

Companions Searching in the Wilderness

Personal Journey

The thesis of this book is, to me, so problematic, and at the same time so compelling, that I think it is necessary to begin by framing the passion which gives rise to the book with personal experience. This is not an approach I would ordinarily take. Everything that I've written about has engaged me passionately and in this sense may be personal. But here, for the first time in my professional life (including publishing essays, reviews, books, and collections over twenty-five years), I think that speaking directly of personal experience will help the reader understand. Whether it persuades is another matter.

The "wilderness" in the title of this chapter is my wilderness; the "searching" my searching. I don't mean anything melodramatic by calling my life a wilderness. Neither does the metaphor point to a life more tragic than others. Every woman and man's life is a wilderness, if by wilderness we understand that everyone is subject to suffering, every

life is to some extent restless, every life is hidden in part to itself, all human relations are subject to “cobweb[s] on the soul.”¹

There is a “dying” to small self which many spiritual geniuses recommend; dying to the self which suffers, the self which is restless and subject to alienation and illusion. The dying is surely the gateway to happiness. It leads to “purity of heart,” sometimes, but not exhaustively, associated with “apatheia”: “a relatively permanent state of deep calm resulting from the integration of the emotional life under the influence of agape.”²

But this dying is not easy work. Jesus of Nazareth said we have to die if we are to be reborn, and Saint Paul that we must be crucified with Christ so it is Christ who lives in us.³ The Zen master, Shunryu Suzuki says: “In order to live in the realm of Buddha nature, it is necessary to die as a small being moment by moment.”⁴ Sufi literature records the wisdom that we should die before we die. And Bede Griffiths, invoking the wisdom of Hinduism and speaking of the difficulty of uniting the small self (*jivatman*) with the Great Self (*Atman*) as a figurative “fall,” (life in the wilderness banished from Eden) says “The fall is the fall into self consciousness, that is into a consciousness centered in the self which has lost touch with the eternal ground of consciousness, which is the true Self.”⁶

Compassion is one of the great products of this dying, coming in from the wilderness of self-centeredness. And yet, Thomas Merton calls compassion “my new desert,” a dry and punishing place.⁷ This coming in from the wilderness is not easy.

Searching is tantamount to living well, to living a reflective life, to living a spiritual life. Merton writes that spiritual life is first of all a life.⁸ What “searching” or “spiritual” add to “life” is the connotation that one is paying attention to their lives, to what they are becoming, to the kinds of lives they are sculpting. (Later in this chapter I will fill this in a bit more and employ the idea of “faithfulness” to the human vocation.)

By calling my life a searching life, I mean nothing terribly narcissistic. In fact, to say so, to call my life a searching life, floods me with gratitude and with humility. Humility, a sense of truthfulness, that my searching life, the opposite of a life of drift, is so little a product of my

own authorship and so much the product of influences for which I am not worthy and therefore especially grateful. These influences include a certain kind of a parent, a certain kind of a teacher, a certain kind of spouse, a certain kind of son, a certain kind of friend.

The personal experience I want to share which animates this book is the profound influence during the last twenty years of Judaism and of Buddhism on my search in the wilderness, and how these influences have fully enriched my Catholicism. Mine is an experience like Raimundo Panikkar's of which he writes: "I left [Europe] as a Christian, I 'found' myself a Hindu, and I 'returned' a Buddhist without having ceased to be a Christian."⁹

The experience leads me to believe that people in any religious community and spiritual path can be enriched by clues to living spiritual lives from both practices and beliefs native to religious communities and spiritual ways other than their own. And further, this need not undermine people's rootedness in their religious communities of primary affiliation. Finally, people in every religious community deserve to be exposed to clues perhaps more richly etched and practiced in other spiritual ways. And each and every religious community should sponsor interreligious encounter of this kind in this sense.

During the last twenty years, my escalating exposure to Jews and Judaism has taught me a rich new way to be a Christian, specifically a Catholic. A spotty but deepening study of biblical, historical, and contemporary religious, moral, and cultural Judaism has grown together with a more substantial study of the history and theological justifications of Christian antisemitism and what they demand of Christian religious educators and theologians. Alongside these developments, inextricable but more important than either of them, I have during these years befriended and been befriended by a small legion of Jewish women and men who continue to teach me lessons in humor, intellectual integrity, moral sensitivity, and humanity.

By humanity I mean kindness. Philo of Alexandria, known as well to history as Philo the Jew, wrote the immortal words, "Be kind, for everyone you meet is fighting a great battle."¹⁰ Moral sensitivity evokes a Jewish acquaintance who, after his deceased and revered father ranks

Isaiah the Prophet and Pope John XXIII his second and third heroes of repair of the world (*tikkun olam*). This man embodies their ideals in his human practice in business, politics, philanthropy, and personal life.

Conrad Hyers speaks of humor “in the midst of conflict and anxiety, success and failure, faith and doubt...com[ing] to terms...with the ambiguities and ambivalence of the human situation...with absurdity, evil, suffering and death.”¹¹

Clearly my further instruction in humor (for it is, also, my childhood birthright), has not been a minor theme. For this and many blessings, I give thanks for the late Rabbi Murray Rothman, one of whose invaluable contributions to my life has been to share with me this truth: that life is a river, or maybe it's not a river.

I said that Jews and Judaism have taught me a rich, renewed way to be a Christian, to be a Catholic. Building on a foundation of conciliar Catholic theology (the theology of the Second Vatican Council, which is itself indebted to Jewish influence), Jewish life and thought have enhanced my sense of the Church as a community and of moral life as balancing individual and common goods. Even shifts in my view of Jesus Christ, beyond the study of the “Jewishness of Jesus,” and touching the central idea and experience of incarnation itself, show a Jewish influence. I have in mind here not only the doctrine of the Incarnation, least of all in its docetic expression (where the emphasis on Jesus' divinity virtually denies his humanity). Rather, my continued embrace of (and by) Jews and Judaism reveals to me ever deepening layers of the incarnational spirit or ethos: that the divine and the human are locked in intimate embrace and human transcending, moving toward the Holy One. (I will say more about these theological influences in chapter four).

