

Judaism and Christianity II — After a Colloquium and a War

KRISTER STENDAHL

A reprint from
Harvard Divinity Bulletin
Autumn 1967

In 1963 the Harvard Divinity School arranged for a Roman Catholic-Protestant Colloquium. Many factors converged into that decision and invitation. Some of our faculty had served as Observers at the sessions of the Second Vatican Council and were following closely its further developments. In 1958, the Charles Chauncey Stillman chair for Roman Catholic Studies had been established at Harvard University, and it had been decided that this chair should be in the Divinity School rather than in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. For the academic year 1962-63, we were granted permission to use the funds for this Colloquium in lieu of the visiting professorship envisaged. And, above all, it was the right moment to highlight and scrutinize the new spirit of ecumenism by placing it in the crucible of academic inquiry. For all of us who participated in the seminars, the Colloquium was a stimulating and reassuring experience. Our scholarly deliberations indicated that the image of an ecumenical breakthrough—as pictured by the press-coverage of the Vatican Council—was, indeed, a well-founded one, and we could push beyond what was already achieved. In addition, there were the symbolic effect of Cardinal Bea's lectures and the demonstration that Roman Catholics were not guests but co-workers in the theological enterprise of the Divinity School.¹

In some ways things turned out differently with the Jewish-Christian Colloquium to which the Divinity School invited an equal number of scholars in the fall of 1966. And these differences are symptomatic of the present state of Jewish-Christian relations. The outward arrangements were similar. A wide range of such consultations had taken place, the press-coverage of which usually highlighted a new "ecumenical" spirit. It was deemed timely to choose this topic for the major scholarly celebration of our 150th anniversary year as a Divinity School. Names like those of George Foot Moore and Harry A. Wolfson indicated Harvard's substantial part in the serious academic study of the topic. The present faculty had played its part in these areas, both in the States and in the Middle East. The generous interest of the American Jewish Committee allowed us

to plan on strong international participation. The aim was the same as three years earlier. We wanted to test, in the sober and sharp light of academic inquiry, where the cutting edge was in studies significant to the widespread dialogues of Judaism and Christianity. We wanted to test how well-founded the publicized spirit of brotherhood was, and, hopefully, to suggest lines for further progress. I think it is fair to say that we did not come very far. We did not do so well. But that is also important, since it indicates how mandatory it is to work harder. Thus it may be useful to have me, as one of the participants, reflect in writing on some of the reasons for such a state of affairs.²

Here we must consider a basic incompatibility between Judaism and Christianity. We are used to treating them as two "religions" or two "traditions" contributing to Western culture. But in doing so we may well overlook elements which are constitutive. Both as religions and as traditions, Judaism and Christianity are related to each other in ways which make it difficult for them to be merely parallel phenomena. On the one hand, Christianity grew out of Judaism with a claim to be the fulfillment thereof, and, on the other, in the history of ideas they are intertwined beyond disentanglement. It could be argued, for example, that the beneficial contribution of Christianity to Western culture was exactly its function as the vehicle for the Jewish component in Christianity, while some of the less attractive elements of Christian ideology are the properly "Christian" ones. Or—as is often done in Christian circles—such an argument could be put forward in its absolutely opposite form. So complex is the matter when considered in the history of ideas.³

When we think of Christianity and Judaism as communities of faith, as church and synagogue, the incompatibility is perhaps most obvious in the fact that the church is by definition set on mission and conversion, and that this missionary thrust includes the hope that Jews accept Jesus as their long-awaited Messiah. Judaism, on the other hand, has no *equivalent* urge toward evangelization among the Gentiles.^{3a} While this difference in the theological structure of the two has led to gruesome things where the Jews constituted a minority placed in a so-called Christian society, the problem itself is not dependent on a minority/majority situation. While it can be alleviated in a secular and pluralistic situation, it remains a problem at any direct confrontation between Church and Synagogue. It is a problem which works both ways. The "pressure" from the Christian side heightens the fear on the Jewish side, and leads to frequent pleas that the Christians declare a non-mission

Krister Stendahl is Frothingham Professor of Biblical Studies. In 1963, the *BULLETIN* printed his convocation address *Judaism and Christianity: Then and Now* [republished in M. E. Marty and D. G. Peerman, eds., *New Theology* No. 2, Macmillan Paperback, 1965, pp. 153-64].

