



2009 - An Eventful Year of Jewish-Christian Dialogue

31/12/2009 | Rutishauser SJ, Christian M.

In 2009 the Jewish-Christian dialogue was severely disturbed and repeatedly beset by various irritations, not least by the topic of missionizing the Jews. CHRISTIAN M. RUTISHAUSER, head of the department education in Lassalle Haus in Bad Schönbrunn (Switzerland), takes stock against the background of The Twelve Points of Berlin of the International Council of Christians and Jews and the pope's journey to the Holy Land.

2009 - An Eventful Year of Jewish-Christian Dialogue

Like the exchange among other collectives of society, the dialogue between religious communities is indispensable in view of an increasingly integrated world. Already the conciliar text "Nostra Aetate" identifies globalization as the historical context of interreligious dialogue. However, the dialogue between Jews and Christians developed out of a different necessity. Since the Christian anti-Judaism was unmasked as an attitude of mind that had paralyzed Christianity, after the Shoah the idea emerged to oppose something to the National Socialist anti-Semitism.

The Jewish-Christian dialogue therefore began in the 40s of the 20th century, approximately 20 years earlier than the interreligious dialogue; and it shows up to the present day its own laws. This is because Christians start the dialogue with other religions where these are demographically strong, whereas the discussion with Jews on the one hand is determined by coming to terms with the recent history and on the other hand by the particular contentual ties connecting the two communities. This unique relation of the Church to the Jews is already mentioned in "Nostra Aetate" when the fourth article opens with the statement that the Council while reflecting on the mystery of the Church meets per se with Judaism. This cannot be overlooked, regardless of all the talk of Abrahamic ecumenism and the rightly emphasized importance of the trilateral discussions between Christians, Jews and Muslims.

Thus, after the unprecedented élan of the awakening, the Jewish-Christian dialogue has more than 60 years after the war left the pioneering phase behind and entered a transitional phase - a development that cannot be noticed in the Christian dialogue with other religious traditions.¹ Several factors contribute to this special situation of the Jewish-Christian relations: The epoch of the Holocaust survivors and of the witnesses of the Shoa is coming to an end, the coming to terms with the past has reached a certain goal, the great theological questions and their answers under the terms of the postwar period are available, the personal commitment of Pope John Paul II in the Jewish-Christian dialogue is history, and the socio-political part of the dialogue is increasingly determined by the Israel-Palestine conflict. Moreover, the inner-Catholic argument about the interpretation of the Second Vatican Council, which has begun under Pope Benedict XVI, has almost shown like a textbook that Jews have to bear the collateral damage, and that Christians - often without being aware of it - define themselves at the expense of Jews. The relationship to Judaism is like a seismograph for the interpretation of the Council.

Thus, in 2009 there were several events and enterprises that will shape the Judeo-Christian relations in the future. First, the lifting of the excommunication of the four bishops of the Society of St. Pius X, to whom the notorious Holocaust denier Richard Williamson belongs. Although the Jewish-Catholic relations have, despite the massive and persistent protests, not entered the state

of a serious crisis, they were nevertheless exposed to severe irritations. Second, the dispute over the missionizing of Jews, triggered by a document of the discussion group of "Jews and Christians" of the Central Committee of German Catholics. The discourse has brought to light how little the achievements of the Jewish-Christian dialogue have been acknowledged by the hierarchy in recent decades. Thirdly, the pope's journey to the Holy Land in May 2009, which just by the almost complete silence on the Judeo-Christian dialogue has shown Benedict XVI position. Fourth, the initiative of the International Council of Christians and Jews" (ICCJ), which wants to continue the dialogue by its Twelve Points of Berlin. It tries to recall the spirit of the birth of the Jewish-Christian dialogue, and thus to face the current challenges. In view of all these incidents we do well to turn our attention at the end of the year to the state of Jewish-Christian Dialogue in order to fathom what has happened.

The ICCJ and the Twelve Points of Berlin

Let's start with the definitely positive initiative "A Time for Recommitment" of ICCJ, which is an umbrella organization for 38 national organizations of the Jewish-Christian dialogue. Its this year's annual conference from 5 to 8 July in Berlin, organized in cooperation with the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, has recognized that the Christian-Jewish dialogue needs a renewal. Seventy years after the outbreak of war and in the 60th year of the German Coordinating Council of Societies for Christian-Jewish Cooperation, the reunited Berlin was the ideal place in order to adjust the objectives and tasks of the dialogue to the current social conditions, and to proclaim them anew.

