

Non-violence of Buddhism and Peace of Christ for a better India

Martin Alukaputhussery

University of Innsbruck, Austria

Abstract

What is true of India may be true in other societies that we can really raise from the particular to the general in our reflection. India offers an ideal model to reflect on the problem of generalization, not only because of the presence of all great and small religions, but also because of its efforts to build a secular society according to a democratic constitution that has a positive attitude to all religions. The teachings of Buddha and Christ are the greatest heritage that man has received from the past. Their message of non-violence and peace, love and compassion, tolerance and understanding, truth and wisdom, respect and regard for all life, freedom from selfishness, hatred and violence, delivered 'over two thousand years back, stands good for today and will stand forever in making peace and harmony in society.

Keywords

Pañca-sīlāni, Non-violence, Beatitudes, Peacemakers

Cited as: Alukaputhussery, Marin. (2015). Non-violence of Buddhism and Peace of Christ for a better India (Version 1.0). Jnanadeepa: Pune Journal of Religious Studies, Jan-June 2015(18/1), 155–170.
<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4163810>

The world today is in a state of turmoil; valuable ethics are being upturned. The forces of materialistic skepticism have turned their dissecting blades on the traditional concepts of what are considered human qualities. Yet, whoever has the concern for culture and civilization will concern himself with practical and ethical issues. For ethics has to do with human actions and conduct. It takes place in the society and concerned with our relationship with ourselves and with our fellow men. By nature man is not perfect, he has to train himself to be good. Ethics plays an important role in the life of the man.

Indian Context

Today we live in a world of violence, terrorism, corruption, persecution, oppression, affliction, brokenness, destruction, conflicts, pain, agony, tension and turmoil. In the context of this crisis of the world, peace and harmony is the cry of the modern world. In particular, this is the cry of the people in India especially minorities who undergo religious persecution, oppression and violence at every moment. Diversity is a characteristic of the pluri-religious and multi-cultural fabric of India. Being a secular nation, India treats all religions with equal honour and allows them equal liberty. This attitude is also manifested in her Constitution. The inner pluralism of Indian religiosity is her ability to absorb and assimilate creatively the new elements of other traditions with which India has come into contact down through the centuries. This all-accommodative and assimilative character of India, especially with regard to religion, is her strength, vigour and competence.

This world-renowned Indian composite atmosphere is passing through a new phase with the emergence of fundamentalism and communalism. The harmonious situation of the nation is to a certain extent disturbed. There may be various reasons behind the communal violence. Even though the political and social factors play a prominent role behind all these problems, they are often kept in the background and religious issues are brought to the forefront.¹ If we take the field of religion as an example, one way is to affirm one's own legitimacy to the others, even if those who claim legitimacy may be a minority and may face persecution.

Another way is to order everything in a hierarchy, often placing oneself at the top. For instance, Christianity thinks of itself as the latest and most perfect covenant coming after the cosmic and Judaic covenants. The caste system is an example in the social sphere. Many sects in Hinduism tend to become castes. Still another solution is to acknowledge pluralism at a phenomenal level, but to affirm a basic unity that is either transcendental or eschatological.² In this spectrum, where can we place the contemporary encounter between religions? Is there an ideal situation towards which we should move? What are prospects in the concrete, historical situation? How can we come to terms with it in a creative way so that it helps rather than hinders India's effort to build a better future for all its peoples? In this context the non-violence of Buddhism and the beatitudes of Christ invite to be peacemakers and to promote peace and harmony.

Pañca-sīlāni (The Five Precepts of Buddhism)

Buddhist philosophy can be considered as concrete philosophy because it is quite practical and intelligible. The enlightenment of a person occurs at a stage where the mind is transformed to a stage of purification or perfection that the thoughts and actions are fully devoted with that of the ultimate reality. To live is to act, and our actions can have either harmful or beneficial consequences for oneself and others. Buddhist ethics is concerned with the principles and practices that help one to act in ways that help rather than harm. The core ethical code of Buddhism is known as the five precepts, (properly, the 'five virtues': *Pañca-sīlāni*)³ and these are the distillation of its ethical principles. The precepts are not rules or commandments, but 'principles of training', which are undertaken freely and need to be put into practice with intelligence and sensitivity.