In the present article he builds on the New Testament evidence there given and goes further, both in time and in thought.

stance, in conformity with that of Judaism. If *we* don't, why do *you*? The incompatibility is a basic one, and is one of the most serious factors in the Jewish dispersion with its concern about assimilation.

This leads us to another factor which troubles a dialogue between Judaism and Christianity: the whole web of guilt and fear which the 2000 years of our common history has made us inherit. It could perhaps be said that one issue in our Colloquium as an academic enterprise was whether the scholarly approach should attempt to stand above this factor, and achieve a non-emotional detachment therefrom. Were Auschwitz and Belsen to be considered admissible evidence in our court of discussion, or not? The problem reminds me of the discussion whether nuclear warfare is just another quantitative development of weaponry, or whether it changes the ethical problems of the world in a qualitative fashion so as to make many earlier forms of argumentation obsolete.

Such discussions can often turn cynical. It seems that the attempted genocide of the 40's, even if considered "only" a quantitative intensification of the pogroms, is a valid reason to ask new and more drastic questions about Christian responsibility, and exactly in that academic fashion. Christian theologians, preachers, and laymen all tend to make a most convenient distinction between Christianity as an ideal phenomenon—a priori beyond suspicion of any guilt in these matters—and bad "Christians" who in their lack of true Christianity have committed heinous crimes. But after 2000 years, such a facile distinction becomes rather suspect. It is a striking example of the most primitive mistake in the comparative study of religions. One compares one's own religion in its ideal form with the actual form and manifestations of other faiths. We must rather ask openly and with trembling whether there are elements in the Christian tradition—at its very center—which lead Christians to an attitude toward Judaism which we now must judge and overcome. It is an odd form of anti-intellectualism to believe that the theology is all right but the practice and sentiments of individuals are to blame. It may well be that we should be more responsible for our thoughts and our theology than for our actions. To trust in "men of good will" and to leave the theological structures unattended is bad strategy.

The Harvard Colloquium had its challenge exactly at this point. We could take for granted that we were all for brotherhood and against bias and discrimination. We had all done our part at community activities to the betterment of social and personal relations between Christians and Jews. But now we were to test the theo-

retical bases for such desirable attitudes. And here we found that little had been done which could constitute a consensus. And even less had been done so as to intimate a new starting point.

It could perhaps be argued that this was partly due to a more accidental incompatibility at our Colloquium. We were fortunate in having a wider spread of theological and philosophical opinion among the Jewish participants than was perhaps the case with those who spoke out of a Christian tradition. In the future, this should be corrected by widening the Christian spectrum. The main threat to ecumenical work is that more and more significant voices are frozen out, while those who remain in conversation pride themselves on their increasing agreements. Nevertheless, the radical nature of our problem can perhaps be well exemplified by two publications which have appeared since the Colloquium.

On my desk is an edition of the Gospel of John, the title page and dust-jacket of which state—partly in re-assuring Gothic print—that here is "The Gospel according to Saint John, in the words of the King James Version of the year 1611. Edited in conformity with the true ecumenical spirit of His Holiness, Pope John XXIII, by Dagobert D. Runes. The message of Jesus is offered here without adulteration by hate and revulsion against the people of the Savior."⁴ In this edition, some twenty shorter or longer passages of the Fourth Gospel are deleted,⁵ and at other points, references to the Jews are exchanged for general terms like "the people," "the crowd(s)," etc. In 7:13, 19:38, and 20:19 we read that those friendly to Jesus acted out of fear of the Romans—not of the Jews, as the text says. Such an edition is based on a laudable sentiment. And many of us would prefer a New Testament without the marks of bitter feelings between Church and Synagogue. But it is hard to believe that the production of a fraudulent text can help anyone. There is no manuscript basis whatsoever for these deletions and changes.⁶

I have not brought up this type of pious fraud in order to ridicule what is intended as a positive attempt toward bettering Jewish-Christian relations. Rather, it points toward the serious fact that the Christian Bible itself contains material about the Jews which must strike the contemporary reader as offensive and hateful.

That such and similar New Testament sayings have functioned as "divine" sanction for hatred against the Jews is well-known and a commonly accepted fact. The more crucial question is whether they should not be defined as having in themselves, and in their very biblical context, that element of bitterness and hateful zeal.