The Berlin meeting was planned in a long transatlantic dialogue process, including last year's conference at the University of Geneva (Switzerland).² Thus, the conference began with the ceremonial signing of the developed Twelve Points of Berlin by the representatives of national organizations. Chancellor Angela Merkel gave the lecture during the ceremony of the German Coordinating Council in the French Cathedral [Französischer Dom], while inter alia Interior Minister Wolfgang Schäuble, Bishop Wolfgang Huber, chairman of the Council of Evangelical Churches in Germany, and Rabbi Henry Brandt as Jewish President of the German Coordinating Council were present at the opening ceremony.

After all, the Christian-Jewish understanding is in Germany not only a matter of Churches and civil society but also of the state. Together with essays and speeches on Jewish-Christian dialogue, the Twelve Points, all of them accompanied with short remarks, were presented to the public in a German-English edition by Deborah Weissman, the President of ICCJ.³

The first four Berlin theses are aimed at the Christians around the world and are calling for: *First*, to combat all forms of anti-Semitism; *second*, to promote interreligious dialogue with Jews; *third*, to develop a theological understandings of Judaism that confirm its distinctive integrity; and *fourth*, to pray for the peace of Jerusalem. The next four theses are aimed at Jews and Jewish communities and call for: *fifth*, to acknowledge the efforts of many Christian communities in the late 20th century to reform their attitudes toward Jews; *sixth*, to reexamine Jewish texts and liturgy in the light of these Christian reforms; *seventh*, to differentiate between fair-minded criticism of Israel and anti-Semitism; *eighth*, to offer encouragement to the State of Israel as it works to fulfil the ideals stated in its founding documents. Finally, further four theses follow addressing Jews, Christians and generally all people of good will: *ninth*, to enhance interreligious and intercultural education; *tenth*, To promote interreligious friendship and cooperation as well as social justice in the global society; *eleventh*, to enhance dialogue with political and economic bodies; and *twelfth*, to network with all those whose work responds to the demands of environmental stewardship.

Already the twelve theses alone (without the short expositions) show how differentiated the addressees are selected, how each party is invited to do its "homework", and that even difficult issues, such as the position towards Israel, are not avoided. The same accurate, sophisticated and

highly detailed work can also be seen in the 27-page essay "The History of a Relationship in Transition", following the theses and describing 2000 years of Jewish-Christian relations.⁴ All the simplistic stereotypes, e.g. that 2000 years of Christian anti-Semitism have now turned into 60-years of understanding, are smashed by it. Likewise, the too simple metaphors for the Jewish-Christian relationship - root and grafted branches, sibling religions, Christian breeding ground for anti-Semitism, etc. are critically examined by the Jewish writer Mark Saperstein.⁵ The reading of the other contributions is also refreshing, because they bear witness to an awareness that is trained in the dialogue with others, and a capacity for self-criticism - without abandoning one's own claims.

The Twelve Points of Berlin together with the other writings are less theological statements about Judaism and Christianity and their relationship.

Rather, they describe the structure of dialogue against the background of a concretely experienced history, which entails its specific issues, sensitivities and requirements. Such a document would not have been possible without the detailed work done over the past decades, without the discussions between Jews and Christians at various levels, and especially not without the intellectual and communicative tradition which is characteristic of Judaism and Christianity in their best times. Let's hope that it is a paradigm, that it can shape further circles in both religious communities, and also inspire a dialogue between other religious traditions. At the Berlin conference the about 150 participants were in numerous workshops definitely engaged in detailed discussions and listened intently to the different lectures, as e.g. that of Bishop Henry Mussinghoff, who represented the Catholic Bishops' Conference. He also spoke of such controversial theological issues as the understanding of the Covenant, the missionizing of the Jews, Incarnation theology, and theology of the Land Israel.

It is to be hoped that the Twelve Points of Berlin, which want to give the Jewish-Christian dialogue new perspectives in a globalized world, will have an equally lasting reception history as it was granted the ten theses of Seelisberg proclaimed in 1947 in a visionary "emergency conference on combating anti-Semitism". Under the shock of the Shoah, sixty five representatives of Judaism, Christianity, politics and science had then assembled in Switzerland. In five commissions they adopted documents in order to provide concrete instructions for education, communication and media, national and international politics and thus to help to eliminate anti-Semitism and all form of racism. Unfortunately, today even protagonists of Jewish-Christian dialogue hardly know those texts.⁶ Only the ten theses of the Commission III, which solely dealt with religious issues, have got historical impact. Based on the preparatory work of Jules Isaac about the Christian anti-Judaism and the Christian "teaching of contempt" toward Jews, and bearing his hallmark, the Seelisberg theses were directed at the Christians in order to make them aware of the fact that their historical and spiritual roots are entirely in Judaism.

