

Through Each Other's Eyes: A Shin Buddhist-Catholic Dialogue¹

by Kenneth Paul Kramer, *San Jose State University, San Jose*

Since we have been a dialogue
And can hear each other.
(Hölderlin)

If I could introduce you to a practice that Jodo Shin Priest Shōjun Bandō calls “eternally enlightening,”² and Catholic Professor of Japanese Religions (at Sophia University) Ernest Piryns calls “the way to greater salvation,”³ would you be at all interested? This presentation will address what I take to be the *future presence* of the Shin Buddhist-Catholic dialogue by focusing on a specific method to facilitate that encounter, the *interview-dialogue*, and then by reporting instances of such exchanges which occurred during a recent trip to Japan (1991). My purpose in the conducted dialogues was to travel beyond the usual discussion of epistemological, teleological and metaphysical categories of comparison (not that these are unimportant), in order to inquire into a more fundamental question: Who is Buddhist and who is Christian when looking through each other's eyes?

Of course, even that question may not be fundamental enough. I recall an encounter with Gishin Tokiwa (Professor of Liberal Arts at Hannazono College, Kyoto) in which the topic being discussed was Zen practice:

Tokiwa In Zazen there is no point to reach. Outside of Zazen, however, there seems to be a point to reach. I would not call myself a Zen Buddhist. Priests call themselves persons of Zen.
Kramer Do you call yourself anything? Just Tokiwa?

Tokiwa About that, also, I am very vague. I respond to your questions with the name Tokiwa. That is my responsibility in this world.

BEING A DIALOGUE

I began the series of dialogues with two assumptions, the first of which needed immediate correction, namely that Buddhists are not as interested in the dialogue as Christians are. Michio Shinozaki (Dean of the Risshō Kōsei-Kai Seminary in Tokyo) told me in an interview that when he was sent to America by President Niwano, he was told first to see Christianity from the point of view of *The Lotus Sutra*, and then to see *The Lotus Sutra* from the point of view of Christianity. To this President Niwano added, “If you become converted to Christianity, that's OK!”

A day later, Jodo Shin Priest, Kōshin Yamamoto (of the Myōenji Buddhist Temple in Kawasaki), expressed his deep interest in Buddhist-Christian dialogue.

Yamamoto From a cause and effect point of view, my existence is affected by your existence. To deepen one's religious faith, unless you respect the other's point of view (and one's own also), we will never come to a platform of mutuality. To come to grips with my faith, I must respect your faith, and come to know it. To be in the *other person's* shoes is to discover who we are. Mutual respect and

understanding are necessary for this to happen.

Kramer Is there a teaching or practice in Jodo Shin which specifically addresses this issue of mutuality?

Yamamoto Yes, *listening*. There is no prayer in Jodo Shin, just listening. We listen to the teaching of the historical Buddha and to the teaching of the Patriarchs. All are in the sphere of the *dharmā*, or faith. There cannot be several faiths. Saint Shinran said: "To hear is to receive truth." But listening is more than hearing with one's ears. It can be reading, or seeing one's body language. It is on all levels — from the heart. And it is more than just listening to Buddhist teachings.

Kramer Let me reflect back to you what I heard to make sure I have it right. Listening, first of all to one's own tradition, deepens the listener's knowledge of that tradition (so that he or she understands more exactly what is to be brought into a dialogue). Then, one's listening may be broadened to include other traditions (so that one more clearly understands the other's point of view). If that is correct, might there not be a third way of listening — a listening (or a re-listening) to my own faith-expression through the eyes of the other?

Yamamoto I would call that part of the second listening, because when I listen to the other, my own viewpoint broadens. Doors are opened more widely, and there comes a point where religious squabbling should be *passé*.

Exchanges such as these convinced me that some Buddhists are far more willing to engage in cross-traditional dialogue than I had supposed. At the same time, in each case it was necessary for me to initiate the dialogue, a fact which highlighted the necessity of developing a *skillful means* to best facilitate such exchanges.

