



5-4-2016

Transnational Identities and Religious Traditions: A Case of Religious Double Belonging in India

Enrico Beltramini
Santa Clara University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13023/disclosure.25.11>

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/disclosure>

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).



Recommended Citation

Beltramini, Enrico (2016) "Transnational Identities and Religious Traditions: A Case of Religious Double Belonging in India," *disClosure: A Journal of Social Theory*. Vol. 25 , Article 12.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13023/disclosure.25.11>

Available at: <https://uknowledge.uky.edu/disclosure/vol25/iss1/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Theory at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in *disClosure: A Journal of Social Theory* by an authorized editor of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

Transnational Identities and Religious Traditions: A Case of Religious Double Belonging in India

Cover Page Footnote

I thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, which helped me to improve the manuscript. For advice and encouragement in my research on this topic, I thank Leonard Fernando SJ, Professor of Church History and Systematic Theology, Vidyajyoti College of Theology, Delhi, India.

Transnational Identities and Religious Traditions: A Case of Religious Double Belonging in India

Enrico Beltramini
SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY

Double religious belonging has been growing as a phenomenon in the Roman Catholic Church and in other Christian denominations.¹ The most striking aspect has been the possibility of belonging to two distinct religious traditions. This vague and still controversial trend has finally found its way into scholarly literature and the religious consciousness.² It is in this context that a growing number of Westerners have sought in non-Christian religions not an alternative but rather a supplement or a complement to their core Christian beliefs. Paul Knitter, whose 2009 book *Without Buddha I Could Not Be a Christian* has influenced the theology of religious pluralism, is a case in point.³ Knitter is representative of those Christians who have sought to enter into dialogue with non-Christian religions and arrived at some kind of multi-religious identity, an identity that incorporates experiencing multiple religious traditions without falling into an assemblage of identities or syncretism. However, Jeffrey Carlson defends an alternative option—that unmixed religion traditions do not exist in nature:

Belonging... is inevitably a selective reconstruction from an array of possibilities, in which the many possibilities become one coherent amalgam that works to provide meaning and purpose. If one calls oneself a Christian, or a Buddhist, it means that one has selectively appropriated aspects of a vast array of practices and beliefs that have been identified by those who came before as “Christian” or “Buddhist.”⁴

A more rigorous and more specific way for dealing with religious double belonging—if there is to be one—still needs to be articulated, particularly with regard to the relations among faith, religious tradition, and identity. Does religious double belonging include the deposit of faith, i.e., the truths of a religion, or does it operate instead at a secondary level, at the level of articulation of faith (tradition), or simply at the level of identity?

In this article, religious double belonging is examined through the lives of two French Roman Catholic priests who moved to India for spiritual search and mission. I discuss religious double belonging in the larger context of inculturation, and I survey inculturation as a hybrid option between colonialism and nativism. In this context, the following discussion covers 1) how hybridity operates at the different levels of identity, religious tradition, and faith, and 2) how the two French priests arrived at such a hybrid option.⁵

This is an article at the intersection of historical theology and culture. I offer a definition of

the main terms used here: “identity” is cultural identity; “faith” stands for the deposit of truths (i.e., in Christianity is the body of saving truth revealed by Christ to the Apostles) for Monchanin and “being in Christ” for le Saux. “Tradition” stands for the articulation of the deposit of faith (i.e., in Christianity is the transmission of revelation for the belief of the faithful) for Monchanin and representation of the state of “being” for le Saux. The sum of identity, tradition, and faith is labeled “characteristics;” “essential” is for unconditioned and “contextual” is for conditioned. Finally, “nativism” stands for native-born characteristics, “colonialism” for replacement of the indigenous characteristics by foreign ones; “indigenesness” stands for Indian characteristics, and “foreignness” stands for European characteristics.

Double Religious Belonging

Jules Monchanin (1895-1957) and Henri le Saux (1910-1973) were two French priests who established a Roman Catholic ashram in India in 1950. Their project was to reach the very core of the Indian soul and to Christianize it from within. As monasticism has been the primary form of spiritual quest and religious commitment in India since the Vedic era, the *raison d'être* of an Indian Benedictine ashram was an attempt to integrate into the Church the vocation of the Indian *sannyasa*. *Sannyasa* is a distinct and rare form of monasticism that avoids any sort of social and ritual engagement for the sake of the absolute, transcendent, and ineffable Divine. *Sannyasa* in Sanskrit means “renunciation of the world,” renunciation of all, including identity. The Indian *sannyasa* embraces acosmism and renounces to the self. “Who is the seer?” monks like to repeat to distinguish the speaking “I” (the phenomenological ego) from the true “I” (the interior Self). With Monchanin and le Saux, “la vie missionnaire” and “la vie contemplative,” mission and monasticism, were finally entangled for the first time since the Middle Ages. India, the timeless country of sages and holy men, the tradition of such spiritual treasures, the most precious gem of Asia, seemed at hand.

Monchanin and le Saux’s project of a Roman Catholic ashram in India was a turning point, an attempt to overcome the counterfeits and shortcomings of the previous waves of Christianization. It marked a dramatic shift in the missionary strategy: from colonialism to inculturation. Inculturation, in Monchanin’s view, maintains the priority of the faith over culture, so that Christian missionaries embrace Indian cultural forms as long as the specificity and the integrity of Christian faith are not compromised. The central point of Indianization was that Monchanin and le Saux would “become” Indian without ceasing to be Christians and would formulate their faith in Indian terms. Monchanin’s plan was to adopt Indian philosophy with a certain discernment in order to give expression to the deposit of faith in the Indian context. Accordingly, inculturation confronts both colonialism and nativism (indigenous characteristics are maintained, including faith and religious tradition). This understanding of the inculturation project of Monchanin and le Saux as a hybrid option between colonialism and nativism is a lens through which we see emerging the question of double religious belonging. Does double religious belonging operate at the level of identity, religious tradition, or faith?

Monchanin and le Saux reacted in two different ways to the process of inculturation. Monchanin arrived in India in 1939; he loved India and felt at home there. He left India only in 1945, soon after the end of the World War II, to be the secretary to his Indian bishop in Rome (he returned to India in the beginning of 1947). He also left India in September 1957, when it was discovered that Monchanin had a tumor in the abdomen, to die a month later in Paris. He forged a true transnational identity. In his encounter with Indian religious tradition, however, he experienced an absolute rejection. Monchanin considered Hinduism—fundamentally different from Christianity—homogeneous in its radical heterogeneity. He reacted by rejecting the entire indigenous religion tradition *en bloc* and recovering his European Christian tradition. He declared to a friend:

I react in a contrary direction; never have I felt myself intellectually more *Christian* and also, I must say, more *Greek*.⁶

Monchanin argued the absolute truth of Christianity and the parallel fallacy of Hinduism; he also claimed that tradition is not subject to hybridization. Le Saux, who moved to India in 1948, never left the country and formalized his Indian citizenship in 1960. He became Indian without ever ceasing to be French, maintaining multiple identities that were hierarchically structured, which he used strategically depending on his (or his audience's) circumstances. However, a more complex dynamic happened at the level of religious tradition: le Saux declared that Hinduism and Christianity are both true, since religious traditions operate at the level of culture.

In summary, two French priests, active between 1939 and 1977, negotiated their Western identity, Christian tradition, and faith in encounters with India and Hinduism. Somehow, both were in a position to consider and eventually experience some form of double belonging. In the end, Monchanin resolved to add an Indian facet to his French identity, while maintaining his native-born characteristics as far as his Christian faith and faith articulation were concerned. Le Saux also articulated a dual identity, French and Indian, but he then crossed the boundary that exists between Christians and Hindus, claiming that "Hinduism is true. I know it," an assertion grounded in his understanding of Christianity and Hinduism as religious traditions, which are true at level of faith articulation.⁷

Monchanin's Contextualist Identity and Essentialist Tradition

In pursuing his inculturation project, Monchanin necessarily adopted an "indigenization from above." He was aware of the capacity within Christianity to reproduce its constructions and then refashion them as indigenous—that is, to generate Christian reproductions of indigenous structures as a means of mission. However, the identity strategy at work within mission was always related to Christianity and therefore, despite the intent, inculturation recreated Christian structures. To put it differently, Monchanin's inculturation project proposed a hybrid identity that was constrained by the semi-essentialist tradition and essentialist faith. In fact, Monchanin's inculturation strategy was not really an attempt to negotiate French priesthood in exchange for Indian monasticism, but rather an implication of him understanding Christianity as superior to Hinduism. Monchanin's concentration of an essentialist faith, characterized by purity and perfection, functions as an anchor within the inculturation strategy, where identity can be understood as complementary. With Monchanin, inculturation is cultural hybridity, including—with a certain discernment—tradition.

He made clear that "Our task (...) is (...) to accept [in Hinduism] that which is compatible, to reject that which is incompatible with Christianity."⁸ At the level of religious traditions, the meeting with Hinduism would happen on Christianity's terms. He was careful to frame his project not as a combination of Catholic faith and Hindu thought, but rather Catholic faith and Indian thought. In this context, he made clear that identity can be negotiated, while faith cannot.

In addressing how Christian religious tradition—i.e., theological concepts and patterns of thought that have been elaborated in the European dogmatic tradition—can be negotiated in the Indian context, Monchanin proceeded with caution. In methodology, he aimed to collide with Indian thought in order to uncover the primitive expression of Christian faith. He believed that, in coming into contact with India, he would be able to "recapture Christianity in its original vigor."⁹ In terms of principle, Monchanin seemed to see tradition as composed of two parts: an "infrangible core of the Revelation itself," the dogma at its pristine state, and several "constellations" formed around this nucleus—the subsequent development that began in the times of the Apostolic Fathers carried on through the course of the European history

of Christianity. He argued that “no medieval summa and no critical history of dogmas can surpass the theology of Paul and John.”¹⁰

Thus, the dual movement of Monchanin’s theological enterprise is clear. On one side, he clashes with India in order to reach the essence of Christianity. In fact, he points out that his move to India will help him “to rethink everything in the light of theology and to rethink theology through mysticism, freeing it from everything incidental and regaining, through spirituality alone, everything essential.”¹¹

This essential core, once freed “from everything incidental,” would become the irreducible, non-negotiable pure state of Christian dogmas, the criteria presiding over the replacement of a European set of terms with Indian ones deemed more fitting to the Indian mind. In theorizing this semi-essentialist character of tradition, Monchanin creates an anti-assimilation stance against the risk of misrepresentation of the revealed mystery, and he protects faith from any sort of hybridity. The fundamental essence of faith and tradition is pure and authentic and autonomous from its cultural cloths: if the path of inculturation is reversed and Christian missionaries liberate themselves from indigenous customs, if they plumb the depths of their faith, then what they will find is fundamentally Christian.

The meeting with India did not pose the greatest threat to Monchanin’s identity, while his encounter with Hinduism forced him to reconsider the possibility of a hybrid tradition. In fact, once Monchanin clashed with Hinduism, he rediscovered his European Christian roots. He called himself “Greek” as a short-cut for the Christian mindset that emerged from the synthesis between biblical narrative and Greek philosophy in the Classic Era. European-based tradition, for Monchanin, paradoxically was reinforced in the process of inculturation, as defined as a difference from the Indian thought. Monchanin’s original notion of a “gravitational center” and successive synthesis of Christian thought in Europe and beyond was replaced by the notion that Greek metaphysics can claim exclusive privilege for interpreting Christian faith. In his mind, Christianity was unencumbered and untouched by the cultural collision birthed by the encounter with Greek philosophy. More importantly, although Monchanin envisioned a project of hybrid identity, semi-essential tradition, and essential faith, he ended up recovering entirely his nativist tradition. In the context of the alternative options between hybridity and purity, Monchanin promoted a form of purity that opposes any form of non-cultural hybridity while also opposing any form of colonialism.

Le Saux’s Contextualist Identity and Tradition

In contrast with Monchanin’s dual identity (French and Indian), le Saux’s identity is a negotiation that fluctuated between fluidity and fixity. Le Saux had multiple identities, hierarchically structured and used strategically according to specific circumstances. He was French and Indian; he was Christian and Hindu. He could identify himself as a Christian and Hindu because, as he pointed out, Christian is a *namarupa*, that is, it operates at level of “name (*nāma*) and form (*rūpa*).” Christian tradition—and Hindu tradition—operates at the level of culture. In other words, for le Saux, there were no non-cultural religious traditions. Every religion is rooted, encapsulated, and expressed in a culture, beginning with the most primordial and hidden archetypes which necessarily govern that religion’s worldview. That suggests that there a kind of primary experience exists, an original consciousness.¹² Le Saux clearly expressed this point in his diary, when he explained how the process from the primary experience to the dogma works.¹³ Le Saux felt deeply the challenge he faced in experiencing and expressing the relativization of religious forms.

The moment in history in which we are living calls us to a stern purification of all our means institutional, intellectual, etc. To recognize the essential beyond all the forms in which it

repeatedly embodies itself...But then, in allowing the forms to yield their place, not to lose anything of the essential. The motives for abandoning forms are so mixed—just as mixed as those for keeping them intact. Who will be able to recognize the Spirit in all its purity? Who will be willing always to want nothing but the Spirit?¹⁴

We recognize the influence of Monchanin's essentialism here. For le Saux, however, there was no pristine state; at the end of the day, the entire tradition is incidental. The line of demarcation between the essential and the incidental coincides with the change of status between the awakening and its articulation (the religious tradition). "There is only the Awakening. All that is 'notional'—myths and concepts—is only its expression."¹⁵

The nature of religious tradition, which epitomizes a fundamental difference between Monchanin and le Saux, is set in the context of missionary discourse. Monchanin takes a conservative position and argues that tradition should arise out of a synthesis of biblical faith and Greek rationality. Le Saux exposed the inadequacy of Monchanin's concentration on an essentialist tradition characterized by purity and its narrow definition of identity. In particular, an essentialist tradition cannot be self-critical or negotiated. In an essentialist tradition there are already the seeds of a hierarchical distinction between the essentialism of the Christian missionaries and the essentialism of the indigenous, because the Christian missionaries control the representation. The hierarchical distinction remains in place when the binary is inverted and a stronger position is given to the indigenous tradition. For le Saux, hybrid tradition can be liberating for the missionary because it allows the emergence of a new tradition, in essence creating conditions for a non-nativist tradition. This new tradition is no longer under the authority of the Christian missionaries and therefore is marked by unpredictability. Hybridity is then not simply the result of an inculturation strategy, but is a tradition that emerges from the interaction between the two nativist traditions. In this space of interaction, there is no longer the possibility of pure tradition, for either the missionary or the indigenous. In this case, hybridity no longer stands for confusion, but rather represents mixing, impurity, and flux. The binary Christian-Hindu vanishes and with it disappears the power of representation of Christian missionaries: the missionary is free from the authority of his Church. The hybrid tradition is a vehicle of emancipation. Le Saux defies categorization, his hybridity embodies ambivalence: he is Hindu-Christian. Hybrids have no stable identities; they are not completely subaltern identities; they are simultaneously compliant and subversive. Inevitably, Le Saux negotiates his identity within the Church. Hybridity creates a liminal space that problematizes simply binary notions of superior/subaltern.

It is in this liminal space that le Saux attempts to create a new, communal, hybrid identity. Offering himself as a model, he calls for his readers' allegiance. The radical disconnection between the subaltern and the superior is precisely what le Saux adopted as a narrative—a narrative that decenters Rome and establishes a new center as the "real" center. Le Saux speaks as a subaltern voice. If the subaltern can speak, however, then that subaltern is no longer a subaltern. While Monchanin constructs a center based on purity and perfection, le Saux constructs a subaltern center (and a subaltern periphery) based on hybridity. In 1969, for example, le Saux played an influential role in the Catholic Church's All-India Seminar in Bangalore, contributing a book-length memorandum on how the Indian Church should be renewed through contact with Hindu sources, through liturgical reform, and through contemplation.¹⁶ In *Towards the Renewal of the Indian Church* (1970), he reminds the Church of the primacy of spiritual values and contemplation.¹⁷ These narratives reify le Saux's position at the center—a position that authorizes and authenticates everything that orbits. If le Saux's position is the subaltern center, then the Indian Church represents in his mind the subaltern periphery. Le Saux is interpreting the Indian Church in a way that marks her as "other" in the relation to the pervading European-based Church (Rome). Thus, for le Saux, the Indian Church is the subaltern periphery. The religious geography between Monchanin