I undertake the training-precept (*sikkha-padam*) to abstain from onslaught on breathing beings.

I undertake the training-precept to abstain from taking what is not given.

I undertake the training-precept to abstain from misconduct concerning sense-pleasures.

I undertake the training-precept to abstain from false speech.

I undertake the training-precept to abstain from alcoholic drink or drugs that are an opportunity for heedlessness.

Not killing or causing harm to other living beings

The well-known five precepts (*Pañca sīlā*) are to be followed by every Buddhist. The first and the fundamental ethical precept for Buddhism corresponds to the Hindu and Jain concept of ahimsa, 'non-injury', and is generally regarded as the most important one: 'Non-injury is the distinguishing mark of *Dhamma*'. It is explained as casting aside of all forms of weapons and being careful not to deprive a living being of life. Every person, who follows Buddhism, is expected to refrain from meat. Buddhist monks and nuns have to follow even stricter code of rules than the lay person and they abstain from practices which would even unintentionally harm living creatures. For instance, they do not travel during rainy season because it is possible to harm worms and insects that come to the surface in wet weather. The same concern for non-violence prevents the monks from digging the ground. There are several instances which we can see in Buddha's life where he strongly opposes any injury to the living being, no matter whether it is deliberate or non-intentional. The term non-violence cannot be just confined to abstaining from injuring just living creatures, but it means cultivation of compassion and sympathy for all living creatures.⁴

In taking this precept a Buddhist recognizes his relationship with all living things, a relationship which is so close that the harming of any living creature is inevitably the harming of himself. The Buddha taught the advisability of comparing one's own life with that of other beings: Everyone fears violence, everyone likes life; comparing oneself with others one would never slay or cause to slay. The precept applies to all creatures irrespective of size. It does not exclude the killing of animals for the Vedic sacrifices (*yajna*) or, as do the commandments of some religions, that of lower animals. A Buddhist does not sacrifice living beings for worship or food, but sacrifices instead his own selfish motives.⁵

There are five things necessary to constitute the crime of taking the life. 1. There must be knowledge that there is life. 2. There must be assurance that a living being is present. 3. There must be the intention to take life. 4. With this intention there must be

something done, as the placing of a bow or spear, or the setting of a snare; and there must be some movement towards it, as walking, running, or jumping. 5. The life must be actually taken.⁶

There are six means of killing: (i) killing with one's own hands (*sahatthika*), (ii) causing another to kill by giving an order (*anattika*), (iii) killing by shooting, pelting stones, sticks, etc. (*nissaggiya*), (iv) killing by digging trenches, etc., and entrapping a being (*thavara*), (v) killing by the powers of *iddhi*, or occult means (*iddhimaya*), (vi) killing by mantras, or occult sciences (*vijjamaya*).⁷ Whatever device may be used, the individual who kills or destroys the psychic life of a sentient being commits the evil deed of *panatipata-kamma-patha*. This kamma may be caused through the door of speech since the act of killing could be performed on receiving an order from another person.

There are eight causes of destruction of life: 1. Evil desire. 2. Anger. 3. Ignorance. 4. Pride. 5. Covetousness. 6. Poverty. 7. Wantonness, as in the sport of children. 8. Law, as by the decree of the ruler.⁸ This crime is committed, not only when life is actually taken, but also when there is the indulgence of hatred and anger; hence also lying, stealing and slander, may be regarded in some sense as including this sin.