So it is that several years before I read David Tracy's characterization of liberation theology (with its view of communal Church, social morality, and truly human Christ), as a re-Judaizing of Christianity,¹² I was already well on my way to understanding Jews and Judaism as defining influences for Christianity to be faithful to the God of Israel.¹³

During roughly the same twenty-year period, my life has been deeply enriched by increasing study and appreciation of Buddha and Buddhism, especially Zen practice. This has assisted me profoundly to pray the

Christian prayer of silence employing technique derived from practice of *zazen* (Zen seated meditation). This is so important to my well-being and what social harmony I promote that it truly validates Rabbi Heschel's remark that prayer "saves the inner life from oblivion."¹⁴

Of course I am not alone in having been attracted to Buddhist practice in the last twenty years. The movement of Westerners to incorporate this practice into their lives in other religious communities, or, more controversially, to replace earlier religious affiliation, is the subject of much commentary, some of it negative, even ridiculing. This is all fine where "good trees" do not bear "good fruit," where so-called Buddhist practice finds exhaustive expression in greater personal equanimity but no greater justice, forgiveness, or compassion.

But the easy dismissal of Buddhist meditative practice as a fad is really deeply ignorant and represents a somewhat jaded failure to notice the profundity of the simple, in this instance, the elemental simplicity of seated practice. For in a world filled with people who think they know a great deal (much of which turns out to be illusory), Buddhist practice invites us to stop, to sit well and comfortably, to breathe deeply, calmly, peacefully so we can return to the present moment in silence. In this way we purify consciousness and perception, we are enabled to act compassionately, and we more fully celebrate life's joys and bear with its sorrows.¹⁵

This is prayer focused especially on inner life and on stillness. There is also the Western Christian apophatic (negative, silent, imageless) tradition of contemplative practice from which the prayer of silence comes. This provides a route from within Christianity to some of the same fruits as Zen practice offers. Still, anyone who has stayed with the simple disciplines of such practice—the posture, the breathing, the patient, sustained sitting long enough to experience deepening levels of presence, silence, and peace, and rising from sitting to act more gently and kindly—such a one will know how precious Zen and other forms of Buddhist practice can be to anyone, regardless of the religious community in which they are especially rooted.

The immanence of the divine, a defining idea of the Catholic incarnational spirit, is what is in play when we give priority to the impor-

tance of meditative prayer. The process itself is nothing less than revelatory. In Roger Haight's words (on revelation) we are "welcoming in receptivity the self-communication of the divine."¹⁶ And Augustine, writing in a distinctively "Catholic" tone, recommends the importance of meditative prayer when he writes "Descend into thy self, go into the inner recesses of thy mind. If thou be far from thy self how can thou be near to God?"¹⁷

It remains to say that each element of this experience, my own enrichment by Judaism and by Buddhism, as well as the capacity to integrate these influences in an enriched Catholicism, is associated in a special way with a great spiritual teacher from each tradition.

It will become clear shortly, and throughout this book, how great an influence Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel has in my life. With regard to Buddhism, Thay (teacher) Thich Nhat Hanh occupies a similar place. This book does not deal with Buddhist-Christian relations. In two earlier works of mine, however, which lay out a program and theological foundation for giving priority to contemplation education in the lives of people in religious communities, his influence is clearly evident.¹⁸

It is above all to Father "Louie," to Thomas Merton, that I turn each day for wisdom to live a spiritual life in a Christian key. Later in this book, I will explore Merton's place as a uniquely honest, expert, and fearless exemplar for persons in many religious communities, on many spiritual paths. Merton, it seems to me, is "right" about so many things needed to live lives that are faithful to the human vocation. Not the least of his gifts was to see so clearly and express so articulately the richness available through interreligious encounter.

Thesis

I've already said that this book is animated by the belief "that people in any religious community or any spiritual path can be enriched by clues to living spiritual lives...from religious communities and spiritual ways other than their own...[that] this need not undermine people's rootedness....that people deserve to be exposed to [other] clues [and that]...each religious community should sponsor interreligious encounters of this kind...."

Framed even more directly, the thesis of this work is that people in every religious community, on every spiritual path, should come to practice spiritual companionship, to encounter one another as siblings—all God’s children—and our ways of faithfulness should, as far as possible, become transparent to one another. In a word, we should pray together as well as separately. In Rabbi Heschel’s words, we need one another “to search in the wilderness for wellsprings of devotion, for treasures of stillness, for the power of love and care for man...to cooperate in trying to bring about a resurrection of sensitivity, a revival of conscience.”¹⁹

The problems attending this thesis will be touched on below and dealt with at length in chapters two, three, and four. These problems, as I said in the first sentence of this book, are profound. And yet surely there is a simple truth in Leonard Swidler’s observation that “Everyone searching for religious meaning and truth, no matter how convinced by and committed to a particular tradition or position, if they would act with integrity must have a radical openness.”²⁰

The thesis calls us beyond what so many of its finest participants seem to envision by “dialogue.”²¹ This is certainly true of much theological dialogue between Jews and Christians, perhaps less so in conversations between Buddhists and some Christians.

The need to go beyond dialogue of a certain kind can be seen in the framing of boundaries of dialogue by so advanced a practitioner as David Novak, of whose work more will be said in chapter two. For now I note his initial remarks in an excellent volume of reflections by Jewish scholars and rabbis called *Christianity in Jewish Terms*. Despite the sensitivity of so many of the contributions, as well as the basic intent of the book, the text nevertheless begins with Novak’s caution that there can be no fudging of truth claims in interreligious dialogue, for after all, “Some things are true all the time, everywhere and for everyone.”²²

How different this is from Rabbi Heschel’s words “that the most significant basis for the meeting of men of different religious traditions is the level of fear and trembling...humility and contrition...where all formulations...appear as understatements...,” and our souls “stripped of pretensions and conceit...we sense the tragic insufficiency of human faith.”²³

Theological dialogue seems so often to end at the water's edge of protecting truth claims. It would be a great mistake, however, to alienate the processes of searching the wilderness together (a process that takes us beyond guarding truth claims to common prayer), from engagement together in theological discourse or dialogue. The desert father Evagrius Ponticus said, "If you are a theologian you truly pray, [and] if you truly pray you are a theologian."²⁴ And I am certain Rabbi Heschel had something similar in mind in distinguishing "theology" from "depth theology."²⁵

The possible complementarity of theological dialogue and a fuller spiritual companionship is no where to date, to my knowledge, better displayed than in the encounters achieved in the Catholic-Jewish Colloquium conceived and conducted over two years (1993-95) by Mary C. Boys and Sara Lee. These meetings engaged twenty-two Jewish and Catholic educators in six two-day-long sessions. Boys writes of them: "For Colloquium participants the ties of friendship meant a serious investment in the health of the other's faith traditions..." and that participants in the Colloquium experienced "the virtues of friendship—patience, hard work, humility [and] 'holy envy' (experiencing something so profound in the beliefs, rituals or practices of another tradition that one wishes his or her own community of faith also had or practiced it....)"²⁶