and le Saux firmly creates a center/margin dichotomy where le Saux functions as a “new center” that is produced by hybridity. Le Saux, then, becomes the model for the Indian Church in a reimagined world, where Rome has been displaced as the center by the Indian Church. Hybridity becomes the opportunity for le Saux to create a hybrid community in the midst of a pure, dominant, European-based tradition; however, this is not enough to put the matter to rest.

What exactly does it mean that Le Saux was Christian and Hindu? He wrote that the two traditions, the Hindu and the Christian, are the “two forms of a single ‘faith.’”¹⁸ Which faith was that “single faith”? Le Saux’s identity as one who is “I Am”—(*aham asmi*, “I am Brahman” (Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 1.4.10 of the Yajur Veda) and *antequam Abraham fieret, ego sum*, “Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58)—trumps all of his other nested identities. Le Saux would place his status as “I Am” above being French, Indian, or even being a monk (even if part of his Christianness). In what constitutes le Saux’s central argument against a Roman center, he concentrated on the relationship grace-revelation. Diminishing revelation from the outside and asserting grace from the inside was his goal. Revelation from inside is characterized as doctrinal. The complement to revelation from the outside is grace from the inside. This grace from the inside is—in the context of le Saux’s narrative—the Awakening. Diminishing revelation from the outside and asserting grace from the inside was his goal. His book *Hindu-Christian Meeting Point*, subtitled “Within the Cave of the Heart,” is a translation from the French by Sarah Grant. As she writes in the introduction, this book was written a few months before le Saux’s death, but after his experience of awakening, or “the reality of Upanishads and gospels.” He carefully wrote and scrupulously edited the book, so that it might prove helpful to readers and drive them to “the awakening... to awareness of the truth of their own being.”¹⁹ Accordingly, for le Saux awakening is awakening to a natural state of being. Le Saux devoted much effort to redefining his idea of the awakening, especially in connection with the issue of the extension of the Church and the historical phase in which she stood. The two issues found a connection soon enough, even if a long period of gestation was needed before locating an acceptable degree of completeness. The development of his thought can be followed in a few intermediate passages of his diaries. He says that “the Church is primarily all those men who are in the present state or in the potential state of their awakening.”²⁰ Here le Saux links the Church with the awakening.

As a matter of fact, it is a Pauline move. Paul understood the coming of Christ not only for the twelve tribes of Israel, but also for the disinherited nations, nations that are the result of Yahweh’s dispersal of the nations at Babel (Deuteronomy 32:8-9). Those disinherited should be appreciated with respect to Yahweh’s inheritance, Israel, and the rectifying message of Jesus. Paul saw his ministry as instrumental in bringing back those people from the disinherited nations in Israel, and he interpreted himself as a conduit for their return to the true God: “And so all Israel will be saved” (Romans 11:26). The reality of the emerging Church, the true Israel, including the disinherited nations, displaces the old identities and establishes a new one. In this context, Paul has—similarly to le Saux—multiple identities which he can adjust to accommodate Gentiles, Romans, and Jews, because in the end, Paul’s identity—like the one of Israel’s people—distills to one who is “in Christ.” The unity of those who are in Christ (have faith in Christ) is far more important than adherence to any law.

The same can be said of le Saux’s notion of Church of Awakening: the unity of those who are in Christ (those in the state of their awakening) is far more important than adherence to any religious tradition. Le Saux is self-identified as a Christian or a Hindu in many of his private writings, but his identity in “I Am” is his primary means of self-expression, specifically with himself. As a matter of fact, he identifies himself as “being in Christ,” because “I Am” is Christ’s name. He elaborates his view quite precisely. Le Saux clarifies that “Christ is not a *namarupa*. His true name is I AM.”²¹ So, le Saux is Christian because he is in Christ. He follows Paul in his perspective to address the Gentiles who are *in Christ*. When le Saux writes of his Church of Awakening as “primarily all those men who are in the

present state or in the potential state of their awakening,” his readers are invited to superimpose another facet to their own eventually complex, multiple identities. In other words, le Saux’s call to be part of the Church of Awakening necessitates some reprioritizing of the other facets of his readers’ multiple identities. He urges his readers to put their “being” first, “their awakening,” their “in Christ” first, as he has done, above all other components of their identity.

