

Looking back, moving forward: The place of the Engaging Particularities Conference series and the future of comparative theology

Author: Tracy Tiemeier

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),
Boston College University Libraries.

Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Theology Dept., Boston College, 2007

**Looking Back, Moving Forward:
The Place of the Engaging Particularities Conference Series
and the Future of Comparative Theology**

Tracy Sayuki Tiemeier
Loyola Marymount University
30 March 2007

INTRODUCTION

I want to thank Karen Enriquez and the entire planning committee for inviting me to speak with you tonight. It is an incredible honor for me, and not a little bit daunting. When Karen first emailed me with the invitation, I responded, “Are you *sure*? I could get you Jim Fredericks...Wouldn’t you rather have Jim Fredericks? – Jim is at least a *real* comparative theologian?!?” Lucky for me, the planning committee did not change its mind; and so here I am standing before you tonight feeling a little strange, as I know that I’m no longer a graduate student, but I definitely do not feel like a “real” comparative theologian. I confess that I feel a little unqualified and a bit out of my league in opening up this conference. How could *I* be a “keynote speaker” in a room full of people who have struggled with me in my doctoral work, who have been with me in my joys and in my sorrows – and sometimes in late-night karaoke bars singing quite loudly and off-key?!?

What I am happily, though, is *living proof* that there is hope for graduate students out there to finish their dissertations and EVEN to get a job! Believe me, if I can do it, so can you; and I know some of you, in fact, did (congratulations to Dan, Jon Paul, and anyone else I might have missed). So there *are* academic positions out there in comparative theology and interreligious dialogue, and even more opening up every year. The hiring record for Engaging Particularities alums is quite good, and so I feel in great company. I draw on their spirits tonight

as I open up this year's conference and share with you some of my own thoughts on the significance and place of this series.

I suppose that it is also appropriate in this fifth year of the Engaging Particularities conference to pause and reflect on where we've been and where we're headed. In several short years, the conference has become nationally-known, bringing together students from programs all over the country in conversation, support and professional development. In the course of my talk tonight, I will give you a little bit of the history and background of the conference in light of Jesuit initiatives in interreligious dialogue. I will also talk about the development of the conference and its place as an important student forum for innovative research.

The Engaging Particularities conference covers a wide range of methodological and practical concerns in comparative theology, interreligious dialogue, theology of religions and missiology. Because of its format, schedule and focus, the conference is in a unique position to impact these interrelated fields of study. Tonight I focus primarily on the significance of the conference for the future of comparative theology, though I hope that our discussion will also shed light on and include the wider concerns of interreligious dialogue, theology of religions and missiology. As you will see, I believe that there is an important interconnection between all of these fields and the commitment of the Engaging Particularities conference in holding them together is part of its unique personality and power.

BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

The Engaging Particularities conference must be understood in the context of the 1995 Thirty Fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, and particularly in light of the

General Congregation's Decree Five, called *Our Mission and Interreligious Dialogue*.ⁱ Decree Five states, in part:

General Congregation 34 encourages all Jesuits to move beyond prejudice and bias, be it historical, cultural, social, or theological, in order to cooperate wholeheartedly with all men and women of goodwill in promoting peace, justice, harmony, human rights, and respect for all of God's creation. This is to be done especially through dialogue with those who are inspired by religious commitment, or who share a sense of transcendence that opens them to universal values.ⁱⁱ

We realize that God, who wants all people to be saved, leads believers of all religions to the harmony of the Reign of God in ways known only to him.ⁱⁱⁱ God's Spirit is in continuous dialogue with them...An open and sincere interreligious dialogue is our cooperation with God's ongoing dialogue with humanity. "By dialogue we let God be present in our midst, for as we open ourselves to one another, we open ourselves to God."^{iv v}

As a part of the Jesuit commitment to dialogue, General Congregation 34 outlines specific guidelines for its various Jesuit ministries, including Jesuit educational institutions, which direct Jesuit schools to inculcate in their students an understanding of and respect for religions, a valuing of interreligious collaboration, and a deepened personal faith.^{vi} It moreover requests that the Father General consider the establishment of a secretariat for interreligious dialogue.^{vii}

Indeed, the General announced the formation of a secretariat in 1996 with Fr. Thomas Michel coordinating the work. The U.S. initiative began in 1997 with the combined efforts of Fr. Michel and Fr. Frank Clooney.^{viii} In the Spring of 1998, Clooney was appointed by the US provincials to be their first Coordinator for Mission and Interreligious Dialogue. The Coordinator began organizing and developing a network of interested Jesuits and others at work in Jesuit

institutions.^{ix} The first national meeting of the Advisory Committee on Interreligious Dialogue occurred in February of 2000, in St. Louis.^x