(The "holy envy" referred to is pivotal to achieving spiritual companionship. The term was coined by the great ecumenist and Scripture scholar, Krister Stendahl, who sees its presence "when we recognize something in another tradition that is beautiful but is not ours, nor should we grab it or claim it....Holy envy rejoices in the beauty of the other.")²⁷

Nowhere in the report of Colloquium sessions is the efficacy of these encounters more evident, their likely evolution over the course of the meetings from theology to depth theology, from "mere dialogue" to something deeper, than in these words of David Ellenson, a Jewish theologian associated with the project: "The Colloquium was a profoundly religious experience; it drew its participants into the boundlessness of the Divine. It challenged participants to move beyond the narrow limits in which they

confine the Holy One to acknowledge in their heart of hearts that God, the Mother and Father of all of us, has many children. . . .”²⁸

Ellenson’s words are remarkably consonant with David Tracy’s assertion that “the praxis of interreligious dialogue itself, I believe does not merely bear a ‘religious dimension.’ It is a religious experience.”²⁹ And Boys writes of her own hopes and expectations for dialogue that is “an encounter with the religious ‘other,’ the ‘stranger’ [and] is a catalyst for continuing religious conversion because it throws one upon the graciousness of God, the Wholly Other in our midst.”³⁰

I mention the possible complementarity of theological dialogue and spiritual companionship which seems to be expressed in the Colloquium meetings. My caution is based on two factors. First, to my knowledge, very few if any interreligious theological dialogues are informed by the educational sophistication which Boys and Lee brought to these meetings. I share a pedigree with Mary Boys; we both studied religious education with many of the same masters. Boys cites one of them, Dwayne Hubner, reflecting the educational practice with which she and Lee sought to underpin the theological dialogue which they sponsored (the quotes within quotes are Hubner’s words): “We might think of education as the ‘meeting of the historically determined self with the new, the strange, the strangers’ in such a way that the profound longing and thirst central to human life are ‘recognized as the source and goal of life.’”³¹

These words point to a very profound practice of education, one in which education means relationships between people (and also beyond human exchanges alone), relationships that are intrinsically religious. In this view, nothing less than our faithfulness to the human vocation is at issue in educational practice. Such practice is transformative; there is always some conversion going on. But theological dialogues which are not framed and informed by such profound education practice run the risk of stopping at the edge. However deep the learning and sincere the will to speak and listen well, these dialogues may end, in the phrase of Juan Luis Segundo, in the exchange of “mere erudition.” They may remain, as Cardinal Newman said, “notional” rather than “real.”

The second caution arises from a feature of Mary Boys' own reflection on the Catholic-Jewish Colloquium and its larger educational context. This occurs in a chapter of her remarkable work, *Has God Only One Blessing? Judaism As a Source of Christian Self Understanding*. The chapter is a thoughtful reflection on re-education, on conversion or transformation, resulting from dialogue. It relies in part and significantly on the ideas of Bernard Lonergan and those of Walter Conn, and reports substantially, though in part, on the series of meetings between 1993 and 1995. It is, however, principally about the conversion of attitudes of the Christian participants in the Colloquium, though clearly Jewish participants were deeply moved as David Ellenson's words make clear, and which will be attested again when I return to a discussion of the Colloquium in the Epilogue of this work. This is not cited as fault. Like my own 1997 book on Jewish-Christian relations, *Boys' text*, published in 2000 CE, is chiefly directed at repairing Christian attitudes. However, the tenor of the chapter, suggestively called "Re-Educating Ecclesia," pinpoints at least one ambiguity about the relationship between theological dialogue and achieving spiritual companionship.

Problems

I am tempted (in fact, I have succumbed to the temptation), to begin this section by citing Rabbi Heschel's uproarious observation about a man with no problems. Heschel says that "man has problems. Even God has problems. [But]...here stands a man...who has no problems! Do you know why? He's an idiot!"²³²

As noted, this is only the first, brief, rendition of the range of problems of which the author is aware that attend the thesis of this book. It seems to me I must attach a magical power to intoning these caveats as if the more I do so the more I change the odds affirming the possibility of evolution to a stage of spiritual companionship among people in various religious communities, on different spiritual paths. Here I treat in brief five problems associated with the general thesis of this book, problems in sharing clues to spiritual living across any potential pairing of religious communities and spiritual ways and five problems specific to deepening the encounter between Jews and Christians.

The first general problem is that there is no paradigm modeling the way in which significant numbers in any two religious communities might achieve deep levels of encounter with one another beyond dialogue. There are examples of deep interreligious encounter that may or may not serve as paradigms or models for broader movements, and there are many individual exemplars. Bede Griffiths comes to mind as an exemplar in Hindu-Christian relations. And Merton's appreciation of Zen and the influence of this appreciation in his writings on identity, self-consciousness, presence, and silence, are another example. There are also, as already noted in the discussion of the Catholic-Jewish Colloquium, some instances of a tantalizing "possible complementarity," with spiritual companionship perhaps evolving from theological dialogue.

Finally, we have many heartening examples of members of different religious communities acting in common to serve persons through works of justice and of peace. I have argued elsewhere,³³ and still maintain, that this should not be held up as the end of interreligious encounter but a profound outcome of it. I will take up the issue again in chapter two.

Forging deep interreligious encounter is presumably linked to what participants perceive as the benefits. There seem to be two general possibilities here. Either we experience encounter as confirming and enriching elements that are prominent within our own religious community and its spiritual way, or we experience the enrichment of our religious community by the introduction of elements, of spiritual practice for example, that are not so well developed in our religious community. Paul Knitter's discussion of what he takes to be the uniqueness of John Cobb's approach to articulating theological grounds for embracing religious pluralism is instructive here. Knitter believes that unlike other prominent figures in this area of theological work, Cobb avoids the idea that "all religions have the same basic (or essential) task which each carries out with rough parity."³⁴ What is more attractive to Knitter in Cobb's approach is that it is based on the idea that "...all religions have different tasks."³⁵

Whatever one makes of the distinction (to which we will return at the end of this chapter), neither approach assures achieving deep encounter or provides a paradigm overcoming the asymmetries between the parties to any possible pairing of significant numbers in any two religious communities.