This issue is well and tragically demonstrated in

recent book by Cardinal Bea.⁷ It had been his eager expectations to have the Second Vatican Council make a strong statement which in effect would condemn all anti-Jewish sentiment, social and theological, as sin against God and his Christ. Much attention has been given to the ways in which this statement was finally toned down to a far more guarded and general one and placed in the context of the Council's "Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions." By his book and by its very title, Bea tries to salvage his original intention and to give as positive an interpretation as possible to what finally was decreed. In that sense the book is a moving personal document. We should, however, not blame the outcome at the Council only on political pressure from the Arab world—Christian and Muslim—nor on an ill intentioned conservatism among the bishops. Bea's own presentation makes it perfectly clear that the theological structure of the New Testament material cannot so easily be brought into harmony with a spirit of love and humility on the side of Christians. 1 Thess. 2:14ff. stands out and bothers Bea continuously (e.g., pp. 74, 87, 158, 165) and he can only counterbalance it with the Pauline sentiment in Rom. 9:1ff. Much attention is given to the fact that the gospels often confine the responsibility for the death of Jesus to the Sanhedrin or to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; hence it is not tied to all "the Jews" of that time, let alone of later generations. This is not the place to argue whether such an interpretation can be defended. If it is, it is a fine point, immensely difficult to retain, in the future development. Nor does it quite suffice to stress the love of Christ as an antidote to the bitter language about the Jews to which the Christian bible-reader is exposed. At least history shows, that so far, that has not been enough. In short, one reason for the defeat of Bea's intentions at the Council was that too many texts from the New Testament were against him. This is the really serious level of Christian anti-semitism: can the church admit to the tinge of anti-Jewish elements in its very Scriptures?

Much of recent discussion, especially the one related to the Vatican Council, has centered around the question of the "guilt" of the Jews for the crucifixion of Jesus and the so-called deicide. It may be that this specific issue is the natural one to focus upon within the Roman Catholic tradition, and within that context the Council's declaration achieves a certain corrective when it declares that "what happened in his (Jesus') passion cannot be charged against all Jews, without distinction, nor against the Jews of today."⁸

But there is a more subtle and, I think, more powerful

form of the anti-Jewish element in Christian theology to consider, especially in Protestantism and then most prominently in Lutheranism.⁹ I refer to the theological model "Law and Gospel." According to this model, this habit-forming structure of theological thinking, Jewish attitudes and Jewish piety are by definition the example of the wrong attitude toward God. The Christian proposition in the teachings of Jesus, Paul, John and all the rest, is always described in its contrast to Jewish "legalism," "casuistry," "particularism," ideas of "merit" etc. This whole system of thinking, with its image of the Pharisees and of the political Messianism of the Jews, treats Jewish piety as the black background which makes Christian piety the more shining. In such a state of affairs, it is hard to engender respect for Judaism and the Jews. And the theological system requires the retention of such an understanding of Judaism, whether true or not.¹⁰ Even when the seriousness of Jewish piety is commended, it is done with faint praise: it may be admirable in its sincerity but just for that reason, it is more off the mark.¹¹

All this adds up to a deep-rooted tension between Judaism and Christianity. In a historical perspective there is little surprise that that should be so. The early Christian movement was a distinct and vigorous sect within Judaism, fierce in its critique of other segments of Jewish religious life. Just as was the Qumran sect at the Dead Sea, the writings of which are filled with scathing and even hateful comments about the Jewish establishment in Jerusalem.¹² The prophetic tradition within Judaism reaches equally fierce expressions, "for the Lord reproves him whom he loves, as a father the son in whom he delights" (Prov. 3:12, cf. Hebr. 12:5ff.) and the prophet did his part of that reproving. In a prophetic tradition, this is the natural discourse.

What makes for the problem for Christianity versus Judaism is that this prophetic language fell, so to say, into the hands of the Gentiles. It should not be forgotten that perhaps all of our literary remains from the earliest period of the Christian movement are not only in the Greek language (which was used at that time also by many Jews—even by the majority of the Jews), but was shaped in its present form by churches which were predominantly Gentile in their constituency. In seeking its identity, this primarily Gentile church found its rationale partly in the "no of the Jews" to Jesus Christ. To Paul, the Jew, this "no" was a mystery which he treated with awe, and which, according to him, should create even greater awe and reverence in Gentile minds (Rom. 11:20). Nor does he suggest a Gentile mission to the Jews. As a good Pharisee, he leaves the solution

in the hands of God (11:25-36).

