

rich ethnographic detail of this work allows for the kind of comparative work by specialists in the field that most modern (American influenced) types of ethnographies no longer avail themselves to. The work is also a valuable contribution to social organization and kinship studies as well as to the anthropology of religion. This work, furthermore, provides valuable insights into some methodological issues and challenges faced by indigenous anthropologists, including the difficulties and dynamics of negotiating multiple self-identities (in the case of the author, indigene, kin, anthropologist, and Catholic priest). The book also contributes to ongoing scholarly discussions on Christian-Muslim relations, which generally tend to focus on the issues of global terrorism, and the violent, separatist, or ethno-nationalistic aspects of these relations, particularly in a Southeast Asian context. The author addresses such interreligious relations and provides an explanation as to why these Christian-Muslim relations among the eastern Kéo at least, do not automatically possess the character of “conflict” and “violence.” A thorough understanding of the culture and history of specific localities and people is significant in this regard. While tensions may arise locally in the context of ongoing interreligious conflict in Indonesia and the rest of the world, for the eastern Kéo, the indigenous cultural system for now appears to mitigate and resolve such tensions – the “House of the Ancestors” mediating with the “House of God.”

(The reviewer’s multiple identity relations with the author should be pointed out – Philip Tule Muwa is a friend, an adoptive brother [*nala*] through my own research and “fictive” kin network from Ngada district of Flores, a former classmate from the Australian National University with common doctoral supervisor, a fellow anthropologist, and a Catholic “spiritual advisor.”)

Andrea K. Molnar

Zimoń, Henryk (ed.): *Dialog międzyreligijny*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2004. 380 pp. ISBN 83-7306-184-3.

Modern man, more than ever before, is aware of religious and cultural pluralism. Recent times have witnessed the emergence of awareness that our world consists of plurality of cultures and religious traditions and that peoples and nations have the right to their distinctive characteristics. This new attitude can be observed in the Church, which recognizes the positive values in this plurality and in the interreligious dialogue. A major impulse for this dialogue comes from Paul VI’s encyclical “*Ecclesiam suam*,” published during the Second Vatican Council (1964). The Pope presented the Church as being destined to continue God’s salvific dialogue conducted by God with humanity for ages. For Europeans, who grew within the Christian traditions, the contact with followers of other religious traditions invokes certain postures. What attitude toward “others,” whoever they may be – Muslims, Buddhists, Hindus, etc. – is called for by the Christian faith and experienced in such an environment?

The collective work “The Interreligious Dialogue,” edited by H. Zimoń, is an attempt to address these issues. Zimoń is the director of the Department of History and Ethnology of Religion at the Institute of Fundamental Theology at the Catholic University of Lublin and an expert in the areas of non-Christian religions – especially the African religions, religions of nonliterate peoples, Buddhism, and interreligious dialogue. The book was published by the Scientific Society of the Catholic University of Lublin, as the sixth volume in the *Religiological Studies* series. It represents the fruit of the symposium of Polish fundamental theologians, which took place at the Divine Word Seminary in Pieniężno on April 27–28, 2000.

The book consists of thirteen articles, of which five deal with issues of theology and eight pertain to the dialogue with African traditional religions, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism. The articles were authored by professors from Polish university centers – experts in fundamental theology and comparative religion. The book begins with the table of contents in both Polish and English (5–12), a list of abbreviations (13–15), and the introduction by the editor in Polish and English (17–28).