The second general problem is that the thesis of this book is, on the face of it, utterly prescriptive. That is to say it isn't at all clear at the outset that what is advocated here, even if viewed positively, is actually attainable. In chapter two I cite the work of Fayette Breaux Veverke. She asks, suggestively, whether anyone or many people believe or can come to believe that building "bridges" is consistent with maintaining "boundaries." The problem is seen more sharply when we remember that the bridge whose construction, or expansion, is proposed here is the bridge to becoming spiritually transparent, as far as possible, to one another. This bridge is of far greater expanse than that of theological dialogue alone.

A third problem is that the call to find ways, as companions, to search in the wilderness together flies in the face of rising tides of religious fundamentalism in our day. Martin Marty and R. Scott Appleby's book, *Accounting for Fundamentalism*, helps dramatize the antithesis between the thesis of this book and the spirit of fundamentalism: "Fundamentalism appears as a strategy, or set of strategies, by which beleaguered believers attempt to preserve their distinctive identity as a people or a group...[from] outsiders who threaten to draw believers into a syncretistic...milieu."³⁶ In this milieu, advocates of dialogue are deeply suspect. How much more suspect are "co-religionists who appear to have adapted all too well to modernity through unholy compromise"³⁷ when the call is to spiritual encounter deeper than theological dialogue?

The companion problem to the rise in fundamentalism (and our fourth general problem) is the eclipse of the liberal theological imagination. This book is entirely a work of the liberal theological impulse, as is all interreligious engagement, provided the motives are sincere. In chapter two I will lay out in summary form, and in chapter four at length, the content of a liberal theological view of the defining symbols,

practices and beliefs of Christians. Chapter three deals with the liberal theological view of the pivotal issue in all interreligious engagement at any level, the issue of revelation. The primary purpose of this exercise is to show the reader who is not Christian the richness of Christian belief when it is liberated from dogmatic obscurantism, cynical manipulation and intellectual naivete.

David Tracy provides a precise and persuasive definition of the liberal model of theological reflection. We are thinking in the liberal theological key when our work making religious experience intelligible is deeply influenced by historical consciousness and by the effort to discover contemporary patterns of common human experience. Historical consciousness might unearth the context out of which Catholics, for example, came to believe and teach that an all-loving God consigns unbaptized babies to Limbo for all eternity. Plumbing patterns of common human experience might cause the same (theologically liberal) person to abandon the teaching! Or, historical consciousness might unearth the origins and influences of patriarchy overshadowing the relative inclusiveness of the primitive Christian Jewish community. Attending to patterns of common human experience might cause people to reject the idea that God prefers men to women! This is the liberal impulse in religion and in theology; contrast it with Pope John Paul II speaking of “the noisy propaganda of liberalism, of freedom without truth or responsibility” and the problem crystallizes.³⁸

A final general problem with the thesis of this book is that there continues to be so much interreligious strife, including violence, but also ignorant, negative stereotyping coming from sources least expected because presumed to be more sophisticated. An example of this back peddling can be found in recent Vatican characterizations of Buddhism.

In the last few years, Vatican officials have stumbled badly in caricaturing Buddhism. Though Pope John Paul II had a number of admiring things to say of Buddhism, his principal message with regard to this spiritual path was really a calumny, presumably unintended but hard to reconcile with the Pope’s broad erudition. In his 1994 book, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*,³⁹ the pope paints an erroneous and reductionistic picture of essential Buddhism as entirely inward and socially irresponsible.

But the pope is topped by his intimate collaborator in triumphalism, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI. In 1998 remarks, Ratzinger dismisses Buddhism as an “autoerotic spirituality.”⁴⁰ Responding, Buddhist scholar and Buddhist Francis Cook notes the “linking [of] Buddhism with Onan’s solitary vice and hinting in the strongest terms that both are wasting their time, to say the least.”⁴¹ Cook comments: “This is strange in the light of the atmosphere of the Second Vatican Council and its stated hopes for more respect and understanding, as well as for more dialogue. Which Vatican are we to believe?”⁴²

What the pope and the cardinal are culpably ignorant of, or know but refuse to acknowledge, is the long and rich tradition, in Mahayana Buddhism especially, placing compassion (*karuna*) at the heart of Buddhist practice and setting the image of the Bodhisattva, the compassionate Buddha, on high for emulation. Cook is especially justified in asking which Vatican to believe. He has in mind a point of conciliar theology that the pope and cardinal dishonor. For it is in the Second Vatican Council’s document, *Ad Gentes*, that we read that Christians “should carefully consider how traditions of asceticism and contemplation whose seeds have been sown by God in certain ancient cultures before the preaching of the Gospels might be incorporated into Christian religious life.”⁴³

Turning to the specific problems of Jewish-Christian relations, we need to begin by acknowledging the extraordinary repair of these relations since the middle of the last century. Reports of the eclipse of anti-semitism will always be premature, but it is not useful to ignore the remarkable strides Jews and Christians have made together since the end of the Second World War. (That he fails to take account of this progress is one of the chief criticisms of Daniel Goldhagen and his book, *Moral Reckoning*).

I will detail the story of this progress in chapter two. But positive developments notwithstanding, there is still a broad range of problems in these relations, problems which take on a special character when we look to deepen the encounter between Jews and Christians.

The first problem is our common history. In the late 1940s, the French Jewish philosopher Jules Issac gave this history the name “teach-

ing of contempt.” In his 1947 essay, “Has Anti-Semitism Roots in Christianity?” Issac identified eighteen elements in the centuries of Christian derogation of Jews, elements ranging from negative interpretations of the teachings of Hebrew scripture, through the decide charge (that the Jews murdered God), to the “de-Judaizing” of Jesus and more.⁴⁴ These and other teachings throughout the centuries gave rise to persecution and pogrom, inquisition and expulsion, forced conversion and auto da fe (public spectacles in which the sincerity of Jewish converts would be subjected to impossible tests; when the tests were failed, the Jews were executed). Thanks to the work of Robert Kertzer,⁴⁵ we now know that official Catholicism hammered this contemptuous teaching home until the very brink of the Holocaust, a horror that could not have occurred apart from the centuries of teaching contempt.

The reconciliation between so many Jews and Christians, our range of theological dialogues, and work in common to assist people to have justice and peace are themselves startling in the light of our shared history. One wonders what strains might be placed on relations by the effort to deepen these relations as profoundly as envisioned here by the effort to systematize a far broader and deeper spiritual encounter with one another.