But once this Jewish context and identification was lost, the words of Jesus and the earliest witnesses of the apostolic period received a new setting. They were not any longer operating within the framework of the Jewish self-criticism. They hardened into accusations against "the Jews," the synagogue across the street, and against the people who claimed the same Scriptures, but denied its fulfillment in Jesus Christ.

The drastic consequence of such form-critical observations could perhaps be stated somewhat like this: The Christian Church has no "right" to the use of these prophetic statements, once it has lost its identification with Judaism. Even if we repeated the actual words of Jesus, preserved by tape-recordings, these very words would mean something else, something contrary to his intention, once they were uttered from without instead of from within the Jewish communities.¹³

The compassionate sorrow of Jesus as he placed himself in the succession of the prophets and wept over Jerusalem (Mt. 23: 37-39) hardened into a self-righteous reassurance in the church; and the way in which Jews chose to remain aloof to Christian claims angered the frustrated missionaries and theologians so as to make the Jews the primary example of the enemies of Christ. Such sentiments color practically all expressions of Christian theology, from New Testament times (including the gospels) to the present.¹⁴ There is little reason to wonder about the fear and tensions in this area. The question must be asked—as it was at our Colloquium—if the present attempts to purge Christian liturgies, catechisms and hymnals from overt antisemitic elements are not only coming too late, but are primarily too timid and totally insufficient. The church is not only responsible for its intentions, which may be honorable, but also for what *actually* happens in the minds of its *actual* members and half-members as they have been and are exposed to its Scriptures and message.

What should and could then be done? It is clear to me that Christian theology needs a new departure. And it is equally clear that we cannot find it on our own, but only by the help of our Jewish colleagues. We must plead with them to help us. And as far as we are concerned, it is not a dialogue we need; we are not primarily anxious to impart our views as they impart theirs. We need to ask, in spite of it all, whether they are willing to let us become again part of their family, a peculiar part to be true, but, even so, relatives who believe themselves to be a peculiar kind of Jews. Something went wrong in the beginning. I say "went wrong," for I am not convinced that what happened in the severing of

the relations between Judaism and Christianity was the good and positive will of God. Is it not possible for us to recognize that we parted ways not according to but against the will of God?

I know that this is a strange way to speak. I know that it may be branded as historical romanticism, an attempt to turn the clock back. But why call it "to turn the clock back"? Why not say instead that the time has come for us to find the alternatives which were lost at that ancient time, alternatives which are the theological expressions of our repentance and of our understanding as they force themselves upon us today?

In this respect the parallel to the ecumenical movement is highly instructive. After a period of improved relations between the churches, Christians came to a point where the parting of ways in the past appeared to have grown out of diverse concerns within the one church. Many of these differences—some of them pre-figured already in the rich variations within the New Testament itself—are serious, but none serious enough for the divisions which hardened into distinct "churches" and "sects." And, to be sure, no excuse could or should be found for the way in which this "hardening" developed into walls of suspicion and wars of suppression. So began a new attempt to find ways of growing together again. Not a syncretistic compromising of conflicting views, but a strategy developed by which actual churches begin to express the once lost unity. This is not a romantic way to play the fourth, or eleventh, or sixteenth century. It is a way to respond to one's own faith and understanding in the twentieth.

There are good theological reasons for a similar movement in the relation between Judaism and Christianity. Needless to say, there are differences, too. But if it be true that "something went wrong" in their parting of the ways, we should not elevate the past to an irrevocable will of God, but search for the lost alternatives.

What they are is too early to say. There may be many. The important thing is to accept the possibility that there are such. My own thinking is naturally influenced by my studies of the first century of the Common Era. In the Colloquium, strong arguments were given by Jewish and Christian scholars of that period to the effect that *both* "Judaism" as we know it and "Christianity" have their respective beginnings in the first century. Out of the varied and rich religious life of post-biblical Judaism prior to the year 70, there emerged two main traditions. One was Rabbinic Judaism as codified in Mishna and Talmud, the other was Christianity. *Both* claimed their continuity and authenticity from the Scriptures and the ongoing post-biblical tradition.

