



Stars in the Night: Abraham Geiger and Leo Baeck as Precursors of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue

31.10.2006 | Lehmann, Karl Cardinal

Karl Cardinal Lehmann, President of the German Catholic Bishops' Conference, reviews recent developments in the Christian-Jewish dialogue and explores its indebtedness to two leading figures in Reform Judaism in Germany, Abraham Geiger and Leo Baeck.

Stars in the Night: Abraham Geiger and Leo Baeck as Precursors of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue

Karl Cardinal Lehmann

**Address upon receiving the Abraham Geiger Prize from Abraham Geiger College (rabbinical seminary),
University of Potsdam
Berlin, March 20, 2006**

Seldom have I been so surprised and honoured as by the decision to award me the Abraham Geiger Prize. All the greater is my gratitude to those responsible for the decision, above all the Abraham Geiger College at the University of Potsdam and its principal, Rabbi Dr. Walter Homolka. I am pleased to be able to briefly explain what this honour means to me.

I.

Let me begin with the name of the man for whom the prize is named. Abraham Geiger, who was born on 24 May 1810 in Frankfurt am Main and died on 23 October 1874 in Berlin, is mainly known for his efforts to give shape to liberal Judaism that arose in the course of the 19th century. He grew up in an orthodox

family and received a traditional Talmudic education. While pursuing his education, mainly at Bonn University, he showed a growing inclination to adapt Judaism to the modern age. For him this did not mean a rejection of Judaism as it had existed in the past, but rather a rediscovery of original tendencies that he saw in its monotheism and ethics. While the Greeks had contributed the spirit of philosophy to Western civilization, the Jews had given the Western world the “religious spirit,” which had provided a firm foundation for ethics. He was also convinced that over the centuries this living faith had lost some of its strength as a result of the strict Talmudic focus on the law. This basic attitude had been cemented by the ghetto imposed on the Jews through Christian intolerance. We know that Abraham Geiger had noted such basic attitudes in the conflict between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.¹ Geiger was convinced that the Pharisees had interpreted the Bible in the spirit of their time, while the Sadducees were caught up in the letter of the Bible.

Abraham Geiger showed a decided preference in the liturgy for the German language. Despite a somewhat brusque manner – as shown in his criticism of the dietary laws, for example – he always adopted a moderate attitude to his own tradition. “Within the reform movement Geiger occupied a middle-of-the-road position, mediating between the more radical endeavours of Samuel Holdheim and Kaufmann Kohler on the one hand, and the conservative, proto-nationalist groupings represented by Zacharias Frankl and Heinrich Graetz, on the other.”²

Finally, Abraham Geiger was an extremely capable historian, whose research gave

fresh impetus not only into rabbinical Judaism, but also into early Christianity. Nor is his significance confined to these fields. His works demonstrating the influence of rabbinical literature on the text of the Koran have just been reissued.³ In his view, Islam was not the product of heretical Christian groups, but a product of Judaism. Judaism, not Christianity, was the foundation of Western civilization.

In Abraham Geiger's eyes, Jesus was a liberal Pharisee. He did not see Jesus as expressing any new ideas. He did not discard any elements of Judaism. Christianity only really began when Paul obscured the exemplary monotheism of Jesus' words and actions by the adoption of heretical thinking. Whatever one may say about these conclusions today, it cannot be denied that Abraham Geiger broke significant ground toward research into the historical Jesus – especially in the context of contemporary Judaism – which has given food for thought not only to today's researchers, but also to those engaged in the Jewish-Christian dialogue.⁴

Abraham Geiger was an archetypical founding figure who provided a host of inspiration. This applies particularly to the effect of his prayer book, which became the basis of the liturgy in Reform communities worldwide. He was firmly convinced that Judaism had to face up unreservedly to the modern age in order to survive. It is quite certain that this courage to preserve the past by engaging in creative dialogue with the present made him one of the great shapers of Reform Judaism. Hence it was only logical that in 1871, after a long

period of suspicion, he should have been appointed to a post at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin. And today it is only right that the Abraham Geiger College, as that institution's heir, should bear his name. I should like to close this section by quoting Rabbi Leo Trepp: "It must be emphasized that Geiger backed his own reforms to the hilt, regarding them as essential to Jews' survival... Geiger [was] an enthusiastic Jew whose reforms were designed to reinvigorate Judaism and dissuade Jews from conversion."⁵

II.