Beatitudes

The word "beatitude" comes from the Latin *beatitudo*, meaning "blessedness." The phrase "blessed are" in each of the beatitudes in the bible implies a current state of happiness or well-being. Each beatitude in the Greek text begins with the word "μακάριος" which poses a special problem in translation. Through the centuries, it has gone through various translations. Often found translations of this word are "blessed", "happy", "fortunate", "lucky", "esteemed", "honoured", "well off" and "congratulations". The fact that there are various translations, shows the difficulty of expressing the meaning of the Greek term "μακάριος" in English.⁹ However, the Greek word "μακάριος" should be translated not as "happy" which refers to temporary

condition based on externals, more of a subjective feeling, but as “blessed” because the opposite of “blessed” is not “unhappy” but “cursed (Mt 25:31-46; Lk 6:24-26).¹⁰ The expression held a powerful meaning of "divine joy and perfect happiness" for the people of the day. The classical form of beatitude contains three distinct parts. First there is a declaration of blessing. Second, a virtue is named. Third, an appropriate reward is announced. Thus beatitude is a literary form that begins with the word “blessed” and constitutes a declaration of praise for an individual who can expect an appropriate reward from God. The question has often raised whether these blessings are law or gospel, ethical requirements or eschatological blessings.

Beatitude as the part of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain

The Sermon of the Mount is the central piece to the gospel of Matthew and the Beatitudes are the important teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. Betz assumes that the sermon was an epitome of Jesus' teaching centered on living the will of God.¹¹ The Sermon on the Mount regards the thought of kingdom of heaven and greater righteousness as central to the teaching of Jesus. The beatitudes (Mt 5:3-12) function as the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount. Righteousness (Mt 5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33) and kingdom of heaven/God (Mt 5:3, 10; 5:19, 20; 6:10, 33; 7:21) are the two catch words that permeate the whole sermon and each of these terms appear twice in the beatitudes itself.¹² The Sermon was created from the ethical sayings by Jesus and arranged by Matthew. The Sermon on the Mount which is the longest piece of teaching of Jesus in chapters 5, 6 and 7 emphasizes ethical and eschatological dimensions. The basic content of the Sermon consists in Jesus Messiah as the one whose coming fulfils the Old Testament promise for the coming of the age of salvation, the coming into history of the kingdom of heaven. Jesus who came to fulfil the old law (Mt 5:17-19) gave his commands in the Sermon which transcends the old law. These commands demanded a new starting point in one's relationship with the Father (Mt 6:1-7:12) as well as with one another (5:21-48). These demands function as the principles of Christian living. They are the entrance requirements for the kingdom.¹³

Only those who transcend the righteousness of the Scribes and

Pharisees by the observation of this greater righteousness will enter the kingdom of God (Mt 5:20; 7:21). The Sermon on the Mount expresses also a realized eschatology based on the fulfilment of the law that happened through the coming of Christ (Mt 5:17-18). At the same time it speaks explicitly of a future time when the kingdom of God will be accomplished at the accompanying final judgement. This future orientation is made clear in the following verses 5:19-20, 29-30; 6:6, 10, 17; 7:7, 21-23, 24-27. I think we need to understand the beatitudes in the background of these ethical and eschatological dimensions which focus on the kingdom of heaven in the sermon.

Luke's Sermon has sometimes been called the "Sermon on the Plain" in contrast to Matthew's "Sermon on the Mount". The sermon as recorded by Luke is largely paralleled in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. But much of Matthew's sermon is not in Luke 6 but scattered here and there in Luke's gospel. The sermon on the plain (Luke 6: 27-45) is made up of rules of conduct for the disciples, presented in argumentative form. These rules are divided into two sections, one directed at the outside world (Lk 6: 27-38), and the other at the inside world of the group of the disciples (Lk 6: 39-45). The beatitudes are sayings that pronounce someone "blessed." Thus they are statements of assurance, containing both disclosure and promise. The woes in verses 24-26 are the exact counterparts of the beatitudes. These are addressed to whom the sermon on the Plain is composed. Since the disciples are warned, the woes may not be curses but can be mere threats, although pronounced with solemnity and definiteness.

Beatitudes as Exhortations

There is an ongoing debate and discussion among the scholars, whether Matthew's beatitudes are ethical demands or eschatological blessings or both. Scholars like George Strecker, Herman Hendrickx and Jan Lambrecht regard the beatitudes as ethical commands and promise rewards for those who are deemed virtuous.¹⁴ It is challenged by Robert Guelich and W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison who consider the beatitudes as consoling eschatological blessings.¹⁵ Mark Allen Powell and Warren Carter view the beatitudes as both reversals for the unfortunate and rewards for the virtuous.¹⁶ Matthean beatitudes in contrast to

Lukan beatitudes have clear ethical dimensions. In Matthew's beatitudes, the eschatological blessings do not eliminate or overshadow the ethical thrust. Thus, I think Matthew's beatitudes promise a reward of kingdom of heaven, comfort, inheritance, fulfilment and demands to practice ethics which leads to a unique way of life.

It is true that the beatitudes are formulated in the indicative mood of fact and not in the imperative mood of the moral sermon. Still to those who are merciful, pure in heart, peacemakers, righteous, and those who have stability in facing persecution for Christ's sake is an indirect exhortation to live accordingly. They are people who trust only God; wait patiently for his intervention without imitating the wicked ones and who have deep desire to fulfil all that God demands. In fact, the Gospel reveals that the virtues presented in the beatitudes were essential characteristics of Jesus himself. Thus, the beatitudes are indirect demands to imitate Jesus. The emphatic use of *αὐτοὶ* in the beatitudes affirm that only those who live according to the norms presented in the beatitudes, and not others can enjoy the blessings offered in the beatitudes and invites all to keep the ethical demands of the beatitudes.¹⁷

Beatitudes as a true means of Peace

Beatitudes as divine demands exhort the disciples to practice ethics, which leads to a unique way of life, which is the mark of a true Christian. The mark of being a true and authentic Christian is to hunger and thirst for righteousness, to be merciful, pure in heart, and peacemakers. Righteousness demands the disciples to be in right relationship with God and others according to the will of God. Mercy which refers to forgiveness of sins by God and God's unconditional mercy invites to pardon our neighbour (Mt 6:12, 14-15) and to love our enemies (Mt 5:43-48). It shows that the followers of Jesus are expected, to be merciful on our fellow brothers and sisters in order to receive mercy from God. Mercy also refers to love and concern for the poor (Mt 12:1-8; 25:31-46) Thus, mercy is not merely an inner attitude, but something that we do concretely. It is not mere compassion or sympathy but solidarity which leads us to efficacious involvement of doing

good works to our neighbour. Pure in heart refers to single-minded devotion to God which stems from the internal cleansing created by following Jesus. Jesus demands of his disciples a life style characterized by pleasing God and his will. Purity of heart demands integrity from the disciples which comes from internalizing the commandments of Jesus set in the Sermon on the Mount.

A true mark of a Christian is peacemaking. Mt 5:9 invites the Christians to be peacemakers. Peacemaking is the responsibility of the followers of Jesus. Peacemaking is linked, to loving our enemies and involves reconciliation (Mt 5:44-48; Lk 6:27-28). The peacemakers must possess certain qualities like love, mercy, non-violence and justice (righteousness).

In the context of persecution and oppression, Jesus exhorts and demands the disciples to live a life of righteousness by doing good works, to be merciful by forgiving neighbours and loving enemies, and to be peacemakers by reconciling and loving enemies. All these ethical demands of the beatitudes, promote to build peace and harmony with God, self and others. The primary task and responsibility of the disciples of Jesus is to practice the ethical demands of the beatitudes, which results in living a peaceful and harmonious life.

μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται

Blessed are the Peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God

The Peacemakers will be called sons (children) of God. To understand this we need to ask questions: who is a peacemaker in Hellenistic culture or at the time of Jesus? What is the role of a peacemaker? What are the characteristics of peacemaking? Who can be called sons of God?

Peace in the OT

The Hebrew word for “peace” in the OT is שלום (shālôm).¹⁸ In the reading the OT, we sense a strong desire of the people for peace throughout the Hebrew Bible with different nuances in different books. In Pentateuch, shl ômā is used as a greeting or salutation

(Gen 37:9) or as a leave taking formula (Gen 43:27-28; Ex 4:18). In Deuteronomic literature *shālôm* makes a shift to political realm. But *shālôm* acquires both a theological meaning and a theological character when it is associated with Yahweh. In the book of judges we read “Gideon built an altar there to the Lord and called it, The Lord is Peace” (Judg 6:24). In the book of Isaiah we come across several references to peace: “Peace will be like a river if one keeps the commandments of Yahweh.” (Is 48:18). Joy is an element of peace (Is 55:12). שלום means freedom from all that causes grief. Yahweh promises to extend *shālôm* like a river (Is 66:12). Is 45:7 “If α m h e l i g h t , a n d c r e a t e d a r k n e s s : I m a k e p e a c e , a n d c r e a t e v i l l e : I t h e L o r d d o a l l t h e s e t h i n g s .”

In Jeremiah 29:7 we see that *shālôm* is complete well-being and Yahweh is giving that complete peace. Jer 33:6 “Behold, I will bring it health and cure, and I will cure them, and will reveal unto them the abundance of peace and truth.” Psalmist says “Seek peace and pursue it” (Ps 34:14). 2 Maccabees says “May he open your heart to his law and his commandments, and may he bring peace” (2 Macc 1:4). Pro 10:10 says: “He who winks the eye causes trouble, but he who boldly reproves makes peace.” All the above texts show that *shālôm* has a wide range of nuances and the source and subject of peace is God. People were praying to God for peace, because they broke *shālôm* by their disobedience to God and his covenant. In this context, God through his prophets promises a Messiah, the Prince of Peace, (Isa 9:6) through whom God would restore all creation to wholeness, rightness (Zech 8:12) and effect peace on earth.¹⁹

Peace in the NT

In the New Testament, the Greek word used for “peace” is εἰρήνη. It translates the Hebrew word שלום (*shālôm*).²⁰ In the NT, especially in the synoptic gospels, kingdom of God ushered in by Jesus the Messiah (Mt 4:17) is the advent of this promised reign of universal and eternal *shālôm* t h e k i n g d o m o f r i g h t e o u s n e s s a n d p e a c e (R o m 4:17). T h e t h e m e o f p e a c e i s s e e n t h r o u g h o u t t h e g o s p e l s . T h e r e a r e s e v e r a l r e f e r e n c e s t o p e a c e f u l a t t i t u d e w i t h i n t h e e n t i r e N T . I t d e s c r i b e s b o t h t h e c o n t e n t a n d g o a l o f

Christian preaching, since the message is called the Gospel of Peace (Eph 6:15).

Peacemaker- ειρηνοποιός

The adjective ειρηνοποιός is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT.²¹ A verbal equivalent is found in Col 1:20. It reads: “And through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross.” In the context of this verse the one who reconciles all things to him is God. The participle ειρηνοποιήσας refers to the Son. He assumes the role of the peacemaker (Rom 5:1). He liberated us from sins (Col 1:14), established peace with God and thus he is the decisive peacemaker. We have many other texts in the NT where Jesus is presented as the bringer of peace: (Luke 2:14; 19:38; Acts 10:36; Eph 2:14-18). Similarly, God is qualified as “God of peace” in several texts (Rom 15:33; 16:20; Phil 4:9; 1Th 5:23; Heb 13:20).

In the Hellenistic culture the adjective ειρηνοποιός is used for the Greek and Roman emperors. It was thought only kings and emperors would bring peace. The peacemaking was considered the responsibility of those who were in authority. So, they established peace, security, and socioeconomic welfare of their peoples by force. For the NT authors peacemaking is clearly different from imposing peace by force. It is an act of love. Peacemaking refers to making of peace between peoples, parties and enemies and bringing them into a relation of unity, and harmony.²² We see a few references to this idea of making peace or living in peace with others. There are four texts in the NT where the verb “live at peace” or “keep peace with” occurs. Mark 9:50 says “Salt is good; but if the salt has lost its saltiness, how will you season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with one another.” Rom 12:18 “If possible, on your part, live at peace with all”. 2 Cor 13:11 “Finally, brethren, farewell. Mend your ways, heed my appeal, agree with one another, live in peace, and the God of love and peace will be with you.” 1 Thess 5:13 “Esteem them very highly in love because of their work. Be at peace among yourselves.”