Each came to brand the other as unfaithful and heretical in their respective teaching and practice. Such an admittedly oversimplified model has much to commend it as far as historical scholarship is concerned, and it serves to question many of our traditional views.¹⁵

It is obvious that a Christian plea for a new relation between Judaism and Christianity of the kind we have wished for here must raise serious questions in the minds of the Jewish community. Even if it were granted that our intentions were serious when we describe our plea as one borne out of repentance and humility—for we are the ones to ask that we be recognized as a peculiar kind of Jews, and it is up to “Judaism” to see if that is possible—it must be recognized that such a question is a new one, and utterly unexpected from our divided and common history. We Christians must be prepared to face “conditions,” and that will be the time when the seriousness of our repentance will be tested. Such “conditions” may be interpreted by some as a compromising of our faith. At that point, it will be of utmost importance for Christian theology to see clearly what “our faith” is, and what must be judged to be expressions of that faith which were conditioned by our division, rather than by the revelation in Jesus Christ and by the will of God.

Obviously Judaism, on its side, will have to face similar searching questions. But rabbinic *halaka* knows how the time can be ripe for something new, and this, if any situation, is one “when it is a time to do something for the Lord” (Gittin 60a, cf. MBer. 9:5).¹⁶

It should be noted that our thinking here is openly informed by a theology of history. That is, we do not think about religious matters in terms of timeless truths, revealed in a form unrelated to the situations in which they are given. Both their original form and their continuous interpretation depend on the situations to which they speak. And the religious communities which listen and interpret are organic bodies which must find out what God wants now, as he governs his people and his world. Without attention to that *now*, our interpretations can never be true, although they may sound orthodox in a literal sense.¹⁷

In such a context, a comment which was made repeatedly at the Colloquium deserves attention. When Christians take for granted that their faith and theology is superior to Judaism, they often do so for the very simple reason that Christianity followed upon Judaism as a new and hence superior “philosophy.” Or an argument of Heilsgeschichte makes it easy to see the later stage as superior to an earlier one. If that be so, we should take the emergence of Islam far more ser-

iously than we usually do, for here is a tradition which makes the reasonable claim of having superseded both Judaism and Christianity, and doing so according to the will and plan of God. We should at least not close our minds to the suggestion that future theological reflection, Christian and Jewish, will cut through the immense historical barriers against bringing Islam into our serious consideration.¹⁸

It may seem almost ironical to bring up such a matter at the present time. Just as centuries of Western history were marked by hatred between Christians and Muslims—while the Jews were treated far better by the latter than by the former, first in Spain and then under the Turks—so today the tension between Muslims and Jews is one of the concerns of the world at large. It should not be forgotten, however, that the Arabs most involved in the present crisis are not to be identified with the Muslims since a sizable number of them are Christians. Also for that reason I find it important to close my reflections about Judaism and Christianity with some observations on the situation after the military victory of the Israelis in the summer of 1967.¹⁹

It is clear enough from what we have said already that current events and theological work are not unrelated. Theology—be it academic or unconsciously embedded in piety and spontaneous reactions—does inform man’s actions, for better or for worse.

The relation between Judaism and the State of Israel is naturally quite complex. It would be wrong to identify the two, both in terms of Israel itself, and in terms of the vast majority of Jewry living in other parts of the world. But it would be equally wrong to consider Israel a purely secular state. To be sure, its constitution guarantees freedom of religion, and retains the religious courts for Christians and Muslims in matters of marriage etc., according to the ancient system inherited from the Turks and the British. But Israel is a Jewish state and its religion is Judaism. Without getting involved in the difficulties of defining “Jew,” “Judaism” and “Israel,” it is important for Christians and Westerners to realize that a certain kind of “clean thinking” does not work here, although it would be convenient. I refer to the view—expressed also by some Jews—that Israel is a political and secular phenomenon, while Judaism is to be defined in spiritual terms as a religion or a tradition. At this juncture in history, at least, that is not so. The driving forces which made Palestine—rather than Uganda—the goal for Zionism²⁰ are reason enough for the intertwining of Jewish faith and the State of Israel. That force was rooted in the Scriptures and the tradition. Our evaluation of the present situation must take that into

account. Whether we like it or not, when we speak and think about the State of Israel, we are speaking about a very substantial element of Judaism. Not only in terms of so many Jews, but also in terms of Jews who see the State of Israel as the fulfillment of God's promises.