The Abraham Geiger College and the Abraham Geiger Prize have manifold links with the name of one of the greatest rabbis and scholars. I refer to Leo Baeck, who was born on 23 May 1873 in Lissa (Posen Province) and died on 2 November 1956 in London. Albert Friedlander described him as a "paradigm of German Judaism in the 20th century."⁶ In the period between the Kaiser's Germany and the Nazi dictatorship he was in many respects a figure of paramount importance, as a rabbi, a scholar and, finally, as a pastor for many who suffered political persecution. His work *Das Wesen des Judentums* (The Essence of Judaism),⁷ seen mainly as a riposte to Adolf von Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums* (The Essence of Christianity),⁸ established him as an outstanding interpreter and spokesman of a modern, self-confident Judaism.

Baeck's life and importance as a scholar cannot be examined in detail here. His brilliant apologia for the Jewish faith not only gave the Jewish minority cultural self-confidence in the face of the temptation to convert under the pressure of

anti-Semitism, but also declared Judaism the “religion of the future” by referring to its religious and ethical superiority. This basic text of 20th century Jewish liberalism seeks to explain why Judaism became such a great force in world history and how the latter is inconceivable without it. It is not a particularist religion of laws, but a profoundly universalist faith. “At the heart of the Jewish religion there is neither dogma nor religious inwardness, but the moral deed as a response to God’s will as revealed in the commandment and aimed at justice in the world.”⁹ Sometimes Leo Baeck’s focus on the viability of Judaism in everyday life has been misinterpreted as a fading out of the spiritual. But he was very well aware of the necessary dimensions of devotion and prayer, the observance of feast days, and all forms of religious life. Admittedly, he was imbued with confidence that the fulfilment of God’s will was a real possibility. Thus *Das Wesen des Judentums* ends with a rousing call for its “preservation.” He is concerned with the preservation of Jewish identity, but also with leading an exemplary life in keeping with the moral and religious ideal upon which alone this identity rests. “And so indeed Judaism was, and continued to be: the non-antique in the ancient world, the unmodern in the modern world. Such was to be the essence of the Jew: history’s great non-conformist, its great dissenter. That was what he was there for. This was why his struggle for his religion had to be a struggle for his self-preservation. There was no notion of power in this, but of the antithesis of power – it was a question not of power, but of individuality, of personality as laid down by the Eternal Will. It was a question not of power, but of strength. Jewish existence lived in the world as strength, and strength was greatness.”¹⁰

This greatness was demonstrated by Leo Baeck in a very special way when

Germany entered the darkest period in its history. In January 1943 he was deported to Theresienstadt, where he devoted himself entirely to pastoral tasks. Until the liberation in 1945 he helped by means of numerous lectures to strengthen the inmates' will to survive. It was a unique form of resistance against the inhumanity of the Nazis. In Theresienstadt he also wrote a book called *Dieses Volk. Jüdische Existenz* (This People: Jewish Existence), frequent revisions of which held up its publication until 1955. It told of the path taken by the Jewish people throughout history and, while painfully aware of the suffering undergone, nevertheless ended with a chapter entitled "Hope." He could only reach this conclusion because he believed that God's covenant with his chosen people continued to thrive. Its leitmotiv was: "This people is part of a covenant that embraces all peoples on earth." The clear conclusion is that Leo Baeck has a place in the history of 20th century Judaism that can hardly be overestimated. And yet I have not said anything of his numerous public functions after the war in London, where he spent the remainder of his life. His great biographer Albert H. Friedlander writes: "Right from the start Leo Baeck was for me the central figure who decisively influenced my understanding of Judaism... he became a witness of how the German Jews descended into the depths of Hell. More than just a teacher and academic... he was, and remained, a star in the night."¹¹ Thus Leo Trepp writes: "Through his steadfastness and courage in the Nazi period Leo Baeck (1873-1956) has earned an immortal place in Jewish history."¹² Hence it is only natural that the Central Council of Jews in Germany has been awarding the Leo Baeck Prize for 50 years, that the headquarters of the Central Council should be called the "Leo-Baeck-Haus," and that we are now celebrating the setting up of the Leo Baeck Foundation, which is to make an important contribution in support of the Abraham Geiger College.