My second assumption, however, proved more valid, namely that to become interactively involved with each other (*i.e.*, from within the heart of each tradition), it was necessary for Buddhists and Christians to shift the basis of their

encounter from *having* a dialogue (in which two or more people are speaking *at* each other), to *being* a dialogue (in which two or more people speak *with* each other). Thinkers as diverse as Martin Buber and Hans-Georg Gadamer attest to this by discussing, in some detail, two mutually related distinctions. First, they agree that a demarcation can, and should, be made between monologue, dialectic and dialogue. Whereas in a monologue, the other is objectified, typified and kept at a distance (if not dismissed completely), and in a dialectical exchange, the claim-counterclaim between self and other is finally a form of self-relatedness (with the other remaining within the role of "counterclaimest"), in genuine dialogue two unique persons, or more, converse in an I-Thou structure of honest openness which both preserves, yet dynamically overcomes, their separateness. And second, each uses words such as "genuine," or "authentic," or "true," or "real" adjectivally with the word "dialogue" to point the reader beyond what is ordinarily meant by the term (*i.e.*, *having* a dialogue), to a more inter-participatory meaning (*i.e.*, *being* a dialogue).

As is well known, Buber's philosophy of dialogue finds its classic expression in *I and Thou*⁴ where he contrasts two primary relational attitudes — "I-it" (the primary word of experiencing and using which occurs entirely within the "I" and lacks mutuality), and "I-thou" (the primary word of relationship which is characterized by directness and mutuality). In a later work, *Between Man and Man*,⁵ Buber developed his philosophy of dialogue by emphasizing both 'the primal setting at a distance' and the 'entering into relation'. The first presupposes the second, and the second is the act by which one becomes fully human .

For Buber, genuine dialogue cannot be located in either of the participants, but is found in their "betweenness," in what he calls the "interhuman." The basic movement of genuine dialogue is a *turning* of one's *being* to allow the other to be present as a whole, unique person. It is a process,

Buber writes, of "the making present of another self and in the knowledge that one is made present in his (or her) own self by the other — together with the mutuality of acceptance, of affirmation and confirmation."⁶ For Buber, the mutual "making present" is a process which not only accepts and affirms the other, but as well confirms the other, even through disagreement.

According to Gadamer, who bases his theoretical remarks on the Platonic dialogues, to experience the other truly as a Thou, is to remain completely *open* to the other, even if "I myself must accept some things that are against me, even though no one else forces me to do so."⁷ To engage in an authentic dialogue, from his point of view, the partners must not "talk at cross purposes;" rather, they must allow themselves "to be conducted by the subject matter to which the partners in the dialogue are oriented."⁸ In this way, not only do each of the participants in the dialogue have a voice, but the dialogue itself has a voice so to speak, especially when each person is skilled in what Gadamer terms the "inner logic" of questioning. Rather than asking questions in order to establish a pre-existing opinion, to genuinely understand the other, one must "go back *behind* what is said" by asking "questions *beyond* what is said."⁹ The more genuine the dialogue, the less is it directed by the will of either participant. More correctly, he suggests, we "fall into conversation."

As striking as it is, the similarity of Buber and Gadamer's distinction between what might be called pre-authentic and authentic dialogue, is not the primary concern here. Rather, I am interested in the application of this distinction to inter-religious dialogue.

In each of the following encounters, whether self-consciously or not, in one way or another my partners seemed to be keenly aware of this distinction. For example, while meeting with Eiko Kawamura (Professor of Theology at Hanazono College in Kyoto), I asked her if enlightenment was once and for all, and/or whether it included unenlightenment.

Kawamura Enlightenment is self awareness of true self. At the instant of enlightenment we have no words, no consciousness. We are consciousness itself! Later, after we lose all things in emptiness, all things return. The true self is from the beginning, but I am not aware of it. Buddha-Nature is aware of it. From the beginning both selves exist, but until enlightenment these two selves are separated. I am always sitting on the one hand, yet I am I in the speaking.