We began our reflections by pointing to the incompatibility of Judaism and Christianity. This is not only a "difficulty" in dialogue. It is also necessary to grant to Judaism its right to work out its own problems according to its own understanding of its Scripture and tradition. It is not for us to impose on Judaism our understanding of what are the "true insights of the best of the prophets." It is not for us to prescribe for Judaism that its religious aspirations should not be tied to a land or a city, "to a piece of real estate" as one Christian writer chose to express it. It is true indeed that Judaism has lived and flourished in the Dispersion for 2000 years, but it did so because somewhere in its soul was the hope for the return. That hope became spiritualized at times, but never really so. Judaism as we know it today is related to the Land, the *Eretz*. Its rabbis and its believers may differ widely in their interpretations of this fact and its foundations,²¹ but it is hardly our task as Christians to lecture the Jews on how they as Jews should read their Scriptures.

For this reason, I am inclined to think that some of the present discussion about the possibilities of an international Jerusalem overlooks one important point. The discussion often centers on the access to the sacred sites. For Christians and Muslims that term is an adequate expression of what matters. Here are sacred places, hallowed by the most holy events, here are the places for pilgrimage, the very focus of highest devotion. It would be cruel indeed if such places were not available to all the faithful.

But Judaism is different—although the Wailing Wall came to take on much of that same character, partly under the influence of the Christian example. The sites sacred to Judaism on the Israeli side have no shrines. Its religion is not tied to "sites," but to the Land, not to what happened in Jerusalem, but to Jerusalem itself.

I would not argue that this settles the matter in favor of Israeli rule in Jerusalem. But I would argue that we as Christians concerned about the right relation to Judaism must recognize the difference between the access to Christian and Muslim sites, and the Jewish attachment to the city. To overlook that is another form of a patronizing *interpretatio christiana*. To Christians, Jerusalem is a holy city by virtue of its shrines. For us it would be more than natural to worship at them in a Jewish city;

one could even say that such a situation would be preferable, since that is how it was when it all happened.

In the months and years to come, difficult political problems in the Middle East call for solutions. Christians both in the West and in the East will weigh the proposals differently. But all of us should watch out for the ways in which the ancient venom of Christian antisemitism might enter in. A militarily victorious and politically strong Israel cannot count on half as much good will as a threatened Jewish people in danger of its second holocaust. The situation bears watching. That does not mean that Israel is always right or that its political behavior and demands should always be supported by all who as Christians would like to be considered honorary Jews for Jesus Christ's sake.

Our stance, rather, presupposes our trust in Judaism's capacity to find its own way as it seeks viable structures for the relation between its faith and the political realities of the State of Israel, and of the global community of nations and men. The Christian West has learned far too slowly and reluctantly that a close interplay between religion and politics has dangers so insurmountable that our best choice must be an acceptance of pluralism and the secularization of political decisions. The progress in that direction has also paved the way for many of the improvements in Jewish-Christian relations in the West. For that reason, it is only natural that we hope for similar developments within the Jewish state. To most of us, such a development is the only one in which we can put our realistic hopes for peace and co-existence. When we as Christian theologians want to defend the freedom of Judaism to find its own answers, we cannot help hoping that such answers can be aided by the negative experience we—and they as a minority in Christian societies—have had, experiences which have taught us to fear rather than rejoice in religion as a political factor. In politics the theologian, Christian and Jewish, must recognize that he is an amateur, and his professional concern for the ways of God should not cover over that simple fact.

I have no doubt that Judaism has the spiritual capacity to find its own solutions to the problems at hand. The present political situation may well unleash a type of Christian attitude which identifies Judaism and Israel with materialism and lack of compassion, devoid of the Christian spirit of love. Even a superficial knowledge of Judaism in its own terms makes it abundantly clear that such is not its nature. And an even more superficial acquaintance with church history suffices to silence such a patronizing attitude. Our hope for Israel should rather be for political wisdom in accordance with the riches of

the long and varied tradition of the Jewish faith, a faith rich in compassion, as it always remembers the words "... for you were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Ex. 22:21).