In Pauline terms, le Saux frames the Church as Israel, Yahweh’s inheritance. For him,

The Church is Israel extended to the Mediterranean world in the setting of the Roman Empire and its successors, but she is hardly extended beyond these limits even to our days. The Church is Israel, which does not recognize anymore the privilege of race and blood to enter the kingdom, but still recognizes members of the Kingdom those who have accepted integration into the human form of society in which she has developed.²²

He reimagines, then, a world where the Church of the Awakening now functions as the true Israel. In his writings, he retells the story of the Church to make a place for the awakened men (and women) as if they are the people of the disinherited nations. These writings capture him in the process of mythmaking, a process that incorporates the awakened people into the story of the Church. Who are these awakened people? He is Christian, and his Church of Awakening falls under the umbrella of Christianity, yet he does not imagine these people as members of the existing Church; in fact, the Church as a symbol is now exploding into symbols that are more powerful, more universal.²³ The Church as Yahweh’s inheritance is replaced by the Church as Yahweh’s all nations. Thinking in terms of multiple identities, it’s likely that le Saux imagines these awakened people as occupying a hybrid identity that is not completely “other” than what they are but is certainly not identical to their previous status. He attempts to provide different ways of being Christian (“being in Christ”), specifically insisting on an apocalyptic rupture introduced by the meeting of Christianity with India, leading to a new Church-order without the doctrinal opposition so characteristic of his current Church.

Conclusion

This article addresses the complex topic of double religious belonging in the context of a mission in India. Two French Catholic priests take a hybrid position as an alternative to a colonial and nativist position. Does religious double belonging operate at the level of faith, religious tradition, or identity? This study of Monchanin and le Saux helps identify religious tradition as the natural candidate. Monchanin’s concentrated use of purity/pollution narrative throughout his writings only accentuates his rejection of any religious double belonging. The universe, for Monchanin, is divided between Christianity and Hinduism, mutually irreducible. Once religious tradition is conceived as rhetorical rather than ritual or doctrinal, the religious barriers of the community are dismantled. The cultural dimension of tradition in le Saux leads to the emergence of a new ecclesial reality, in which Christians are equated with Hindu. In the Church of Awakening, the Christian and Hindu identities are subordinated, superimposed by the status of “being in Christ.”

Notes

1. I thank the editors and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, which helped me to improve the manuscript. For advice and encouragement in my research on this topic, I thank Leonard Fernando SJ, Professor of Church History and Systematic Theology, Vidyajyoti

College of Theology, Delhi, India. Unless otherwise noted, all translations to English in this article are my own.