Kramer Perhaps this is like the difference between *having* a dialogue (two monologues: no meeting) and *being* a dialogue (in which my speaking and listening and your speaking and listening together form the dialogue that we are). Martin Buber pointed to the realm of the *between*. For me, I am the dialogue that we are, and you are the dialogue that we are. I am no longer just I. You are no longer just you.

Kawamura The conversation speaks for itself.

Kramer Yes, it has a voice, and its voice speaks through us. This is interpenetration. In a short essay, with the poem's line as its title, Buber quotes Hölderlin: "Since we have been a dialogue."¹⁰ In that essay, commenting on Hölderlin he suggests that "we ourselves are the dialogue," and "our being spoken is our existence." This to me is the Buddhist-Christian encounter at its depths — when I can, while being Christian, *be* a dialogue with you as a Buddhist such that my being Christian in a sense, temporally, falls away. I become, in Rinzai's sense, like a person of no title.

As I reflect upon this and other dialogues with Jodo Shin and Zen Buddhists, as well as with Christians involved in the inter-religious encounter, it becomes clear that the method (or skillful means) which guided the conversations might be called the interview-dialogue. That is, while I approached each encounter with several pre-planned questions in mind — e.g., 1. In what ways has your dialogue with Christians clarified or enriched your own faith? 2. Does the Christian perspective in any way affect your practice? and 3. What would you

like to ask a Catholic who views Christianity through Buddhist eyes? — after the conversation was underway, I turned the conduct of the dialogue over to the conversation itself.

Based on my experience in Japan, I would characterize these interview-dialogues as a differentiated listening, and a differentiated questioning. In ordinary conversations, we listen to identify, to judge, to agree or to disagree, and our questions are motivated by attempts to establish our point of view as the correct one. Being a dialogue, on the other hand, involves the co-occurrence of two processes: *Discernment Listening* (listening past judgments and associations to hear both what is said, and what is underneath the spoken words); and *Interactive Questioning* (formulating questions which open up new questions by allowing the dialogue itself to have a voice). Each can be described in a sentence. Discernment Listening (*with* and *as* rather than *to* and *for*) allows new possibilities to suggest themselves both in, and underneath, the words spoken, so that each person can listen into that opening. For its part, Interactive Questioning does not seek what is typical (which denies reciprocity) but, because the dialogical relationship between self and other has its own voice (which in turn generates new questions), recognizes that relationship to be as important as either of the participants in the dialogue.

With this as a backdrop, the following discussion is a portion of an interview-dialogue with Shōjun Bandō on the afternoon of June 17, 1991, at the Bandō Temple in Tokyo. Though I came with questions in mind, it was as if the dialogue conducted us. Since *inter-religious* dialogue always includes one's *intra-religious* ponderings, which at times occur in the midst of the actual dialogue, I include (as best as I remember them) thoughts and associations which occurred during the conversation itself, and which provide the reader the associative contexts from which my questions arose.

ETERNALLY ENLIGHTENING

Kramer In my own life, my understanding, my practice and my expression of Catholicism has been challenged, vitalized and clarified by my encounter with various forms of Buddhism. In your own life and practice, in what way, if any, has your faith been clarified or deepened or affected by your encounter with Christianity?

Bandō Yes, I have had many such experiences. For example in the Autumn of 1960, Dr. Paul Tillich came to Japan for the first time, and he had dialogues with Buddhists. I attended four or five of his lectures which he gave at Kyoto University. As a student, I was deeply impressed with him, more so than with, for example, Karl Barth. And I had the opportunity to take Dr. and Mrs. Tillich around in Tokyo and Kyoto, and had a chance to hear him speak many times. Since then, I have been very interested in his writings, especially with his emphasis on the significance of religious symbols. When I was reading his views on religious symbols, all the time I was reminded of its significance for Jodo Shin. When he said that symbols are different from signs, that symbols are born while signs are made, that the symbol has something eternal in it while the sign does not, and that a symbol can open up levels of consciousness that cannot be opened by signs, I was always thinking of the significance of Nembutsu.

