission, then, will not consist merely in providing hospitality and assistance, but in a humility and willingness to receive the contribution of the other. The mission will no more be impelled by the conviction that kingdom of God is "within" one self, but perhaps "between" us.²⁰ The Church's mission will be oriented towards the Christian presence rather than the presence of Christians.²¹ Clearly, the presence of Christians was once predominantly motivated by a desire to convert and conquer. But Christian presence implies the readiness

to be corrected and complemented, besides the impulse to serve and love. We may still ask: what happens to the traditional Christian mission of conversion? Here, as Panikkar points out, the three key words of the parable of Mission theology – salt, light, and leaven are very instructive.

But should we not remember that leaven is subversive and that the leaven does not desire to convert everything into leaven? Should we remind ourselves that salt is bitter and does not desire to convert everything into salt, convert everything into something Christian, but rather that the omelet be a better omelet, the steak be a better steak, the Hindu be a better Hindu, the humanist become a better humanist?...And must we not remind ourselves that light is invisible? That when I think that I see light, I see really the enlightened and not the light itself?²²

From Christology to Christophany

Another intercultural implication we wish to draw for a new Indian Christian Identity is the required passage from Christology to Christophany. One of the main problems that Christians face in relating themselves to people of other faiths is their understanding of Christ – particularly his uniqueness. But it is surely possible to universalize Christ without at the same time exhibiting exclusivism and fanaticism. This, of course, is a great challenge:

To be a fully, totally orthodox Christian in which Christ for you is everything, and at the same time not be exclusivist, not be fanatic, and not to pay the price of tolerance and broad mindedness by diluting your Christ as one of the many "unknown Christs" in the other traditions. I don't think that Christ is one among many. I don't think that all the religions are the same. All religions are different and each is unique. The thing is that we have a kind of interpenetration; and in my understanding of Christianity, I have to somewhat incorporate all the other religions. But equally, the Hindu, in his understanding of his religion, has to also somehow incorporate all the other religions. It's a little like famous *perichoresis* of the Trinity, in which each is totally in the other and yet totally different. And that's why the Trinity is not three things – it is interrelatedness, but not three. In each are the other two. So, in an analogous way, I have to discover in my religion all the others, but without doing violence to the others. For me,

Christ is the symbol of that kind of thing.

Christians do not have a monopoly on Christ. Christians don't know all the dimensions of Christ. If you were a Hindu you would call it Brahman, Krishna, Atman, or whatever, and you would be discovering the aspects of which I had not any idea. And which I may never know. *But I cannot but call it Christ.* We are all in a symphony; my single voice is all I have to say, but only when everybody sings is the symphony complete.²³

In other words, the shift from Christology to Christophany would imply a re-visioning of the usual Christology which would totally and exclusively identify Jesus of Nazareth with Christ. In the revised understanding, Christ is recognized to be much larger than that which manifested in the Jesus of Nazareth of Christianity. It is all a question of acknowledging the Christ-aspects as revealed also in other religions.²⁴

Consequently, in this new vision the role and task of a Christian can no longer be that of taking Christ to somebody, but it will be more of discerning Christ that a person already is. We need here a new Christology which would recognize and accept the larger reality that Christ is. Here, we submit, comes the place and significance of Christophany – the manifestation of Christ. Christophany, in Panikkar's view, stands for the manifestation of Christ as a symbol of totality of reality: cosmic, divine and human. For this reason, every creature and every reality, is a Christophany. Here, the problem of the uniqueness of Christ loses its rigour, as every reality is indeed unique.

From Option to Cosmic Confidence

The third implication that we wish to spell out for a new Indian Christian Identity is the envisaged shift from option for the poor to cosmic confidence as the basis of Christian commitment and action.

The present day encounter of religions exhibits an important characteristic: It is to focus its attention on the poor and downtrodden of the endangered earth. The religions of the world, with all their differences and varied visions, have begun to speak with each other with a common concern for the welfare of the victims of the earth.²⁵

But this concern and commitment has always been the identifying mark of Christianity. Christianity, with its "preferential option for the poor," would not like to be second in its thirst for justice and in its efforts to uplift the poor and downtrodden. The

justification of Christians is also linked with their interest and commitment to justice, which is exemplified in the Gospel words: "the Kingdom and its Justice." And Christianity will certainly have no hesitation to endorse and elaborate on the Liberation Theologians' perspective that "there can be no justification as such without justice."

The question is: Can not this Christian concern and commitment to the poor have a more solid base than "options" and "decisions"? Here comes the role of cosmic confidence from which option has to be ultimately proceed. Panikkar states:

The concern for the poor presupposes precisely a cosmic confidence. In fact, why do we get so indignant at injustice, premature deaths, and sufferings if not because we assume a cosmic confidence in reality, in which somehow we trust and believe that life cannot be so senseless, unjust and cruel as to justify such manmade oppressions? Is it that cosmic confidence which triggers the healthy decision of the "option?" It is the awareness of injustice, which leads to the "option." But this injustice is only detected because of our presupposition that there is a *cosmic order* which the injustice has precisely violated.²⁶

Furthermore, what is the result, after all, of our "option for the poor?" Has it really been effective enough? To be sure, without the preferential option for the poor, the situation would have been worse, and much has been achieved by Christianity's conscious engagement for justice. Yet the question remains: what is our answer to those who suffer right now, in this very moment?