My part in this work did not begin until the second national meeting in May of 2001, held in Montreal, for which I was Assistant to the Coordinator for Mission and Interreligious Dialogue and eventual Advisory Board member. During the course of the weekend, in which fifteen people came together from a variety of Jesuit institutions and backgrounds, participants were charged with the task of taking the reflections of the first national meeting the previous year and developing them into a concrete “agenda regarding possible practical initiatives in the United States.”^{xi} Each participant was invited and challenged to come up with specific ideas on how they might promote dialogue in their Jesuit institutions.

As the only graduate student in attendance, I, of course, focused on how we might begin to develop support for graduate students involved in dialogue and mission work. Over the next year, as I worked with Frank Clooney to update contact lists of faculty, administrators and program directors interested in dialogue issues at Jesuit institutions and to compile data on dialogue initiatives in these institutions, I continued to reflect on how to keep my own promise to organize interested graduate students.

A student conference seemed like an obvious answer, and my ignorance about the amount of work that pulling it off would entail was a blessing in disguise. If I knew then what I know now, I might not have undertaken this task in the same year I was studying for my comprehensive exams! Nevertheless, I pushed forward with a small, but fearless, planning committee and we would hold the first Engaging Particularities conference in the Spring of 2003, sponsored by the Jesuit Community of Boston College, the Theology Department and the U.S. Assistancy. The first planning committee included Dan Joslyn-Siemiatkoski and Adrienne Nagy,

and we did it as an experiment without any great plans for continuing the conference in the future (though we did indeed hope it would continue). This event would prove to be the first student conference (indeed, the first conference, period) of its kind. As an all-student conference that was student-led and student-run, it provided an important place for students to present their work and publicly participate in current discussions on interreligious dialogue and mission studies.

We tossed around a number of names for the conference, but ended up settling on “Engaging Particularities: New Directions in Comparative Theology, Interreligious Dialogue, Theology of Religions and Missiology.” Our conference title sought to highlight the significant constructive impact students were already making in these fields, as well as to emphasize what we saw as an important methodological insight of comparative theology, that interreligious encounters ought to be relational, specific and deep encounters with religious persons and traditions.

EVOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE

The Engaging Particularities conference has evolved a lot over its five years of life. In the first year, we focused heavily on Jesuit institutions of higher education, so that we might stay focused on the Jesuit mission and begin developing Jesuit networks of graduate students. In subsequent years, however, we would invite students from other colleges, universities, schools of theology and seminaries, and especially from the local Boston Theological Institute schools, thereby broadening and deepening our conversations. We relied heavily on the contact lists that were initially developed by Frank Clooney. Because the networks of students had not yet been created, we opted for a “top-down” approach, in which we contacted Jesuits, faculty and

administrators in Jesuit schools of higher education and asked them to pass along our conference information to possibly interested students. While this approach got the initial word out, we hoped that future years might move forward largely from the “bottom-up,” where the conference was promoted largely through student word of mouth.

As with any new conference that has not yet developed a name or a distinctive “brand,” as I’ve subsequently learned is the technical term, we were not sure if we would get many quality submissions or if anyone would show up. We really didn’t know what we were doing *at all* and muddled along in our first year, proceeding by intuition and common sense (which, of course, graduate students are notoriously deficient in). In the end, however, I think the conference was a great success, due in large part to what would become a characteristic feature of this series, which is extended and sustained conversation among all the participants over the course of an entire weekend. Paper presentations and responses therefore provided initial starting points and stimulated this wider discussion and collaboration of the group.

Adrienne Nagy notes other successful aspects of the conference that have also endured and become an important part of the landscape of the Engaging Particularities series: first, we were able to raise a surprising diversity of topics and concerns over a short weekend; secondly, because respondents have the paper (at least, theoretically) several weeks in advance, responses were thoughtful and opened up interesting discussions; thirdly, we actually did end up – even in our first year – with some excellent papers and presenters, including participants from Regis College – Toronto, Loyola University – Chicago, Marquette University and St. Louis University; and, finally, the weekend integrated formal presentations and conversations with informal activities, such as dinner, prayer and even an after-hours excursion to a bar to watch the NCAA tournament games of one of our participants’ schools.^{xiii} (I think it was a Marquette Final Four

game. We had a great time; but unfortunately, Marquette lost badly to Kansas.^{xiii} And, yes, I actually looked it up on ESPN.com to make sure I got the teams and the outcome correct! It's a theological research first, at least for me.) The fellowship, in the end, really helped to solidify the kind of deep and lasting relationships we were hoping to create.

Our successes were not without their challenges (we will call them challenges, not "failures" – it sounds better!); though these challenges did become very valuable lessons. Dan Joslyn-Siemiatkoski remembers those challenges largely in terms of framing the contours of the conference itself: How wide a scope would we take? Should we emphasize particular themes, in order to craft a more cohesive conference, or maintain a looser focus simply on specific areas of study?^{xiv} Moreover, because we ended up framing the conference on "new directions" in comparative theology, for example, where exactly was the field so that we would even know where those new directions might be headed and choose sessions appropriately?

Because of the open nature of the conference, papers were to be given to the respondent ideally with enough time for the respondent to think of ways for opening the paper up to the wider group discussion. This, of course, is always a difficulty; for as we all know, getting a paper done in time to present is hard enough (believe me, I know, simply based on trying to get this presentation done in time for tonight!); but getting it to the respondent several weeks in advance is sometimes a Herculean task. Thus, Adrienne Nagy remembers how we had to scramble when we had presenters cancel at the last minute, submit papers to their respondents late, or give them to respondents in a very rough draft or overly long form.

The respondents were charged with the task of opening up the conversation, rather than offering a definitive interpretation of the presentation. This is something difficult for any of us to learn, however, as our tendency in academics is to offer a second paper ON the paper. So, while

we communicated instructions to respondents beforehand, we were sometimes in the difficult position as a group to digest almost too much for one conversation. This abundance of riches, however, was not a big problem, though it did present us with a time concern, as we really wanted the discussion to engage all members of the group and not to be a two-person dialogue. As a result of these challenges, though, that first planning committee learned valuable lessons in refereeing paper proposals, setting up sessions, giving directions to presenters and responders, and mediating disputes over late papers, all the while negotiating the complex logistics of ordering food, managing travel and housing issues, publicizing the event and making last-minute changes to the schedule.

On the one hand, we saw the conference as valuable in learning the ropes of the academic guild together as students, from both ends of making presentations and crafting a response to learning how to be an organizer and planner of such conferences. These tools are invaluable, and in the second case, hard to learn before exiting graduate school. On the other hand, the conference sought to develop a student community of those working and researching in the fields of comparative theology, interreligious dialogue, missiology and theology of religions. Not only does this promote student research, it also develops invaluable networks of students interested in similar (and even not so similar) areas. We ultimately hoped that these relationships would be long lasting, as we left graduate programs and entered the professional world of teaching and research.

The unique atmosphere of this intentional community was worth any irritations and difficulties we experienced as a planning committee. Unlike many conferences where people pop in and out and attend as they are able, we definitely wanted to have a more intense kind of

weekend encounter for people. In this, we were largely successful, and our few failures, or challenges, allowed us to articulate further what kind of conference series this was going to be.

At the end of the weekend, we had the “What next?” meeting. The overwhelming consensus was to hold the conference again the next year, doing a better job at publicizing and crafting sessions, and throwing out a wider net. Thus, for the second conference in 2004, we would include a panel session on feminism and evangelization that was comprised largely of students from Boston University. In addition to BU and the schools represented the previous year, the 2004 conference would also include participants from Fordham University, Weston Jesuit School of Theology, and Jesuit School of Theology – Berkeley. We were again truly able – with a few hitches, as is natural – to create an atmosphere of student collaboration and discussion. At the end of that year’s sessions, it became clear that there was an important place for the Engaging Particularities conference and that it should become an annual event, in some form or another.

In my third and final year, we would move further into the local BTI community by also including participants from Harvard. We had by this time, worked out a lot of the logistical issues in terms of papers, respondents, moderators and the most important element, of course, FOOD; but conferences will always have their individual quirks and kinks, and this one would have an incident that would come to be one of my favorite Engaging Particularities moments. When it comes to presentations and responses, keeping time has always been a concern for us, as with any conference situation. For us especially, though, we wanted presenters and responders to be mindful of their timing, so that we would have plenty of space in the schedule for group discussion. The concern, however, would come to a head in this 2005 conference, when a moderator had to interrupt and cut off a respondent who had gone on too long. Because of the

closeness of everyone involved, in knowing moderators, presenters, responders, and indeed the entire group present, there proceeded to be a silent comedy of shocked faces, winks, nudges and muted laughter that shot all over the room for several minutes straight. It will forever be a classic Engaging Particularities moment, and it was also the first (and only) time that I ever thought a respondent might beat up a moderator. It was a good lesson (and funny, too) for us all in time management and grace under pressure.