The second and third problems are the facts of Jewish minority status and of Jewish assimilation.

A variety of historical, cultural, and ideological factors have combined to make Jews, in significant percentages, disproportionately effective and influential in a range of cultural, educational, and professional works. Among the historical factors is the very isolation to which Jews have been subjected from time to time throughout the centuries. Among the cultural and ideological factors is the power and importance traditional Jewish spiritual and moral teaching attaches to the mitzvot of study. But, although prominent, Jewish women and men are very small minorities within populations in which they are numbered, save Israel. When we add to this the fact of precipitous assimilation rates of Jewish persons in countries like the United States, the grounds for resisting the practices advocated in this book become evident.

I think these factors are in play even where relations are at their best.

Consider the scores of Jewish theological, educational, and rabbinic leaders who signed *Dabru Emet* (“A Jewish Statement on Christians and Christianity”). One of the “eight statements about how Jews and Christians may relate to one another” is this: “A new relationship between Jews and Christians will not weaken Jewish practices....An improved relationship will not accelerate the cultural and religious assimilation that Jews rightly fear. It will not change traditional forms of worship nor increase intermarriage between Jews and non-Jews, nor persuade more Jews to convert to Christianity, nor create a false blending of Judaism and Christianity.”⁴⁶

A powerful endorsement, at once cautious but unafraid. Yet, to me, the statement seems to presuppose that relations continue to consist chiefly of common ethical practice and sensitive theological discourse. I am not confident the statement would be made in front of a broad movement among Jews and Christians to do those things necessary to “search the wilderness” together, to share “wellsprings of devotion...” and “treasures of stillness,” to do together things that require even more spiritual companionship and transparency.

The fourth special problem in deepening Jewish-Christian relations is of an entirely different kind from the first three. In an earlier formulation of the thesis of this book I said that people in one religious community can be enriched by “clues” in other religious communities. Under clues I included both “practices and beliefs.” The fourth special problem has to do with the usefulness of Christian beliefs to Jewish companions in the proposed deeper encounter.

The issue is not whether it would enrich the life of a Jewish person to *believe* a Christian belief. With Michael Kogan, to whom we will have further reference in chapter two, I affirm that the adoption by Jews “...of any part of the kerygma [proclaimed message] of Christianity,” is “inauthentic and unnecessary.”⁴⁷ And Pope John Paul II affirms this same sentiment in effect when, over and over again, he refers to the Jewish people as “the people of the Old [sic] Covenant never revoked by God.”⁴⁸ So it isn’t a question of Jews believing what Christians believe, (or for that matter Muslims believing what Buddhists believe). The question is the possible *usefulness* of Christian beliefs for Jews (or

Buddhist beliefs for Muslims) and the problems that attach to this issue.

As noted earlier, the liberal theological perspective informs this book from beginning to end. In this view, the language of belief is analogical and metaphorical, not literal; its truth is existential and moral, not metaphysical. What is at issue when one asserts that the beliefs of members of one religious community might be useful to members of other religious communities is, first of all, whether others can understand the meaning of these beliefs as expressions of religious experience. If they can, then they may recognize comparable religious experiences, “theology” may become “depth theology,” and they may be consoled by this experience of solidarity and common purpose with other spiritual seekers.

I hope the reader appreciates by now that for me clarifying the meaning of religious beliefs is not the chief instrument for deepening encounter. It is a work of theological dialogue that either short-circuits, ending with swapping “mere erudition,” or leads beyond itself, transformed by common prayer, to spiritual companionship. Nevertheless, finding the body of convictions—the credal element, the beliefs—of the others to some significant extent feasible, finding that these convictions point to and illumine some common religious experiences, seems at least very helpful.

But when we turn to this dimension, we are confronted with a great, thick edifice of Christian dogmatic positivism, obscurantism, and naïve realism. Many Christians, especially in the so-called “grand churches” like Catholicism with our elaborate doctrinal systems, have been so intent on defending antique and arcane language and interpretation of doctrines from ideological trends of the modern world and from one another, that we have rendered the meanings of these great Christian convictions virtually impenetrable to ourselves and certainly to people in other religious communities. Commenting on the causes for this, within historical Catholicism, Edward Schillebeeckx ascribes the syndrome to 500 years in thrall to “Cartesian dualism and post-Reformation defensiveness.”⁴⁹

I fully appreciated the thickness of this blockage when a Jewish friend and colleague, a man of learning and sensitivity, a theologian, a

rabbinic leader and ecumenist, announced good-naturedly to a classroom of Christians I had asked him to address that there could be no incarnation in Judaism precisely because for Judaism everyone is an incarnation of the Divine. My friend was alluding, of course, to the doctrine of the incarnation, especially in its docetic form, in which the claim “Jesus Christ is God” is made without qualification or nuance. The meaning that was blocked, not only from my Jewish friend but also from many Christians, is the broadly incarnational spirit that is characteristic of a great deal of Christianity at its best, a meaning that is also present in christology proper. Of this dimension, John Macquarrie writes: “if we hold fast to the existential dimension in understanding christhood...we see christology as a kind of transcendental anthropology...[a view of human beings as *all* moving toward the Divine, which moves toward them]...with christhood as the goal toward which created existence moves.”⁵⁰

Karl Rahner has also, and famously, criticized how trinitarian language has evolved in Catholic doctrinal practice.⁵¹ And I myself have heard spiritually and theologically sophisticated Christians employ the language “Father, Son and Holy Spirit” as if the language stipulates precisely who—the mysterious—God is, rather than disclosing the analogous experience of the Divine as “lordly” (*Adonai*), near to us (*Shechinah*), and inhering in us and between us as spirit (*Ruah*).

One can speculate, further, that because of the obscurantism of the controversies about transubstantiation over the centuries, my friend would not make a connection between what Christians say of the experience of eating blessed Eucharist bread and drinking Eucharist wine and an observation like Rabbi Heschel’s that the Divine may be experienced in so small a thing as “a morsel of bread.”⁵²

The final problem specific to Jewish-Christian relations I might just call the regular recurrence of recidivist attitudes, the expression of relatively primitive understandings of one another, after much progress and from sources we would least expect. I know this is something that happens among Jews. But relations between Jews and Christians are neither historically nor morally symmetrical. And it is for me, principally, to note instances of backsliding among Christians.

