Types of Interreligious Dialogue

Sergey Melnik

The existing classifications of types of interreligious dialogue have limitations and shortcomings and do not allow us to describe this extremely complex, multi-faceted phenomenon in a systematic and complete way. The article presents an original classification of interreligious dialogue that provides a more sophisticated tool for analyzing this phenomenon. On the basis of the "intention" criterion, i.e. the motivation that encourages followers of different religions to come into contact with each other, four major types of interreligious dialogue are "polemical," "cognitive," "peacemaking," and "partnership". These types of dialogue are lined up respectively around the following questions: "Who is right?", "Who are you?", "How can we live together peacefully?" and "What can we do to improve the world?" Using the criteria goal (tasks headed towards by the participants in the dialogue); principles (starting points which determine the interaction), and form (participants in the dialogue), various kinds of dialogue within each of the four types are identified and described. Presented classifications provide an approach that can be useful for analyzing various kinds of interreligious dialogue.[1]

Keywords: interreligious dialogue, classification, interfaith relations, types, peacemaking, cooperation, diplomacy, theology, comparative theology, theology of religions, state-religion relations.

Religion plays an important role in the life of contemporary societies all over the globe. According to Peter Berger, the world is "as furiously religious as it ever was, and in some places more so than ever"[2]. The scholar argues that modernity gave rise not to secularization, but to pluralism—which implies coexistence of and close interaction between adherents of various value systems and worldviews within one society. Becoming particularly essential in today's interdependent and interrelated world is the task of exploring a complex of problems pertaining to the establishment of positive relationships between followers of different religions, which is usually called "interreligious dialogue."

Interreligious dialogue as a scientific problem

Religious leaders, politicians and experts often mention interreligious dialogue in their speeches; yet, the interpretation of this notion can vary greatly. Catherine Cornille, a specialist in interreligious dialogue, notes that

> The term dialogue tends to be used to cover a wide range of engagements between religious traditions, from daily interaction between believers living in the same neighborhoods to organized discussions and debates between expert scholars, and from formal or casual exchanges between spiritual or institutional leaders to inter-religious activism around social issues. The goals of particular

---

[2] Peter Berger, "Deseculariation of the world: a global overview," in *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*, ed. Peter Berger (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center, W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1999), 2.

dialogues may differ—from peaceful coexistence to social change and from mutual understanding to actual religious growth.[3]

Terrence Merrigan believes that interreligious dialogue falls into a category of terms that everyone uses but no one is able to explain[4]. In this regard, he writes:

> "dialogue" is perhaps the most ambiguous term in the vocabulary that has developed around the challenge to religions posed by globalization and pluralization. Scratch the surface of this term and a whole range of interrelated issues make their appearance, including questions about the precise aims of dialogue, the appropriate (or necessary) conditions for dialogue, the topics to be discussed (or avoided) during dialogue, the criteria for evaluating the success (or meaningfulness) of dialogue, and so on.[5]

He, along with many other researches, points to a problem caused by the fact that interreligious dialogue is a complex, many-faceted phenomenon.[6] Hence, classification of forms of interreligious dialogue becomes an urgent research task.

The best-known attempt to devise such classification was made by the Roman Catholic Church. It highlights the following four types of interreligious dialogue: dialogue of theological exchange (theological dialogue; dialogue of study); dialogue of religious experience (dialogue of spirituality, spiritual dialogue); dialogue of action; and dialogue of life.[7] Theological dialogue is aimed at exploring another religion, at trying to comprehend how it views these or those issues, and often entails drawing a comparison with one's own doctrine. Within the framework of the dialogue of theological exchange, "specialists seek to deepen their understanding of their respective religious heritages, and to appreciate each other's spiritual values."[8] The spiritual dialogue implies very close acquaintance with another religion, even to the extent of using its spiritual practices, and its goal is often seen as "mutual enrichment." As the document *Dialogue and Proclamation* notes, within the framework of "the dialogue of religious experience . . . persons, rooted in their own religious traditions, share their spiritual riches, for instance with regard to prayer and contemplation, faith and ways of searching for God or the Absolute." The dialogue of action is a joint activity of believers working towards common goals, such as, for instance, rendering aid to the needy. In the dialogue of action, "Christians and others collaborate for the integral development and liberation of people." By the dialogue of life, the Catholic classification denotes contacts between ordinary believers of different religions in the course of everyday life (at work,

---

[3] Catherine Cornille, "Introduction," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-religious Dialogue*, ed. Catherine Cornille (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2013), xii.

[4] Terrence Merrigan, "Introduction. Rethinking Theologies of Interreligious Dialogue," in *The Past, Present, and Future of Theologies of Interreligious Dialogue*, ed. Terrence Merrigan and John Friday (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2017), 2.

[5] Merrigan, *Introduction. Rethinking Theologies of Interreligious Dialogue*, 2.

[6] Marianne Moyaert, "Interreligious Dialogue," in *Understanding Interreligious Relations*, ed. David Cheetham, Douglas Pratt and David Thomas (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 201–12.

[7] *Dialogue and Proclamation: Reflection and Orientations on Interreligious Dialogue and the Proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Document of Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue*,
https://w2.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/documents/rc_pc_interelg_doc_19051991_dialogue-and-proclamatio_en.html.

[8] *Dialogue and Proclamation*

between neighbors, between parents at school, etc.). The dialogue of life takes place "where people strive to live in an open and neighborly spirit, sharing their joys and sorrows, their human problems and preoccupations."[9]

Each of the aforementioned kinds of dialogue corresponds to the "level" at which it is carried out: "head" (using intellectual abilities for exploring another religion), "heart" (gaining insight into the perspective of another's religious experience), "hands" (undertaking practical activities), and "daily life." For this reason, the theological, spiritual, and practical kinds of interreligious dialogue are sometimes respectively called "dialogue of head," "dialogue of heart" and "dialogue of hands."

Table 1. Catholic classification of interreligious dialogue

dialogue of theological exchange (theological dialogue, dialogue of study)	dialogue of head
dialogue of religious experience (dialogue of spirituality, spiritual dialogue)	dialogue of heart
dialogue of action (practical dialogue)	dialogue of hands
dialogue of life	

While providing structure to various forms of interfaith interaction, the Catholic classification has its shortcomings. For instance, it does not take into consideration some important forms of interfaith relations. Left aside in this classification is a polemical aspect of interfaith interaction, i.e. disputes over the trueness of religions. This topic will be examined below. Describing the Roman Catholic classification of the types of interreligious dialogue, Marianne Moyaert suggests adding "diplomatic dialogue" to the four types within this classification.[10] Such kind of interreligious dialogue, i.e interaction between heads of religious communities and other high-ranking official representatives, mainly finds its expression in the form of numerous interfaith forums, summits, conferences, and sessions of respective councils and commissions receiving the widest press coverage. The Catholic approach places interreligious dialogue in the context of discussion of theological problems and puts forward "spiritual dialogue" as the "true dialogue" which leads to the changes in participants' views as a result of the meeting. Presumably, this is the reason why contacts between officials, often formal and leaving aside doctrinal problems, found no reflection within the framework of the Catholic classification of the types of interreligious dialogue. At the same time, the diplomatic interreligious dialogue is widespread and essential for the present-day interfaith relations, Therefore, it requires special attention and consideration. So, one of the shortcomings of this classification is that it devotes no attention to the diplomatic interreligious dialogue. This is just one of many examples.

Besides, the kinds of dialogue presented in the Catholic classification are too general and can point to rather different forms of interfaith interaction. Some universities practice the so-called "intergroup" interreligious dialogue. It implies that students not only explore each other's religious traditions and participate in organized conversations, but also engage in socially beneficial activities

---

[9] *Dialogue and Proclamation*
[10] Moyaert, *Interreligious Dialogue*, 203–04.

("multi-faith action").[11] Yet, this practical work, for instance, in a campus territory, does not only mean that those involved in the dialogue strive to make the world around them better, for professionals or hired staff would do the job more successfully. The importance of such cooperation is in an opportunity that working together provides to young people for a deeper acquaintance with each other, for establishing friendly relationships. So, in this case joint activities are important not so much due to the results that can be achieved, but rather as a means to harmonise relations between adherents of different religions. The latter example shows that the emphasis on the "level" at which the dialogue is carried out ("dialogue of hands" in this case) sometimes does not clarify the essence of interfaith relations. The form is the same, but the goals are different. We should add that social changes can be attained not only by means of practical activities, i.e. "hands," but also by means of "word"—through joint statements, researches, or simply cordial handshakes in public between religious leaders setting an example of friendly relationships. Furthermore, the notion of "theological dialogue" is too broad. It can include both fundamental concepts of theology of religions describing a problem of correlation between various religions in the context of such categories as trueness and salutariness (Karl Rahner's concept of "anonymous Christianity") and, at the same time, a comparison between concrete specific aspects of religious worldviews.