III.

Leo Baeck has also been a source of inspiration for the Jewish-Christian dialogue on many different levels. ¹³ He repeatedly referred to the Jewish roots of Christian thinking, recognizing Jesus as an important Jewish figure and seeing the gospels as a part of Jewish history. His characterization of Judaism as the “classical” and Christianity as the “romantic” religion is a classification which I am not alone in finding inadequate. But the area marked out by these two terms is still a wide one. More important and longer-lasting is the inspiration he gave for a close examination of Christian roots in the context of the Jewish soil from which they sprang, an inspiration felt even to this day.

Christianity itself is inconceivable without its origins in the people of Israel. One need only think, for example, of John 4:22: “For salvation is of the Jews.” And the well-known passages in chapters 9-11 of the Epistle to the Romans which state quite clearly: “Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee” (Romans 11:18). Incidentally, one can neither delete nor ignore the New Testament passages that are critical of the Jews. They need careful interpretation today. The Holocaust undeniably opened our eyes once more to anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. It changed the perception of biblical texts, thus exerting an important hermeneutical function in the process of interpreting these texts. The whole history of the estrangement between the Church and Judaism is a burden which today’s churches cannot simply shake off. The weight of history is too great. Anti-Semitism remains a problem.

Despite many birth pangs the Second Vatican Council succeeded in issuing an

epoch-making text on the relationship between Judaism and the Church in its declaration entitled *Nostra Aetate*. In the period following the Second World War and the horrors of National Socialism there was an urgent need for a change of course by the Church and it was undeniably the popes themselves who pushed ahead with this project. On Good Friday 1959, John XXIII had offensive words deleted from the so-called “Great Intercessions.” Anti-Semitism was to be condemned for its Christian roots in an admission of guilt by the Church; a positive doctrinal statement was to put an end to the Church’s ignoring of Israel. At the same time there was no denying the fundamental difference whereby the Christians believed the Messiah had already come in the person of Jesus, whereas the Jews still awaited his coming.

A wide range of intensive activities was undertaken, not least in Pope John Paul II’s great admission of guilt in the year 2000. This also applied to the German-speaking area, a fact which is well documented. The dialogue needs to be systematically continued, although I cannot go into any more detail on this now. ¹⁴

The pre-eminence of the Jewish-Christian dialogue is explained by the reasons I have already given. The Jews are our elder brothers. We cannot forget what Christians have done to them. That is the reason why – quite apart from the ecumenical movement within the church – this dialogue continues to enjoy a high priority in the debate between faiths. I believe that the Second Vatican Council’s reform of the liturgy has been a great help here. The Great Intercessions for Good Friday now say: “Let us also pray for the Jews, to whom God, our Lord, first spoke. May He preserve them in the allegiance to His covenant and in the love of His name, so that they may reach the aim to which His will shall lead

them... hear the prayer of Thy Church for the people which Thou first chose as Thine own: Grant that it attain the fullness of redemption.”

I have already mentioned the Council Declaration *Nostra Aetate*, although I cannot deal with it in any greater detail here.¹⁵ It was followed by many similar declarations, such as the *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate*, Article 4 of 1 December 1974 and *Notes on the Correct Way to Present Jews and Judaism in Teaching and Preaching in the Catholic Church* of 24 June 1985, both issued by the Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews. I should also like to draw attention to three documents from the German-speaking area: *Unsere Hoffnung* (Our Hope), Resolution of the Joint Synod of Dioceses in the Federal Republic of Germany, 22 November 1975 (Part IV. 2); *Theologische Schwerpunkte des jüdisch-christlichen Gesprächs* (Key Theological Issues of the Jewish-Christian Dialogue), working paper of the Jewish-Christian Forum of the Central Committee of German Catholics, 8 May 1979; *Über das Verhältnis der Kirche zum Judentum* (On the Church's Relationship to Judaism), Declaration of the German Bishops, 28 April 1980.¹⁶ In these texts,¹⁷ which also include a declaration by the French bishops from the year 1973, the above-mentioned perspectives are repeated, confirmed and reinforced. The Church no longer defines its own existence polemically in opposition to Israel or from a position of aloofness. It recognizes the origins of its own faith and its own election in the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets. There is frequent resort to the image of the olive tree (cf. Romans 11). The image of the peace of Christ from Ephesians, chapter 2, where Christ reconciles Jews and heathens into one body by the cross, plays a major role. In future there can be no religious or theological self-definition of the Church at the expense of the