I recalled Professor Masao Abe's words a few days earlier in the Palace Side Hotel Coffee Shop in Kyoto. "When I studied at Union Theological Seminary in 1957," Abe remarked, "Paul Tillich emphasized that love without justice is not true love, and justice without love is not true justice. In Buddhism, compassion is always seen with wisdom. Compassion without wisdom is not true compassion and wisdom without compassion is not true wisdom. But in the Buddhist tradition, the notion of justice is weak, not lacking, but weak.

Buddhism has been too indifferent to justice. So through the dialogue I came to realize the importance of integrating justice with śūnyatā. That is a very urgent issue."

That is one example. Another is D.T. Suzuki's lectures which open up a very deep meaning of enlightenment. For example, he always maintained the synchronicity of the crucifixion and the resurrection. He always said that according to the Bible, after three days Christ arose. But in Buddhist eyes, that three days is in an instant. There is no distance between these two happenings (crucifixion and resurrection) .

Also, I was impressed with Erich Fromm's interpretation of "I am that I am!" According to him, that expression means, "I am becoming that which I am becoming."¹¹ It signifies eternal becoming and not physical, substantial existence. God's essence then is the eternal movement of love. That statement helped me to see that God is not a noun but a verb, even though we take the word as a noun.

Kramer How interesting that you would bring up Tillich. When I spoke with Masao Abe a few days ago, he also referred to Paul Tillich. Beyond Tillich's influence through his encounter with Buddhists, what do you feel is missing in the contemporary dialogue between Buddhists and Christians, the presence of which would deepen the exchange? What do you think needs to be included in such dialogues which is often missing?
Bandō Absence of mind!

His spontaneous and instaneous response hit me like a Zen clout! I felt the dynamics of the dialogue immediately deepen.

Kramer Such a simple thing. Can you say bit more about this?

Bandō In the depth of emptying our mind, then mutual understanding will more naturally arise. I think that seems to be the core.

Kramer You speak of "mutual understanding." Is there anything beyond mutual understanding that Buddhist-Christian dialogue leads to? For instance, John Cobb speaks of mutual transformation as well.¹²

Bandō Yes, I agree with him. It is an eternal process. There is no end to it.

Kramer Yes. You spoke previously of "eternally enlightening."

Bandō I spent five months with Cobb once in Honolulu, and whenever he came to Tokyo we met.

For some reason this reminded me of my meeting at Nanzan University in Nagoya with Professor Roger Corless. He had used the phrase "mutually fulfilling" to characterize Buddhist-Christian dialogues. I recalled being surprised by his statement that he was the host of two practices — Buddhist and Catholic — because each is fully true for him, and each expresses truth in ways which cannot be reconciled. In his vision, the next step in the Buddhist-Christian dialogue will be taken by those who will practice what he calls "co-inherent meditation."

Kramer Can you give me an example of this mutual transformation from your side? How are you transformed?

Bandō Through a decreasing of misunderstanding. Always our mind gives rise to many misunderstandings. Very often we are not aware of this and on the basis of that misunderstanding, we unknowingly continue in that misunderstanding. Our own way of understanding is not quite in accord with the other's way of understanding.

Kramer: So in that sense, the mutual understanding and the mutual transformation go hand in hand.

Bandō Yes.

Kramer Are you open to being changed in the dialogue?

Bandō Both exclusivism and relativism are not religious. Religion equals a person's whole existence. My attitude toward the other is a result of

spiritual influences and the possibility of change. I just *listen* to convictions of others. If their truth is convincing, then I will nod and even I will praise it.

Kramer Does it become part of your faith?

