

对话十诫

宗教对话和意识形态对话的基本原则

列奥纳多·斯维德勒 / LEONARD SWIDLER

这是关于对话十诫 (Dialogue Decalogue) 的“经典”版本，写在“深层对话”这个术语创造出来之前，当然，这个版本着重“脑的对话”（还有“手的对话”、“心的对话”、“圣的对话”——参见拙作“深层对话 / 批判—反思 / 竞争—合作：人类最本真的生存和行为之道”，《普世研究杂志》Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 47, 2 [Spring, 2012], 143-151.) 它的最初版本由刊登在《普世研究杂志》(Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 15, 3 [Summer, 1978], pp. 413f) 中的另一文“宗教对话的基本原则”所提出的四个基本原则，扩展到“对话十诫：宗教对话的基本原则” (Journal of Ecumenical Studies 20,1 [Winter, 1983]:1:4, 到1984年定为“对话十诫：宗教对话和意识形态对话的基本原则”。从那时到现在，它至少以9种语言出了39版。这些常识性的指导原则之所以冠名为“对话十诫” (dialogue decalogue) 是出于便于记忆的考量：至少犹太人、基督徒和穆斯林们都会乐于接受这个词 “decalogue” (十诫)，而且朗朗上口，便于记忆，因为这两个词的英文都以字母D开头。

Dialogue is a conversation on a common subject between two or more persons with differing views, the primary purpose of which is for each participant to learn from the other so that s/he can change and grow. This very definition of dialogue embodies the first commandment of dialogue.

对话是持不同观点的两个人或者两个以上的人之间针对某个共同主题的交谈，其最主要的目的就是让大家彼此学习，从而促进他 / 她的改变和成长。关于对话的最本质定义蕴含在第一条对话诫命中。

In the religious-ideological sphere in the past, we came together to discuss with those differing with us, for example, Catholics with Protestants, either to defeat an opponent, or to learn about an opponent so as to deal more effectively with her or him, or at best to negotiate with him or her. If we faced each other at all, it was in confrontation—sometimes more openly polemically, sometimes more subtly so, but always with the ultimate goal of defeating the other, because we were convinced that we alone had the absolute truth.

过去，当来自不同宗教-意识形态领域的人坐在一起时，比如天主教徒和基督新教徒，人们要么是为了击败对手，要么是为了更有效地了解对手以便对付对方，要么是 为谈判增加砝码。相遇的人们不外乎是为了对抗——只不过有时在言论上更为公开，有时则隐蔽些而已；人们在一起往往是以战胜对方为终极目标，因为他们确信唯有自己是拥有绝对真理的。

But dialogue is *not* debate. In dialogue each partner must listen to the other as openly and sympathetically as s/he can in an attempt to understand the other's position as precisely and, as it were, as much from within, as possible. Such an attitude automatically includes the assumption that at any point we might find the partner's position so persuasive that, if we would act with integrity, we would have to change, and change can be disturbing.

但对话不是争辩。对话者要开明地怀着同情心来聆听对方，因为他 / 她得尝试尽量准确地理解对方的观点，最大可能地从自我出发去了解真相。这种态度自然包含了这种假设，那就是我们会发现对方观点的合理之处，如果我们愿意坦诚面对，那么我们就必须改变，尽管改变令人不安。

We are here, of course, speaking of a specific kind of dialogue, an *inter-religious, inter-ideological* dialogue. To have such, it is not sufficient that the dialogue partners discuss a religious/ideological subject, that is, the “ultimate meaning of life and how to live accordingly.” Rather, they must come to the dialogue as persons somehow significantly identified with a religious or ideological community. If I were neither a Christian nor a Marxist, for example, I could not participate as a “partner” in Christian-Marxist dialogue, though I might listen in, ask some questions for information, and make some helpful comments.