people of Israel, but only the recognition of a fundamental and enduring “spiritual bond.” Despite their rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, the Jews are still loved by God. It cannot be concluded from the fact that the Church sees itself as the “new people of God” that the Jews have been rejected or cursed by God. The errors arising out of vulgar theology are being put right. The Church deplors all outbursts of hatred and manifestations of anti-Semitism. Mutual acquaintance and esteem must be deepened by theological studies and a dialogue between brothers. Jews and Christians are joined by their orientation towards the future. Together with the prophets, the Church awaits the Lord’s Day, which is known only to God and on which all peoples shall praise and call upon God with one voice. There is an increasing tendency to discuss the Catholic Church’s own share of guilt. It is not just a question of expressing regret, but of really condemning what went wrong.

In recent years the German bishops have supplemented these aspects, the absence of which has often been deplored. Allow me to quote the bishops’ statement on the relationship between Christians and Jews issued on 20 October 1988, the 50th anniversary of the pogroms of November 1938 (a joint publication of the Berlin Bishops’ Conference, the German Bishops’ Conference, and the Austrian Bishops’ Conference on 20 October 1988¹⁸). The 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War in 1995 provided an occasion to recall many of the prejudices and hostile attitudes which led to the catastrophe. In January 1995, a declaration on the 50th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp was published, which corresponded to a declaration of the Polish Bishops’ Conference on the same date. These

declarations left no doubt as to the complicity of Christians and the Church. The relationship between Christians and Jews was placed in a larger context in the statement of the German bishops of 24 April 1995 commemorating the end of the Second World War fifty years earlier. Some key issues were reaffirmed and summarized in an ecumenical declaration issued jointly with the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD) on 8 May 1995. Similar utterances are to be found in numerous declarations issued on 8 May 2005.

Reference was made deliberately to an “initial breakthrough,” which applied – and continues to apply – to many fields and disciplines. Hence one may proceed on the assumption that a genuinely new epoch has been entered into, with no possibility of returning to what preceded it. Undoubtedly, a lot still has to be done to consolidate and expand this initial breakthrough. I am quite convinced that in the course of the reception process – not across the board but in isolated cases – there will be stagnation, and perhaps occasional setbacks even. Of course we will have to go more deeply into the question of how far the churches were complicit in the terrible events of the Shoah. The overall situation will have to be described in a more nuanced way than has been possible hitherto. Oppression and persecution are not the inevitable products of interpreting the Holy Scriptures. But the actual chain of historical events strengthened the disposition to hate Jews. “In this way anti-Semitism is a treasured souvenir of Christianity even in places where Christianity has been rejected, and the consequence of this for us is that, in pursuit of its political aims, the Nazi regime was well able to exploit the anti-Semitism practised and disseminated by Christianity for centuries, while not hesitating to undermine the Church and those who had faith in it and to oppress them in their turn.”¹⁹

Fundamental theological issues remain, such as a more subtly differentiated definition of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. The traditional definitions are scarcely adequate to describe the changed relationship between Judaism and the Church. Here we have Erich Zenger to thank for providing important pointers.²⁰ A more precise theological clarification of the relationship between Israel and the Church raises difficult questions. How are we to speak of them both? They certainly are not just two institutions. Nor can they be understood in terms of a permanent opposition. What is the special task of the Jewish people in God's plan? One cannot just talk of two parallel paths to salvation. All this moves some, especially in evangelical circles, to pose the question of the "Jewish mission."²¹ Finally it should be mentioned that the Jewish-Christian dialogue has also led to a new form of cooperation based on biblically inspired ethics, which basically concerns the themes of justice and the preservation of creation, peace and care for life, and especially support for human rights.