As we look and work toward a new structure for our common trust in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—and of Jesus of Nazareth, that trust includes our personal confidence in Judaism as a force for peace and justice.

Notes

- ¹ For the material see Samuel H. Miller and G. Ernest Wright, eds., *Ecumenical Dialogue at Harvard: The Roman Catholic-Protestant Colloquium*. Cambridge, Mass., The Belknap Press [Harvard Univ. Press], 1964.
- ² My perspective is limited, especially by the fact that our work was divided into three Seminars, and I took part in Seminar II, devoted to biblical and theological questions, subsumed under the title "Torah and Dogma." Seminar I dealt with the period of the 16th century Reformation, and especially with the question whether the Calvinistic emphasis on the Old Testament and Covenant leads to a difference in the Jewish-Christian question, as compared with the Lutheran and its pattern of Law-Gospel theology. Seminar III addressed itself to the social dimensions of the problem and focused on "Secularism: Threat and Promise." We hope to publish a selection of the papers in a forthcoming issue of *Harvard Theological Studies*.
- ³ Hans Jonas' lecture—"Jewish and Christian Elements in Western Philosophical Tradition"—at the Colloquium argued impressively that the Christian contribution to Western philosophy was in matters relating to Creation, and thus "Jewish," while Christology and trinitarian speculation had fostered little of significance.
- ^{3a} For the evidence of Jewish missionary activity in the period before the Crusades, see B. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidental, 430-1096* (Etudes juives 2; Paris, 1960), 159-212.
- ⁴ New York, Philosophical Library, 1967.
- ⁵ Major deletions: 2:12-22; 5:15-18; 7:19-23, 32-36, 43-52; 8:37-59; 9:22-23, 27-29; 11:52-57; 12:10; 13:14, 19-24, 32, 35-36; 19:4-8, 15-16, 31-37.
- ⁶ In his *The Jew and the Cross* (New York, Philosophical Library, 1965), Runes gives what seems to be the rationale for his "editing." There he speaks of the gospel accounts as "set down by the evangelists of the Bishop of Rome in the fourth century" (p. 25), cf. "the scribes of the Bishop of Rome" (p. 26). It so happens that the oldest papyrus to any New Testament book is a fragment to the Gospel of John which begins with the words "the Jews" in 18:31, where Runes pretends to bring us back beyond the anti-Jewish papal scribes of the fourth century by reading "the people." And the whole fragment contains 18:31-34, 37-38, i.e. exactly some of the verses deleted by Runes. But the papyrus fragment is from ca. AD 125. On the other hand, 7:53-8:11, the moving story about the woman taken in adultery, is included in Runes' edition, although all significant manuscripts indicate that it was added by Christian scribes, perhaps just in the 4th century!
- ⁷ Augustin Cardinal Bea, S.J., *The Church and the Jewish People*. New York, Harper & Row, 1966.
- ⁸ See, Bea, *op. cit.*, p. 152. On the Jewish question at the Council, see also G. H. Williams, *Dimensions of Roman Catholic Ecumenism* (IARF Papers on Religion in the Modern World 1; 1966), 30-34.
- ⁹ And it should be noted that Lutheran theologians, and historians unconsciously shaped by a Lutheran tradition, have played a disproportionately great role in contemporary New Testament studies. Names like Jeremias, Bultmann, Käsemann, etc. appear on the American scene as "highly critical scholars," but they are all Lutheran in background and commitment.
- ¹⁰ See my article on "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," in which I try to show how this image of Judaism is not that of Paul's, but of the Western tradition from Augustine, via Luther, up to the present. *Harvard Theological Review* 56 (1963), 199-215; reprinted in *Ecumenical Dialogue at Harvard*, pp. 236-56. See now also D. Georgi, *Der Kampf um die reine Lehre im Urchristentum als Auseinandersetzung um das rechte Verständnis der an Israel ergangenen Offenbarung Gottes*, in Stöhr, ed., *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament*. Munich, Kaiser Verlag, 1967.
- ¹¹ It has been argued that many articles in the great *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (ed. G. Kittel et al.) contain antisemitic elements, especially, some of those produced during the 30's and 40's. It is true that it even contains some seriously meant references to e.g. A. Rosenberg's *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Such details can be easily corrected. More serious is the fact that, by and large, it labors under the above-mentioned model, according to which Judaism is an inferior and erroneous approach to God.—This question is the more significant once this indispensable tool for New Testament studies is in the process of publication in English translation, four volumes having been published so far [*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964-]. While the use of this impressive work is to be highly recommended, its readers are advised to keep the above-mentioned problem well in mind. For recent developments, see A. Roy Eckardt, *The Jewish-Christian Dialogue: Recent Christian Efforts in Europe*, *Conservative Judaism* 19:3 (1965), 12-21, cf. also, in fuller form, *Journal of Bible and Religion* 33 (1965), 149-55.
- ¹² Paul's idea of collecting coals of fire on the enemies' heads (Rom. 12:19) has its perfect parallel in the Quoran community. Its members are taught to practice secret hatred against their opponents, assured of their future punishment through God's righteous judgment. See K. Stendahl, *Harb Non-Retaliation and Love*, 1QS x:17-20 and Rom. 12:19-21, *Harvard Theological Review* 55 (1962), 343-55.
- ¹³ Without these hermeneutical consequences, this question is well exemplified by Joseph A. Sittanyer, *Anti-Semitism and the Cry of "All the People"* (Mt. 27:25), *Theological Studies* 26 (1965), 667-71.
- ¹⁴ At the Colloquium, John Dillenberger, in his paper on "Judaism and Protestantism: Some Historical Patterns