The theological part of the book (29–157) contains five articles. The first article, “Christological Basis for Interreligious Dialogue,” written by M. Rusecki, presents the concept of the dialogue and provides an analysis of christological foundations of the interreligious dialogue, addressing such issues as Logos in protology, Jesus as the subject of messianic hope, annunciation and incarnation, divine and messianic consciousness of Jesus, revelational and motivational character of Jesus’ miracles, revelation on the cross and redemption, Christ’s resurrection and its meaning. The author declares that christology – when it is properly understood and when it constitutes recapitulation of theology – provides firm and lasting foundations for various forms of interreligious dialogue. Bishop Z. Pawłowicz in the first part of his article, “Interreligious Dialogue in Poland” (65–84), discusses the fundamental principles of interreligious dialogue; in the second part, he presents its practical dimensions in Poland, where in addition to Christianity four religions – Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism – are present and where there are also various religious movements and spiritual and ideological associations. F. Solarz, in “The Attitude of the Church to Non-Christian Religions in Light of the Council schemes in the Declaration ‘*Nostra aetate*,’” analyzes the attitude of the Church to non-Christian religions in light of four council schemata in “The Declaration on the Relation of the Church to non-Christian Religions – *Nostra aetate*.” In her article “The Personalistic Bases for the Dialogue between the Church and Non-Christian Religions According to John Paul II” (123–141), K. Parzych presents individual characteristics of persons, meetings of persons, exchange of individual values, intentions of good and truth in personal relations as well as resulting knowledge and reconciliation as the foundation of the dialogue. The Church’s

mission is to present to other religions the truth of Christ's incarnation. The theological part of the book is concluded by J. Urban's "Interreligious Dialogue and the Church's Missionary Activity." The dialogue is understood as a value in and of itself, and its goal is mutual understanding and enrichment and fuller conversion of all to God. The dialogue is an element of the evangelization mission of the Church, and it has its source in God, who out of love to humankind was the first to begin the salvific dialogue.

The theological and comparative religious subject matter of the book (159–370) begins with H. Zimon's article "African Spiritual and Religious Values as the Basis for the Interreligious Dialogue." The following values were selected and discussed: sanctity of life, community life, the concept of the Supreme Being, sacredness of the Earth, spirits of ancestors, afterlife, morality, prayers, and rituals. These values have significance in and of themselves as seeds of the Word and constitute providential preparedness for evangelization. In "The Dialogue between Christianity and Hinduism," B. Maik, in the first part, presents the most important tenets of Hinduism and the history of its contact with Christianity. In the second part, she shows the forms of the contemporary implementation of this dialogue, which is comprised of: the dialogue of daily life, which consists in the realization of the commandment of love of one's neighbor, the dialogue of works (common charitable works, social, health, and educational activities), the dialogue of experts (learning and understanding of the doctrines of both religions and discovery of similarities and differences), and the dialogue of spiritual experience conducted in ashrams and meeting places, where participants reflect over the possibilities of enriching the Christianity with the spiritual and religious values of Hinduism. L. Fic, in "The Dialogue between Christianity and Buddhism," deals with the relationship of these two religions through the course of history, the dialogue of the Church with Buddhism in the documents of the Second Vatican Council and in the teachings of the Popes Paul VI and John Paul II. In the latter part of the article, the author discussed the Asian dialogical meetings and the centers of the dialogue between Christianity and Buddhism.

Four articles address the issues of the dialogue between Christianity and Islam. In "The Dialogue of Christianity and Islam in the Teaching of John Paul II" (pp. 259–288), E. Sakowicz discusses the most important documents and speeches of the Holy Father. The dialogue with Islam is a challenge and a program, which derives from the very nature of religion. The Church strives to reconcile with Islam in the sphere of common human values. K. Kościelniak's "The Is-

lamic Eschatology" discusses the possibility of the dialogue based on the Moslem teaching of "purgatory" (*Al-A'râf*); it also presents the state of research by the European orientalist, explains the terminology, the exegesis of sura 7,46–49, and the theological concept of purgatory, with the indication of the influence of the nestorian and monophysitic teachings. The difficulty in the Muslim-Christian dialogue is the difference in the understanding of purgatory in the Islamic theology, which perceives of purgatory in terms of a place, while in Christianity purgatory is viewed as a state. In "The Dialogue of Christians with the Muslim Brother in Jordan" (311–338), A. Waş presents the dialogue of Christians with the fundamentalist Islamic political-religious organization. It is worth noting that in his presentation the author utilized not only the literature of the subject but also data from his own fieldwork conducted in Jordan. S. Grodź, in "Amadou Hampâté Bâ – a Witness to Muslim-Christian Relations in West Africa" (339–352), presents the personal relationship that developed between Theodore Monod from the Senegalese Dakar and the fulbean Muslim Amadou Hampâté Bâ from Mali in the 1940's and 1950's. L. Kamykowski's article, "The Specific Character of the Dialogue with the Jews" (353–370), concludes the theological and comparative religion part of the book. The author sees in this dialogue a sui generis model for other types of the Church's dialogue with the world and religions. The positive elements of this dialogue include the common cultural and religious foundation and the perceptible willingness to engage in the dialogue.

It should be noted that each article is accompanied by a summary in a West European language. The final part of the book includes the index of names (371–380).

The book is of considerable substantive value, and it is carefully edited. It provides comprehensive material on the subject of the interreligious dialogue; the subject matter of the book is presented both from the theological point of view based on the doctrine of the Catholic Church and from the viewpoint of theology and comparative religion which refers to specific religions and to specific spheres of contact with those religions. The book is the first work of this type to be published by the Catholic scientific community in Poland. It is directed to theologians, experts on religion, pastors, catechists, and persons who are interested in religions and the interreligious dialogue. In the face of religious and cultural pluralism, interreligious dialogue is a necessity and a condition for world peace and recognition of human values. This dialogue contributes to a large degree to the nurturing of the spirit of tolerance and mutual understanding and respect.

Zdzisław Kupisiński

Réponse à la critique de Julien Bauer. – Le compte-rendu fort critique de Julien Bauer (de Jacques Gutwirth, *La renaissance du hassidisme*. Paris 2004. Cf. *Anthropos* 100.2005: 264–265) m’a étonné et déçu car je considère que ses petits livres, “Les juifs hassidiques” (Paris 1994) et “La nourriture cacher” (Paris 1996), auxquels d’ailleurs je me réfère à de nombreuses reprises dans mon ouvrage, sont très substantiels et intelligents.

Tout d’abord la plupart des reproches de détail de Bauer concernent des notes et non le texte lui-même. Ainsi je n’aurais pas dit que la mise en oeuvre de la prescription du *shatnès* – ne pas mélanger des matières végétales et animales, par exemple lin et laine dans un vêtement – n’est pas limitée aux hassidim. Pourtant dans ma note je déclare bien qu’il s’agit d’une prescription biblique (Lévitique 19: 19, Deutéronome 22: 9–11) ce qui sous-entend qu’elle est obligatoire pour tout juif observant. Deuxième critique discutable: j’ai affirmé, toujours en note, que *glatt cacher*, mot à mot, dans un premier sens, “cacher lisse” s’applique au type de couteau utilisé dans l’abatage rituel alors qu’il s’agirait, selon le compte-rendu de Bauer, “de l’absence totale d’aspérité dans les poumons de l’animal”. Dans son propre petit livre sur la nourriture cacher (p. 15) Bauer rappelle que le couteau de l’abatteur rituel doit “posséder une lame au fil parfait” et un peu plus loin que les poumons de l’animal doivent être “en bon état” (14–15); il ne dit pas qu’ils doivent être totalement lisses. Par contre tout spécialiste sait que la question des couteaux ultra-lisses utilisés par les hassidim fut au coeur des controverses entre ceux-ci et les orthodoxes classiques (voir Bauer lui-même p. 46).

Autre note mise en question par Bauer: j’ai affirmé que la coutume séfarade de la *mimouna*, repas après la clôture de la Pâque, fête qui oblige les juifs observants à huit jours d’interdiction absolue d’aliments avec levain, comportait en Afrique du Nord la présence amicale des voisins arabes qui concouraient au retour à une alimentation “normale” avec force baklava, couscous, etc. J’ai dit que ce commensalisme avait certainement *contribué* (je souligne ce que j’avais écrit dans mon livre) au rejet de cette coutume décrétée par les hassidim. Les raisons religieuses avancées par Bauer existent, mais il suffit de lire l’excellent article d’Albert Suissa, “Ma *mimouna* à moi” (dans la revue *Ariel* 1998: 105) pour comprendre combien cette coutume était ancrée dans une intense symbiose judéo-arabe; il écrit: “seul le goy, le musulman en l’occurrence, pouvait procéder à l’entrée du *hamets*, [levain], tabou de la Pâque, dans les foyers juifs”. Bauer affirme que ma supposition concernant le rejet par les Loubavitcher de “ce commensalisme avec les musulmans” relève de l’acrobatie intellectuelle. Pourtant Laurence Podselver, bonne observatrice des hassidim de Loubavitch en France, signale dans “Le mouvement Lubavitch: déracinement et réinsertion des séfarades” (*Pardès* 1986/3: 67) que le rejet par Loubavitch de cette coutume, au nom d’un manquement aux lois de la Pâque, veut aussi signifier que le renoncement à cette coutume est lié à la survie même du groupe. Il y a donc bien une raison sociologique

à ce rejet ... Mon analyse n’est donc nullement saugrenue.

J’ajouterai encore un commentaire sur une autre critique, à mon avis accessoire: j’ai négligé de mentionner l’existence d’écoles orthodoxes non hassidiques présentes à Paris avant celles de Loubavitch. Je donne volontiers acte à Bauer de ce correctif, mais de là à me taxer de “révisionnisme”, terme qui en histoire concerne habituellement des phénomènes autrement importants (notamment négation du génocide nazi), il y a tout de même une exagération assez étonnante.

Mais venons en à une critique plus fondamentale; je présenterais certes un nombre considérable de données, mais sans “. . . que le lecteur ne sache quelle est leur utilité, d’autant plus que les comparaisons sont impossibles en raison de leur aspect fragmentaire”. Bauer semble ignorer ce que représente une démarche d’ethnologue. Celui-ci tente de décrire et si possible d’analyser les groupes qu’il décrit. C’est ce que j’ai fait et, grâce à mes chapitres monographiques pour les lieux majeurs d’implantation hassidique, le lecteur peut se faire une idée de la diversité du mouvement. Pour présenter des groupes de type varié, avec à une extrémité le groupe le plus replié sur lui-même – l’ensemble de Méa Shearim à Jérusalem – et à l’autre extrême les Loubavitcher modernistes de Crown Heights à Brooklyn, je me suis servi des matériaux, les miens et ceux venant d’autres sources, ce qui m’a permis de montrer leurs divers modes d’existence et de fonctionnement. Que ces descriptions présentent des lacunes, j’en suis bien d’accord, mais comment faire autrement faute de certaines données? Devais-je attendre qu’une nuée de thésards (financés par qui?) abordent chacun les divers groupes et fournissent les éléments que je puisse alors homogénéiser? C’était renoncer à toute présentation de l’ensemble hassidique; or je pense que celle-ci, à la fois modulée et globale, fait oeuvre utile et comme le reconnaît Bauer dans son compte-rendu donne “. . . une idée de ce qu’est la vie hassidique aujourd’hui”. N’est-ce pas là l’objectif d’un travail d’ethnologue ou d’anthropologue social et culturel? Par ailleurs, chacune de mes descriptions du hassidisme à Anvers, New York, Jérusalem, Bné Brak ou Paris, comporte des analyses et des comparaisons entre les divers groupes et situation. Enfin, je reprends celles-ci et les étend sur divers sujets supplémentaires (dont la question du renouveau spirituel chez les hassidim) dans un chapitre final, “vision d’ensemble”, chapitre qui fait donc le point sur le mouvement et le met en contexte historique et sociologique. Là encore Bauer me reproche de n’aborder qu’en quelques pages les raisons de la renaissance hassidique (pp. 191–215). Un chapitre de 25 pages de synthèse pour un texte de 218 pages (plus les notes, etc.) me paraît tout de même une proportion plus que respectable.

Reste une autre critique majeure, celle qui concerne l’attitude des hassidim envers le sionisme et l’Etat d’Israël. J’aurais fait la part belle à l’opposition au sionisme d’un seul groupe, Satmar. Or, le hassidisme de Satmar est l’un des plus nombreux du mouvement hassidique – plusieurs dizaines de milliers d’adeptes –