当然，我们这里讲的是某种特殊形式的对话：一种宗教 / 意识形态 “之间” 的对话。为了进行这种对话，仅仅让双方针对某个宗教 / 意识形态的主题，也就 “关于生命的终极意义及据此而采取的生活方式” 这个主题进行讨论是不够的。人们必须以某种宗教或意识形态团体的归属身份来参与对话。比如说，如果我既不是基督徒也不是马克思主义者，那我就不能以 “对话伙伴” 身份参与基督徒-马克思主义者的对话，尽管我可以旁听，可以质询，甚至提出有益的建议。

It is obvious that interreligious, interideological dialogue is something new under the sun. We could not conceive of it, let alone do it in the past. How, then, can we effectively engage in this new thing? The following are some basic ground rules, or “commandments,” of interreligious, interideological dialogue that must be observed if dialogue is actually to take place. These are not theoretical rules, or commandments given from “on high,” but ones that have been learned from hard experience.

显然宗教对话和意识形态对话是当今世界的新生事物。我们不能凭空想象，也不能任凭过去的做法去进行对话。然而我们怎么才能有效地参与进这件新事物呢？下文是宗教对话 / 意识形态对话在现实中发生时必须要遵循的基本原则或 “诫命”。它们不是理论原则，也不是 “从上天” 而来的诫命，而是从痛苦的经验中学习得到的。

FIRST COMMANDMENT: *The primary purpose of dialogue is to learn, that is, to change and grow in the perception and understanding of reality, and then to act accordingly.* Minimally, the very fact that I learn that my dialogue partner believes “this” rather than “that” proportionally changes my attitude toward her; and a change in my attitude is a significant change in me. We enter into dialogue so that *we* can learn, change, and grow, not so we can force change on the *other*, as one hopes to do in debate—a hope realized in inverse proportion to the frequency and ferocity with which debate is entered into. On the other hand, because in dialogue *each* partner comes with the intention of learning and changing herself, one’s partner in fact will also change. Thus the goal of debate, and much more, is accomplished far more effectively by dialogue.

原则1，对话的首要目的是学习，即在感知和理解实在的过程中改变和成长，并据此而行动。在最低限度内，我们了解到对话方所信的是 “这个” 而不是 “那个” 的事实，这可以相应地改变我们对她的态度；态度的改变是我们自身的一种重大改变。我们开始对话，为的是让自己学习，并使得自己得到完善和成长；我们不是像某些人在辩论中希望的那样去强迫他者做出改变——这种希望实现的可能性与辩论的强度和频率成反比。另一方面，因为对话的双方都有向对方学习及改变自己的想法，那么对方也同样会发生改变。因此，辩论以及其它类似的活动，远不及对话所能达到这些效果。

SECOND COMMANDMENT: *Interreligious, interideological dialogue must be a two-sided project—within each religious or ideological community and between religious or ideological communities.* Because of the “communal” nature of interreligious dialogue, and since the primary goal of dialogue is that each partner learn and change himself, it is also necessary that each participant enter into dialogue not only with his partner across the faith line—the Lutheran with the Anglican, for example—but also with his coreligionists, with his fellow Lutherans, to share with them the fruits of the interreligious dialogue. Only thus can the whole community eventually learn and change, moving toward an ever more perceptive insight into reality.

原则2，宗教对话和意识形态对话必须是双边工程——既在每一个宗教团体或意识形态集团之内，也在两者之间。因为宗教对话和意识形态对话是 “团体性” 行为；对话的首要目标是促使每一个对话者自身的学习和改变，它不仅要求所有对话的参与者能跨越信仰——比如信义宗与圣公会对话时——也要求他的同宗者（信义宗的会众们）能分享宗教对话的成果。只有这样，这个团体最终才会学习并改变，同时获得关于实在的更多的敏锐洞见。

THIRD COMMANDMENT: *Each participant must come to the dialogue with complete honesty and sincerity.* It should be made clear in what direction the major and minor thrusts of the tradition move, what the future shifts might be, and, if necessary, where the participant has difficulties with her own tradition. No false fronts have any place in dialogue.

Conversely—each participant must assume a similar complete honesty and sincerity in the other partners. Not only will the absence of sincerity prevent dialogue from happening, but the absence of the assumption of the partner's sincerity will do so as well. In brief: no trust, no dialogue.