Here is where traditional cultures speaking of heaven, *karma*, nirvana, God and Brahman have something essential to contribute. To realize that my life has a meaning (sense) which is *life*, even if I have been invited to the banquet of life just for a few moments, is the only saving hope for many and another exemplification of what I mean by cosmic confidence.²⁷

Would a new Indian Christian Identity be open to and be increasingly guided by this cosmic confidence? Let me hope that it will.

*University of Madras
Chennai, India*

NOTES

¹A revised version of the paper presented at Afro-Asian Philosophers' Association (AAPA) International Conference: Ethnicity, Cultural Identity and Freedom, on the Occasion of the Platinum Jubilee Celebrations of the Indian Philosophical Congress, New Delhi, 30-31 December 2000.

²Arun Shourie, *Missionaries in India. Continuities, Changes, Dilemmas* (Delhi: ASA Publications, 1994), p. 224.

³*Acta Apostolica Sedis* XI (1919): 453, as quoted in Raimon Panikkar, "The Crux of Christian Ecumenism: Can Universality and Chosenness be held Simultaneously?", *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 26: 1, Winter 1989, p. 93.

⁴Arun Shourie, *Missionaries in India, op. cit.*, p. 200.

⁵Cf. T. K. John, "IMAGE. Image of the Christians Presented in India Today," *The Church in India in Search of a New Identity* (Bangalore: N.B.C.L.C., 1997), p. 145. Henceforth as *CISNI*.

⁶Paul Puthanangadi, "Christian Community as a Multi-Cultural Reality," *CISNI*, p. 183.

⁷Cf. Panikkar, "Trisangam: Jordan, Tiber, and Ganges," *A Dwelling Place for Wisdom* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), esp. pp. 134-9.

⁸Cf. John Paul II, *Fides et Ratio*, p. 72.

⁹*Epistle to Diognetus*, Ch. 5, as quoted in Paul Puthanangadi, *CISNI*, p. 181.

¹⁰Kurien Kunnumpuram, *et al.*, "Introduction," *CISNI*, p. 7.

¹¹CBCI, *Report of the General Meeting*, Calcutta, 1974, p. 128.

¹²Cf. Sebasti L. Raj, "Future of the Indian Church: Reflections and Proposals in the Light of CBCI Evaluation," *Jeevadhara*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 166, p. 287.

¹³Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 288.

¹⁴Panikkar, "Modern Science and Technology are Neither Neutral nor Universal," *Europe-Asia: Science and Technology for their Future* (Zurich: Forum Engelberg, 26-28 March 1996), p. 209.

¹⁵For an elaborate study of this Vision, cf. Anthony Savari Raj, *A New Hermeneutic of Reality. Raimon Panikkar's Cosmotheandric Vision* (Peter Lang: Bern, Berlin, Frankfurt/M, New York, Paris, Wien, 1998), esp. pp. 91-103.

¹⁶Cf. Panikkar, "The Dialogical Dialogue," *The World's Religious Traditions. Current Perspectives in Religious Studies*, Whaling F., ed., (Edinburgh, 1984), pp. 201-21.

¹⁷Cf. Francis X. D' Sa, "The Nature of Religion: Reflections on Nature and Religion," *Dialogue and Alliance. A Journal of the*

International Religious Foundation, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 34-55.

¹⁸It means simply this: Each tradition in its ultimate aspects claims or aspires to the *totum* (for instance, Christ is thus not an *avatara* among others or Siva just a God in the world-pantheon), but sees the *totum in parte* in one's own categories. Hence authentic tolerance does not require chopping off particular opinions. One does not need to dilute one's own religious commitments in order to accept those of the other. Cf. Panikkar, "The Invisible Harmony: A Universal Theory of Religion or a Cosmic Confidence in Reality?", *Toward a Universal Theology of Religion*, Leonard Swidler, ed., (New York: Orbis Books, 1987), pp. 139-40.

¹⁹Cf. Panikkar, "What is Comparative Philosophy Comparing?", *Interpreting Across Boundaries. New Essays in Comparative Philosophy*, Gerald James Larson and Eliot Deutsch, eds., (Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 122-8. Here Panikkar argues that, strictly speaking, Comparative Philosophy of Religion or Religions is not possible, because we do not have any neutral platform outside every tradition where comparison may be drawn. We cannot compare (*comparare* - that is, to treat on an equal-par - basis), for, there is no *fulcrum* outside. He further suggests that we can only *imparare* - that is, learn from the other by opening ourselves from our standpoint, to a dialogical dialogue that does not seek to win or convince, but to search together from our different vantage points.

²⁰Cf. "Interview: Raimundo Panikkar," *Epiphany. A Journal of Faith and Insight*, Vol. 3, No. 4, (Summer 1983), pp. 30-1.

²¹Cf. Panikkar, "Present-day University Education and World Cultures," *Interculture*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, Issue 88, p. 12.

²²Panikkar, "The Future of Mission," *Interculture*, Fall/October, '87, No. 97, p. 26.

²³"Interview: Raimundo Panikkar," *Epiphany*, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

²⁴Cf. R. Panikkar, *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism*. Indian Edition. (Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation, 1982).

²⁵Cf. Felix Wilfred, *Asian Dreams and Christian Hope at the Dawn of the Millennium* (Delhi: ISPCK, 2000), p. xvii.

²⁶Panikkar, "A Self-Critical Dialogue," *The Intercultural Challenge of Raimon Panikkar*, Joseph Prabhu, ed. (New York: Orbis Books, 1996), p. 280.

²⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 283-4.