By calling this problem one of recidivism, I am excluding periodic eruptions of naked antisemitism. What I have more in mind is surprising instances when theological anti-Judaism⁵³ surfaces from unexpected sources. An instructive example is Cardinal Avery Dulles' criticism, in Fall 2002, of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' Committee on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs' document *Reflections On Covenant and Mission*.

The episcopal document sets out the rationale for the proposition that "targeting Jews for conversion to Christianity..." is "...no longer theologically acceptable in the Catholic Church."⁵⁴ In taking exception to this proposition, Dulles manages to sidestep Vatican leaders, papal statements, and the work of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. This highly sophisticated theologian lifts some lines from a polemical text of the New Testament and uses them to demonstrate the permissibility of evangelizing Jews. He does this as if God simply wrote the text, giving voice to God's eternal plan. The text is a portion of the Letter to the Hebrews in which it says that the first covenant is "obsolete" and "ready to vanish away" (Heb 8:13), and that Christ "...abolishes the first...in order to establish the second" (Heb 10:9).

In response to this breakdown of exegesis and to this literalism, three Catholic scholars, with the greatest delicacy, remind this distinguished Catholic theologian (created cardinal by Pope John Paul II precisely to honor his theological work), of actual Vatican theology as well as time-honored theological perspectives on appraising the truth of scriptural texts. They write: "In the words of the Pontifical Biblical Commission 'Interpretation of scripture involves a work of sifting and setting aside....'"⁵⁵ And "the magisterium [teaching authority of the church] can explicitly contradict an idea of an individual New Testament author because the Catholic tradition is one of commentary not *sola scriptura* (scripture alone). The author of Hebrews, convinced that he was living in the final stages of history, could argue that the Old Covenant had yielded to the New. Two millennia later, however, in a Church whose pope has prayed for God's forgiveness for the sins of Christians against Jews, such an assertion is unacceptable."⁵⁶

I chose this example because of the deserved prominence of the

recidivist and because of the baldness of the actual offense. The response by Mary Boys, Philip Cunningham, and John Pawlikowski is also instructive in that it is a clear example of the kind of progress made since the achievement of what in chapter two I will call a “second stage” of renewal of relations between Jews and Christians. This is the stage at which, among other examples of progress, polemical anti-Jewish texts of the Second Testament are reinterpreted in the light of the context of the times not taken for timeless divine truth. The point here, in concluding the discussion of special problems associated with deepening Jewish-Christian relations, is that when there can be slippage on matters like this, achieving even more ambitious goals can become remote.

In Praise of Separateness

Nothing proposed here is intended to diminish appreciation of the enrichment of human life by differences, distinctions, even separateness. It is a truism that “variety is the spice of life.” The thesis of this book is not built on ignorance of how important separateness is to both the vitality and the survival of the Jewish people (and by extension, any other conceivable pairing of members of religious communities engaged in deep encounter). Therefore a word is in order about the importance of Jewish separateness and distinctiveness in particular as well as about the general value of such separateness or distinctiveness.

David Gelernter gives us a wonderful essay on separateness in Judaism, on how it “governs the Bible’s view of how Israel should live among the nations.”⁵⁷ He writes: “In the beginning, says the Book of Genesis, was chaos—*Tov va ‘vohu*—...and chaos means mixed-togetherness, unseparation. To banish chaos, you must separate.”⁵⁸

In the Book of Leviticus, God says “Make yourself holy and be holy for I am holy” (Lev 11:44). But in a midrash (rabbinic commentary) on the verse, God’s words are changed to “As I am separate, so you be separate.”⁵⁹ And in the Zohar, the great late thirteenth-century mystical tract of Moses de Leon, it is said “Happy are Israel...the Holy One, Blessed be He, has separated them from all other nations.”⁶⁰

The precursors of rabbinic Judaism, the Pharisees, take their name from the Hebrew—*perushim*—for “the separate ones.”⁶¹

Creation itself consists of separation of earth, sea, and land, and liberation (exodus), of the separation of the Red Sea. Light is separate from darkness, day from night, breeds of animals and seeds from one another. So too are men from women, betrothed women from other men, Jews from Canaanites, milk from meat and the Sabbath from *havdalah*, the “separation blessing” that brings Sabbath to a close.

Gelernter moves compellingly from the symbolic to the sociological. He says that separation from Germany in the 1930s required of German Jews “the enormously painful step of separating themselves from their native world.” And that “American Jews are asked to take a vastly smaller step of separation...when they are requested to disapprove of their sons and daughters marrying gentiles.”⁶² What is at stake is clear and moving: “In human society...a people disperses—mixes with other people and gets lost like a teardrop in the ocean.”⁶³

But Judaism is against dispersal, or should be. And “each time [a Jew] makes a separation or looks through a separation or marches into a separation, he shouts out loud his defiance of chaos...and death.”⁶⁴

So separateness is a deeply compelling issue for Jews. As Gelernter says, Jews and their persecutors through history have “collaborated” in Jewish separateness. Separateness has led Jews and Judaism to extraordinary heights of human achievement, and it has made them objects of scorn. The ultimate importance of an appropriate degree of separateness, of distinctiveness, for the Jewish people is that they shall not disappear; they must not become teardrops in the ocean. But distinctiveness or separateness is a universal value, what Heschel calls “the sense of the unique.”⁶⁵ He writes eloquently of this yearning for distinctiveness expressed on the individual plane: “To the world I am an ordinary man. But to myself I am not ordinary. The issue becomes how to actualize the quiet eminence of my own being.”⁶⁶

In a universal key, we celebrate the relationship between separateness, or separation, and holiness. In a religious context, we would say holiness is the concrete process of being saved where salvation is understood not in cosmic and mythological terms but existentially. John Hicks speaks this way calling salvation “an actual human change, a gradual transformation from natural self-centeredness...to a radical new orientation cen-

tered in God and manifested in the ‘fruits of the Spirit.’”⁶⁷

It dramatizes the link between holiness in this sense and the need for separation and distinction if we consider a contemplative model of holiness. In this mode, every human strength we would strive to cultivate requires separation and even periodic retreat from the larger prevailing influence of our culture. One seeks to grow still surrounded by noise, simple in front of ravenous consumption, slow when everyone is being fast. The goal is gentleness in a sea of violence and calm reflectiveness where many are dispersed and scattered.