原则3，每个参与者都必须怀着绝对的诚实和真诚加入对话。人们要弄清传统中的主次价值会往何处演变，未来会有何种变化，必要的话，参与者甚至要了解自己和自身所处的传统之间的分歧所在。虚伪在对话中没有一席之地。

反过来——每一个对话者必须相信对方怀有同样的诚实和真诚。缺少真诚会妨害对话的展开，对对方所怀真诚的怀疑也会产生同样的后果。总之，没有信任就没有对话。

FOURTH COMMANDMENT: *In interreligious, interideological dialogue we must not compare our ideals with our partner's practice,* but rather our ideals with our partner's ideals, our practice with our partner's practice. For example, compare the former Hindu practice of burning live widows (*suttee*) with the Christian former practice of burning witches and *auto da fe*'s.

原则4，在宗教和意识形态对话中，人们不能用己方的观念来衡量对方的实践，而应用己方的观念来比较对方的观念，用己方的实践来比较对方的实践。比如，人们只能将过去印度教焚烧寡妇（殉夫）的历史事实和基督宗教焚烧女巫及宗教裁判所的历史事实进行比较。

FIFTH COMMANDMENT: *Each participant must define himself.* Only the Jew, for example, can define what it means to be a Jew. The rest can only describe what it looks like from the outside. Moreover, because dialogue is a dynamic medium, as each participant learns, he will change and hence continually deepen, expand, and modify his self-definition as a Jew—being careful to remain in constant dialogue with fellow Jews. Thus it is mandatory that each dialogue partner define what it means to be an authentic member of his own tradition.

Conversely—the one interpreted must be able to recognize herself in the interpretation. This is the golden rule of interreligious hermeneutics, as has been often reiterated by the “apostle of interreligious dialogue,” Raimundo Panikkar. For the sake of understanding, each dialogue participant will naturally attempt to express for herself what she thinks is the meaning of the partner's statement; the partner must be able to recognize herself in that expression. The advocate of “a world theology,” Wilfred Cantwell Smith, would add that the expression must also be verifiable by critical observers who are not involved.

原则5，每一个参与者需要定义自己。以犹太人为例，只有犹太人能够从内部定义成为犹太人意味着什么，其他人都只能从外部对犹太人是什么进行描述；另外，因为对话是一种动态媒介，每一个参与者都在学习和改变，并不断深化、拓展和修正各自作为犹太人的自我认知——并在与犹太同胞不断的对话中审慎地保持自己的身份。因此，对话双方都必须对成为自身所在传统的真正一员意味着什么进行界定。

反过来——被诠释的一方在此过程中必须得到认同。这是跨宗教诠释学的金科玉律，也是被“跨宗教对话的使徒”潘尼卡（Raimundo Panikkar）反复重申的规则。为了理解达意，对话的参与者自然要表达自己对对方之陈述的理解，而对方也必须理解该番表述。“世界神学”的倡导者史密斯（Wilfred Cantwell Smith）还补充说，该理解表述还应该得到那些对话以外的挑剔的观察家们的认同。

SIXTH COMMANDMENT: *Each participant must come to the dialogue with no hard-and-fast assumptions as to where the points of disagreement are.* Rather, each partner should not only listen to the other partner with openness and sympathy but also attempt to agree with the dialogue partner as far as is possible

while still maintaining integrity with his own tradition; where he absolutely can agree no further without violating his own integrity, precisely there is the real point of disagreement—which most often turns out to be different from the point of disagreement that was falsely assumed ahead of time.

原则6，每一个对话者在参与时，必须放弃那种会引起分歧的僵硬前提。每一个对话者不仅要开明地怀着同情心聆听对方的声音，也要在保全自身传统整全性的基础上尽可能地认同对方。当遇到很认可对方但又必然侵害自身的整全性——这里恰恰正是分歧所在——的时候，人们最后常常会发现分歧点并非如此，它们不过是先前的错误设想

SEVENTH COMMANDMENT: *Dialogue can take place only between equals—both coming to learn, or “par cum pari” as Vatican Council II (1962-65) put it. Both must come to learn from each other. Therefore, if, for example, the Muslim views Hinduism as inferior, or if the Hindu views Islam as inferior, there will be no dialogue. If authentic interreligious, interideological dialogue between Muslims and Hindus is to occur, then both the Muslim and the Hindu must come mainly to learn from each other; only then will it be “equal with equal,” par cum pari. This rule also indicates that there can be no such thing as a one-way dialogue. For example, Jewish-Christian discussions begun in the 1960s were mainly only prolegomena to interreligious dialogue. Understandably and properly, the Jews came to these exchanges only to teach Christians, although the Christians came mainly to learn. But, if authentic interreligious dialogue between Christians and Jews is to occur, then the Jews must also come mainly to learn; only then will it too be par cum pari.*

原则7，对话只能在平等的双方之间——彼此抱着学习的态度，或者如梵二会议（1962-1965）所说的，在“par cum pari”（以平等对平等）的基础上展开。走向对话是为了互相学习。因此，举个例子，如果一个穆斯林认为印度教教徒低人一等，或者一个印度教教徒认为穆斯林低人一等，那么对话是不可能发生的。若要在穆斯林和印度教教徒之间形成真正的跨宗教意识形态的对话，双方都得秉承彼此学习这个主要目，只有在这个条件下，它才会是“平等对平等”的对话。这条规则同样表明，不存在任何单向的对话。就拿犹太教徒-基督徒之间在20世纪60年代展开的讨论来讲，其充其量只是宗教对话的前奏。犹太人走向对话只是为了教训基督徒，而基督徒则冲着学习而来——这个评价很好理解，也很恰当。但是，若要基督徒和犹太教徒之间形成真正的对话，犹太教徒也必须主要冲着学习而来，只有这样，对话才会以平等对平等来展开。

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT: *Dialogue can take place only on the basis of mutual trust: approach first those issues most likely to provide common ground, thereby establishing human trust.* Although interreligious, interideological dialogue must occur with some kind of “communal” dimension, that is, the participants must be involved as members of a religious or ideological community—for instance, as Marxists or Taoists—it is also fundamentally true that it is only *persons* who can enter into dialogue. But a dialogue among persons can be built only on personal trust. Hence it is wise not to tackle the most difficult problems in the beginning, but rather to approach first those issues most likely to provide some common ground, thereby establishing the basis of human trust. Then, gradually, as this personal trust deepens and expands, the more thorny matters can be undertaken. Thus, as in learning we move from the known to the unknown, so in dialogue we proceed from commonly held matters—which, given our mutual ignorance resulting from centuries of hostility, will take us quite some time to discover fully—to discuss matters of disagreement.

原则8，对话只能在互相信任的基础上展开：对话首先要涉及那些最可能达成一致的议题，由此来建立人际信任。尽管宗教意识形态对话只能在某种“团体性”的层面实现，也即参与者都要以某个宗教团体或意识形态集团的成员——比如道家或马克思主义者——的身份参与，从根本上说只有人才 能参与对话。人际间的对话只能建立在人际信任的基础上。因此，对话一开始就处理最棘手的问题很不明智，人们应该首先解决那些能够提供共同平台、并由此建立信任基础的议题。如此，人际信任才会逐步加深并扩展，而那些棘手的事情也会逐渐迎刃而解。这样，我们通过学习从已知到未知，在对话中从共识——就那些数个世纪以来累积的敌意所造成的彼此的忽视，将使得彼此颇费时日才能充分发现——到对于那些有争议的讨论。

NINTH COMMANDMENT: *Persons entering into interreligious, interideological dialogue must be at least minimally self-critical of both themselves and their own religious or ideological traditions.* A lack of such self-criticism implies that one’s tradition already has all the correct answers. Such an attitude makes dialogue not only unnecessary, but even impossible, since we enter into dialogue primarily so *we can learn—*

which obviously is impossible if our tradition has never made a misstep, if it has all the right answers. Surely, in interreligious, interideological dialogue one must stand within a religious or ideological tradition with integrity and conviction, but such integrity and conviction must include, not exclude, a healthy self-criticism. Without it there can be no dialogue—and, indeed, no integrity.

原则9，当进入宗教对话和意识形态对话的时候，我们起码得掌握对自我以及对自身宗教或意识形态传统最低限度的自我批判的方法。这种自我批判意识的缺乏，隐含着我们自己的传统已经具备所有问题的正确答案的妄念。这种态度令对话失去必要性和可能性，因为我们进入对话主要是为了我们能够学习——如果自己的传统拥有所有正确的答案，永远不会有失策的地方，那显然就无需学习了。确实，宗教对话和意识形态对话的参与者都必须怀着正直和信念矗立在自身的宗教传统或意识形态传统中，但是这种坦诚和信念必须要涵盖而不是排斥那种健康的自我批判精神。缺乏这种精神就不能有对话——事实上，也不可能有正直。

TENTH COMMANDMENT: *Each participant eventually must attempt to experience the partner's religion or ideology "from within,"* for a religion or ideology is not merely something of the head, but also of the spirit, heart, and “whole being,” individual and communal. John Dunne here speaks of “passing over” into another’s religious or ideological experience and then coming back enlightened, broadened, and deepened [Cf. John S. Dunne, *The Way of All the Earth* (New York: Macmillan, 1972)]. While retaining our own religious integrity, we need to find ways of experiencing something of the emotional and spiritual power of the symbols and cultural vehicles of our partner’s religion/ideology—and then come back to our own, enriched and expanded, having experienced at least a little of the affective side of our partner’s religion or ideology.

原则10，每个人最终都必须试图“从内部”体验对方的宗教或意识形态。一种宗教或意识形态并不仅仅是和头脑有关的，它同样也和灵性、心灵以及“存在整体”相关；而且它既具有个体性的维度，也具有团体性的维度。约翰·顿（John Dunne）建议一个人应该“跨越”到他人的宗教或意识形态的经验中去，然后再以一种受启发、拓展和升华的状态回归[参见John S. Dunne, *The Way of All the Earth* (New York: Macmillan, 1972)]。当保持了自身宗教整全性之时，我们还需要寻找不同的方式去经验对话伙伴的宗教符号/意识形态符号以及相关文化载体所承载的情感灵性力量——然后反求诸己，回到那个深化并扩展了的自我，回到那个至少经历过宗教或意识形态对话伙伴的某些情感层面的自我。

Interreligious, interideological dialogue operates in *four areas*—the “Dialogues of the Head, Hands, Heart and Holy”: the *practical* (Dialogue of the Hands), where we collaborate to help humanity; the *aesthetic/spiritual* (Dialogue of the Heart) where we attempt to experience the partner’s expressions of beauty and her/his religion or ideology “from within”; the *cognitive* (Dialogue of the Head), where we seek understanding and truth, and the fourth, the *integrative area* (Dialogue of the Holy).

宗教对话和意识形态对话在四个领域——“头脑、手、心和圣的对话”领域展开：第一，实践领域（手的对话），在此人们彼此合作共助人类；第二，审美/灵性领域（心的对话），在此人们努力“从内部”体验对方的审美表达以及宗教或意识形态；第三，认知领域（头脑的对话），在此人类寻求领悟和真理；第四，整全性领域（圣的对话）。

Interreligious, interideological dialogue has *three major phases* (its more detailed *Seven Stages* are outlined at www.dialogueinstitute.org/dialogue-resources). In the *first* phase we *unlearn misinformation* about each other and begin to know each other as we truly are. In phase *two* we begin to discern values in the partner’s tradition and wish to appropriate them into our own tradition. For example, in the Buddhist-Christian dialogue Christians might learn a greater appreciation of the meditative tradition, and Buddhists might learn a greater appreciation of the prophetic, social justice tradition—both values traditionally strongly, though not exclusively, associated with the other’s community. If we are serious, persistent, and sensitive enough in the dialogue, we may at times enter into phase *three*. Here we together begin to explore new areas of reality, of meaning, and of truth, of which neither of us had even been aware before. We are brought face to face with this new, as-yet-unknown-to-us dimension of reality only because of questions, insights, probings produced in the dialogue. We may thus dare to say that patiently pursued dialogue can become an instrument of new “re-velation,” a further “un-veiling” of reality—on which we must then act.

宗教对话和意识形态对话有三个阶段（更详细的七阶段说见www.dialogueinstitute.org/dialogue-resources）。在第一个阶段，人们抛弃有关对方的错误信息，开始了解对方的真实面目。在第二个阶段，人们开始思考对方传统所具的价值，并希望能将之恰如其分地吸纳进自己的传统中。比如，在佛耶对话中，基督徒们可能会更欣赏佛教的冥想传统，而佛教徒则可能更欣赏基督宗教的先知批判传统和追求社会公义的传统——这些价值都由很强的传统维系，但又不具有排外性，可以与对方团体结合起来。如果人们严肃、执着并敏锐地对待对话，那么就会进入对话的第三个阶段。在第三个阶段，人们开始探讨实在、意义、真理以及其它人类没有意识到的新领域；正因为这些对话中的问题、洞见和追问，人类开始面对这些崭新但目前未知的实在层面。我们方得如此说：人们耐心寻求的对话正在成为一种新的“启示”（re-velation的拉丁文词根velare的意思是“遮盖”、“蒙上”）工具，成为一种对实在（我们的行动依据）的更深刻的“去蔽”（un-veiling）。

There is something radically different about phase one on the one hand and phases two and three on the other. In the latter we do not simply add on quantitatively another “truth” or value from the partner’s tradition. Instead, as we assimilate it within our own religious/ideological self-understanding, it will proportionately transform our self-understanding. Since our dialogue partner will be in a similar position, we will then be able to witness authentically to those elements of deep value in our own tradition that our partner’s tradition may well be able to assimilate with self-transforming profit. All this of course will have to be done with complete integrity on each side, each partner remaining authentically true to the vital core of his/her own religious/ideological tradition. However, in significant ways that vital core will be perceived and experienced differently under the influence of the dialogue; but, if the dialogue is carried on with both integrity and openness, the result will be that, for example, the Jew will be even more authentically Jewish and the Christian even more authentically Christian, *not despite* the fact that Judaism and/or Christianity have found and adapted something of deep value in the other tradition, *but because of it*. There can be no talk of a “syncretism” here, for syncretism in the pejorative sense means amalgamating various elements of different religions into some kind of a *confused* whole without concern for the integrity of the religions involved—which is not the case with authentic dialogue.

对话的第一阶段和第二、三阶段有一些根本性的差异。我们不能简单地说是后两个阶段只是数量上加入了另一种来自对话者传统的“真理”或价值。相反，因为我们是在自己的宗教/意识形态的自我理解中消化了它们，因此它们也会相应地塑造我们的自我理解。我们的对话伙伴也有类似的观点，如此我们就能够真正地见证出某些自身传统中的深层价值要素，也许它们会对我们的对话伙伴的自我提升有益而被他们吸纳。当然，所有这些都只能在双方全然的整全性上展开，每一方都要真正忠实于各自宗教/意识形态传统中的最核心价值。然而，人们将在对话的影响力下，以特别的方式、从不同角度来感知和经验这些最核心价值；如果对话以开明地怀着坦诚之心展开的话，以犹太教—基督宗教对话为例，结果自然是犹太人更像犹太人，基督徒更像基督徒，不是不在乎犹太教和/或基督宗教已然发现并吸纳了对方传统的某些深层价值，而是正因为它们的吸纳才会令各自更像自己。我们这里并不是讲某种“综合主义”，因为综合主义挺危险，意味着将不同宗教的各种因素混合在一起，变成某种令人困扰的集合，全然不顾相关宗教的整全性——这可不是真正对话的应有之义。