Since this awareness is to a large extent present in the mainstream churches, the Berlin theses could take it up and start again. Christians are to be led on to learn also to respect Judaism in its self-conception, and Jews are reminded of their responsibility towards Christianity, as Jewish Religious leaders and scholars have already been trying in 2000 with the document "Dabru Emet - Speak the Truth".⁷ The ICCJ was able to draw on another preparatory work, namely the updating of the ten points of Seelisberg by the document "A Sacred Obligation" (2002). In it Christian theologians from the United States submit ten theses on the relationship between the Church and Judaism.⁸

In 2007, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Seelisberg conference, the Swiss churches and the Swiss Federation of Jewish Communities (FSCI) also presented new theses on the Jewish-

Christian dialogue. They demanded that Jews and Christians should continue their discussions but also take up the dialogue with the Muslims and shoulder social responsibility in civil society.⁹

What in the summer of 2009 at an international level became apparent as a new obligation is thus an expression of a broader dialogue development in various countries. In this context for Switzerland I'd like to point to the new document of the Protestant/Jewish Dialogue Commission, which was adopted in autumn 2009 and is orientated towards the three concepts: freedom - Scripture - responsibility, and for Germany to "Den rheinischen Synodalbeschluss zum Verhältnis von Christen und Juden weiterdenken - den Gottesdienst erneuern" of December 2008.¹⁰

The old-new Question of the Missionizing of Jews

The broader admission of the Tridentine rite by the *motu proprio* of Pope Benedict in July 2007 and his subsequently delivered reformulation of the Good Friday Intercession for this new rite has raised also in the German-speaking area the question of Jesus Christ's claim to universal salvation. Does this claim also apply to Jews, who are already living with the God of Jesus in the "never revoked covenant", as none other than Pope John Paul II repeatedly emphasized? Are they, like Christians, to believe in Jesus so that they gain salvation, as Pope Benedict's Good Friday Intercession suggests?¹¹ If yes, what is then the value of the "Old Covenant"? In an act of faith Jews have already been following God's revelation *[for centuries]*.

While in the years of dialogue after the Second Vatican Council the question of the missionizing of the Jews had not arisen in the Church, yes, has even been taboo in order to build carefully mutual understanding and appreciation, the situation has now changed markedly. In dialogue circles the question is not repressed, although it was experienced as a fundamental attack on the dialogue by many Jews whose memories of times that they thought they had left behind were reawakened. A clear position against the missionizing of Jews is, as it were, a test case for Jews whether Christians are serious in the dialogue. The fact that the issue is nevertheless not suppressed shows basically how stable the Jewish-Catholic relations have become. But the form in which it is newly asked, the question of missionizing the Jews is ultimately supported by conservative groups, for which the traditional Catholic self-definition and self-assertion is at stake and which have never embarked on a serious Jewish-Christian dialogue.

This constellation became already visible in the debate in the United States of America when in 2002 the U.S. Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs together with the National Council of Synagogues published the statement "Reflections on Covenant and Mission".¹² The well-founded Jewish reflections, which form the second part of the document, emphasize that Judaism has a universal mission. They explain its way of proceeding and the ethics of the Noachic commandments, which ought to apply to all people. The concept of *Tikun ha-Olam*, perfection or repairing of the world is also elucidated. The Roman Catholic reflections in the first part give a precise and subtle analysis of the Church's mission and evangelization, the task of which was to work for and to build the kingdom of God. To invite persons of a different faith to a commitment of faith in Jesus Christ and to entry through baptism into Christianity ... was indeed only one among many aspects of this comprehensive mission. Participating in interreligious dialogue was a path that leads to the kingdom of God. The Jewish path was salutary as that of the Church, but not the Way of Christ, and so the two communities could each through its covenant with God bring justice and salvation into the world.

Immediately after the publication Cardinal William Keeler who is responsible for the relations of the U.S. bishops to the Jews and Chairman of the Commission that had drafted the document found himself compelled to clarify that the reflections would not represent the official position of the U.S. bishops' conference. What followed was a theological debate about the interpretation of "Nostra Aetate," the theological nature of the Jewish people and the missionizing of the Jews, in which

prominent religious leaders like Cardinal Avery Dulles, SJ distinguished themselves. In 2009, seven years later an official note of the U.S. bishops followed, in which they reproach "Reflections on Covenant and Mission" for abridging the concept of mission:

"It is incomplete and potentially misleading in this context to refer to the enduring quality of the (old) Covenant, without adding that for Catholics Jesus Christ as the incarnate Son of God fulfills both in history and at the end of time the special relationship that God established with Israel."¹³

A similar debate was triggered by the document of the "Discussion Group of Jews and Christians of the Central Committee of German Catholics" in the spring of 2009. Inspired by the not very prudent way of Pope Benedict to address relevant Jewish topics and through the discussion about the Tridentine Mass, it released a discussion paper entitled "'No" to missionizing of the Jews - "Yes" to the dialogue between Jews and Christians".¹⁴ The statement, which, unfortunately, argued theologically poorer than the American paper but all the more clearly turned its back on missionizing the Jews was rebuffed by the German bishops; on that occasion especially the Bishop of Regensburg, Gerhard Ludwig Müller argued against it.¹⁵

If one surveys the debate of last spring with its different opinions for and against missionizing the Jews, one becomes aware of the different ways of theological reasoning, as they have become customary since the Second Vatican Council. While some are dogmatically arguing against the background of classical Christology and Soteriology, others take as starting-point a theology that has been moulded by the history of the Judeo-Christian rejections. It seems that dogmatics here has hardly adapted Judeo-Christian theology and tends to a downright "Yes" to the question of missionizing the Jews. The theologians who got involved with the history of Judeo-Christian relationship have nevertheless quickly recourse to a concept of two Covenants, according to which God separately turned to the synagogue and the church and opened two more or less parallel paths that do not allow the missionizing of the Jews.

In June 2009, however, a group of theologians from Europe and the U.S. met in the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem. It has been devoting itself for some years to Christ's relationship to the Jewish people and relates Christology and broad areas of theology to the achievements of the Jewish-Christian dialogue. It is obvious that the insights resulting from the dialogue are far too little adapted by the Scholastic theology. For instance, it is necessary to overcome the thinking in alternatives with regard to the question of Jesus Christ's claim to salvation: classical missionizing of the Jews versus parallel paths of Jews and Christians. This is achieved by differentiating Jesus' universal claim according to the respective target group. The classic Great Commission applies to all pagans, in order to lead them to God of the Bible, whereas Christ's claim to the Jews, who are already with God and in the Covenant, has to look differently. If the Jews are not simply to join the church, because their history of salvation with God has already been opened and they are already the people of God, it is important to ask, what then is Jesus' claim to them? It is about this content-related filling, which one has hardly started to think about, but which is to respect the independence of the Jews, whose very existence is a response of faith to God's initiative.

In this way the Christian faith is not reduced but more deeply understood, because even the New Testament writings are differently approaching Jews and Gentiles. Of course, Christians are to expose themselves to the claim of Jewish theology, as e.g. the understanding of monotheism and the ban on images. That the Jewish-Christian dialogue will be pursued further here, and the Christian self-conception reckons with the Jews as the "Sacrament of Otherness"¹⁶ belongs to the valuable challenges of the future. The two faith communities are chained with each other, whether they like it or not. Here an important contribution can come from the Roman Catholic Church, with its strong dogmatic tradition and a pope who is seeking truth in the interreligious dialogue. He can spiritually enrich the Jewish-Christian dialogue, which today tends to confine itself to ethical, social

and cultural issues.

Pope Benedict XVI and his Journey to the Holy Land

In 2009 the issues of the Jewish-Christian relations were brought to the attention of the public particularly by the lifting of the excommunication of the bishops of the SSPX and by Pope Benedict's journey to the Holy Land, although in both matters the declared intention of the pope had in the first place nothing to do with the Judeo-Catholic dialogue. The former was intended to begin the removal of church schism of a splinter group, and in the Holy Land he wanted to strengthen the local church in the difficult political situation of the Middle East conflict.

Only on the face of it the confrontation with the SSPX is independent of the Jewish-Christian dialogue, but its origin can definitely be traced back to the decree on ecumenism, freedom of religion and "Nostra Aetate", which were rejected by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and his followers at the Council. The anti-Jewish tendencies are still widespread in the SSPX, not only for classical theological reasons but also because the Jews are among the representatives of modernity and its social system that the Pius Brothers combat. So it is no coincidence that a notorious Holocaust denier was among their bishops. Rather, this can be seen even as an act of providence, because people became aware of the spiritual consequences of Pope Benedict's initiative to retrieve the Pius Brothers into the church. Even if only the tabloid press and malicious insinuations reproached the pope with anti-Judaism, it is nevertheless characteristic that the Jewish-Christian relations suffer the negative consequences, and that the Jews suffer the collateral damages of his efforts for the church unity.

This pattern is all too familiar from history - from the Constantinian shift over the expulsion of Jews from Spain up to the modern age. In the New Testament writings as well as by the Church Fathers or the old Scholastic theology, the Jews admittedly were and are often not directly attacked, but they have been used as negative background [*Negativfolie*] to Christian self-conception. However, that Christian and ecclesial identity must not be formed at the expense of the Jews is precisely the great learning process that has developed from the Judeo-Christian dialogue. The Council wanted to see no longer the church in a negative demarcation from modernity but in a positive - as a church that deliberately allows to be positively moulded in her theological thinking through the signs of the times and the essence of the Other. How much more should this be the case if the Others are the "elder brothers in faith"! Is the Jewish Other not engraved on the church in order to keep God, the completely Other present?

It belongs to the tragedy of history, just the Jews as one of the protagonist group of the modern age could get no place in it but were fought through anti-Semitism, and in the Shoah shamelessly persecuted and exterminated. Pope Benedict has repeatedly emphasized that the Holocaust ultimately was a consequence of the dialectic of Enlightenment and that the neo-paganism of the modern age was responsible for it.¹⁷ This was also the implicit message of his speech at Ben Gurion Airport after his arrival in Israel, where he located his view of the Holocaust in the context of the history of religion in modern society. He reveals thus the violence of modernity, which gladly blames the religions for the potential for violence of the cultural and social ruling power. It is understandable that the Western society does not like to hear this, but it must learn to recognize to what extent state and economy long since wield that power that they have withdrawn from religion. Power can be abused by religious and state institutions, and has been widely abused. Against this background, it is important not simply to reject the thesis of the pope concerning the causes of the Shoah. Rather, it has to be considered more seriously; and one's own secular heart-searching has to be practiced, otherwise the repressed guilt is projected on the Catholic Church and her popes, for instance on Pius XII.

It is regrettable that Pope Benedict for his part has not declared during his Holy Land journey as well as in other statements the complicity of the church and her anti-Jewish theology. The church

should lead the way in examining her conscience. Not only the multi-causality for the persecution of Jews in the 20th century would thus become visible, but also the profound theological truth that all are caught up in guilt before God.

About the Jewish-Christian dialogue, Pope Benedict said in Israel hardly anything. He allowed his program to be determined not by the expectations of Western theologians and dialogicians but by the situation of the local church, which needed his attention and support; he made her aware of her roots and the history of salvation in the Hebrew Bible. In the Israeli society Pope Benedict was heavily attacked for that. But he showed his spiritual sensitivity and his familiarity with Judaism particularly in Yad Vashem, where he in his sermon unfolded a wonderful spirituality of names and memories. Although it was for all the world to see, and was spoken at the place of the highest expectations of the Israeli people and Jews worldwide, it was paradoxically not noticed. Most people were waiting so much for historical, sociological, political and explicitly interreligious statements that their heart and mind were dead because their ears did not hear what they wanted to hear.

The Pope did not talk about perpetrators and victims, the Nazis and the Church; he made no apology, and so he came in for a lot of criticism. But those who understand the essence of religious language heard his meditation, which he had chosen for this place in order to commemorate the six million Jewish victims:

"I have come to stand in silence before this monument, erected to honor the memory of the millions of Jews killed in the horrific tragedy of the Shoah. They lost their lives, but they will never lose their names: these are indelibly etched in the hearts of their loved ones, their surviving fellow prisoners, and all those determined never to allow such an atrocity to disgrace mankind again. Most of all, their names are forever fixed in the memory of Almighty God."¹⁸

That the Pope avoided in Yad Vashem the debates on analysis, reconstruction and confessions of guilt as regards anti-Semitism and the Holocaust and chose the language of spirituality bears witness of religious tact, and perhaps also of the metaphysical classification of the events. But that he has too little conducted the aforementioned debates elsewhere is probably a missed opportunity.

But throughout the journey Benedict XVI has remained faithful to his intention: He wanted to support the Palestinian Christian Church. Only in this context he became truly political. During this journey he was less concerned with coming to terms with the past than with faith and justice in the present. That's why in the occupied territories he spoke directly about socially relevant issues, took position in favour for a just peace and pleaded for the two-state solution. Moreover, in the Middle East, at the border-line between a Western enlightened society and a world shaped by Islam, it appeared to him more important to make the socio-political position and function of religion a general topic. This is understandable in view of the current conflict with Islam. Thus, in Jordan but also in Israel / Palestine in inter-religious statements he spoke mainly of the three Abrahamic religions or gave sole attention to the relationship of the Church to Islam. Those who were able to accept this purpose and did not always link this journey with expectations of the Jewish-Christian dialogue were able to follow the pope.

But after the irritation and uncertainty caused by the hand that the pope held out to the traditionalists, positive sign for the Jewish-Christian dialogue are absolutely needed. It is to be hoped that Benedict XVI will still give them in his tenure - for at the moment the result is in the red.

NOTES:

1. The award of the Buber-Rosenzweig-Medaille 2009 to Erich Zenger at the beginning of the Week of Brotherliness took place under the motto "1949-2009. So viel Aufbruch war nie".
2. In 2008 the University of Fribourg remembered the Jewish-Christian conference of 1948, which as prelude preceded the foundation of the ICCJ. This event is summarized in: M. Klöckener, Der Internationale Rat der Christen u. Juden u. die Universität Fribourg, in: Zeit zur Neuverpflichtung. Christlich-jüdischer Dialog 70 Jahre nach Kriegsbeginn u. Shoah, edited by the ICCJ and the Konrad Adenauer-Stiftung (Berlin 2009) 53-61; see also M. Delgado, Konferenz des Internationalen Rates der Christen u. Juden an der Universität Fribourg, in: ZMR 93 (2009) 113-118.
3. See note 2.
4. In the same place 23-50.
5. In the same place 63-79.
6. See Ch. M. Rutishauser, The 1947 Seelisberg Conference: The Foundation of the Jewish-Christian Dialogue, in: Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations 2 (2007) issue 2, 34-53.
7. Christianity in Jewish Terms, edited by T. Frymer-Kensky, D. Novak u. P. Ochs (Oxford 2000); Dabru emet - redet Wahrheit. Eine jüdische Herausforderung zum Dialog mit den Christen, hg. v. R. Kampling and M. Weinrich (Gütersloh 2003); Redet Wahrheit - Dabru emet. Jüdisch-christliches Gespräch über Gott, Messias u. Dekalog, edited by E. Dirscherl and W. Trutwin (Münster 2004).
8. See www.bc.edu/research/cjl/meta-elements/sites/partners/csg/Sacred_Obligation.htm
9. 60 Jahre Seelisberger Thesen. Der Grundstein jüdisch-christlicher Begegnung ist gelegt!, edited by the Schweizerischen Bischofskonferenz, dem Schweizerischen Evangelischen Kirchenbund and the Schweizerischen Israelitischen Gemeindebund (Bern 2007) 4 f.
10. Published by the Evangelischen Landeskirche im Rheinland (Düsseldorf 2008): www.ekir.de
11. About the controversial interpretation of the intercession see "... damit sie Jesus Christus erkennen". Die neue Karfreitagsfürbitte für die Juden, edited by W. Homolka and E. Zenger (Freiburg 2008).
12. http://www.bc.edu/research/cjl/meta-elements/texts/cjrelations/resources/documents/interreligious/ncs_usccb120802.htm
13. See www.usccb.org/doctrine/covenant09.pdf No. 5.
14. The second edition of the declaration with a preface that relates it to other statements of the discussion group and takes up the debate after the first publication can be found under: www.zdk.de/erklaerungen/erklaerung.php?id=181
15. www.dbk.de/aktuell/meldungen/01887/
16. A. Melloni, Nostra Aetate and the Discovery of the Sacrament of Otherness, in: The Catholic Church and the Jewish People. Recent Reflections from Rome, edited by Ph. A. Cunningham Philip, N. Hofmann and J. Sievers (New York 2007) 129-151.
17. A survey over the Pope Benedict's relationship to modernity and Judaism see K. Müller, Die Vernunft, die Moderne u. der Papst, in this periodical 226 (2009) 291-306; K.-H. Menke, Zur Theologie des Judentums bei Joseph Ratzinger, in: IKaZ 38 (2009) 191-205.
18. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2009/may/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20090511_yad-vashem_ge.html

Source: [Stimmen der Zeit](#), 12/2009.

Translated from the [German](#) by [Ernst Förster SJ](#)