

## Christ and the Church in Their Jewish Context

John PAWLIKOWSKI

## 猶太背景中的基督與教會

John PAWLIKOWSKI

[ABSTRACT] The Second Vatican Council radically transformed Catholic understanding not only of Jews and Judaism but also of Jesus Christ and the origins of the Church. Traditionally, Catholics presented Judaism as a superseded religion with no continuing value and the Jews as people doomed to perpetual wandering on the earth until the end of days without ever again having a nation-state as a punishment for their supposed complicity in the death of Jesus. In sharp contrast to Catholic attitudes in earlier ages, both official church statements since the Second Vatican Council and biblical scholarship have reversed the traditional views and have developed an appreciative understanding of Jews and Judaism, leading to vastly improved Jewish-Catholic relations. Today Catholics are urged to become familiar with how Jews view themselves and their tradition. Recently scholars of early Christianity have recognized that Jewish-Christian identity intermingled for far longer than many previously believed. Discussion continues on how best to understand the covenantal heritage that Jews and Christians share. The author proposes viewing the Christian-Jewish relationship in terms of two distinctive, but not totally distinct, paths that intersect

at times but will fully converge only in the eschatological age through a process known only to God.

\*\*\*

## Vatican II

The late Cardinal Carlo Martini, S.J., the former archbishop of Milan and a biblical scholar in his own right, wrote the following in light of the Second Vatican Council and its historic declaration *Nostra Aetate*, which totally transformed the church's understanding of its ties to the Jewish People:

Without a sincere feeling for the Jewish world and a direct experience of it, one cannot fully understand Christianity. Jesus is fully Jewish, the apostles are Jewish, and one cannot doubt their attachment to the traditions of their forefathers.<sup>1</sup>

These words from Cardinal Martini closely parallel the document issued by the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews issued in 1985 to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of *Nostra Aetate*: "Jesus was and always remained a Jew...Jesus is fully a man of his time, and his environment—the Jewish Palestinian one of the 1st century, the anxieties and hope of which he shared."<sup>2</sup>

Both Cardinal Martini and the Vatican *Notes* build on the foundation laid in chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*. In that chapter the bishops of the Council completely reversed centuries of thinking

---

<sup>1</sup> Carlo Maria Martini, S.J., "Christianity and Judaism: A Historical and Theological Overview," in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jews and Christians: Exploring the Past, Present and Future* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> "Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church. June 24, 1985," in *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue*, Vol 1: *The Road to Reconciliation (1945-1985)* edited by Franklin Sherman (New York: Paulist, 2011), p. 208.

regarding the church-synagogue relationship. Since the patristic era when many church fathers developed what is termed the *Adversus Judaeos* as well as the notion of the Jews as a “witness people,” the church in its preaching, theology, liturgy, and art had presented Judaism as a superseded religion with no continuing value and the Jews as people doomed to perpetual wandering on the earth until the end of days without ever again having a nation-state as a punishment for their supposed complicity in the death of Jesus. Their perceived responsibility for Jesus’ crucifixion resulted, so church doctrine claimed, in their expulsion from any further covenantal relationship with God. They were replaced in that covenantal relationship by the church. They were not to be annihilated as a people (this is where Nazism went beyond classical Christian thought) but were to be kept in a marginal and miserable state in human society as a warning to others about the consequences in rejecting Christ.

*Nostra Aetate* totally undercut this classical theology of Judaism within the church with three major assertions: (1) Jews cannot be held collectively responsible for the death of Jesus; (2) Jews remain within the covenant after Jesus’ death; (3) Jesus and his disciples drew significantly from the Jewish tradition of their day. The first assertion was especially significant because it undercut the prevailing outlook on Jews and Judaism on the part of Christians. If Jews were not collectively responsible for Jesus’ death, then there is no basis for the classical claim that they were expelled from the covenant nor for the so-called theology of perpetual wandering as a divine punishment for their murder of the Messiah.

The Canadian scholar Gregory Baum, who was an official expert at Vatican II and had a hand in the original draft of what became *Nostra Aetate*, argued in a 1986 address to the Catholic Theological Society of North America meeting in Chicago that

chapter four of this conciliar declaration represented the most radical change in the ordinary magisterium of the church to emerge from Vatican II.<sup>3</sup> Baum was quite on target with this evaluation. This fundamental shift from Jewish covenantal exclusion to continuing Jewish covenantal inclusion carries with it profound implications for Christological thinking in the church as well as for the church's core identity. Those implications have only been gradually drawn out within Catholic biblical and theological scholarship, as well as in church documents, in the almost fifty years since the passage of *Nostra Aetate* in the closing session of the council in October 1965.

## Official Developments after Vatican II

In terms of Vatican documents building on chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*, the following would be included: (1) the 1974 and 1975 documents from the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews; (2) the 1998 declaration on the Holocaust from the Holy See's Commission with an introductory letter from Pope John Paul II; (3) the 2001 document on the Jews and their Scriptures in the New Testament from the Pontifical Biblical Commission; (4) the many addresses of Pope John Paul II as well as a few from Pope Benedict XVI.<sup>4</sup>

The first two documents contained several important statements. One was the injunction in the 1974 document that

---

<sup>3</sup> Gregory Baum, "The Social Context of American Catholic Theology," in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, Vol. 41 (1986), p. 87.

<sup>4</sup> These documents can be found in the following volumes: Franklin Sherman (ed.), *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue*, Vol. 1; Helga Croner (ed.), *More Stepping Stones to Jewish-Christian Relations: An Unabridged Collection of Christian Documents 1975-1983* (New York: Mahwah: Paulist, 1985). Eugene J. Fisher and Leon Klenicki (eds.), *In Our Time: The Flowering of Jewish-Catholic Dialogue* (New York, Mahwah: Paulist, 1980).

Christians should not create stereotypical views of Jews and Judaism but need to discover how Jews themselves define their identity and interpret their tradition. The 1985 document which focused on the presentation of Jews and Judaism in catechetics and preaching makes several important points about the presentation of biblical themes in both areas. Among the points underlined in that document are the need to present the Old Testament or Hebrew Scriptures as a source of meaning and revelation for Christians and not merely as a foil or prelude for the New Testament, as well as the urgency of properly interpreting the apparent attacks on Jews as an entire community in the gospel of John, which historically has often generated antisemitism within Christianity. In brief, the 1985 documents insist that religious education and preaching must reflect the fundamental changes in the church's understanding of its relationship with the Jewish people that were highlighted in *Nostra Aetate*.

The 1998 document on the *Shoah*<sup>5</sup> or the Nazi Holocaust recognized Christian responsibility and complicity in this horrific event and mandated Holocaust education for Catholic students on a global scale. While the Holocaust occurred within the context of Western Christianity, its roots and its ethical implications impact the faith understanding of Christians everywhere. The Holocaust forces the church to move to a serious examination of its history of antisemitism and the extent to which seeds of antisemitism might still linger within Christian theology, preaching, liturgy, and catechetics. The forceful introduction to this document by Pope John Paul II gives this document added weight in terms of its significance.

---

<sup>5</sup> Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the "Shoah"* (Vatican City: Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, 1998). For a discussion of the document cf. contributions to Judith H. Banki and John T. Pawlikowski (eds.), *Ethics in the Shadow of the Holocaust* (Franklin, WI/Chicago: Sheed & Ward, 2001).

The last major statement from the side of the Vatican is the 2001 document from the Pontifical Biblical Commission,<sup>6</sup> a unit of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, at the time of its release Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger served as President of this Congregation and he contributed a laudatory introduction to the biblical commission's text which runs some two hundred pages. Its analysis turns around how Jews and their scriptures are presented in the various books of the New Testament. It makes two major assertions which remain crucial for the contemporary Christian-Jewish Dialogue. The first is that Jewish messianic understandings are not in vain. This means that the church recognizes the validity of Jewish messianic claims even though their interpretation of messianic prophecies differs in many cases. In his introduction to the document Cardinal Ratzinger supported this interpretation.

The second assertion of continuing importance is the biblical commission's argument that when the Jewish messiah appears he will exhibit the same basic traits that Christians have seen in and through Jesus. So the 2001 document closely connects the fundamental Jewish and Christian messianic visions. This has important implications for Christian theology though the document does not draw these out in any comprehensive way. This is a task left to the church's theologians.

## **Developments in Biblical Scholarship**

In addition to church documents, the half century since Vatican II has seen remarkable developments in biblical exegesis as it

---

<sup>6</sup> Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002).

impacts our understanding of the relationship between the church and the Jewish People. Cumulatively this scholarship is often given the title “The Parting of the Ways.” It began in the latter years of the twentieth century and has continued to lift up new perspectives on the Christian-Jewish relationship in the first centuries of the Common Era and on St. Paul’s view of Christianity’s links with Judaism after the Christ Event. One of the first scholars to develop on this perspective was Robin Scroggs. His work influenced the outlook of the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago, one of the episcopal pioneers in the implementation of chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*.<sup>7</sup>

The “Parting of the Ways” movement has many voices with diverse perspectives. But one finds coalescence on several key points: (1) The separation between church and synagogue was a slow, drawn out process that took at least a century or more in most places and even longer in certain regions. Some scholars such as David Boyarin see the Council of Nicea in 325 C.E. as the decisive point of rupture. (2) There was no clear-cut Christian identity in the first century. Most believers in Jesus and his message continued to regard themselves as part of the Jewish community and engaged in various forms of Jewish religious practice. (3) The Apostle Paul was not inherently opposed to the continuation of the Jewish Torah tradition and in fact personally remained a practicing Jew to some degree even after his “conversion” to Christ. (4) The supposed conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees and Jesus and “the Jews” in John’s gospel was largely rooted in internal battles among various groups of Jews

---

<sup>7</sup> Robin Scroggs, “The Judaizing of the New Testament,” *The Chicago Theological Seminary Register* Vol. 75 Issue 1 (Winter 1986), pp. 36-45. Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, *A Blessing to Each Other: Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and Jewish-Catholic Dialogues* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996).



who had accepted Jesus and his teachings in different ways and were vying for the dominance of their specific perspective.

An additional word is in order regarding Paul and Judaism. Both Christian and Jewish scholars traditionally have pointed to him as the one responsible for the final rupture between Judaism and Christianity. But that traditional outlook on Paul has been undergoing substantial revision in the last several decades. Biblical scholars such as E.P. Sanders and Krister Stendahl launched this new effort and many others, including some Jews such as Daniel Langston and Mark Nanos, have advanced the original initiative with regard to Paul and the Jewish question.<sup>8</sup>

In light of the new research on Paul, the question arises, was he the founder of Christianity or merely a faithful Jew? In some ways the answer is that he was both. There is little doubt that Paul took a very positive attitude towards Judaism and its Torah, though he had important criticisms about its provisions. He would have been aghast at the "denuded" form of Christianity separated from its Jewish soul that eventually emerged in so many quarters of the church, where in the light of the strong "against the Jews" theology in much of patristic theology it became laced with outright contempt for the Jewish People and their faith. In that sense he remained a "faithful Jew." But he did not believe that the coming of Christ had resulted in a fundamental reorientation of faith into a system of belief rooted in the experience of Christ. For Paul, the experience of the resurrected Christ was personally transforming. Paul certainly wanted Jews to

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. E.P. Sanders. *Paul, The Land, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); *Paul and Judaism: Cross Currents in Pauline Exegesis and the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations*, edited by Reimund Bieringer and Didier Pollefeyt (London: T&T Clark, 2012); John T. Pawlikowski, "Rethinking Pauline Theology: Can it Undergird a Positive Christian-Jewish Relationship," in *Justification According to Paul; Exegetical and Theological Perspectives*, edited by Ondrej Prostendnik (Bratislava, Slovakia: Comenius University, 2012), pp. 231-240.



recognize Jesus as the Messiah of Israel as well as of the nations, but this did not mean any wholesale repudiation of the Torah. In fact, from the Pauline perspective, a contradiction between Jesus as the Messiah and the Torah would in fact be rather ridiculous as he sometimes appears to draw a parallel and even identifies the Law with the gospel of God's acts in Jesus Christ.

### **Single Covenant or Double Covenant?**

As biblical scholars and theologians have begun to explicate this new appreciation of Christianity's Jewish roots, a perspective strongly endorsed by Pope John Paul II in his numerous addresses on Christian-Jewish relations,<sup>9</sup> two initial approaches have come to the fore in terms of understanding the early Christian community's relationship with Jewish groups of the time. While within each approach different nuances appear, as we move from scholar to scholar we can generally characterize the two trends as "single covenant" and "double covenant."

The "single covenant" approach holds that Jews and Christians basically belong to one covenantal tradition that began at Sinai. In this perspective the Christ Event represented the decisive moment when the Gentiles were able to enter fully into the special relationship with God which Jews already enjoyed and in which they continued. Some espousing this viewpoint maintain that the decisive features of the Christ have universal implications, including for Jews. The 2001 Pontifical Biblical Commission's document discussed earlier appears to argue that within historical time Jews await the Messiah through their own covenant. There is no need for the organized evangelization of Jews according to Cardinal Walter Kasper, former President of the Holy See's Commission for

Religious Relations with the Jews. But when the Jewish Messiah arrives, his person will be very similar to that Christians have discovered in and through Jesus. Thus Jesus' messiahship retains universal implications. Other scholars in this continuing discussion are more inclined to argue that the Christian reorientation of the original covenant in and through Jesus applies to all people, including Jews.

The "double covenant" theory begins at the same point as its "single covenant" counterpart, namely, with a strong affirmation of the continuing bonds between Jews and Christians. But then it prefers to underline the distinctiveness of the two traditions and communities, particularly in terms of their experiences after the final separation of church and synagogue; Christians associated with this perspective insist on maintaining the view that through the ministry, teachings and person of Jesus a vision of God emerged that was distinctively new in terms of its central features. Even though there may well have been important groundwork laid for this emergence in Second Temple or Middle Judaism, something that Jewish scholars such as Benjamin Sommer<sup>9</sup> and Daniel Boyarin<sup>10</sup> have suggested of late, what came to be understood regarding the divine-human relationship as a result of Jesus has to be regarded as a quantum leap.

Discussion of the best way to present the theological relationship between Jews and Christians continues in earnest. Cardinal Walter Kasper, both during his tenure as President of the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations<sup>11</sup> with the Jews and

---

<sup>9</sup> Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

<sup>10</sup> Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospel: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. Foreword by Jack Miles (New York: The New Press, 2012).

<sup>11</sup> Cardinal Walter Kasper, "The Good Olive Tree," *America* Vol 185 Issue 7 (September 2000), pp. 2-14.

subsequently after his retirement from that post<sup>12</sup> has attempted such reformulation. At this point of history many scholars working within the Christian-Jewish dialogue are looking for other ways of stating the relationship beyond the options of single or double covenant. A single covenantal framework now serves as the generally preferred option but one that is expressed in considerably different way than its predecessor. The dissatisfaction with the original formulation of the single covenant perspective stems from new research on the nature of Judaism in the first century C.E. as well as new insights into the process of church-synagogue separation.

With regard to the composition of first century Judaism, scholars such as Jacob Neusner, Hayim Perelmuter, and Efraim Shmueli have emphasized that Judaism in the first century was far from monolithic.<sup>13</sup> In fact, this was a very creative period in Jewish history. New groups were emerging that challenged the viewpoints of traditional Judaism. What Ellis Rivkin termed “the Pharisaic Revolution,” a revolution that clearly seeded the perspectives of Jesus and early Christianity, was challenging established Jewish perspectives in many areas. Neusner and Shmueli prefer to speak of “Judaisms” rather than “Judaism.”

Since Christian interpretations of the single covenantal perspective are often rooted in an ongoing, linear understanding of the Jewish tradition, it also has to be said that a single covenantal

---

<sup>12</sup> Cardinal Walter Kasper, “Foreword,” in *Christ Jesus and the Jewish People Today: New Explorations of Theological Interrelationships*, edited by Philip A. Cunningham, Joseph Sievers, Mary Boys, and others (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2011), pp. x-xvii.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Jacob Nuesner, *Death and Birth of Judaism: The Impact of Christianity, Secularism, and the Holocaust on Jewish Faith* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); Efraim Shmueli, *Seven Jewish Cultures: A Reinterpretation of Jewish History and Thought* (Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990); and Hayim Goren Perelmuter, *Siblings: Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity at their Beginnings* (New York: Paulist, 1989).

theory can often mask a continued understanding of Christianity as the fulfillment of Judaism along Christian lines. Such theologies of fulfillment, even if they contain a positive view of the Jewish biblical tradition and argue for Jewish covenantal retention after Christ, have difficulty answering the question, to which of the Judaisms is Christianity linked and which might it complete. Most advocates of a single covenantal model have not really dealt with this new, complex picture of the Jewish community in the time of Jesus.

## **Separation of Church and Synagogue**

The other dimension of recent scholarship relevant for a theological understanding of the Christian-Jewish relationship has to do with the view of how and when the separation of church and synagogue actually took place. Most Christians were weaned on the idea that the church was basically established as a distinct religious entity by the time Jesus died on Calvary. On the Jewish side, the prevailing position was that, while Jesus obviously retained ties with the Jewish community, it was Paul, through his mission to the Gentiles, who really brought about the total separation between Christianity and Judaism. As already indicated, both perspectives now appear quite simplistic. Even if we factor in the supposed decisions made on the Christian side at the so-called Council of Jerusalem spoken of in the book of Acts and on the Jewish side at the Synod of Jabneh which supposedly expelled Christians from authentic standing in the Jewish community, we now know that neither the Council nor the Synod gave final closure to the issue of whether Christians are merely followers of the Way of the Jew Jesus or a distinctively new religious community whose views have definitely broken any ties to Judaism.

Important Christian and Jewish scholars are now arguing that the actual separation between the church and the synagogue, while already ongoing by 100 C.E., was not completed until several centuries afterwards. These scholars such as Robert Wilken, Wayne Meeks, Alan Segal, and Anthony Saldarini have uncovered continued ties between certain Jewish and Christian communities, particularly in the East.<sup>14</sup> Evidence of such ties is apparent in the second, third and, in a few places, even in the fourth and fifth centuries. And these ties were not just on the level of religious self-identity. They also affected popular practice. John Chrysostom, for example, launched a harsh critique of Judaism partly out of frustration that Christians in his area were continuing to participate in synagogue services on a regular basis. What sort of role these Christians played in the Jewish service remains a mystery, but their involvement with Jewish worship shows a mindset among them that belief in Christ and his message did not automatically sever connection with the Jewish tradition and the Jewish community. From the Jewish side it is an indication that at least some Jews at the time still considered followers of Christ as belonging to the Jewish community in some way.

In light of the above scholarly developments, some scholars in the Christian-Jewish dialogue have moved away from the earlier option of “single” and “double” covenant. They lean towards new images of the Christian-Jewish relationship that go beyond “elder” and “younger” brother or “mother-daughter,” both of which tend to establish a fundamentally linear relationship between Judaism and

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Wayne Meeks and Robert Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978); Robert Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4<sup>th</sup> Century* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983); Anthony J. Saldarini, “Jews and Christians in the First Two Centuries: The Changing Paradigm,” *Shofar* Vol. 10 (1992), pp. 32-43.

Christianity. In their place they substitute more parallel images such as "fraternal twins" (Mary Boys), "guests in the house of Israel" (Clark Williamson), "siblings" (Hayim G. Perelmuter), or "co-emergent" religious communities (Daniel Boyarin). None of these are fully satisfactory, but they point us in the right direction for further reflection. The "co-emergent" model is the one that seems more likely to bear fruitful results. In this perspective both post-biblical Judaism and Christianity are "new" religious approaches that were each generated by a quiet revolution in Second Temple Judaism.

## **Concluding Reflections**

Let me conclude with a brief outline of my own theological model for the Christian-Jewish relationship. It is one that has been evolving for several decades.<sup>15</sup> I would argue that in the lengthy process of separation from Judaism, Christianity lost sight of the original revelatory vision associated with the Sinai covenant, a relationship as crucial for Christian identity as the subsequent revelation in and through the Christ Event. As a result as Christians we must envision the Christian-Jewish relationship in terms of two distinctive, but not totally distinct, paths that intersect at times but will fully converge, as Cardinal Walter Kasper has insisted (though Kasper does not use the term "paths"), only in the eschatological age through a process known only to God. These paths must be seen as "parallel," replacing the classical vision of a "linear" relationship

---

<sup>15</sup> John T. Pawlikowski, *Christ in the Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue* (New Edition. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001); John T. Pawlikowski, *Jesus and the Theology of Israel* (Wilmington, DE; Michael Glazier, 1989); John T. Pawlikowski, "Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue: A Personal Theological Journey," *Irish Theological Quarterly* Vol. 72 (2007), pp. 147-167.

between the two faith communities. As Christianity became an essentially Gentile religion without much appreciation for its Jewish roots and saw theology translated into Greek philosophical categories and language, it lost an important revelatory dimension rooted in the Torah which Jesus himself manifests and which Paul struggled to maintain even though it was a struggle he would eventually lose, thanks in part to the author of Acts. Thus Judaism as well preserves a distinctive revelation based in history and in creation, something that R. Kendall Soulen has correctly identified as the hallmark of the Jewish covenantal religion.<sup>16</sup> Christians will need to recover this Jewish revelation as part of eschatological completeness.

The Christian and Jewish revelatory paths cannot be merged all that easily. That is why I speak of “distinctive paths” within a single covenantal framework. In the pre-eschatological age I see them continuing to play off each other, both “blessed” by God (to embrace the term used by Mary Boys) until the end of days. This represents a far from complete model, but it answers some of the outstanding questions. Certainly we shall have to continue its development, including whether there is a possibility of opening up this essentially inclusivist Christian-Jewish relationship to a wider pluralistic model without endangering the specificity of the Christian-Jewish relationship. Any expansion towards a trilateral model (Jewish-Christian-Muslim) must include the fundamental changes in the Church’s understanding of the Christian-Jewish relationship.

---

<sup>16</sup> R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).



## For Further Reading

Bernardin, Joseph Cardinal. *A Blessing to Each Other: Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and Jewish-Catholic Dialogues*. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996.

Boyarin, Daniel. *The Jewish Gospel: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. Foreword by Jack Miles New York: The New Press, 2012.

Cunningham, Philip A., Joseph Sievers, Mary Boys, and others, eds. *Christ Jesus and the Jewish People Today: New Explorations of Theological Interrelationships*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2011.

Fisher, Eugene J. and Leon Klenicki, eds. *Pope John Paul II: Spiritual Pilgrimage: Texts on Jews and Judaism, 1979-1995*. New York: Anti-Defamation League and Crossroad, 1991.

Pawlikowski, John T. *Jesus and the Theology of Israel*. Wilmington, DE; Michael Glazier, 1989.

Pawlikowski, John T. *Christ in the Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue*. New Edition. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001.

Pawlikowski, John T. "Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue: A Personal Theological Journey." *Irish Theological Quarterly* Vol. 72 (2007), pp. 147-167.

Pawlikowski, John T. "Pope John Paul II on Christian-Jewish Relations: His Legacy, Our Challenges." The Inaugural John Paul II Lecture on Christian-Jewish Relations. Boston: Center for Christian-Jewish Learning, Boston College, 2012.

Sherman, Franklin, ed. *Bridges: Documents of the Christian-Jewish Dialogue, Vol 1: The Road to Reconciliation (1945-1985)*. New York: Paulist Press, 2011.

[摘要] 梵二會議徹底地改變了天主教對猶太人和猶太教，以至對耶穌基督和教會的起源的認識。傳統上，天主教將猶太教視為基督宗教來臨後已失去其價值，被取代的舊宗教，而猶太人則因他們在耶穌受難中的角色，注定要失去自己的國家，在地上流離失所，直至末日。一反早期天主教的觀點，自梵二以來的教會文件和聖經研究成果均更認同猶太人和猶太教的價值，而天主教會與猶太人的關係亦大為改善。今日天主教關注猶太人如何認識自己和其傳統，而研究早期教會的學者亦發現，猶太---基督宗教相互結合傳統亦在歷史上持續的時間亦比一般所認知的更長。因此，今天仍然在討論如何理解猶太教和基督宗教共同繼承的文化遺產。作者認為基督宗教與猶太教的關係在兩條獨特但非完全相異的道路上發展，在歷史上有交匯的時刻，但在通往末世的旅途上，何時才會完全相融則只有天主才知道。