There are still a number of key issues that have not been gone into with sufficient thoroughness. Let me mention just three complexes: the Messiah question, the unique nature of Jesus as the son of God, and the question of law.²²

The "initial breakthrough" has certainly enabled us to be more relaxed about making critical remarks in a way that would not have been possible in the past. In the face of growing secularisation we would wish for us all to take part in an

intensive debate on the question of God. It goes without saying that we can neither gloss over the prehistory of Auschwitz nor can we take refuge in the end of history in order to relativise Auschwitz. Here it really is a matter of “theology after Auschwitz.”²³ This brings us to a discussion of the meaning of religion today.

I should like to close with a quotation on the “common path of Jews and Christians” from a document issued in 1979 by the Central Committee of German Catholics under the title “Key Theological Issues of the Jewish-Christian Dialogue.” This document seems to me to be ground-breaking with regard to both substance and method: “The mutual respect for the path of the other is thus inseparably bound up with considerable divergences in the view of Jesus – whether or not he was the Messiah of God. But this forces neither Jews nor Christians to dissolve the fundamental bonds imposed by God’s will once one has heeded His call. For this reason Jews and Christians are fundamentally barred from trying to persuade each other to be untrue to the call of God they have heard. This denial is not just based on tactical considerations. Nor is it just a matter of humane tolerance or respect for religious freedom. The most fundamental reason is that Jews and Christians feel themselves called by the same God. Christians’ faith does not allow them to refrain from bearing witness to Jesus as the Christ even in dealings with Jews. Jews’ faith does not allow them to refrain from stressing the fact, even in dealings with Christians, that the Torah cannot be superseded. This gives rise to the hope that this witness could reinforce the other’s faithfulness to the call of God and thus deepen mutual understanding. On the other hand, it should not include the expectation that the other should take back or modify his affirmation of the call.”²⁴

An intensification of the Jewish-Christian dialogue, such as we hope to see in our country following the recent setting up of the Rabbis' Conference, will not only support and reaffirm the common biblical witness, but may stimulate a new interest in some topics concerning the Holy Scriptures and our faith-based communities. So far, mainly because of the efforts of the two major churches, the focus has been on the inner-Christian ecumenical dialogue. This was absolutely necessary and must, of course, continue. But it may be that this concentration has allowed some aspects of the common biblical tradition to be relegated to the background. I am thinking, for example, of the fruitful preoccupation with the major issue of justification. But now, in view of this document, it is surely time for us to occupy ourselves once again with the questions of the Decalogue and the law, of God's edict as the path to life. We shall impoverish ourselves if we fail to do so. The same applies to the issues of creation and peace. They also help us to anchor faith in an appropriate manner in everyday social reality. A recurrent theme of the discussions with Franz Rosenzweig and Emanuel Levinas was the important and positive – as I would call it – observation that the dialogue between Christianity and Judaism can also save Christianity from surrendering to gnosis.²⁵

To intensify the dialogue we now have an important document in the shape of a Jewish commentary on Christians and Christianity entitled "Dabru Emet – Speak the Truth", published in the USA on 11 September 2000.²⁶ This document could become an important guide as the dialogue gains in intensity.

Under the leadership of its principal, Rabbi Dr. Walter Homolka, the Abraham Geiger College has been pursuing a broad programme of cooperation for some time now. This includes symposia – to be held in October 2006 in Rome – on the questions of the origin and function of law in biblical religion, and the appointment of a Catholic theologian – Professor Heinz-Günther Schöttler from Bamberg – as Ephraim Veitel lecturer in homiletics at the Abraham Geiger College.

It is in the context of these promising moves that I see today's presentation of the Abraham Geiger Prize. I thank you once again for this award, which I regard as both an honour and an obligation. I can find a place for myself among the efforts that are being made. Permit me to conclude with a quotation from the Jewish religious philosopher Emil L. Fackenheim, who was awarded the prize in 2002: "Do the gentiles understand? Some do, and therein lies hope, not only for Israel, but also for the nations."²⁷

Notes

1. Cf. his main work: *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judenthums*, Breslau, 1857, 2nd ed. Frankfurt, 1928; cf. esp. L. Geiger, *Abraham Geiger. Leben und Lebenswerk*, Berlin, 1910, reprinted Berlin, 2001; Susannah Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, Chicago, 1998 and the same author's *Abraham Geiger*, in *Metzler Lexikon jüdischer Philosophen. Philosophisches Denken des Judentums von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, edited by A. B. Kilcher et al., Stuttgart, 2003, pp. 244-247 (bibliography).