of Understanding," stressed the significance of Ch. Y. Glock's and R. Stark's inquiry into *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism* (Harper & Row, 1965). This sociological study of contemporary Christian attitudes makes it abundantly clear that antisemitism can hardly be considered unrelated to Christian belief.

- 15 See now also E. Bammel, Christian Origins in Jewish Tradition, *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966/67), 317-35. This article is rich in historical information, but one must question the way in which we finally are told, in the tone of Christian evangelism, that the Jews "had no appropriate scheme to cope with this phenomenon [the person of Christ]" (p. 335).
- 16 As was the case in our Colloquium, the views of Jewish thinkers differ greatly as to the possibilities of going beyond the status quo. Here are three able and representative presentations: S. Siegel, Jews and Christians: The Next Step, *Conservative Judaism* 19:3 (1965), 1-11; J. J. Petuchowski, The Christian-Jewish Dialogue: A Jewish View, *The Lutheran World* 10 (1963), 373-84; J. B. Soloveitchik, Confrontation, *Tradition* 6:2 (1964), 5-29. Note the often recurring quote from Maimonides: "The thoughts of the Creator of the world cannot be comprehended by man, for His ways are not our ways, and His thoughts are not our thoughts. All the matters of Jesus the Nazarene and of Muhammed were done for the purposes of preparing the way for the Messiah and to perfect the world so that it will serve the Lord." (Mishneh Torah, Hilkhoh Melakhim 11:4).
- 17 In Rabbi Soloveitchik's article (see note 16), Judaism is seen as an a-historical, metaphysical entity. Thus our approach would find special difficulty in relation to such an understanding of Judaism—and its equivalents in Christian theology. The same difficulty loomed large in our Colloquium. But this could not be considered a distinction between Judaism and Christianity. It rather cuts across such lines, as it is rooted in different philosophical frameworks of religious thought.
- 18 It is important to note that our observation here differs from the way in which the Declaration of Vatican II deals with Islam. There the relations between Judaism and Christianity are seen in the light of divine economy (Heilsgeschichte) and "common patrimony." But Islam is treated in terms of its doctrinal structure. See, Bea, *op. cit.*, p. 150.
- 19 For a fair statement of Jewish reaction to Christian attitudes in this setting, see now S. Sandmel, *We Jews and You Christians: An Inquiry into Attitudes* (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott, 1967), 51-56.
- 20 See J. Neusner, From Theology to Ideology: The Transmutation of Judaism in Modern Times, in K. H. Silvert, ed., *Churches and States: The Religious Institutions and Modernization*. New York, American Universities Field Staff, 1967. Neusner's article is of special interest since it applies consciously to the study of Judaism the methodology urged by our colleague, Wilfred C. Smith, as stated in his *The Meaning and End of Religion*, and his paper "Traditional Religious and Modern Culture" at *The XIth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions* (1965).
- 21 See R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, Israël et Eretz Israël, *Les Temps Modernes*, nr. 253 (1967), 371-93.