This brings me to last year's Engaging Particularities, which saw a sea change in terms of leadership. Karen Enriquez took over as coordinator of the planning committee in the same year that Dr. John Borelli took over as the US Jesuit Conference Coordinator for Interreligious Dialogue and Relations. With this changing of the guard, new minds and fresh perspectives could imagine whole new possibilities for the conference. The conference expanded further to include students from the University of Notre Dame, Catholic University of America, Creighton University, Catholic Theological Union, and St. Michael's College – University of Toronto.

By now the conference had a foothold not only in Jesuit, Catholic and BTI institutions, but also in wider graduate school circles, as is evident by our diverse participant list this year, which continues its relationship with the aforementioned schools and includes students from Union Theological Seminary and Princeton Theological Seminary. Indeed, the schedule this fifth Engaging Particularities conference is better than ever, and promises to be the most enriching, diverse and ecumenical weekend yet. This on-going development and cultivation of relationships within and without Jesuit institutions of higher education is an essential component of the Jesuit mission and commitment to dialogue. For this continued commitment, I owe a debt of great gratitude to Dr. Borelli, Karen Enriquez – and in particular, to Karen's mild case of OCD.

ENGAGING PARTICULARITIES AND THE FUTURE OF COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY

The Engaging Particularities conference series has consistently brought students together to share their research and discuss important theoretical, methodological and practical issues in comparative theology, theology of religions, interreligious dialogue and missiology. As students, we have some very different concerns, but we often have similar background knowledge in the emerging “classics” of contemporary comparative and dialogical orthodoxy. This puts the Engaging Particularities conference and its students in the unique position to bring these fields together, to develop a common discourse and to push the boundaries in more complex and sophisticated ways.

The first time Jim Fredericks asked me to read one of his articles and give him feedback, I almost fainted. Playing it cool, I said, “Of course, no problem. Just give me a copy and I’ll take a look.” But I was terrified: Would I be able to say anything intelligent? The essay was a fascinating study of comparative theology’s significance for dealing with contemporary issues in globalization and our current, so-called “culture wars”; and I was shocked to discover that I was actually able to give him real feedback (and not merely the cooing affirmation of a groupie). As someone who just finished a dissertation that brought together comparative theology and Asian American feminist theology, I was able to give him some tips on emerging theories of the new Empire and on comparison in Asian contexts. The Engaging Particularities conference gave me the strength and space to bring such issues into my comparative theology; and it allows all of us doing new kinds of comparative theology – whether it is ethnographic, oral, ethical, artistic, or liberation-oriented – to come into contact and discuss the possibilities and complexities of our work. Together, we can explore the classical orthodoxy of comparative theology, and also significantly impact and develop this orthodoxy in a supportive environment.

One of the interesting things I noticed at last Fall's sessions of the newly-formed Comparative Theology Group in the American Academy of Religion is that group members (and even us steering committee members) do not agree on what comparative theology is and how best to do it. Here is the Group's loose definition of comparative theology, maintained in its official Statement:

Comparative (Interreligious) Theology is, like other forms of theology as familiarly understood, primarily a matter of faith seeking understanding (or, in some traditions, perhaps "meditative perception" or "insight"), and this faith as enacted in meditation, visualization practice, ritual, and ethical behavior. Like other forms of theology, it is about and for the sake of knowledge of God or, more broadly, the ultimate mystery toward which life points. In a theology that is comparative, faith and practice are explored and transformed by attention to the parallel theological dimensions of one or more other religious and theological traditions. As theology that occurs within the academy, this communal and inter-communal faith and practice are open to the analysis, comment, and questions of both insiders to the involved traditions, and to other scholars, not necessarily defined by such commitments, who are nonetheless able and willing to explore the full range of dynamics of faith seeking understanding in a comparative perspective.^{xv}

The Statement attempts to maintain a self-critical and flexible discourse, and carefully qualifies these initial comments, both here and later in the document,^{xvi} but the apparent Christian framework of "faith seeking understanding" has led to questions about the possible Christian hegemony inherent in comparative theology and to challenges about whether this is an adequate enough definition of the field. Moreover, as is evident from even this short selection, there is a seeming difference of opinion on the role of the religious context (or lack thereof) out of which the comparative theologian herself may or may not speak. These issues were glaringly obvious in

all three of the Group's AAR sessions last Fall. Is comparative theology in the service of apologetics? Is it essentially a Christian practice? What is the appropriateness or significance of faith-commitment in comparative theology? Different presenters seemed to take very different positions on these and other questions. We did not and do not agree.

While agreement on all of these issues is not essential, some sort of agreed-upon framework is important, if only to make clear those places where we do not agree. For this reason, both sessions of the AAR-CT group next November in San Diego will be dedicated to methodological and theoretical questions. Some of the presentations will ask us to broaden our understanding of comparative theology beyond text-analysis to include ethnographic work or visual representation; others will attempt to develop a cross-religious, cross-tradition discourse for engaging comparative work; and another set of presentations will tackle the question of hegemony in comparative theology, offering positions that employ gender and race analyses, address current questions in globalization and insist that an explicit theology of religions must be a part of comparative theology.

A number of these presenters are graduate students and Engaging Particularities alumns. I encourage all of you to attend these sessions next year and to contribute to our discussions, and even more to consider submitting a session proposal when the 2008 Call for Papers is published. Your voices are important and are valued by the Group and its steering committee. We have a listserv you can join and the steering committee is happy to help you develop sessions, ideas and research. Be assured that you have been well-prepared in your education and your work here at this conference to participate in and contribute to this community of scholars. Thus, while the Comparative Theology Group of the AAR and the established "classics" in the field of comparative theology give us an initial starting point, they also make clear in their ambiguity and

plurality that the “orthodox core” of comparative theology – if such a thing exists – is still very much in development and very open for your contributions. The methodological and practical concerns that we discuss in this very conference are therefore concerns that we can – and must – address in wider comparative theology circles.

The networks created by the Engaging Particularities conference are invaluable for more than research development. It also allows for the development of enduring professional and personal friendships. I have consulted with several of you in this very room on different classes I have been teaching over this last year. Several of you have consulted with me over job applications and interviews. Together, we are building relationships that will have lasting effects on our teaching, research and professional lives.

The conversational nature of the Engaging Particularities conference series allows all of us participants to develop ideas together, to test the limits of our beliefs and practices, and to be transformed in encounter. The conference itself, then, not only talks about comparative theology, it provides a model for comparative theology, where theologians and their theologies are transformed in deep encounter and friendship; where insight occurs through those engaged and committed relationships; where the subjective and affective aspects of theology are not divorced from the objective and intellectual; where people disagree, sometimes quite fundamentally with each other, but they also break bread and pray together. To “engage particularities” is to enter into relationships holistically and completely, conversing across boundaries and worlds in dedicated communities of fellowship.

Because issues of comparative theology are brought together with missiology, theology of religions and interreligious dialogue, the Engaging Particularities conference holds together and interrelates important fields of study that are all-too-often ignored in wider circles. It

assumes that these fields can learn important lessons from each other. The allergy for theology of religions that is demonstrated in many current comparative theologies, for example, can lure us into a false sense that the implicit theologies of religions beneath the surface of our theologies are not important to explore or understand. While comparative theology, like all other theologies, supports a variety of positions on the religions, an unsophisticated, naive or unexamined theology of religions can open up comparative theology to the charges of hidden agendas and imperialism.

The historical, cultural and constructive dilemmas that missiology considers further open up comparative theology to understand its own history, project and goals. How do we connect dialogue and proclamation? What role does culture play in theology and faith? How does social justice connect with Christian mission? Such questions clarify the possibilities and limits of comparative theology, as well; and the interrelated sessions of the Engaging Particularities conference allow us to explore such interconnections, and to understand the depth of encounter and the importance and significance of religious boundaries and difference.

Finally, the very concrete, real, and practical considerations involved in interreligious dialogue keep us honest and engaged in the actual faith communities that comparative theology operates among and between. Questions in interreligious dialogue push comparative theology to understand that theological questions are fundamentally about faithful practice and communities of belief, reconnecting interreligious theological encounter with interreligious social collaboration, interreligious spiritual and experiential exchange, and interreligious every-day living.^{xvii} Such diverse interreligious dialogues provide an enriched context for the practices of comparative theology.