According to Betz, a further reading of the Sermon on the Mount (5:21-48) represents six cases of peacemaking although the term peacemaking is not used.²³ The issues concerning forgiveness (Mt 6:12, 14-15) and judging (7:1-5) are also related to peacemaking. All these texts underscore the importance of peace in Christian life. It should be marked by peace, which is an expression or fruit of genuine love.

Based on all that we have seen so far, we may understand the peacemakers (εἰρηνοποιός) as who actively promote right relationship between people, who demonstrate love and concern for their enemies. They establish peace in the world. In being a peacemaker, one imitates Jesus the prince of peace and the Father in heaven, the God of peace. The peacemaker must have certain characteristics like love and mercy like the Father and the Son. So, this points out that, peacemakers have a role to play in our day today life, in the family, society, and world at large.

Sons of God

The reward promised for the peacemakers is that they will be called sons of God (υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται). The verb “to be called” (κληθήσονται) in the passive voice denotes a divine act by which one becomes a son of God.²⁴ It means that not everyone will be honoured with the title “sons of God” but only those who work for shālôm (wholeness and harmony rather than strife and discord in all aspects of life) and who reconcile others to God and each other will “be called sons of God.”

In the OT the designation “son of God” generally referred to Israel in reference to the people's special relationship with God who had chosen them and made his covenant with them (Ex 4:22; Deut 14:1; Hos 1:10; Jer 31:9). There are few texts in the OT which give the idea of father-son relationship between God and his people. God asked Nathan to inform David that he will raise up an offspring and in this context God says “I will be a father to him and he shall be a son to me.” (2 Sam 7:14). Another beautiful thing is that sonship and peacemaking are brought together in 1Chr 22:9-10.

Matthew uses the expression “sons of God” only twice in his gospel in 5:9 and 5:45. In Mt 5:45 Jesus says: “Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; (ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς) for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous.” Here, the characteristic of the Father is presented who is merciful and compassionate to everyone. He takes care of their needs, and does not prevent the natural powers from serving them. He is gracious to all irrespective of their response, because it is his nature. Similarly, since the disciples are children of the Father, and if they want to become his children, they should treat others, including their enemies and persecutors, as their Father would treat them. Here, loving one's enemies becomes a necessary requirement to be the children of the Father in heaven.

In Mt 5:9 peacemaking is the condition for becoming children of God. The virtue of “love for enemy” is implicit in this beatitude. So, in their mission of peacemaking these blessed ones are in fact imitating their Father in heaven. Father becomes their model. Therefore, by exhibiting conduct corresponding to that of the Father (5:9, 45), they show themselves indeed to be sons of God. The ultimate status of sonship declared at the consummation expresses the complete acceptance by God.²⁵ The peacemakers, who are blessed in the seventh beatitude (Mt 5:9), are the people who share the peacemaking nature of the Father, and are thus called to be his children. Peacemaking was the mission of Jesus. He is our peace; he broke the dividing wall of hostility (Eph 2:14) and reconciled people to God. The “peacemakers” who participate in his mission on earth, will also “participate” in his dignity – the divine sonship.

Conclusion

We find an inner affinity between the non-violence of Buddha and the peace making preached by Jesus. To “make peace” or work for peace” means to strive for love and harmony and seek ways to put an end to all sorts of enmity and violence. The teachings of Buddha and Christ strongly oppose the use of violence. When we draw a sharp boundary between self and others leads to the construction of a self-image that sees all that is not of 'me and

mine' (such as those of another country, race, or creed) as alien and threatening. When this strong sense of self is reduced by practicing Buddhist and Christian teachings, such egocentric preoccupations are thought to subside and to be replaced by a greater appreciation of the kinship among beings. When threatened, we are encouraged to practice patience. Anger is seen as a negative emotion that serves only to inflame situations and inevitably rebounds, causing negative karmic consequences. Non-injury has also its positive counterpart. It demands not only abstention but also practice of loving-kindness, *metta*, to all. Peacemaking is the responsibility of all the human being. It involves a pursuit of justice and reconciliation. As long as there is injustice, exploitation of the poor by the rich, corruption, conflicts and war, suppression of the legitimate rights of the poor, there cannot be peace and harmony in the world. So, peacemakers must try to remove all these, and try to establish peace and harmony.