2. S. Heschel, Abraham Geiger, p. 246.
3. Cf. Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judentum aufgenommen? Edited and with an introduction by F. Niwöhner, Berlin, 2005 (originally published in Wiesbaden, 1833); see also the extensive review by A. Kilcher in the Neue Züricher Zeitung of 20 August 2005 (No. 193), p. 47, entitled “Jüdische Quellen des Korans. Eine philologische Pionierarbeit aus dem 19. Jahrhundert”.
4. Cf. E. L. Ehrlich und der christlich-jüdische Dialog, ed. by R. Vogel, Frankfurt, 1984.
5. Geschichte der deutschen Juden, Stuttgart, 1996, p. 153.
6. Cf. the Werke in six volumes edited by A. H. Friedlander (Gütersloh, 1996-2003); also A. H. Friedlander, Leo Baeck. Leben und Lehre, Stuttgart, 1973; E. L. Ehrlich, Leo Baeck, in H. Erler/E. L. Ehrlich (eds.), Judentum verstehen. Die Aktualität jüdischen Denkens von Maimonides bis Hannah Arendt, Frankfurt, 2002, pp. 147-167; W. Homolka, Leo Baeck. Jüdisches Denken – Perspektiven für heute, Freiburg i. Br., 2006 (cf. also bibliographical references on p. 149); Chr. Wiese, Leo Baeck, in Metzler Lexikon jüdischer Philosophen, pp. 328-332. See also the individual editions of L. Baeck, Das Wesen des Judentums, 6th ed. Wiesbaden (n.d.); Epochen der jüdischen Geschichte, Stuttgart, 1974; Aus drei Jahrtausenden, Berlin, 1938, Tübingen, 1958.
7. Darmstadt, 1905, revised ed. 1921; reprint of the 6th ed. Wiesbaden (n.d.)
8. Leipzig, 1900. Regarding the later editions see that of Claus-Dieter Osthövener, Tübingen, 2005, and W. Homolka, Jüdische Identität in der modernen Welt. Leo Baeck und der deutsche Protestantismus, Gütersloh, 1994; W. Licharz (ed.), Leo Baeck – Lehrer und Helfer in schwerer Zeit, Frankfurt, 1983.
9. Chr. Wiese, Leo Baeck, p. 330.
10. Das Wesen des Judentums, p. 291 et seq.
11. A. H. Friedlander, Das Ende der Nacht. Jüdische und christliche Denker nach dem Holocaust, Gütersloh, 1995, p. 137 et seq.
12. Geschichte der deutschen Juden, p. 216. For the larger context cf. W. Stegmaier (ed.), Die philosophische Aktualität der jüdischen Tradition, Frankfurt, 2000.
13. In addition to the quoted literature cf. R. Mayer, Christentum und Judentum in der Schau Leo Baecks, Stuttgart, 1961; M. A. Meyer, Antwort auf die Moderne. Geschichte der Reformbewegung im Judentum, Vienna, 2000; L. Baeck, Zwischen Geheimnis und Gebot. Auf dem Weg zu einem progressiven Judentum der Moderne = Herenalber Forum, Tagungsband 19, Karlsruhe, 1997; W. Jacob, Christianity Through Jewish Eyes: The Quest for Common Ground, Cincinnati, 1974.
14. Cf. H. Heinz (ed.), Um Gottes willen miteinander verbunden. Der Gesprächskreis “Juden und Christen” beim Zentralkomitee der deutschen Katholiken, Münster, 2004; E. Dirscherl/W. Trutwin (eds.), Redet Wahrheit – Dabru Emet. Jüdisch-christliches Gespräch über Gott, Messias und Dekalog, Münster, 2004 (see especially the bibliography on p. 131 et seq.).
15. Cf. e.g. Vom Vorrang des jüdisch-christlichen Gesprächs im interreligiösen Dialog, Address to the state parliament of Rhineland-Palatinate in cooperation with the Speaker of the Parliament and the Jewish community, Mainz, 30 June 2005; Die katholische Kirche und das Judentum – 40 Jahre nach Nostra Aetate. Paper given on the occasion of the anniversary “Nostra Aetate – Ein folgenreicher Konzilstext. Die Haltung der Kirche 40 Jahre danach”, marked on 28 October 2005 in the August-Pieper-Haus in Aachen and organized by the Episcopal Academy of the Aachen diocese in cooperation with the “Fragen des Judentum (Questions of Judaism)” working group of the Ecumenical Commission of the German Bishops’ Conference. Both texts are being printed.
16. Klemens Richter (ed.), Die katholische Kirche und das Judentum. Dokumente von 1945-1982. With commentaries by Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich and Erich Zenger, Freiburg, 1982.
17. See also: Hanspeter Heinz (ed.), Um Gottes willen miteinander verbunden. Der Gesprächskreis “Juden und Christen” beim Zentralkomitee der deutschen Katholiken, Münster, 2004; and Zentralkomitee der deutschen Katholiken (ed.), Juden und Christen in Deutschland. Verantwortete Zeitgenossenschaft in einer pluralen Gesellschaft. Declaration