CONCLUDING INVITATION

This weekend provides us with a unique opportunity to come together in fellowship and conversation, exploring and interrelating new work in the fields of comparative theology, missiology, theology of religions and interreligious dialogue. The “Comparative Theology” sessions will consider the themes of creation, authority and lordship as Christian scripture and theology is interrelated with ShriVaishnava Hindu, Neo-Confucian, and Daoist texts and thinkers. The “Perspectives on Interreligious Dialogue” panel will offer us multiple models for dialogue, from Pope Benedict XVI’s philosophical or rational approach, to Bede Griffith’s engaged, monastic approach, to the Mennonite Central Committee’s approach in Iran of diaconal dialogue. The “Missiology” session will examine specific examples in 19th and 20th century India and Africa, nuancing, complicating and problematizing our assumptions about the history of missions and the impact local peoples and contexts had on European missionaries. Finally, the session on “Protestant Approaches to Theology of Religions” will deepen our theoretical considerations by exploring new ways of moving beyond the inclusivist, exclusivist, pluralist divide, providing a missional perspective and a renewed discourse for re-thinking Christian normativity and truth claims. These rich papers will all interact in unexpected ways, as we find ourselves converging on topics and threads running throughout our weekend that we will return to and interweave into new possibilities for consideration and debate.

This unrepeatable opportunity must not be wasted. Even now you are asking new questions and posing new challenges in your areas of expertise that will enrich the work of your colleagues and even your mentors. You have the opportunity this weekend to discuss this research, to get feedback from each other, and to collaborate together in a true community of

scholars. In the coming years, you will set the pace for developments in your fields, and I hope you will do so together, beginning here and beginning now.

As an end to my talk tonight, I merely invite you all here to take over where I have left off. In many ways, this talk is an end for me, an end of my student life and my student involvement here with the Engaging Particularities conference series. It is very sad for me, because the collaboration and friendship I have encountered here at this conference over the last four years have been invaluable for me in my personal and professional development. Nevertheless, such endings are necessary for new beginnings. When I handed over the reins to Karen last year and ended my life as a graduate student, I made room for her renewed, more creative conference work. And when Karen steps aside at the end of this year and passes over the reins to Erik Ranstrom, his commitment and leadership will also bring out entirely new possibilities for this conference. Erik, I wish you luck in your future capacity as coordinator of the Engaging Particularities planning committee, and encourage you to continue the work of the past that we have considered here tonight, but also to develop the conference in new ways that meet the changing needs of graduate students working together in comparative, interreligious and missiological work.

I may have ended my student involvement with this conference series, but I begin tonight in a new and exciting mode as a passionately interested and supportive faculty member. I look forward to this new role, to help you publicize your initiatives, to send my students your way for conversation and community, and indeed, to be of service to you in any way I can. This conference is no longer my conference, nor is it for me (though I indeed expect to benefit from your collaborative work here): no, indeed, the Engaging Particularities conference series is your conference, and it is for you to carry forward into the future.

ⁱ Thirty Fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, “Decree Five: Our Mission and Interreligious Dialogue,” Rome, 1995. Full text available at: http://www.jesuit.org/sections/sub.asp?SECTION_ID=192&SUBSECTION_ID=356&PARENT_ID=253.

ⁱⁱ Ibid., 129.2.

ⁱⁱⁱ Cf. Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences, Statement of 20 November 1979, in Rosales and Arévalo, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

^{iv} John Paul II, “Address to the Leaders of non Christian Religions,” Madras, 5 February 1986, AAS 78 (1986): p. 769f.

^v Thirty Fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, “Decree Five,” 133.5

^{vi} Ibid., 145.9.8.

^{vii} Ibid., 155.18.

^{viii} Ray Bucko, SJ, webmaster, “The Jesuit Commitment to Interreligious Dialogue: A History,” <http://puffin.creighton.edu/jesuit/dialogue/background/background.html>, 2000-2006.

^{ix} Ibid. For a report of this phase, see <http://puffin.creighton.edu/jesuit/dialogue/background/phase1.html>.

^x Ibid. For a report of the meeting, see <http://puffin.creighton.edu/jesuit/dialogue/background/phase2.html>.

^{xi} Francis X. Clooney, SJ, “Report on U.S. Assistancy Dialogue Board Meeting,” 18-20 May 2001. See http://puffin.creighton.edu/jesuit/dialogue/events/montreal_may_2001.html.

^{xii} Adrienne Nagy, “Email to Tracy Tiemeier,” 06 March 2007.

^{xiii} See <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncb/ncaatourney03/index>.

^{xiv} Dan Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, “Email to Tracy Tiemeier,” 06 March 2007.

^{xv} “Statement for the Comparative Theology Group for the AAR,” Revised May 2006, II.1. Full text available at: <http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k7562>.

^{xvi} Ibid., II.1-2b, III.

^{xvii} Thirty Fourth General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, “Decree Five,” 131.4.