Bandō In most cases, I find similarities in Jodo awakened. The truth of the other directs me to its place in my own tradition.

Kramer Since I have been asking you questions, let me ask you what question you would most like answered from the Christian standpoint. As you look at the structure of the Christian faith, what question arises which puzzles you, or that you wonder about?

I recalled how Professor Gishin Tokiwa had responded to the same question a few days earlier — “How is the death of Jesus understood in light of the relationship between religion and history?”

Bandō Televangelism! Coercion! That remains a constant question. Can it be religious? Can a fundamentalist interpretation in any tradition be religious? Also, I realize that the way Buddhism was transmitted, not by missionaries but by those who heard and shared the knowledge, that kind of transmission is most ideal. You may wonder why Buddhism and Shintoism co-exist in the minds of Japanese.

Kramer Yes, I have.

Bandō It's very strange, even for us Japanese.

Kramer Yes. On the Shinkansen from Kyoto I asked a woman what tradition she practiced. She said: “Wherever I am, that's what I practice.” I asked her if she had one central practice? “No,” she responded. “Just wherever I am!” But now I want to be more specific about Jodo Shin. How does Shinran describe listening? I have here in mind the ending of *The Hymn of True Faith*.¹³

I was recalling an earlier conversation I had had with Reverend Kōshin Yamamoto. He had explained to me that the last line of the Hymn of

True Faith speaks of “believing “ and that this believing is also “listening.”

Bandō Just believe in the teaching of these masters.

Kramer Does the word *believe* also mean to listen?

Bandō Yes.

Kramer It's a believing-listening?

Bandō Yes. Very often believing and listening are equated.

Kramer This helps me immensely because it seems to me to be very close to one way of understanding prayer. For a Christian, prayer is sometimes seen as listening to God. If I take the position of Jodo Shin (*i.e.*, already believing what I am listening to), what's the purpose of the listening? Or better, how does one listen?

Bandō It's mysterious ... Just spontaneous ... It is an urging which just arises ... That kind of urging. Shinran's definition of faith is very characteristic. Faith is the absence of calculation, the absence of doubt. So if I want to listen to the teaching, then there is no obstruction between teaching and myself. That is faith.

Kramer Interesting, because Tillich wrote in *The Dynamics of Faith*¹⁴ that faith must include doubt. Of course Tillich does not mean skeptical doubt but what he calls “existential doubt,” an element of insecurity which it takes an act of courage to overcome. So there is a difference here?

Bandō Yes. Shinran's definition of faith is negative — not to believe in something. That interests me very much. Gradually I came to realize that in this world there are things which can only be expressed in mythical terms. If it is accepted in this way, that is faith.

Kramer Could it be said, then, that this listening includes hearing not only the explanations of one's own tradition, but also explanations of other traditions?

Bandō Yes. Shinran defines listening as one's hearing the whole story of Amida and having no

doubt. So, listening! I was wondering about the range of meaning. If we can listen, that is already an expression of faith. Like Dōgen said, a person who is sitting in meditation is not a real man, but a Buddha. That is the posture of sitting. It is Buddha. Likewise, when I recite Nembutsu, Buddha is doing this work. There are moments when we can say this. Not always, but in moments.

I recalled Professor Keiji Nishitani's understanding of Shinjin as the true instant when "the past which is further back in the past than any point in the past — that is, the past before any past whatsoever — becomes simultaneous with the present and is transformed into the present."¹⁵ I also recalled a similar practice in Haisidic Judaism of chanting the "Shema," and then drawing out the "d" of the last ekad — in order to draw the past-past (the emanation of Eternal Light) into the present.

Kramer This leads me to a fundamental question. When you recite the Nembutsu, are you also listening?

Bandō To Amida's calling. Our recitation is responding to Amida's calling.

Kramer So, it is not I who recites Nembutsu.

Bandō Amida recites Nembutsu in me.

Kramer Yes. "It is not I, but Christ in me!"

Bandō Yes. As Ippen once said: "There is no distinction between Buddha and myself!"

Kramer But can one say: "God and Amida are one?"

Bandō At the level of Godhead, yes! After that, there are only distinctions.

I recalled echoes of what Jodo Shu Priest Tesshō Kondō of the Shōrin-in Temple in Kyoto, had said: "Yes, I can understand Christianity as almost the same as Buddhism in its deep groundless ground."¹⁶

CO-CREATIVE TRANSLATION

Reflecting on these various conversations, I at first wondered if there is any way in which Shin Buddhist and Catholic teachings and practices can be reconciled? But is "reconciled" the correct word? If by reconciled one means "to restore to harmony or communion," or to "overcome differences," then it does not appropriately describe my encounters with Jodo Shin. What is missing from the notion of reconciliation is a sense of confrontation and difference, or as Professor Piryns expressed it: "The direct encounter of religious messages produces a clash and agreement."¹⁷ A better way to express the question with which I was left — one which more accurately reflects my initial concern: "Who is Buddhist and who is Christian when looking through each other's eyes?" — is this: How does Jodo Shin and Catholic Christianity *implicate* each other?

I choose the word "implicate" for two specific reasons. First, it does not suggest that Jodo Shin and Catholicism are complementary, or in some way different versions of the same truth. Each tradition is unique and each, in its own way, claims to be absolutely true, redemptively salvific and universally applicable. For at the heart of Jodo Shin is the formless, colorless Amida, while at the heart of Christianity is an historic person, Jesus, the Christ. No amount of intellectual acumen or verbal gymnastics can reconcile, or harmonize, these unique expressions. But second, while not complementary, each tradition co-inherently contains unique elements of the other which relativizes its autonomy, or as Brother David Steindl-Rast (of the Immaculate Heart Benedictine Hermitage in Big Sur) has suggested, each is "interdimensional."¹⁸

Etymologically, the word "implication" means "being folded within," and suggests a spatial relation of mutual *interiority*. This more

accurately describes what I discovered to be the case in my personal encounters with practicing members of Jodo Shin, namely that our dialogue was more than an exchange between two different ways of believing, or of practicing beliefs. What became obvious, at least from my side of the dialogue, was a stirring of Jodo's truth *within* me. While aware of the otherness of Jodo's message, by implication I became aware, at the same time, of its withinness. By being a dialogue with Jodo Shin, the touchstones of my own faith were challenged, and even more significantly, directed to inherent references and meanings which, prior to the dialogues, remained unnoticed. The implication of Jodo's "listening," for instance, awakened and renewed my understanding, and practice, of prayer. Not only can the action of contemplative prayer be described as not-me-praying, but in another sense, there is nothing to pray for.

I am left then with one question — How can the way Jodo Shin and Catholic Christianity implicate each other be characterized? In my travels through Japan, I encountered two possible answers — "mutual fulfillment" or "mutual transformation." Mutual fulfillment suggests, to me, a movement or shift in thought which brings one's initial efforts to a conclusion. It implies the conclusion of a process in which a missing dimension is added to one's understanding such that what was hitherto insufficiently perceived comes to completion (e.g., a fuller self-understanding). Mutual transformation suggests that, by virtue of one's encounter with the other, each person is changed from within. It implies a from-the-center-out reanimation of one's understanding of self and of the other which was, in a way, always, already present.

Pondering these two possibilities, I wonder whether there might be a third way to express this mutuality. Perhaps the term mutuality itself pre-judges what takes place in genuine inter-religious dialogue. While fulfillment and/or transformation may occur on *one* side of such dialogues, it does

not necessarily occur on the other. Could there, therefore, be another term which accounts for notions of mutuality and individuality on the one hand, and notions of fulfillment and transformation on the other?

For me, the best way to characterize what occurs between Buddhists and Christians is this: a co-creative (or cooperative) translation of one's self-understanding (and of one's understanding of the other) from a self-referential language into a *reciprocal*, or *co-inherent*, language (made possible by the dialogical process). By this I mean to suggest that a double translation occurs: from a dialogue generated by ordinary listening and questioning, to one made possible by discernment listening and interactive questioning; and from a dialogue between two different voices speaking irreconcilably different points of view, to a truly open dialogue in which each reciprocally challenges, accepts and highlights the other's position. This is what *being* a dialogue can mean — it neither presupposes fulfillment or transformation, nor does it disallow them. For me, the greatest opportunity afforded by inter-religious dialogue (in this case with Buddhists) is not to teach others how I think or understand (though I hope this occurs), but as Zen Master Keidō Fukushima of the Tōfukuji-Monastery in Kyoto put it, to come to understand my own *starting point* more clearly, more profoundly.¹⁹

To conclude, I recall being told by Jeff Shore of Hanazono College in Kyoto what Jodo Shu priest Jikai Fujiyoshi (of Kamakura) once said about his relationship with Shin'ichi Hisamatsu: "I and Hisamatsu walk through the world as in a three-legged race (one leg together, one separate)."²⁰ Borrowing this image, I would say that a Buddhist and a Catholic, as well, dialogue as if in a three-legged race. What carries them forward are their legs outside the bag (even though they may step in different directions). What keeps them together are their legs inside the bag (especially when they step with a co-creative intention). A

consequence of this proposal is not that one necessarily needs to learn how to speak the language of the other, but instead, to unlearn the practice, no matter how cleverly executed, of unilateral monologue on the one hand, and self-referential dialectic on the other.

NOTES

1. A version of this paper was originally presented at the Fifth Biennial Conference of the International Association of Shin Buddhist Studies whose focus was "The First Decade: Retrospect and Prospect," at the University of California, Berkeley (August, 1991).

2. Shōjun Bandō, in a conversation at the Bandō Temple in Tokyo on June 6, 1991.

3. Ernest Piryns, in a conversation at Sophia University in Tokyo on June 3, 1991. See also "The Church and Interreligious Dialogue: Present and Future," *The Japan Missionary Bulletin* (1978).

4. Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, translated by Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938, 1958), especially Part One.

5. Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man*, translated by Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948), Part One.

6. Martin Buber, *The Knowledge of Man*, translated by Maurice Friedman and Ronald Gregor Smith (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 71.

7. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, Second Edition, translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshall (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 361.

8. *Ibid.*, 367.

9. *Ibid.*, 370.

10. Hölderlin, quoted by Martin Buber in *A Believing Humanism*, translated by Maurice Friedman (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967), 85. These are the concluding lines of the poem "Reconciler, you, never believed," the third version.

11. Erich Fromm, quoted by Shōjun Bandō

in a conversation at the Bandō Temple in Tokyo on June 17, 1991.

12. See John Cobb's *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Buddhism and Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

13. Shinran, "The Gatha of True Faith in the Nembutsu" in *Shinshu Seiten* (Japan: Buddhist Churches of America, 1978), 151-156.

14. Paul Tillich, *The Dynamics of Faith* (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1957), see 16-22.

15. Keiji Nishitani, "The Problem of Time in Shinran," *The Eastern Buddhist*, 11/1 (May, 1978), 20-21.

16. Tessho Kondō, conversation in The Palace Side Hotel in Kyoto on June 13, 1991.

17. Ernest Piryns, *op. cit.*

18. David Steindl-Rast, unpublished talk entitled "Christian Confrontation with Buddhism and Hinduism."

19. Keidō Fukushima, in a conversation at the Tōfukuji-Monastery in Kyoto on June 12, 1991. Jeff Shore, of Hanazono College in Kyoto, was the translator.

20. Jikai Fujiyoshi, as reported to me by Jeff Shore in a conversation at Hanazono College in Kyoto on June 11, 1991.