Non-violence dissipates the fear and hostility which engender conflict and so removes one of the main causes of violent disputes. Non-violence and peacemaking as ethical demands, command and challenge, to live a life of righteousness, to be merciful, love and forgive their enemies and to be peacemakers by loving and reconciling with the people, which finally results and leads to live in peace and harmony with God, self and others. The Buddha and Jesus expressed a pattern for the ending of suffering and the way to happiness. Jesus and Buddha saw the same essential truths. The Buddhist goal is the liberation of all sentient beings through full and harmonious development of wisdom and compassion; hence, a Buddhist's spiritual growth is exemplified by activities of wisdom and compassion in life. This may seem too abstract to make sense objectively; however, a Buddhist may experience the peace and empathy resulting from practicing no-attachment and selfless service. The Christian goal is to share the glory of God in the union with God; hence, a Christian's spiritual growth is to be measured by his love of God, his service to God and the sharing of God's love that he has attained with the people. In other words, the goal of Christianity and Buddhism are to be measured by their universal love and compassionate service, which bring peace and harmony in the world.

Notes:

- 1 Matthew Ebenezer, "Persecution and the Church: A Historical Overview," DTJ 6, no. 1 (March 2009): 77-100.
- 2 Somen Das, *Christian Ethics and Indian Ethos* (Delhi: I.S.P.C.K., 1989), 51.
- 3 Nagendra, Singh K.R., *International Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, (Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.: New Delhi, 1997), 257.
- 4 Mathew Chandrankunnel, *Buddhist Ecological Consciousness*, (Journal of Dharma, 39, 1 January-March 2014), 31.
- 5 Muller, M., *Buddha and Buddhism: Studies in Buddhism*, (Calcutta, 1953), 65.
- 6 Saddhatissa H., *Buddhist Ethics, Essence of Buddhism*, (George Allen & Unwin Ltd.: London, 1971), 89.
- 7 Saddhatissa H., *Buddhist Ethics, Essence of Buddhism*, 89.
- 8 Damien Keown, *Buddhist Ethics: A Very Short Introduction*, 7.
- 9 C.S. Keener, *A commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 167.
- 10 M.E. Boring, *The Gospel of Matthew*, (NIB 8; Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1995), 177.
- 11 H.D. Betz, *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*, Translated by L. L. Welborn, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 52.
- 12 Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary* (trans. Wilhelm C. Linss; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1985), 214.
- 13 Luz, Matthew, 217.
- 14 Georg Strecker, *The Sermon on the Mount: An Exegetical Commentary*, trans. O. C. Dean, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 29-30; Hendrickx Herman. *Sermon on the Mount*, (Manila: East Asian Pastoral Institute, 1979), 19-20; Jan Lambrecht, *The Sermon on the Mount: Proclamation and Exhortation*, (GNS 14; Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1985), 62-64.
- 15 Robert A. Guelich, *The Matthean Beatitudes: Entrance Requirements or Eschatological Blessings?* *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976), 431-34; Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew 1, 1-7. International Critical*

- Commentary*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 439-40.
- 16 Mark Allen Powell, "Matthew's Beatitudes: Reversals and Rewards of the Kingdom," *CBQ* 58, no. 3 (July 1996), 461-79; Warren Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-political and Religious Reading* (Bangalore: TPI, 2007), 131.
 - 17 Gundry H. Robert, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 69.
 - 18 It occurs 237 times in the Hebrew OT. Johannes, Botterweck G. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (TDOT), (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapid. Mich., 1977) 15. 13-49.
 - 19 TDOT, 15:14-49, 26.
 - 20 Geoffrey W. Bromiley. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (TDNT), (William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapid. Mich., 1985), 2.400-402, 406-417.
 - 21 Davies and Allison, Matthew, 457.
 - 22 Guilech, Sermon, 91; Betz, Sermon, 138.
 - 23 Betz, Sermon on the Mount, 139.
 - 24 Guilech, Sermon, 92.
 - 25 Guilech, Sermon, 92.