of the Jewish-Christian Forum of the Central Committee of the German Catholics, 13 April 2005, Bonn (n.d.) (2005).

18. Cf. the publication of the joint text in No. 43 of the Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz, Bonn (n.d.)
19. Leonard H. Ehrlich, *Fraglichkeit der jüdischen Existenz*, Freiburg, 1993, p. 173 et seq.
20. Erich Zenger, *Das Erste Testament. Die jüdische Bibel und die Christen*, 4th ed., Düsseldorf, 1994; Erich Zenger, *Der Neue Bund im Alten. Zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente = QD 146*, Freiburg, 1993.
21. Heinz Kremers / Erich Lubahn (eds.), *Mission an Israel in heilsgeschichtlicher Sicht*, Neukirchen, 1985.
22. Cf. Clemens Thoma, *Das Messiasprojekt. Theologie jüdisch-christlicher Begegnung*, Augsburg, 1994.
23. Franz Mussner, *Dieses Geschlecht wird nicht vergehen*, cf. pp. 175 -184; Gabriele Niekamp, *Christologie "nach Auschwitz". Kritische Bilanz für die Religions-didaktik aus dem christlich-jüdischen Dialog*, Freiburg, 1994. Cf. K. Lehmann, *Über die Einzigartigkeit des Holocaust. Anmerkungen zu einem Schlüsselthema im deutsch-jüdischen und im jüdisch-christlichen Gespräch. Address to a ceremonial session of the Akademie gemeinnütziger Wissenschaften zu Erfurt*, Erfurt, 11 June 2005.
24. Rendtorff / Henrix (eds.), *Die Kirche und das Judentum*, p. 257.
25. Cf. *Zeitgewinn. Messianisches Denken nach Franz Rosenzweig*, ed. by G. Fuchs and H. H. Henrix, Frankfurt, 1987, pp. 163-183.
26. See the text and commentary by H. Frankemölle (ed.), *Juden und Christen im Gespräch über Dabru Emet – Redet Wahrheit*, Paderborn/Frankfurt, 2005 (esp. pp. 39-44); and H. Frankemölle (ed.), *Christen und Juden gemeinsam ins Dritte Jahrtausend*, Paderborn/Frankfurt, 2001. I would also draw attention to the numerous contributions to the "Freiburger Rundbrief (Freiburg Circular)" in recent years; cf. also E. Dirscherl/W. Trutwin (eds.), *Redet Wahrheit – Dabru Emet. Jüdisch-christliches Gespräch über Gott, Messias und Dialog = Forum Christen und Juden 4*, Münster 2004; E. Dirscherl et al. (ed.), *Einander zugewandt. Die Rezeption des christlich- jüdischen Dialogs in der Dogmatik*, Paderborn, 2005; H. H. Henrix, *Gottes Ja zu Israel. Ökumenische Studien christlicher Theologie*, Aachen, 2005, and *Judentum und Christentum. Gemeinschaft wider Willen*, Kevelaer, 2004.
27. *Was ist Judentum? Eine Deutung für die Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1999.

{newsItem.description->f.format.html()}