2. For a basic literature on the topic, see: John B. Cobb, Jr., “Can a Christian Be a Buddhist, Too?” *Japanese Religions* 10, no.3 (1979): 1-20; Peter C. Phan, “Multiple Religious Belonging: Opportunities and Challenges for Theology and Church.” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 495-519; Catherine Cornille (ed.), *Many Mansions? Multiple Religious Belonging and Christian Identity* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2002); James L. Fredericks, “Review: Many Mansions? Multiple Religious Belonging and Christian Identity by Catherine Cornille.” *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 25 (2005): 167-170; Gerard Hall SM, “Multi-Faith Dialogue in Conversation with Raimon Panikkar.” *Australian eJournal of Theology* 2 (February 2004): 1-12; Rose Drew, *An Exploration of Dual Belonging* (New York: Routledge, 2011); Patrik Fridlund, “Double Religious Belonging and Some Commonly Held Ideas About Dialogue and Conversion.” *Mission Studies* 31:2 (2014): 255-279. The concept of “double belonging” is developed in this article through quotations from the recent writings of a number of Western scholars, most of them Roman Catholic theologians or historians of religion. See, for example, Robert Schreiter, who has suggested three distinctive ways in which one might describe double belonging: 1. sequential belonging, in which “a person has moved from one religious tradition to another but retains some traces of the earlier belief;” 2. dialogical belonging, in which “two traditions dwell side by side within the life of a person, and there may be greater or less communication between the two The self that mediates this duality is...seen as . . . a conversation that actualizes now one tradition and then another;” and 3. simultaneous belonging, in which “a person has moved through sequential belonging but then chooses to go back and reappropriate earlier belongings on a par with current allegiances. This reappropriation does not entail subsuming one system into another but rather finding a way for them to coexist beyond dialogical belonging.” He cites Raimundo Panikkar as an exponent of such a position. Robert J. Schreiter, “Christian Identity and Interreligious Dialogue: The Parliament of the World’s Religions at Chicago, 1993”, unpublished paper given as a lecture in the Faculty of Theology of the Free University of Amsterdam on October 28, 1993.
3. Paul Knitter, *Without Buddha I Could Not Be a Christian* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009). While Knitter calls himself ‘a Buddhist,’ Christianity remains the primary source of identity for him. In an interview, he clarified this point: “Definitely the noun is Catholic or Christian; the adjective is Buddhist. My primary identity is Christian.” See: Thomas C. Fox, “Double Belonging: Buddhism and Christian Faith.” *National Catholic Reporter*, June 23, 2010. Accessed January 10, 2016. <http://ncronline.org/news/double-belonging-buddhism-and-christian-faith>
4. Jeffrey Carlson, “Double Religious Belonging: A Process Approach: Responses.” *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 23 (2003): 77-83, 79.
5. While I am aware of the rich scholarship on intersectionality, in this article I am committed to the notion of hybridity. I believe that, in the case of Monchanin and Le Saux, the concept of hybridity, which is less compromised with notions of ‘power’ and ‘domination,’ is more appropriate than intersectionality as a tool for analyzing their experiences.
6. Quoted in Sten Rodhe, *Jules Monchanin, Pioneer in Hindu-Christian Dialogue* (Delhi: ISPCK, 1993), 47.
7. Henri le Saux, *La Montée au Fond du Coeur: LJ journal Intime du Moine Chrétien–Sannyasi Hindou, 1948-1973*. Introduction et Notes de Raimon Panikkar (Paris: OEIL, 1986). Translated as *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, tr. David Fleming and James Stuart (Delhi: ISPCK, 1998), 348 (11.5.72).

8. Jules Monchanin, *Lettres à sa Mère 1913-1957* (Paris : Cerf, 1989), 542.
9. Jules Monchanin, *Théologie et Spiritualité Missionnaires* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1985), 85.
10. Monchanin, *Théologie et Spiritualité Missionnaires*, 86.
11. Monchanin described his farewell meeting with de Lubac, just before his leaving to India (April-May 1939) in a letter to Duperray: "J'ai revu le P. de L..., seul, longuement. Il m'a redit toute son amitié, étant celui qu'il cherchait, réalisant l'intuition qu'il avait eue, dès séminaire: repenser tout à la lumière de la théologie et celle-ci par la mystique, la dégageant de tout l'accessoire et retrouvant, par la seule spiritualité, tout l'essentiel ... Il a surtout aimé mes notes sur l'amour et celles sur l'Inde. Il pense que c'est en me heurtant à l'Inde que je pourrai refaire la théologie, beaucoup mieux qu'en creusant les problèmes théologiques pour eux-mêmes" *Ecrits spirituels, présentation d'Edouard Duperray* (Paris: Editions Le Centurion, 1965), 21-22.
12. John Glenn Friesen, "Abhishiktānanda's Non-Monistic Advaitic Experience" (PhD diss., University of South Africa, 2001), 50.
13. Le Saux, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, 367-71 (2.2.73).
14. James Stuart (ed.), *Swami Abhishiktānanda: His Life Told Through His Letters* (Delhi: ISPCK, 2000), 180 (14.6.66).
15. Le Saux, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, 386 (11.9. 73).
16. Henri le Saux, *All India Seminar: The Church in India Today* (New Delhi: CBCI Centre, 1969).
17. Henri le Saux, *Towards the Renewal of the Indian Church* (Bangalore: Dharmaram College, 1970).
18. Quoted in Jacques Dupuis, *Jesus Christ at the Encounter of World Religions*, tr. by Robert R. Barr (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 90.
19. Henri le Saux, *Hindu-Christian Meeting Point—Within the Cave of the Heart* (Bombay and Bangalore: CISRS, 1969). Reprinted with the author's revisions (Delhi: ISPCK, 1976), 118.
20. Le Saux, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, 317 (25.8.70).
21. Le Saux, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, 357 (10.7.72).
22. Le Saux, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, 124 (6.9.55).
23. Le Saux, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, 373 (17.2. 73).

Bibliography

- Carlson, Jeffrey. "Double Religious Belonging: A Process Approach: Responses." *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 23 (2003): 77-83, 79.
- Cobb, John B. Jr. "Can a Christian Be a Buddhist, Too?" *Japanese Religions* 10, no.3 (1979): 1-20.
- Cornille, Catherine (ed.). *Many Mansions? Multiple Religious Belonging and Christian Identity*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2002.
- Drew, Rose. *An Exploration of Dual Belonging*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Dupuis, Jacques. *Jesus Christ at the Encounter of World Religions*, translated by Robert R. Barr. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.
- Fox, Thomas C. "Double Belonging: Buddhism and Christian Faith." *National Catholic Reporter*, June 23, 2010. Accessed January 16, 2016. <http://ncronline.org/news/double-belonging-buddhism-and-christian-faith>
- Fredericks, James L. "Review: Many Mansions? Multiple Religious Belonging and Christian Identity by Catherine Cornille." *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 25 (2005): 167-170.
- Fridlund, Patrik. "Double Religious Belonging and Some Commonly Held Ideas About Dialogue and

- Conversion.” *Mission Studies* 31, no. 2 (2014): 255-279.
- Friesen, John Glenn. “Abhishiktānanda’s Non-Monistic Advaitic Experience.” PhD diss., University of South Africa, 2001.
- Hall SM, Gerard. “Multi-Faith Dialogue in Conversation with Raimon Panikkar.” *Australian eJournal of Theology* 2 (February 2004): 1-12.
- Knitter, Paul. *Without Buddha I Could Not Be a Christian*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009.
- Le Saux, Henri. *La Montée au Fond du Cœur: Le Journal Intime du Moine Chrétien–Sannyasi Hindou, 1948-1973*. Introduction et Notes de Raimon Panikkar (Paris: OEIL, 1986). Translated as *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart*, tr. David Fleming and James Stuart. Delhi: ISPCK, 1998.
- . *All India Seminar: The Church in India Today*. New Delhi: CBCI Centre, 1969.
- . *Hindu-Christian Meeting Point—Within the Cave of the Heart*. Bombay and Bangalore: CISRS, 1969. Reprinted with the author’s revisions. Delhi: ISPCK, 1976.
- . *Towards the Renewal of the Indian Church*. Bangalore: Dharmaram College, 1970.
- Monchanin, Jules. *Ecrits spirituels*. Edited by d’Edouard Duperray. Paris: Editions Le Centurion, 1965.
- . *Lettres à sa Mère 1913-1957*. Paris : Cerf, 1989.
- . *Théologie et Spiritualité Missionnaires*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1985.
- Phan, Peter C. “Multiple Religious Belonging: Opportunities and Challenges for Theology and Church.” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 495-519.
- Rodhe, Sten. *Jules Monchanin, Pioneer in Hindu-Christian Dialogue*. Delhi: ISPCK, 1993.
- Schreiter, Robert J. “Christian Identity and Interreligious Dialogue: The Parliament of the World’s Religions at Chicago, 1993.” Unpublished paper given as a lecture in the Faculty of Theology of the Free University of Amsterdam on October 28, 1993. Stuart, James (ed). *Swami Abhishiktānanda: His Life Told Through His Letters*. Delhi: ISPCK, 2000.