Separateness, in so far as it is the necessary condition for the preservation of some distinctiveness, is intrinsic to every healthy religious community and spiritual way. As my teacher, Gabriel Moran, has never ceased to insist (chiefly because over the years the importance he attaches to the distinction between “religion” and “religiousness” has been so often misunderstood), there is no religion in general. There are only specific communities in which specific symbols, rituals, convictions, moral practices, and patterns of common life are effective in promoting lives of holiness, lives in which the divine-human relationship is experienced, the practice of justice, forgiveness, and compassion endorsed, and people in some significant numbers helped to live well and happily. It must be that this value, legitimate separateness, can co-exist with deepening encounter of people in different religious communities.

Spiritual Companionship

The risks of working toward a deeper level of encounter between people in different religious communities are hardly greater than those of an inappropriate segregation or isolation from each other. As Heschel says, we really need each other to search together in the wilderness for devotion, for stillness, for love and care, for the courage to believe, for a resurrection of sensitivity and a revival of conscience. We need clues from one another, beyond the patterns of any one religious community, clues which may correct or complement the perspectives and practices prominent in our own religious communities.

Here we return to the earlier discussion of Paul Knitter’s distinction between the idea that all religions have the same essential task and the

view that each has a different task. The latter idea, which Knitter associates with John Cobb, was also championed by Bede Griffiths. In *Return to the Center*, Griffiths proposes that the great Middle Eastern religions promote a sense and taste for the transcendent and the Eastern religions for immanence. Regardless of how one views the issue, the potential for clues from one religious community and spiritual way enriching others remains. For ultimately, growth from spiritual companionship is entirely existential. By existential I mean compelling, concrete, real, and immediate, affecting me now.

I have shared how, concretely and really, Jews and Judaism help me retrieve and celebrate the incarnational ethos: that the divine and human are locked in intimate embrace. This is an inheritance of my Catholic upbringing, but somewhat muted by the Jansenistic (moralistic) tinge of that mid-twentieth century “Irish (American) Catholicism.” In the same way, the wedding of Zen practice with Christian prayer of silence is an indispensable strength in my life. On these experiences, and others, rests my claim that “each and every religious community should sponsor interreligious encounter of this kind.” I think these are precisely the kind and quality of human experiences to which Bernard Lonergan was referring when he said that “it is through knowledge and appreciation of others that we come to know ourselves and to fill out and refine our appreciation of values.”⁶⁸

And we should be clear about the outcomes we seek, about what truly enriches. We will know encounters leading to spiritual companionship are succeeding if these encounters hasten and deepen the qualities of faithfulness in those engaged in the encounters. The faithfulness is to the human vocation. The human vocation is to practice becoming a masterpiece. To practice becoming a masterpiece is to practice living well. To live well is to grow, perhaps only little by little, in the qualities of reverence, gratefulness, joy, stillness (or silence), creativity, courage, justice, forgiveness, compassion, and (in a religious context), praise and penitence before the Holy One.

If it true that this work of faithfulness can be enhanced by sponsoring encounter beyond dialogue (though not in opposition to it), it would be a shame if such encounter were thwarted for fear of relativiz-

ing truth claims. Here we return to David Novak's claim "that some things are true all the time, everywhere and for everyone...." This is a formula for concluding dialogue before it can advance to deeper levels of encounter, even spiritual companionship. It is also quite simply not so. There is, however, *one thing* that is true all the time. It is a truth that might be experienced and celebrated by *everyone, everywhere*. And this one thing, in the words of Jacques Dupuis, is that "the principle agent of interreligious dialogue is the Spirit of God, who is present in the traditions on both sides and who animates the partners.... It is the same God who works saving deeds in human history and who speaks to human beings in the depths of their hearts."⁶⁹

The next chapter explores the evolution of relations between Jews and Christians to the brink of spiritual companionship. It contains a fuller treatment of the problems surrounding this evolution, and it frames in an introductory way ideas dealt with in subsequent chapters. Chapter three deals with the pivotal theological issue of revelation; chapter four with what I have already referred to as "the usefulness of Christian beliefs to Jewish companions." The final chapter, chapter five, deals with the essential practice for achieving spiritual companionship, the practice of contemplation. And the epilogue deals with how we teach one another about one another.

What is before us is how to find a path for people in any two religious communities (Jews and Christians are employed as an example), a path beyond fixation on truth claims, a path to deepened spiritual lives, and therefore, a path to enhanced practice of justice, forgiveness and compassion.

I think Irving (Yitz) Greenberg (not alone but profoundly) understands that this is the proper path and how to travel it. Greenberg seems to stake faithfulness itself on the quality of the encounter. He writes that the very authenticity of Jewish embrace of the covenant "will demand that Jews and Christians remain open to each other, that we learn from each other."⁷⁰ He affirms that there must be "respect for the distinctiveness and validity of each other's traditions."⁷¹ But, unlike Novak, Greenberg acknowledges that "Such openness puts no religious claim beyond possibility."⁷² And finally he tells us that the affirmation

of a deep level of interreligious encounter need do nothing “to undercut the belief of each group that it is *an* [my emphasis] elected people of God. There is enough love in God to choose again and again.”⁷³ These are ideal words with which to continue.

Notes

1. Quoted in Margaret Farley, *Personal Commitments: Beginning, Keeping, and Changing Them* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986), p. 56.
2. Cyprian Consiglio in Bruno Barnhart and Joseph Wong, *Purity of Heart and Contemplation: A Monastic Dialogue Between Christian and Asian Traditions* (New York: Continuum, 2001), p. 67.
3. Galatians 2:19f in the *New Revised Standard Version*.
4. Shunryu Suzuki. *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind* (New York: Walker/Weatherhill, 1970), p. #1f.
5. Cited in Shaykh Fadhlalla Haeri, *The Elements of Sufism* (Shaftesbury, Dorset, GB: Longmead, 1990), p. 53.
6. Quoted in Barnhart and Wong, op. cit., p. 64.
7. In Jonathan Montaldo and Patrick Hart, OCSO, *The Intimate Merton: His Life from His Journals* (New York: Harper Collins, 1999), p. 86.
8. Thomas Merton, *Thoughts in Solitude* (New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1956), p. 46.
9. Raimundo Panikkar, *The Intrareligious Dialogue* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), p. xxvii.
10. Quoted from “De Mutatione Nominum,” David Winston, translator, in *Philo of Alexandria: The Contemplative Life, The Giants and Selections*. (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), p. 233.
11. Conrad Hyers, *The Comic Vision and the Christian Faith: A Celebration of Life and Laughter* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1981), p. 35.
12. David Tracy, “The Christian Understanding of Salvation-Liberation,” *Face to Face: An Interreligious Bulletin*, vol. XIV, 1988, pp 40–44. “The move to total liberation in these Christian interpretations of ‘salvation’ is...correctly described as a necessary re-Judaizing of Christian soteriology against some individualistic, ahistorical and apolitical traditional readings.”