The basic principle of the Catholic classification lies in revealing which aspect of human nature is involved in the dialogue to the maximum possible extent: intellectual ("head"), emotional and sensual-volitional ("heart"), or active ("hands"). However, the "spiritual dialogue" implying deep immersion in another religion and "enrichment" can be rejected by many believers as inadmissible from the perspective of their religious beliefs. For example, the Turkish religious studies scholars representing the Islamic position spoke negatively of the "spiritual dialogue," noting the incomprehensibility for them of the tasks and importance of such dialogue and expressing cautious attitude towards it, seeing in such dialogue the Catholicism's concealed attempts at proselytism.[12] Indeed, disputable is a premise that other religions can be a source of spiritual enrichment for a believer, that for a purpose of "spiritual development" one has to immerse in another religion and use its spiritual practices rather than gain a deeper insight into his/her own. Moreover, some Catholic experts present the model of relationships, which corresponds to the principles of the spiritual dialogue as the true dialogue to be pursued in promoting interfaith relations.[13] Although, we will note once again, such "spiritual dialogue" can be rejected by many believers as inadmissible.

It is obvious that while the aforementioned four types of dialogue within the Catholic classification give an idea of a variety of interfaith relations and some of its major forms, this classification is too general to provide enough instruments for the comprehensive description of the sphere of interfaith relations as a whole. When it comes to the number of dialogue types, scholar Sallie B. King offers the broadest classification, distinguishing seven types of dialogue: official,

---

[11] Islam N., Steinwert T., Diane Swords D., "3Dialogue in Action: Toward a Critical Pedagogy for Interfaith Education," *The Journal of Interreligious Studies*. Issue 13 (2014): 4–10.

[12] R. Catalbaş, K. Cetinkaya, "Interreligious Dialogue in the Views of Turkish Historians of Religions," *HTS Theological Studies* Vol. 71, 3 (2015): 1–6. DOI: 10.4102/hts.v71i3.2896.

[13] Leonard Swidler, "The Dialogue Decalogue," J*ournal of Ecumenical Studies 20, 1 (1983): 1–4,* https://dialogueinstitute.org/dialogue-principles

parliamentary-style, verbal, intervisitation, spiritual, practical, and internal[14]. We will not go into details describing this classification, but will just point out the following. King adds to the three major types of dialogue from the Catholic classification (practical, theological and spiritual) the "official dialogue" and two concrete forms of contacts between representatives of different religions: "parliamentary-style" and "intervisitation." She also introduces "internal dialogue" to describe individual acquaintance with other religions.

For the most part, the "official dialogue" corresponds to the "diplomatic" dialogue. At the same time, by using this name King places emphasis on who enters into interreligious dialogue—an official or representative of a religious community's administrative structures, rather than just an ordinary believer who has no responsibilities. King notes that the official dialogue is chiefly aimed at preventing ethno-confessional conflicts and harmonizing relationships between religious communities by means of maintaining diplomatic contacts. However, that is not always true. For instance, official representatives of the Roman Catholic Church can engage in joint prayers or issue such official documents as *Nostra aetate*, which contain conceptual theological reflections on certain problems of interreligious dialogue. That is to say, the label "official dialogue" does not clarify its content. The same can be said about the parliamentary-style dialogue: it is just a form that can be laden with various meanings. On the whole, it makes sense to consider it as a kind of "official dialogue," since engaged in it, as a rule, are official high-ranking representatives of religious communities.

The notions of "practical" and "spiritual" dialogue are borrowed by King from the Catholic classification. At the same time, she uses the term "verbal" to describe the dialogue which is aimed at the comparative study and understanding of another religion and traditionally known as "theological." It seems that the very use of the term "verbal" is caused by a desire to emphasize that interreligious dialogue is not at all limited to a conversation, but can include practical activities, emotional content, and innermost reflections on the correlation between religions, and can facilitate spiritual growth. So, apparently, King wants to point out that dialogue is a very broad phenomenon and its verbal expression is just one of its possible aspects. And yet, the parliamentary-style dialogue, for example, finds its major expression in speeches. In this, as well as in many other types of dialogue, speech is involved. For this reason, the term "verbal" does not seem the most appropriate. Once again, we see that a specific label for dialogue, verbal in this case, can have different meanings.

Characteristically, the "monastic dialogue" often viewed by scholars as an illustrative example of "spiritual dialogue," in King's classification becomes an example of "intervisitation." Again, this notion gives no idea of the goals and principles of the dialogue it denotes. We should make a distinction between, on the one hand, a visit of an official leader of a Christian community to an Islamic educational institution, where he may speak about common challenges facing religions, including a problem of interaction with the secular consciousness, and, on the other hand, Catholic monks living in Buddhist monasteries and using spiritual practices of another religion. While by its form the monastic dialogue implies "reciprocal visits," by its meaning and principles of interaction it can be regarded as "spiritual dialogue." King's approach in general lacks a

---

[14]Sallie B. King, "Interreligious Dialogue," in *The Oxford Handbook of Religious Diversity*, ed. Chad Meister (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 102. King cites Diana Eck, "What do we mean by dialogue?," *Current Dialogue.* December (1986): 5–15.

common attribute for distinguishing different types of dialogue. That is why, strictly speaking, what she presents is not a classification, but an unsystematic enumeration of various possible forms of dialogue. Problematically, their names often do not clarify their content, which can be very diverse.

There are other classifications of interreligious dialogue: by Eric J. Sharpe (discursive, human, secular, interior dialogue), Paul O. Ingram (conceptual, socially engaged, interior dialogue), Jeannine Hill Fletcher (activist, parliament, storytelling models of dialogue), Oddbjørn Leirvik (spiritual and necessary dialogue).[15] By the logic of their arrangement, the classifications of Sharpe and Ingram are similar to the Catholic framework. We will not go into detailed analysis of these classifications, but will only note that each of them uses such names for determining different kinds of dialogue that cannot be found in other ones. It shows that in describing interreligious dialogue numerous separate approaches are used, resulting in the lack of certainty and clarity.[16] As we demonstrated, even the best-known and broadest classifications of interreligious dialogue have significant shortcomings. Interreligious dialogue is, indeed, a complex and many-faceted phenomenon. It is characteristic that King comes to the conclusion that in view of different factors of influence that must be taken into consideration, "there can be no standard list of types of dialogue" at all.[17]

Table 2. Classifications of interreligious dialogue

Eric J. Sharpe	Catholic classification		P.O. Ingram
Human dialogue	dialogue of life		–
secular dialogue	dialogue of action	dialogue of hands	socially engaged dialogue
Discursive dialogue	theological dialogue	dialogue of head	Conceptual dialogue
interior dialogue	spiritual dialogue	dialogue of heart	interior dialogue

An approach that helps scholars systematize various kinds of interreligious dialogue and present their typology would be promising for the understanding of the phenomenon of interreligious dialogue in general. However, the Catholic classification and other existing approaches have limitations and shortcomings and, therefore, do not provide adequate and complete description of this phenomenon.[18] That is to say, the description of interreligious dialogue in a wide variety of its possible forms constitutes a scientific problem which has not lost its topicality to this day. Presented below is an approach that uses more sophisticated and delicate instruments

---

[15] Eric J. Sharpe, "The Goals of Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *Truth and Dialogue: The Relationship between World Religions*, ed. J. Hick. (London: Sheldon Press, 1977), 81–82. Paul O. Ingram, "Christian–Buddhist dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-religious Dialogue*, 388–89. Jeannine Hill Fletcher, "Women in Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-religious Dialogue*, 168–84. Oddbjørn Leirvik, "Philosophies of interreligious dialogue: Practice in search of theory," *Approaching Religion*, Vol. 1 (2011): 16–24.

[16] Sergey Melnik, "Klassifikacii tipov mezhreligioznogo dialoga: analiz sushhestvuyushhix podxodov [Classifications of Types of Interreligious Dialogue: Analysis of Existing Approaches]," *Gosudarstvo, religiya, cerkov` v Rossii i za rubezhom* 4 (2018): 87–118 (In Russian). doi: https://doi.org/10.22394/2073-7203-2018-36-4-87-118

[17] Sallie B. King, "Interreligious Dialogue," in *The Oxford Handbook of religious diversity*, ed. Chad Meister (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 102.

[18] Sergey Melnik, "Klassifikacii tipov mezhreligioznogo dialoga: analiz sushhestvuyushhix podxodov [Classifications of Types of Interreligious Dialogue: Analysis of Existing Approaches]," *Gosudarstvo, religiya, cerkov` v Rossii i za rubezhom* 4 (2018): 87–118 (In Russian). doi: https://doi.org/10.22394/2073-7203-2018-36-4-87-118

in developing a classification of interreligious dialogue and therefore, should be helpful in providing a more versatile and detailed description of different kinds of interfaith relations.

Four types of interreligious dialogue

The basic criterion that I propose to use for the classification of interreligious dialogue is "intention," i.e. motivation which encourages followers of different religions to come into contact with each other. The existing classifications and approaches focus on the forms, in which interreligious dialogue can be expressed, and sometimes on its tasks and other aspects, while the issue of motivation by itself does not become a topic for reflection and is left aside. Religion as worldview and value system is characterized by a tendency to assert its uniqueness and is organically integral and self-sufficient. Therefore, from the perspective of religious consciousness, possible motivations for a believer to enter into dialogue with adherents of other religions are rather limited, and their clarification is essential for understanding the character of interreligious dialogue. On the basis of the *intention* criterion, I distinguish four major types of interreligious dialogue: polemical, cognitive, peacemaking and partnership. Using such criteria as *goal* (what tasks do participants in interreligious dialogue set themselves?), *principles* (what principles lie behind the interaction?), and *form* (who participates in the dialogue and in what form is it expressed?) different kinds of each of the dialogue types can be identified and described.

Such criteria as "intention," "goal," and "principles" are, roughly speaking, theoretical or conceptual. They describe a particular way, framework, mode of interfaith interaction—what we denote as "kinds of dialogue" in our classification. As for the *form* criterion, it shows which actual examples pertain to a particular kind of interreligious dialogue. Of course, each of the kinds can be illustrated by numerous examples. Further on, in describing interreligious dialogue in the context of the *form* criterion, I will give one or several examples for each kind of dialogue under examination.

Table 3. Classification criteria.

Criterion	
1. **Intention**	What encourages followers of different religions to come into contact with each other?
2. **Goal**	What tasks do participants in interreligious dialogue set themselves?
3. **Principles**	What principles lie behind interfaith the interaction?
4. **Form**	Who participates in the dialogue ("high," "middle" / "conceptual," "grass root" levels), what is its form of expression?

To the extent that religions assert the uniqueness of their founders and sacred texts, their traditions can be considered not just as coexisting, but also as contradicting and competing worldview systems. An attempt to spread or defend one's faith may serve as an intention for adherents of different religions to come into contact with each other. The *goal* of polemical dialogue is to propagate one's religion, to urge the opponent and audience of the dispute from the opposite side to admit erroneousness of their beliefs, to realize preferability of the other religion and, ideally, to convert to it.

Polemical dialogue is based on two principles: firstly, belief in one's religion's uniqueness and conviction that, in one way or another, followers of other traditions are mistaken and deluded; secondly, determination to defeat the opposing side in the dispute and to demonstrate superiority of one's religion and groundlessness of the opponent's position. There are specific topics and "problematic points," as well as settled argumentation and counter-argumentation strategies that have been used repeatedly in polemical dialogue without any significant changes for centuries. For example, Christian apologists over and over again responded to objections of Jews and Muslims over such issues as God's Oneness and Trinity (that the teaching on God the Trinity is not polytheism), possibility of the Divine Incarnation, mission of Jesus Christ, obligatory circumcision, original sin, seeming similarity between veneration of icons and idolatry, and importance of monasticism and church sacraments.[19]

Polemical dialogue can find its expression in the *form* of disputes during meetings between believers (both ordinary laypeople and prominent theologians), as well as in the *form* of respective writings. The history of religion also knows many examples of polemical discussions that were later recorded. For instance, in 1263 in Barcelona, in the presence of King James I of Aragon an interreligious disputation took place between Dominican Friar Pablo Christiani, a convert from Judaism, and a well-known Rabbi Moshe Ben Nahman (Nachmanides, *Ramban*). The latter was declared "the winner."[20]

Nowadays, representatives of different religions continue to engage in polemical dialogue. For instance, in Eastleigh alleys, Kenia, a phenomenon of street debates is spreading. The debaters, local Christians and Muslims, argue over dogmatic topics:

> In the debates, young adults contest, defend, and project the superiority of their religion over the other. For instance, some Muslim youth tell their Christian counterparts that the word Islam means peace and thus that Christians should convert to Islam if they are truly peaceful. Such public acts of contention underscore the mistrust and hostility that defines Muslim–Christian relations in Eastleigh. In addition to street-level quarrels, some notorious clerics have been known to consistently incite hatred in their followers.[21]

There is a concept, widely spread among western scholars, that regarded as interreligious dialogue can only be the interaction of "positive," "constructive" forms: "the category of inter-religious dialogue may then be used to refer to any form or degree of constructive engagement between religious traditions."[22] It should be noted that in this context the term "positive" is seen as something allowing to establish better relations between religions, i.e. less conflicting and more harmonious. But, for example, a Christian saint of the second century, Justin Martyr, wrote *Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew*, in which he described a polemical exchange with a Hellenized Jew on the veracity of Christianity.[23] Such understanding of the term "dialogue" goes back to the dialogues of

---

[19] Daniel Madigan, "Christian–Muslim Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 247–49.
[20] "Disputation of Barcelona" in *American-Israeli Cooperative Enterprise & Encyclopaedia Judaica*, last modified 2008, https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/disputation-of-barcelona
[21] A. Rink, K. Sharma, "The Determinants of Religious Radicalization: Evidence from Kenya," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 62 (6) (2018): 1232.
[22] Cornille, Introduction, xii.
[23] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho (*Pickerington: Beloved Publishing, 2015).

Socrates, whose aim was to reveal the truth. A thesis that the model of polemical dialogue is a thing of the past and is practically not to be found in the present-day practice of interfaith relations also seems disputable. This assertion is only true for the interreligious dialogue between officials, which is to a large extent of diplomatic character, and for the academic discussion, albeit not in all cases. To laypeople and theologians, to any thinking believer, such topic as trueness of their religion and soundness of its ideas does not and cannot lose its relevance, given the diversity of religious traditions and forms of religious experience and emergence of new religious movements. For this reason, in considering the present-day interfaith relations the polemical aspect should not be left aside. Now, same as before, it can have different forms, starting from disputes between ordinary believers and ending with theologians' writings, implicitly or explicitly polemizing with other religions.[24]

We should also clarify that the overcoming of religious diversity through debate and conclusive shared apprehension of the truth can be viewed as one of the positive forms of interfaith relations. Yet, such interaction can be characterised as "truth-seeking dialogue," which we will examine below as a kind of cognitive dialogue. In some of its forms the polemical and the truth-seeking dialogue can take up adjacent position and be closely related. At the same time, the aim of entering into the polemical dialogue is not to apprehend the truth, but to spread one's own understanding of truth, to demonstrate superiority of one's own religion and, ideally, to convert an opponent to one's own faith. Renunciation of one's beliefs and claims and acceptance of some common ideas happen very seldom in the course of such debates. So, we should distinguish the polemical dialogue as a separate independent kind of interfaith relations from the truth-seeking dialogue.

At the same time, one cannot but admit that polemical dialogue, as a rule, does not help bring people closer together, but, on the contrary, implies that people are driven by a desire to "defeat" the opponent, and therefore can provoke antagonism and confrontation. We will not go beyond brief description of the goal, principles and forms of polemical dialogue and will devote more attention to the types of interreligious dialogue that have been developing at the present-day stage, the beginning of which we trace back to the late nineteenth century.

To followers of different religions, "striving to cognize" the other, which even Aristotle regarded as the main characteristic of human nature, may constitute an intention to come into contact. Such cognitive interreligious dialogue can arise out of intellectual curiosity, the striving to clarify some ideas and concepts of other religions and to talk about truth and purpose of life. Besides, studying other traditions helps deepen the understanding of one's own faith.

Catholic Professor Leonard Swidler, in reflecting on the outlook prerequisites for the worldwide importance and scale of interreligious dialogue throughout the twentieth century, points to a global change in human consciousness, comparing it with Thomas Kuhn's concept of epistemological paradigm shift. Swidler ascribes the expansion of interreligious dialogue to the recognition and development of some new intertwined gnoseological principles: historicism (historical and cultural conditionality of concepts of truth), intentionality (focus on action), sociology of knowledge (social and historical conditionality of thinking), limitations of language,

---

[24] Seraphim Rose, *Orthodoxy and the Religion of the Future* (Platina: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 1975).

hermeneutics (problem of interpretation), and dialogue (dialogical nature of cognition and thinking).[25]

What serves as a major incentive to interreligious dialogue at present is the awareness of inevitability of coexistence of believers belonging to different traditions and topicality of the task to preserve peace amidst religious diversity, as well as of the high-degree interconnection and interdependence of the contemporary global civilisation. Hence, the goal of the peacemaking interreligious dialogue is to prevent conflicts and bring about and maintain peace and accord between followers of different religions.

Finally, the awareness that there is too much human suffering in the world can also serve as motivation for entering into interreligious dialogue. Religion plays an important role in the life of contemporary societies all over the globe. Adherents of different religions can combine their efforts in order to render aid to the needy, to make their everyday life together more comfortable, and to attain desired social changes. Such cooperation of believers in the spheres of common interest is carried out within the framework of partnership dialogue.

It is worth noting that the motivation behind peacemaking and partnership dialogue is very similar. Here dialogue is aimed at maintaining peace and harmonious joint life of the faithful of different religions. In this context, interreligious dialogue is seen as an instrument of preserving social peace and accord and resolving different practical issues related to the coexistence of followers of various religions (peacemaking and partnership dialogue). The focus of peacemaking and partnership dialogue is on the interaction of religions as social institutions, on the ways to ensure their harmonious coexistence. Besides, the strengthening of peace can be considered as one of the possible problems which requires for its resolution cooperation between believers within the framework of partnership dialogue. These two types of dialogue, peacemaking and partnership, can conjoin in the course of interfaith meetings. For instance, the Religions for Peace Tenth World Assembly, held in Lindau August 20–23, 2019, explored the theme *Caring for our Common Future—Advancing Shared Well-Being*. The Assembly's sub-themes were "Caring for Our Common Future by Advancing Positive Peace," "Caring for Our Common Future by Preventing and Transforming Conflicts," "Caring for Our Common Future by Promoting Just and Harmonious Societies," and "Caring for Our Common Future by Protecting the Earth." The former two sub-themes fit into the category of peacemaking dialogue; the latter two (Promoting Just and Harmonious Societies, Protecting the Earth), into the category of partnership dialogue.

Despite their similarities, we should differentiate between the motivations behind the peacemaking and the partnership dialogue: overcoming of conflicts (on the one hand) and cooperation between believers for the sake of peace advancement (on the other). Peacemaking is a separate independent sphere of interreligious dialogue. Using as an example the Religions for Peace Assembly, we can note that during its work meetings were organised between representatives of various countries' conflicting sides, who practised different religions. Sitting at a negotiating table were representatives of conflicting sides from Myanmar, Bangladesh, Congo, South Sudan and other countries. Discussed at those meetings was how their participants, who belonged to different religions, could help ease the tension caused by a conflict in their country and attain peace. It is

---

[25] Leonard Swidler, "The History of Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 10–13.

not the same as cooperation between religions aimed, for example, at helping restore rain forests – the topic considered during the Assembly's last panel on Protecting the Earth. In this case religions combined their efforts and presented a united front, so to speak, in order to bring about changes in society. So, the motivations behind the peacemaking dialogue (contribution to conflict resolution) and the partnership dialogue (cooperation aimed at advancing peace) are closely related, but nonetheless different.

It is also important to realise that the word "intention," used to describe one of the classification criteria, is a specific term that requires additional explanation and a certain extent of abstracting,and should not be interpreted only in its literal sense. Classification of interreligious dialogue is a theoretical framework, helpful for analysing social phenomena. The "intention" criterion does not so much describe motivations for engaging in dialogue of specific people (which can change, such that the result of the dialogue may not correspond to its initial intention, and so on), as it allows us to distinguish its four fundamental types in the course of theoretical analysis. "Intention" as a classification criterion is an answer to a theoretical question: what can actually encourage a bearer of religious consciousness to reach out to another religion? (Or, why should a religious person enter into a dialogue?) Four possible answers to this question are given. Based on them, we can delineate four major types of dialogue. That is, with a glancing understanding we can state, applying the "intention" criterion, that interreligious dialogue can be "something about disputes aimed at proselytism," "something about cognizing each other," "something about promoting peace among people," or "something about joint activity." Then, based on the other criteria, in each of these spheres, "topics" or "types," as they are called in the article, we can distinguish various kinds and describe them. Thus, using the "intention" criterion, we can distinguish polemical, cognitive, peacemaking, and partnership types of dialogue by considering which of the following questions is being addressed: Who is right? How can we live peacefully together? Who are you? and What can we do to make the world a better place?

Below we will consider major types of cognitive, peacemaking, and partnership types of dialogue on the basis of such criteria as *goal*, *principles* and *form*.

Table 4. Types of Interreligious Dialogue.

1. Polemical dialogue	3. Peacemaking dialogue
(Who is right?)	*(How can we live peacefully together?)*
2. Cognitive dialogue	4. Partnership dialogue
(Who are you?)	*(What can we do to make the world a better place?)*

Kinds of cognitive interreligious dialogue

Dialogue of theological exchange (theological dialogue) and *dialogue of religious experience* (spiritual dialogue) mentioned above within the framework of the Catholic classification fall into the category of cognitive dialogue.

The *goal* of theological dialogue is to gain understanding of another religion, which implies mutual examination, respectful exchange of opinions, clarification of positions on particular doctrinal or ethical issues and their comparison with postulates of one's own faith. Participants in interreligious meetings often note that acquaintance with other religions allows them to look at

their own faith from a new perspective and to understand it better. To them, it is an important aspect of such dialogue. Sallie B. King's outline includes the following *principles* of theological dialogue, recognized by the majority of experts: ability "to listen, to hear the words of the other;" competent knowledge of one's own religion; refusal to enter into dialogue "with the intention or desire of converting one's dialogue partner;" freedom from "preconceptions of where the dialogue will lead;" "respect equal of other;" and readiness to hear critical remarks about one's own tradition. As she demonstrates, all these principles can be derived from and substantiated according to Hans-Georg Gadamer's concept of philosophical hermeneutics.[26]

Classified as theological dialogue can be numerous meetings enabling participants to acquaint themselves with concepts of other religions and compare them with those of their own. As an example of theological dialogue, we can mention the international Confucian-Christian conferences held in Hong-Kong in 1988 and in Berkeley in 1991. Those meetings and collected presentations published as their follow-up mark the beginning of the present-day stage in the dialogue between Christianity and Confucianism. The following topics were discussed at the conferences: comparison of what Christianity calls relations between God and the world with what Confucianism calls interaction between "humaneness" ("ren") and "heaven" ("tian" or "dao"); personal and public ethics; and relationship between nature and human being. Among other issues raised within the framework of the Confucian-Christian dialogue was whether Confucianism is a religion.[27] Another vivid example of theological dialogue is the 2014 collection of research papers entitled *Handbuch christlich-islamischer Dialog.*[28] In some of its chapters, a Christian and a Muslim set forth their religions' position on various topics, namely, concept of God, Holy Scripture, humankind's place in creation, suffering, ethics, human rights, family, eschatology, and so on.

The *goal* of spiritual dialogue is often defined as "mutual enrichment," "spiritual and personal growth" of its participants.[29] Many *principles* of spiritual dialogue are identical with those of theological dialogue, since they both imply the striving to cognize another worldview and way of thinking. At the same time, in spiritual dialogue emphasis is made on a deeper insight into the other spiritual tradition and on one's own transformation during the process of interaction. Catherine Cornille has written at length about the principles of spiritual dialogue, distinguishing virtues of the practitioner as follows: *epistemological humility* ("recognition of the very possibility of change or growth within one's own tradition"), *commitment* (to one's own religion), appreciation of the *interconnection of religions* (recognition of universal value of religious teachings), *empathy*, and *hospitality* ("recognition of actual truth in another religion and hospitality toward integrating that truth in one's own tradition").[30]

As an example of spiritual dialogue, scholars often mention the Monastic Interreligious Dialogue, in which many Roman Catholics have been engaged. One of its pioneers was Thomas

---

[26] King, *Interreligious Dialogue*, 101–114.

[27] John Berthrong, "Christian–Confucian Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 296–310.

[28] *Handbuch christlich-islamischer Dialog*, ed. Volker Meißner and Martin Affolderbach and Hamideh Mohagheghi and Andreas Renz (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag, 2014).

[29] Leonard Swidler, "The 'Dialogue of Civilizations' at the Tipping Point: The 'Dialogosphere'," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 50, 1 (2015): 6.

[30] Catherine Cornille, "Conditions for inter-religious dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 20–33.

Merton (1915–1968), a Roman Catholic monk who embraced the Buddhist meditation practices in Japan, Sri Lanka, and Tibet. Behind the desire to acquaint himself with the eastern religious figures and spiritual traditions was disappointment in the monastic Order of Trappists, to which he belonged. Despite doctrinal differences between Christianity and Buddhism, Merton discovered that, at the level of religious experience, believers have much in common. By the end of his life, Thomas Merton had come to the conclusion that the Christian monasticism was in need of reforms by means of the so-called "contemplative dialogue," which included Christians' engagement in Buddhist spiritual techniques. Merton's work was continued by Henri Le Saux (Swami Abhishiktananda), Jules Monchanin (Swami Paramarubyananda) and Bede Griffiths. They looked at the Christian doctrine and spiritual experience through the lens of India's religions, founded special ashrams, and practiced neo-Christian spiritual techniques which, they taught, could be very useful for the spiritual development of Christians themselves.[31] Henri Le Saux was ordained into *sannyasa* and thus became a monk both in the Roman Catholic and Hindu traditions.

In 1978 the Roman Catholic Church set up commissions for monastic inter-religious dialogue in Belgium and the USA, which made a significant contribution to the promotion of dialogue between Catholicism and religions of Asia. One of the commission's major initiative was a project of East–West Spiritual Exchanges. As part of this project, groups of Catholic and Zen Buddhist monks lived in one another's monasteries for a certain period and then shared their experience. During the first exchange that took place in 1979, when Buddhist monks from Japan lived for some time at Christian monasteries in Europe, a symposium on The Monk as Universal Archetype was organised, at which the main speaker was Raimon Panikkar. During the second exchange in 1984 Catholic monks lived at Zen monasteries in Japan. One of the participants in that exchange, Father Abbot Simone Tonini, said: "At a deeper level, persons rooted in their own religious traditions can share their experiences of prayer, contemplation, faith and duty, as well as their expressions and ways of searching for the Absolute. This type of dialogue can be a mutual enrichment and fruitful cooperation for promoting and preserving the highest values and spiritual ideals of man."[32] After the third meeting (held in 1987), Pope John Paul II honored its participants, including forty Japanese monks, with his personal audience.[33]

Another example of the spiritual Catholic-Buddhist dialogue is the so-called "Gethsemani Encounter." The first meeting took place in 1996 at Gethsemani Abbey, the Trappist monastery in Kentucky, USA. Participants in the Gethsemani Encounter initiative believe that

> specific meditative and contemplative prayer techniques lead Buddhist and Christian practitioners to a unitive experience of an Absolute Reality named differently by Buddhists and Christians that both transcends as it is simultaneously immanent within all things and events at every moment of spacetime. This experience, known in Christian mystical theology as 'apophatic' experience, is unitary in structure for both Buddhists and Christians. During such experiences, subject–object differentiations and conceptual differences utterly drop away from consciousness so that reality, the way things really are in

---

[31] Pierre-Francois Bethune, "Monastic Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 37.

[32] Ibid., 39.

[33] Ibid., 40.

contrast to the way our egos wish or desire things to be, is apprehended without doctrinal boundaries"[34].

Eric J. Sharpe wrote about "human" dialogue (which he also calls "Buberian") that can be regarded as yet another form of cognitive dialogue.[35] Human dialogue implies that there is the fundamental method of perceiving the other—not as a soulless object of one's kind, "It,"—but as a personality of intransient value and unique individuality with which one needs to establish living I-Thou relations. Those engaging in human dialogue strive to see in the representative of another religion not a bearer of certain "beliefs" and "concepts," but, first of all, a human being as he/she is. In this regard Eric J. Sharpe writes: "Human ("Buberian") dialogue . . . assumes that it is possible for human beings to meet purely and simply as human beings, irrespective of the beliefs that separate them."[36] It is worth noting that, in terms of the Catholic classification, human dialogue can be compared to the "dialogue of life" (while it requires additional explanation, when it comes to the principles of classification these types tally).

The *goal* of human dialogue is to establish personal contact with a believer of another religion. Discussed in the course of human dialogue can be doctrinal and social problems, religious experience and any other topics of interest for its participants. The content of discussion can be less important than the very act of meeting. Human dialogue is based on such *principles* as empathy, respect for the partner's unique identity, and striving to learn the other's experience perspective. Scholars also pointed to the following principles of interaction desirable for successful implementation of human dialogue: "equality of level" (that is, there should be no substantial differences in participants' status), common goal formulated together, support from influential non-governmental and religions organisations, voluntary, repeated and long-continued contacts, and recognition of the interaction as the constructive one by all its participants.

As an example of "human dialogue" we can mention the "storytelling model" of interreligious dialogue practiced by women. Feminist scholar Jeannine Hill Fletcher points out that the dialogue between women belonging to different religions is characterised by the tendency of "telling life stories," i.e. interest in their own experience, in faith as a way of life, rather than a system of beliefs expressed in scriptures and doctrine. According to Hill Fletcher, attention to the way faith manifests itself in everyday life and affects it and to the way religion is seen through the filter of a person's biography, as well as discussion of person-centric topics within the "storytelling model" of dialogue "build the bonds of friendship necessary for theological conversations or action plans."[37]

It seems helpful to clarify distinctions between the theological and the human dialogue, since during interfaith meetings these two types can sometimes conjoin. Eric J. Sharpe notes that the theological dialogue (he uses the term "discursive dialogue") "involves meeting, listening, and

---

[34] P. O. Ingram, "Christian-Buddhist Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 388–89
[35] Erick J Sharpe, "The Goals of Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *Truth and Dialogue in World Religions*, 77–95.
[36] "Dialogue of Religions," in *Encyclopedia.com*, last modified August 2020,
https://www.encyclopedia.com/environment/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/dialogue-religions.
[37] Jeannine Hill Fletcher, "Women in Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 168–184.

discussion on the level of mutual competent intellectual inquiry."[38]. So, the theological dialogue is the "dialogue of head," which implies that intellectual activity predominates. As for the human dialogue, it implies extended personal contact with a representative of another religion.

Let us give one more example of the theological dialogue to demonstrate its difference from the human dialogue. Established in 1997, the Joint Russian-Iranian Commission for Orthodoxy-Islam Dialogue holds sessions by turns in Tehran and Moscow once in two years on average. The Commission's primary focus is on discussing various problems pertaining to the role of religion in the life of society. Its meetings have been devoted to such topics as "The Role of Interreligious Dialogue in International Relations" (Tehran, 2001), "Interfaith Dialogue and Cooperation as Instruments for Achieving Lasting and Just Peace (Moscow, 2016), "Religions and Environment" (Tehran, 2018).[39] Yet, at some of the sessions the Commission members have discussed theological topics, such as "Eschatology and Its Influence on the Present-Day Life" (Tehran, 2006) and "Teaching on God and Man in Orthodoxy and Islam" (Moscow, 2008). The two latter meetings can be characterised as theological dialogue: expert participants delivered addresses on various aspects of the notion of eschatology from the perspective of the Christian and Islamic doctrines. Theological and academic presentations focused on the concept of God in each of the two religions. Participants had an opportunity to ask follow-up questions and exchange opinions on the topic under discussion. The speeches of such meetings can be collected and published. So, it is an intellectual activity, through which participants gain deeper insight into another religion and, perhaps, determine similarities and differences of religious worldviews. While in session, such meetings provide food for thought. However, when all speeches have been delivered, the meeting has been adjourned, and its participants have shaken hands, it is possible that there will be no communication between them thereafter. That is, no sustained personal contact is involved in it, contrary to the human dialogue.

Evidently, the "storytelling model" of interreligious dialogue mentioned above as an example of the human dialogue is another kind of relationship. Having established friendly relations, female believers can discuss various topics, including those that have nothing to do with religion (for example, their families, clothing, work, and so on). Of course, they can also discuss doctrinal issues; but then this intellectual endeavour could be characterized as theological dialogue. If they want to organize some social activities (for example, to render support to a needy social group), then such interaction will be characterized as partnership dialogue. So, while the human dialogue can conjoin with other types of dialogue in the course of interfaith meetings, boundaries between those various types can shift. Therefore, this aspect of interfaith relations should be denoted as a separate.

Scholars also write about "truth-seeking dialogue" or "dialogue of truth" that can be regarded as yet another form of cognitive dialogue.[40] It seems that setting search for truth as a possible *goal* of dialogue traces back to the dialogues of Socrates. In this context, joint efforts of different religions' followers to seek the truth should comply with the main *principles* of Socratic

---

[38] Dialogue of Religions, *Encyclopedia.com*, last modified August 2020,
https://www.encyclopedia.com/environment/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/dialogue-religions
[39] The ninth meeting of Joint Russian-Iranian Commission for Orthodoxy-Islam Dialogue takes place in Tehran, Department for external church relations of the Moscow Patriarchate, last modified 2020, https://mospat.ru/en/2014/08/27/news107162/.
[40] Moyaert, *Interreligious Dialogue*, 203.

dialogue: truth as a problem, which implies a possibility of seeking it; clarification of the partner's position; doubt; argumentation; persuasion; acquiring new knowledge or theses as the result of the discussion to be accepted by its participants, and so on. At the same time, some researchers have noted that such Socratic model of dialogue, suggesting objective discussion of a particular issue, is ideal but not to be found in the practice of interfaith relations in view of its impossibility in discussions on dogmatic topics between the faithful. The reason is that a believer is emotionally and existentially interested in the outcome of the dispute, and continued commitment to one's faith even, perhaps, by the act of will, despite logically faultless arguments of the opponent, can be considered as a virtue by religious consciousness.

The interreligious truth seeking dialogue can take place when the experts engaging in it try to find out together whether certain hypotheses are true or not, or reflect on the essence of some phenomenon, for instance, terrorism under the banner of religion. *On the Peace of Faith* by Nicholas of Cusa can serve as an example of the theological writing that describes a discussion between believers corresponding to the Socratic model of the objective search for truth.

One can learn about another religion not only when meeting with representatives of other spiritual traditions, but also individually, by reading sacred texts. Various problems pertaining to the study of other religions from the perspective of a believer were conceptualized in such discipline as comparative theology, founded by Francis Clooney, is a new research area originating from within Christian theology. The major *goal* of comparative theology is to study another religion with the view of understanding it and comparing with one's own. It corresponds, first of all, to theological dialogue. At the same time, Francis Clooney points out that comparative theology can be considered in the three following aspects: as comparing theological systems of different traditions; as raising and resolving theological issues on purely theological grounds in the comparative context; as new "constructive" theology emerging as the result of comparative analysis of different religions' theology.[41]

The fundamental *principle* of comparative theology is emphatic study of another religion. That is, one strives to cognize internal methodology and hermeneutics intrinsic to the spiritual traditions under examination, rather than to interpret them in the context of a particular research paradigm.[42] Comparative theology manifests itself in the *form* of research works focusing on the comparative study within different religions of such topics as, for example, concepts of God, holiness, grace, revelations, afterlife, and so on. This is an actively developing research field. Besides the works of Francis Clooney himself, we can mention *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam: Basis for Interfaith Dialogue* by Máire Byrne.[43]

---

[41] Francis X. Clooney, "The Emerging Field of Comparative Theology: a Bibliographical Review (1989–95)," *Theological Studies* 56, 3 (1995): 521–50.

[42] In addition, study of other religions should be academic and conform to the criteria of scientific objectivity. Lately, a number of scholars have highlighted the prospects of using principles of philosophical hermeneutics formulated by Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur in comparative theology. Paul Hedges, "Comparative Theology and Hermeneutics: A Gadamerian Approach to Interreligious Interpretation," *Religions* 7, no. 1 (2016): 1–20, https://doi.org/10.3390/rel7010007. Marianne Moyaert, "Ricoeur and the wager of interreligious ritual participation," *International Journal of Philosophy and Theology* Vol. 78, is. 3 (2017): 173–199.

[43]Maire Byrne, *The Names of God in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam: Basis for Interfaith Dialogue* (London, N. Y.: Continuum, 2011).

Although there are certain similarities and affinity between comparative theology and interreligious dialogue, they are, after all, different phenomena. Comparative theology is a sphere of academic theological studies, intellectual framework, it does not need to involve actual interaction between people, while interreligious dialogue focuses on conversation between believers, and these conversations have theological constituent.[44] Clooney explores the relationship between comparative theology and interreligious dialogue by using the "dialogue of study" concept (or "theological dialogue") from the Catholic classification. In this context comparative theology can be viewed as a consequence, internalized variant of interreligious dialogue caused by the deepening of interest in another tradition in the process of communication between believers. Or we can say that, *vice versa*, interreligious dialogue as a "study" of the other is an external form of comparative theology, in which study is conducted by means of communication between believers or scholars.[45] Clooney notes that comparative theology can help gain knowledge of another religion, clarify various issues of comparative nature and thus significantly deepen interreligious dialogue.[46]

Clooney considers comparative theology as a form of "interior" interreligious dialogue, wherein "the other" is a text, not a living interlocutor. As "reader," the participant in the "interior dialogue" not only learns about another religion, but can also rethink various aspects of his/her own faith, broaden his/her worldview and undergo personal changes, and as author/writer, can say his/her lines. Clooney notes: "On a substantive level, in my interior dialogue as reader and as writer, my intention is not simply to listen to or learn from Hindus who speak of their scripture and interpretive traditions. Rather, as a Christian reader and writer, I myself read conscientiously and take to heart some theologically substantive and (usually) spiritually rich classic of a Hindu tradition, and allow its ideas and arguments, affective states and movement toward transformation of life to infuse and affect my Christian faith."[47] On the whole, in terms of this classification comparative theology can be regarded as one of the kinds of cognitive dialogue (in most cases theological dialogue) at the conceptual level.

The table below summarises the results of the study of the major kinds of cognitive dialogue.

Table 5. Kinds of Cognitive Interreligious Dialogue

Title	Goal	Principles	Form (Example of realisation)
Theological dialogue	Cognition of another religion	Ability to "listen" to the dialogue partner, respect, competence, openness to changes in the perception of another religion by	Joint Russian-Iranian Commission for Orthodoxy-Islam Dialogue (sessions the Commission members discussed

[44] Francis X. Clooney, "Comparative Theology and Inter-Religious Dialogue," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*, 53–54.
[45] Ibid., 54.
[46] Ibid., 60.
[47] Ibid., 57–58.

		acquiring new knowledge, rejection of proselytism	theological topics, such as "Eschatology and Its Influence on the Present-Day Life" (Tehran, 2006) and "Teaching on God and Man in Orthodoxy and Islam"), *Handbuch christlich-islamischer Dialog* (2014).
spiritual dialogue	spiritual and personal growth, enrichment	involvement of the "heart" in the dialogue, striving to share to some extent another religion's experience. C. Cornille: "epistemological humility," "commitment," "interconnection," "empathy," "hospitality"	Monastic Interreligious Dialogue, "Gethsemani Encounter."
human (Buberian) dialogue	establishment of personal contacts with representatives of other religions	I-You relations (Martin Buber). Respect for unique identity of the dialogue partner	"storytelling model" of interreligious dialogue
dialogue of truth	search for truth	creation of the space for free expression of opinions and beliefs, objective discussion of problems facing participants in the dialogue	Nicholas of Cusa *On the Peace of Faith*

Kinds of peacemaking interreligious dialogue

As was demonstrated above, within the framework of cognitive dialogue there can be many different tasks ("goal" criterion) that determine possible course of cognition and respective principles. It is the focus on the tasks that allowed us to explore most accurately different kinds of cognitive dialogue. Peacemaking dialogue is hinged on the topic of strengthening peace among

adherents of different religions. The goal can be formulated in a similar way for all kinds of peacemaking dialogue—it is promotion of peace and accord and conflict settlement. However, when speaking about peacemaking dialogue, it is very important to note at which level it is carried out, whether it is the level of religious leaders acting as representatives of their communities, or the level of experts, or the grass root level. The level determines principles of peacemaking dialogue, which are of great significance for delineating its various kinds. Therefore, it seems expedient to consider different kinds of the peacemaking interreligious dialogue in the context of such criterion as *form* or *level* of its participants: high; expert/conceptual, and grass-root.

Special attention should be devoted to such practical interaction at the "high" level between heads of religious communities and other high-ranking official representatives as diplomatic interreligious dialogue. For the most part, the diplomatic interreligious dialogue can be viewed as a sort of peacemaking dialogue, for its major *goal* is to ensure conflict-free, peaceful and harmonious coexistence of people professing different religions. In addition, diplomatic dialogue can also have a task of promoting cooperation with the view of making the everyday life together in society more comfortable in social, legal, educational and economic spheres. In this context, we can say that the diplomatic interreligious dialogue includes aspects of peacemaking and partnership dialogue, with the prevalence of the former. One more task of diplomatic dialogue, which is not openly declared but nonetheless should be noted, is that its participants, representing their religious communities, are concerned with protecting their own interests and maintaining and improving social importance and status, theirs and those of their religious associations.

Major *principles* of diplomatic dialogue are: institutional character (people enter into it as representatives of their religious organisations), secular-centric discourse, state-religion relations dimension, regularity, symbolic importance. Considering diplomatic dialogue in the context of the *form* criterion, it is expedient, following Oddbjørn Leirvik's suggestion, to distinguish between "government-initiated communication" and "civil society initiatives," i.e. the dialogue initiated by religious communities or activists.[48] Besides, it should be taken into account that diplomatic dialogue can be carried out at the four different levels: national, subnational (local), international, and conceptual.

The peacemaking interreligious dialogue at the "high" level of religious leaders can be aimed at settling particular social conflicts, as exemplified by the efforts of the religious leaders of Azerbaijan and Armenia to render assistance, through the mediation of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, in overcoming the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Such trilateral meetings were repeatedly held from 1993. The latest one took place in Moscow on September 8, 2017. Participating in it were His Holiness Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and All Russia; Sheikh ul-Islam Allahshükür Pashazade, chairman of the Caucasus Muslims' Board; and His Holiness Karekin II, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians.[49] As the result of the negotiations, joint statements were adopted, calling for peaceful and just resolution of the conflict. The *task* of such dialogue is to use the authority of religious leaders and peacemaking potential of religion in order to defuse tension between conflicting sides. The *form* of the dialogue is the trilateral meeting of the

---

[48] Oddbjørn Leirvik, "Philosophies of interreligious dialogue: Practice in search of theory,*" Approaching Religion* 1, 1 (2011): 16–24.

[49] Trilateral meeting of religious leaders of Russia, Azerbaijan and Armenia takes place in Moscow, Official website of Moscow Patriarchate, last modified 2015,https://mospat.ru/en/2017/09/08/news149885/

heads of the religious communities, as well as their joint statements. Analysing these trilateral meetings in terms of *principles*, we can note that the joint statements are similar in content, containing a number of close ideas and appeals. One of the essential principles of these statements, emphasised by the participants in the meetings, is the idea that the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has political and interstate character, has no religious ground and is not an expression of contradictions between Muslims and Christians. The statements adopted by the religious leaders also contained the following principles: reference to pacifist religious values (including remarks on enmity among people regarded as a sin and pacification of conflict as God-pleasing deed, based on quotations from the Holy Scriptures); indication of similarities in the worldview of followers of Christianity and Islam (faith in One God, close moral norms, opportunities to present joint response to the challenges caused by the spreading secularism); appeal to various social groups (including politicians and representatives of mass media) with the view of facilitating the settlement of the conflict; positioning themselves as the sides which are not involved in the conflict, but concerned for the good of all people; inadmissibility, from the point of view of religion, of any acts of violence, and so on.

One of the most wide-spread principles of the peacemaking dialogue at the "middle" expert ("conceptual") level consists in revealing and emphasising similarities in religious worldviews. Thus, for the Abrahamic religions such common tenets can be faith in one God the Creator, similar concepts of His attributes (loving towards mankind, merciful and forgiving, worthy of praise), the Revelation given through prophets, necessity of submission to God-given commandments, judgement after death, reward or retribution in the afterlife. Often special attention is devoted to the attempts to bring religions closer together on the basis of similar ethical perceptions (for instance, Hans Küng's Global Ethic Project. Yet another example of the peacemaking dialogue at the conceptual level is an open letter entitled *A Common Word between Us and You* sent by 138 Muslim scholars and religious leaders to Christian leaders in 2007. The *goal* of the letter was to help strengthen peace between followers of Islam and Christianity. The major *principle* was to underline affinity between Christianity and Islam exemplified in the utmost importance that both religions attach to the commandments "to love God" and "to love one's neighbor." The *form*, rather original in this case, was the open letter from Muslim spiritual leaders and theologians to Christian leaders.

At the "grass-root" level, especially among young people, the important *goal* of peacemaking dialogue is the prevention of extremist sentiments and strengthening of accord, mutual respect and friendship between representatives of various nationalities and religions. To achieve this goal, the following *principles* can be applied: learning more about one another's religions and cultural traditions; fostering mutual understanding by means of joint participation in socially beneficial activities; focusing on tolerance-promoting religious values; texts and stories about the life of various figures of spiritual authority; highlighting common historical and cultural background, and so on. The dialogue between young people belonging to different religious traditions can take such *forms* as interfaith youth camps, various meetings, or interreligious educational programmes at universities. One example here is the "intergroup" interreligious dialogue mentioned above.[50]

Table 6. Kinds of Peacemaking Interreligious Dialogue

---

[50] Islam N., Steinwert T., Diane Swords D., "3Dialogue in Action: Toward a Critical Pedagogy for Interfaith Education," *The Journal of Interreligious Studies*. Issue 13 (2014): 4-10.

Title	Goal	Principles	Form
Peacemaking initiatives at the "high level" (the most widespread kind is diplomatic dialogue)	To use the authority and administrative resource of religious leaders for conflict settlement and promotion of peace	Demonstrating positive relations between religious leaders as setting an example for ordinary believers, reference to pacifist religious values, demonstrating solidarity on various problems	Large-scale interfaith international forums (for example, the Congress of the leaders of world and traditional religions, held regularly in Kazakhstan)
Peacemaking at the "conceptual" level	To develop concepts that can serve as the foundation for peaceful coexistence between believers of different faiths	Revealing and emphasising similarities in religious worldviews, showing the peacemaking potential of religions	open letter "A Common Word between Us and You" (2007)
Peacemaking at the "grass root" level	To promote mutual respect, understanding and harmonious relations between ordinary believers of different faiths	Intensifying constructive communication between believers, gaining knowledge of each other's religious worldviews and way of life, rejecting false stereotypes and prejudices, appealing to religions' pacifist values, promoting trust by means of personal meetings	"intergroup interreligious dialogue" between students

Partnership interreligious dialogue

Within the framework of partnership dialogue followers of different religions carry out various joint activities. Using the *goal* criterion, we can distinguish the three following areas of cooperation: human being, society, and environment.

Cooperation in the first area is aimed at rendering aid to particular groups of people in need. It can be assistance provided by representatives of different religions to people in hospitals, to elderly and indigent people. Such interreligious activism takes various forms. For example, in Moscow it is a common practice, supported by the city administration, for believers of different faiths to donate blood.

The second area of cooperation within partnership dialogue implies religions' contribution to building up just, harmonious and thriving societies, as well as religious associations' practical interaction in social sphere. There are numerous approaches and suggestions as to what and how religions can and must improve in the life of society. According to many of these approaches,

religions should act together in order to promote moral education. Thus, Buddhist philosopher and public leader Buddhādasa (1906–93) stated that the essence of all religions is to save human beings from egoism and suffering and help them attain the state of unselfishness. Buddhādasa believed that the opposition to the ideology of materialism and egocentrism in its various forms—nationalistic, hedonistic, political and spiritual—should constitute the primary task of cooperation between different religions.

As Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and All Russia pointed out, "the fundamental contradiction of our epoch and at the same time the major challenge to humankind in the twenty-first century is the confrontation between the *liberal* (secular-humanist) and *religious-traditionalist* value systems. In view of this, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church emphasised the necessity of cooperation between various religions in promoting traditional moral values and counteracting the spread of the secular liberal standard which is associated with the main threat to the human civilisation today—limitless freedom, moral relativism and destruction of public morality.[51] Concepts used by Buddhādasa and Patriarch Kirill to explore various areas and principles of interfaith cooperation can serve as an example of partnership dialogue at the "middle"/"conceptual" level.

When speaking about the strengthening of traditional moral and spiritual values in society as one of the possible common tasks for various religions, we should note that such partnership dialogue can find its expression, among other things, in joint statements of representatives of different faiths. For example, the Interreligious Council of Russia repeatedly issued statements, expressing its concern over the threat of destruction facing the institution of family, and raising its voice in defence of traditional understanding of marriage as the union between a man and a woman. In 2016, the Interreligious Council of Russia released an anti-abortion statement On the Protection of Unborn Children.[52]

Within the third area, the cooperation between religions is carried out with the *goal* of resolving ecological problems. It includes protecting the environment, as well as developing ecological consciousness. The *principles* governing the attitude towards the environment and cooperation with other religions in developing environmental friendliness find their reflection in various scholars' concepts and official documents. One of such documents is "The Position of the Russian Orthodox Church on Topical Problems of Ecology." As an example of the *form* of partnership dialogue, we can mention the Interfaith Rainforest Initiative implemented by the Religions for Peace.[53] The Interfaith Rainforest Initiative is an international, multi-faith alliance that works to bring moral urgency and faith-based leadership to global efforts to end tropical deforestation.

---

[51] Kirill (Gundyaev), Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. *Freedom and responsibility. A search for harmony—human rights and dignity of the individual.* Moscow: Publishing House of the Moscow Patriarchate, 2016.
[52] "On the Protection of Unborn Children", *Statement of the Interreligious Council of Russia,* Official website of Moscow Patriarchate, last modified 2016, https://mospat.ru/en/2016/06/02/news132511/
[53]Interfaith Rainforest Initiative, last modified 2019, https://www.interfaithrainforest.org/

Table 7. Kinds of Partnership Interreligious Dialogue

Title	Goal	Principles	Form
Cooperation in the area of "human being"	To render aid to particular groups of people in need	Values of mercy and compassion as common for different religions	Rendering aid to people in hospitals, to indigent people
Cooperation in the area of "society"	To contribute to building up just, harmonious and thriving societies	One of the examples: strengthening of traditional moral values in society and opposition to the ideology of moral relativism and permissiveness and to undermining public morality are a common task for different religions.	Anti-abortion statement of the Interreligious Council of Russian "On the Protection of Unborn Children"
Cooperation in the area of "environment "	To resolve ecological problems	Awareness of humanity's responsibility for nature, which is God's creation; rejection of consumerism in the attitude towards nature; appeal to religious values as the basis for environmental friendliness	Interfaith Rainforest Initiative

Conclusion

The approach presented here—based on highlighting the four major types of interreligious dialogue (polemical, cognitive, peacemaking and partnership) and on distinguishing and describing various kinds of these dialogues in terms of the *goal*, *principles* and *form* criteria—provides instruments for devising a classification of interreligious dialogue and analysing numerous problems of interfaith relations. Interreligious dialogue is a very complex, many-faceted phenomenon, which makes it very difficult to present a comprehensive classification of its kinds in one article. Thus limited, I was compelled to leave aside some of the kinds, problems, aspects, and examples of interreligious dialogue. Rather, this article focuses only on interreligious dialogue's basic kinds, describing in one or several examples the implementation of each. The main task of the article was to demonstrate the potential of the approach to classification of interreligious dialogue outlined herein.

The approach presented here can also be used for describing and classifying other forms of interreligious dialogue. For example, we might look into such specific form of interreligious dialogue as joint prayers practiced by adherents of different religions. In compliance with the *principles* criterion, and using terminology of Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI), we should differentiate between the subtypes of interreligious and multireligious prayer. The interreligious prayer means simultaneous joint prayer of the faithful focusing on the ordinary topics—namely, doxology, thanksgiving, and various supplications (promotion of peace, conflict settlement, etc.)

For example, Mahatma Gandhi—who believed that God is one and only called different names, and that all religions can be seen as different roads leading to one and the same mountain top— practiced joint interreligious prayer among his followers, including Hindus, Muslims and Christians[54].

Multireligious prayer is performed by believers separately, in accordance with the rules of their own traditions, but in the sympathetic presence of representatives of other religions. A widely-known example of the multireligious prayer was the World Day of Prayer for Peace in Assisi, Italy, in 1986, initiated by the Roman Catholic Church. Back then, the Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, and Shinto religious leaders prayed at several Catholic churches and monasteries. In the square in front of the tomb of Francis of Assisi, the religious leaders, in turn, said prayers for peace. Commenting on this interfaith meeting, John Paul II insistently emphasized that the representatives of different traditions had assembled in order to "pray for peace," not to "pray together."

So, the joint prayer for peace in Assisi fits into the category of peacemaking dialogue. When, in Gandhi's community, people of different faiths were praying for social reforms—for more justice in the life of society—that joint prayer was as an expression of partnership dialogue. Based on the "principles" criterion, we can draw distinctions between joint interreligious prayer and joint multireligious prayer. Here is another example: Pope Francis called upon "the believers of all the religions to unite together spiritually on May 14, 2020, in a day of prayer and fasting, to implore God to help humanity overcome the coronavirus pandemic."[55] This initiative, which falls into the category of partnership dialogue, can be regarded as multireligious prayer. As these examples illustrate, the classification approach presented herein allows us to "slice and dice" everything when exploring the interfaith relations.

Classification as a theoretical framework implies that each kind of dialogue has its goals and principles of implementation. Therefore, there are distinctions between different kinds of dialogue and they should not be merged. That is to say, every particular interfaith encounter can be classified within one of the kinds of dialogue. Yet, when we speak about actual dialogues, certain explanation is required. Based on the example of the Religions for Peace 10th World Assembly (20–23 August 2019, Lindau), we can note that, in the course of interfaith meetings, different kinds of dialogue may conjoin. For instance, during the Assembly, both peacemaking and partnership dialogue took place. Meetings between representatives of conflicting sides at a negotiating table, held at the Assembly with the view of discussing possible ways to settle a conflict, fit into the category of peacemaking dialogue; but when participants in one of the sessions discussed the Interfaith Rainforest Initiative, they engaged in partnership dialogue.

Additionally, in reality, some dialogues can transform into one another. For example, a meeting aimed at respectful acquaintance with another religion (cognitive dialogue) can transform into an effort to demonstrate superiority of one's own religion (polemical dialogue). Each of these

---

54 Tam Ngo, Dan Smyer and Peter Veer. "Religion and Peace in Asia," in *The Oxford Handbook of Religion, Conflict, and Peacebuilding*, ed. R. Scott Appleby, Atalia Omer, and David Little (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 407–429. Michael Amaladoss, "Inter-religious worship," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-religious Dialogue*, 92.
55 Americamagazine, last modified 2020, https://www.americamagazine.org/faith/2020/05/02/pope-francis-joins-muslim-leaders-calling-world-day-prayer-end-coronavirus

kinds of dialogue can be examined individually and at the same time described within the classification system I have proposed here.

Moreover, some kinds of dialogue can be very closely related. For example, occasionally, in order to establish accord between believers belonging to different religions (peacemaking dialogue), it is necessary for them to gain knowledge of another religion. In this case, it can be difficult to differentiate between cognitive dialogue and peacemaking dialogue. Yet, the difference exists. In peacemaking dialogue, cognition of another religion is seen as a *means* to promote peace (i.e. in terms of the presented classification, *cognition* is a principle of peacemaking dialogue), but not as a *goal*. In cognitive dialogue, *cognition* is seen as a *goal*; harmonization of relationships is an attendant, additional *effect* produced by the dialogue. When looking at specific interfaith encounters, we can see the difference. However, the latter example, which, probably, makes it difficult to draw a definite distinction between peacemaking and cognitive dialogue, is a very rare thing. Normally, distinctions between different kinds of dialogue can be seen rather clearly.

In short, what has been presented here is a frame of reference, a theoretical framework, which offers one possible approach to the systematization of various forms of interreligious dialogue and provides instruments for their analysis.

ೞ෬