13. I summarized these impressions in chapter five, "The Genius of Judaism," Padraic O'Hare, *The Enduring Covenant: The Education of Christians and the End of Antisemitism* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), pp. 128–151.
14. In Samuel Dresner (ed.), *I Asked For Wonder: A Spiritual Anthology of Abraham Joshua Heschel* (New York: Crossroad Press, 1997), p. 46.
15. This is a generative theme running throughout the rich, broad, and deep work of many decades, of my teacher, Gabriel Moran.
16. Roger Haight, SJ, *Jesus, Symbol of God* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press, 2000), p. 194.
17. Quoted in Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 1, (New York: Scribner, 1956), p. 157.
18. Padraic O'Hare, *The Way of Faithfulness: Contemplation and Formation in the Church* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993), and *Busy Life, Peaceful Center: A Book of Meditating* (Chicago: Thomas More Press, 1995).
19. Quoted in Frank Ephraim Talmadge (ed.), *Disputation and Dialogue: Readings of Jewish-Christian Encounter* (New York: KTAV Publishing House and the Anti-Defamation League, 1975), p. 86.
20. Leonard Swidler, *After the Absolute: The Dialogical Future of Religious Reflection* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 52.
21. An excellent example of embodying of both the limitations of the "dialogue" model and its incipient possibilities is Tikva Frymer-Kensky, David Novak, et al (eds), *Christianity in Jewish Terms* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000).
22. Ibid. p. 4
23. In Talmadge. op.cit., p. 348.
24. In *The Praktikos* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cisterian Publications, 1978), p. 65. Translated with an Introduction by John Eudes Bamberger, OCSO.
25. Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Insecurities of Freedom* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1966), p.112ff.
26. Mary C. Boys, *Has God Only One Blessing? Judaism as a Source of Christian Self-Understanding* (New York: Paulist Press, 2000), p. 271.
27. Krister Stendahl, "From God's Perspective We Are All Minorities," *Journal of Religious Pluralism*, 1993, p. 10.

28. David Ellenson quoted in Boys, op. cit. p. 277f.
29. David Tracy, *Blessed Rage For Order: The New Pluralism in Theology* (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), p. 4.
30. Boys. op. cit. p. 277.
31. Quoted in Mary Boys and Sara Lee, "The Catholic-Jewish Colloquium: An Experiment in Interreligious Learning," *Religious Education*, vol. 91, no. 4. 1996, p. 432.
32. Susannah Heschel (ed), *Moral Grandeur and Spiritual Audacity* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1996) p. 402.
33. Padraic O'Hare, *The Enduring Covenant*, op.cit., p. 57f.
34. Paul Knitter (ed), *Transforming Christianity and the World: A Way Beyond Absolutism and Relativism* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press, 1999), p. 61.
35. Ibid.
36. Martin Marty and R. Scott Appleby, *Accounting For Fundamentalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 1.
37. Patrick Arnold, SJ, "The Rise of Catholic Fundamentalism," *America*, April 11, 1987, p. 298.
38. Pope John Paul II, "For Pontiff Day of Emotion," *Boston Globe*, August 19, 2002, p. A8.
39. Pope John Paul II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), p. 85ff. The Pope speaks in part well of Buddhism, but ultimately as a system of a "purely negative enlightenment" in which the world is seen as bad.
40. Cited in "Zen and the Impurity of Purity" by Francis H. Cook, Barnhart and Wong. op cit. p. 124. See also Leo D. Lefebure "Cardinal Ratzinger's Comments On Buddhism," *Buddhist Christian Studies*, 18 (1998) 221–223.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., p. 124f.
43. In Austin Flannery OP (ed), *The Basic Sixteen Documents of Vatican Council II* (Northport, NY: Costello Publishing Company, 1996), p. 469.
44. See note 12 above.
45. David D. Kertzer, *The Popes Against the Jews: The Vatican's Role in the Rise of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001).

46. Quoted in Tikva Frymer-Kensky, Novak et al., op. cit. p. XVII. "Dabru Emet means 'to speak the truth.'"
47. Michael S. Kogan, "Christian-Jewish Dialogue in the Twenty-First Century: Where Do We Go From Here? A Jewish Reflection," Conference paper delivered at Boston College, June 18/19, 2000, p. 6.
48. Cited in Mary C. Boys, Philip Cunningham, and John Pawlikowski, SM, "Theology's Sacred Obligation," *America*, Oct. 21, 2002, p. 15. See also Eugene Fischer and Leon Klenecki, eds., *Spiritual Pilgrimage: Texts on Jews and Judaism, 1979-1995* Pope John Paul II, (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1996).
49. Edward Schillbeeckx, OP, *A Survey of Catholic Theology 1800 to 1970*, p. 31. Edited with an introduction by Mark Schcof, OP.
50. John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), p. 276.
51. Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Theology* (New York: Crossroad, 1985), pp 134-36.
52. In Dresner, op.cit., p. 16.
53. Here the term "anti-Judaism" and the reality behind it is distinguished from antisemitism, the former, to simplify, theological opposition to Jews and Judaism, the latter hating Jews and Judaism. I have dealt at length with the distinction in my 1997 book, *The Enduring Covenant*, see note 13 above. David Kertzer has made a persuasive case that the distinction is vacuous. See note 45 above.
54. Boys, Cunningham, Pawlikowski. op. cit., p. 14.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., p. 15.
57. David Gelernter, "Judaism Beyond Words," *Commentary*, vol. 113 #5, May 2002. All quotes from pp. 31-36. My special thanks to Lawrence Lowenthal for bringing this power and thoughtful essay to my attention.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.
65. S. Heschel. op. cit. p. 396.
66. Abraham Joshua Heschel, *Who Is Man?* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1965), p. 35.
67. John Hicks “A Pluralist View,” in Denis I, Okholm and Timothy R. Philips (eds), *More Than One Way? Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralist World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House), p. 39.
68. Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), p. 253.
69. Quoted in Barnhart and Wong. op. cit., p. 124.
70. Irving Greenberg “Judaism, Christianity, and Partnership After the Twentieth Century” in Tikva Frymer-Kensky, Novak, et al., op. cit, p. 36.
71. Ibid.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid.