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Recommended Citation
RENE LAURENTIN concludes his commentary on the conciliar Statement concerning the Jewish people with a paragraph bearing this meaningful title: *The Significance of the Jewish People in Relationship to the Church.* The very positive views of the Council on all the human realities of this world, which God made our birthplace and the ambiance of our thoughts, have put an end to the convenient solution that made us see in Judaism only a negative attitude toward Jesus Christ and His message. Quite deliberately, the Council avoided defending the Christian faith against deviations and errors; it wished to present what the Christian faith brings to the world and to those who live there. In confronting other faiths, the Council felt obliged to define Christianity in relation to them and, for that purpose, sought to give a brief sketch of their features.

This was a new and most delicate task for a council. Wishing to avoid Catholic terminology, the Second Vatican Council could not use the technical language of these nonchristian religions, neither the rabbinical nor the other traditions. What it had to do, then, was to evoke in modern, understandable language, certain Jewish realities of a religious nature that are at odds with the Christian life. It did not presume to describe Judaism from within; it was even reproached for not having spoken of "Judaism" but rather of "the Jews" and "the Jewish religion." To be sure, the Council only meant to take a position on a few points. The very fact, however, that it favored "mutual knowledge and respect" as well as the "patrimony" the Church has in common with the Jews, showed the Council’s wish to offer no more than a point of departure. An impetus was given to further studies: If the Jew is not the enemy who refuses the faith by which

I am saved, what is he for me destined to live with him? or what is the place of the Jews in which Jesus of Nazareth, re-cornerstone?

**SALVATION, THE CHURCH**

How is Jesus Saviour? It is an examination above all. It is not any more followed on death. Although always in Matthew, and only timidly present in Mark, it is especially through Luke and John, the "Saviour" and "salvation." This is the situation (Rom 1:16). The savior periods were kings whose mission was to lead the people through destructive adverse powers; such was the case with the 50 to 80 A.D. Yavneh Judaism of Yavneh and, even more, the Temple; the best proof of what is given to the Mishnah. The Temple of the school of Hillel, ensured Jewish Empire and personal rewards. The salvation of the community was assured by salvation by fidelity and Yom Kippur. The redemption is still present in the K, "3bd" will become rare among the Jews and eternal life.

The situation was different from obviously Pauline soteriology. On the Conciliar Statement on the Jews, it specifies links the beginnings of the Christian faith, to Moses, to the patriarchs, to the "patrimony" and "salvation"; second, when the salvation is prefigured by the Exodus. More can lead us to a common inv
I am saved, what is he for me before God in the world in which I am destined to live with him? Going beyond individual perspectives, what is the place of the Jews and of Judaism in the Christian vision in which Jesus of Nazareth, recognized as Christ the Saviour, is the cornerstone?

**SALVATION, THE CHURCH, AND THE PEOPLE**

How is Jesus Saviour? It is this idea of salvation that we must examine above all. It is not only an eternal life in the invisible that follows on death. Although absent from the vocabulary of Mark and Matthew, and only timidly present in the Johannine writings which speak of the salvation of the world (Jn 4:22, 42; 1 Jn 4:14), it is especially through Luke and Paul that the New Testament knows “Saviour” and “salvation.” The Gospel is a power of God for salvation (Rom 1:16). The savior kings of the hellenistic and Roman periods were kings whose might could protect their people from destructive adverse powers; such a prince was sadly lacking in Judea in the years 50 to 80 A.D. Yet, after the great upheaval of 70, the Judaism of Yavneh and, even more that of Tiberias after 133, prospered greatly—the best proof of that prosperity being the final form given to the Mishnah. The Torah, as it was defined by the pharisaic school of Hillel, ensured Jewish life within the frame of the Roman Empire and personal reward in the world-to-come. The salvation of the community was assured by the gift of the Law and individual salvation by fidelity and Yom Kippur. Messianic or collective salvation is still present in the Kaddish and Shemoneh Esreh. The root *ysh*’ will become rare among the rabbis; it now refers rather to merit and eternal life.

The situation was different when Paul wrote his letters, and it was obviously Pauline soteriology that the Council applied when, in its Statement on the Jews, it speaks twice of salvation: first, when it links the beginnings of the Church's faith and her election to the patriarchs, to Moses, and to the prophets “according to the mystery of salvation”; second, when it sees “the salvation of the Church” prefigured by the Exodus. More precise than the first, the second text can lead us to a common investigation of the biblical notion of salva-
tion; the Hebrew term "ysh" is clearly concerned with the salvation of a community living on earth, in the midst of a creation governed by God according to cosmic laws. It is not a question of eliminating the individual aspect of salvation or neglecting salvation at the end of time. We have here the beginning of a biblical reflection on the way the God of Abraham, according to the Sacred Books, saves the believing community in the midst of perils. This aspect of salvation is conceived and developed quite differently in the various Christian denominations. It depends on their ecclesiology; the logion of Matthew 16:18, with its thoroughly semitic turn, "The gates of Sheol (Hades) shall not prevail over the Church," will have to be restudied in this light. It is a case parallel to the berit 'olam, the "eternal covenant," of the Torah, which is the basis of many rabbinical reflections. The biblical notion of salvation by an eternal covenant continuing from generation to generation implies that, in the community chosen by God, not only do the faithful find the source of eternal life, but they possess communally a divine grace that enables them to dress their wounds, as well as to renew and enrich their lives.

This can prepare us to study the texts of Scripture, no longer as aphorisms belonging to the religious and moral order as theorems do to the mathematical order, but as witnesses to the unity and vigor of the life of a community, be it the Church or the Synagogue. The problem of salvation arises in the conscience of a man as soon as he perceives the inadequacy of his inner impulses. He does not think of salvation when he feels full of strength. Nor does he think of salvation when the society in which he lives seems to be just and capable of securing the fulfillment of his vital drive. But the sane conscience is concerned about salvation when it sees the fragility of the supports necessary to life, the fragility of man himself (through sickness or defeat), the fragility of the social organism in which each man is born and grows up and which seems to him marred by injustice or weakness. Thus the Bible seemed to the mind of the Israelite, whose life was never without shocks and crises, as a living response of a living God to the unrest of living men. To be sure, in our times as in all others, a man can refuse to face the problem of salvation. This may be because of a deep-rooted confidence in the vitality of his nation or culture, or because of a no less deep assurance of himself and his faculties. This is true of force except the one that was kings of Assyria and Egypt.

Yet, already in that history in the Bible, there is an Aware that he has not force, still undefined, that he is a prototype of consciousness in the midst of perils. In the time of Abram, where Abram (the profoundly human and religious) is led by an intricate religious, moral, and an intricate religious impulse to the act of adoration, to the covenant of blessing that is none other than that of the chosen people. The God of Jacob, the history of man; the Biblical dynamism that made a people out of a clan (metamorphosis, out of the beginning of a community the son of God, Isaac), of Jesus of Nazareth, the "Son of Man.

Obviously, this last test for salvation is a call upon Scripture to be read. Abraham throughout the history of salvation the greatest repugnances brought about was true, and the situation of the Church Christian movement is similar. Their objections are as for Paul and the (3) Christianity is seriously basic to Jewish belief.

3. Among recent Jewish works are J. Morgenstern, Some Studies, particularly the chapters on Eucharist.

And his faculties. This trust can induce a man to seek no other vital force except the one that bears him up naturally. Some texts of the kings of Assyria and Egypt show that this response is as old as man. Yet, already in that ancient, highly civilized Orient, and essentially in the Bible, there is another energizing force to which man appeals. Aware that he has not created himself, he addresses the mysterious force, still undefined, that brought forth his life amid other lives. Directly, he addresses this cosmic power that awakened his life and consciousness in the midst of an already existing world. In Mesopotamia, where Abram (who will become Abraham) was born, this profoundly human and limpid attitude is expressed in hymns, prayers, and an intricate religious culture. This attitude in man is responded to by the activity and power of the personal God of Abraham who promises, encourages, and guards His faithful servant, assuring him of blessing that is none other than the blossoming of his own life and that of his descendants. The God of Abraham, who will also be the God of Isaac and Jacob, thus makes His appearance in the concrete history of man; the Bible will testify to His action, the efficacious dynamism that made a family out of a man, a clan out of a family, a people out of a clan, a state out of a people, and, by a unique metamorphosis, out of the ruins of Samaria and Jerusalem the beginning of a community that crosses the frontiers so as to gather, with Jesus of Nazareth, the “remnant” of alien peoples.

Obviously, this last transformation is our concern here. Even if we call upon Scripture to bear witness to the dynamism of the God of Abraham throughout the history of Israel, our Jewish brethren experience the greatest repugnance in admitting that what Jesus of Nazareth brought about was truly the communication of the Torah to the nations, in accord with the prophecy of Isaiah 42:1-4 and 51:4-5. Their objections are as follows: (1) The Torah was not communicated because for Paul and the Christians the Torah was abolished. (2) The Christian movement is not in line with the prophecies since it made the situation of the chosen people, not better, but more precarious. (3) Christianity is seriously unfaithful to certain biblical data that are basic to Jewish belief.

3. Among recent Jewish studies on Christianity viewed from historical sources is J. Morgenstern, Some Significant Antecedents of Christianity (Leiden, 1966), particularly the chapters on Easter, the Suffering Servant, Son of Man, and the Eucharist.
With this triple objection of Judaism in mind, we must pursue the Council's work of reflection in the light of our sources and history, but without ever forgetting that we question them, not out of curiosity or speculation, but in the name of man's life. Much less must we forget that the God of Scripture is the One who is God of the very life of the universe, He who made, makes, and will make "heaven and earth"—that is, the whole of the world that moves—but not without man. Since all these objections cannot be treated in this article (to do so would also be premature), I shall limit myself to a preliminary study on the place of Israel and the faith in the eyes of St. Paul.

PAUL AND HIS WRITINGS

Many attribute the rupture between Jews and Christians to Paul, and some exegesis seems to justify this when it has Paul say that the Torah is abolished. One should never tire of repeating that Paul never proclaims this abolition⁴ and says the contrary in Romans 3:31: "In preaching faith, do we rob the Law of all its value? On the contrary, we confirm the Law!"⁵ It is with the help of Paul himself that some Christian reactions can be effectively corrected on this point. Studying him will be most useful in allowing Jews and Christians to understand one another in full independence before the God whom they revere, and before the world where they have to work together, without confusion and without unfaithfulness. For all his

⁴ See the author's study in Esprit (October, 1963), pp. 6–10. Father P. Benoit has criticized Father Baum who describes the Christian economy in terms of law (The Jews and the Gospel [Westminster, Md., 1959], p. 193). In doing so, he has strongly emphasized the newness that Christ brings (Revue Biblique, 1964, p. 84). But the question is whether, for Paul, the Christian can live by faith without having first accepted the Law as tutor in the way foreseen by Romans 2:14–15. When man lives by faith in the Christ, the fullness of the Law and its accomplishment, the authority of the revealed Law gives way to the authority of God's Utterance, the living Word. But if he does not live by faith in the Christ, he remains subject to the Law whose economy is not abolished, even though the gift of God permits it to be transcended without being denied. Incidentally, the Law is but one of the aspects of the Torah.

⁵ This follows the French ecumenical translation, Paris, 1967. The New English Bible renders this verse: "Does this mean that we are using faith to undermine law? By no means: we are placing law itself on a firmer footing."

broad humanistic Greek wrote most of his letters to the Synagogue; the breach, as a prisoner and was well five years before.

Again, when Paul speaks, it is not in order to oppose no substitution of one legal Jerusalem which knows with her children' (Gal 4:26). Among which is the Roman beyond the Torah which and makes Greeks and Jews. Paul's interpretation of the whole pharisaic school; a Abraham, heir according to circumcision, which has throughout the generations to be disputed. The pharisees privileges of Abraham's nation. To this, he could have read saw this extension in God's nations of the earth shall be. To be more precise, it was:

The regime of the Temple, the Jewish community in the Greek period, was a letter, ever since the period had its own interpretation of the Herodians, the Pharisees. All these groups had the same way, the disciples of the Sanhedrin who was:

6. W. D. Davies, in Paul's out many rabbinical element,
I must pursue the history, but of curiosity must we of the very "heaven and not without article (to preliminary Paul.

Again, when Paul speaks of the Israel of God in Galatians 6:16, it is not in order to oppose the Church to the Jews. For him, there is no substitution of one people of God for another. There is the empirical Jerusalem which knows only the Torah and finds itself in "slavery with her children" (Gal 4:25), subject to the elements of this world among which is the Roman Empire. And there is the other Jerusalem beyond the Torah which communicates the liberating force of Christ and makes Greeks and Jews children of God (3:26-28). Of course, Paul's interpretation of the Torah differs from the one given by the whole pharisaic school; according to him, one can be "of the seed of Abraham, heir according to the promise" (3:29), without practicing circumcision, which had been imposed on Abraham's offspring throughout the generations (Gen 17:9-10). This point of view can be disputed. The pharisaic school would say that Paul extends the privileges of Abraham's covenant to the covenant made with Noah. To this, he could have replied that the Torah itself doubtlessly foresaw this extension in Genesis 22:18: "In your descendants all the nations of the earth shall be blessed." Obviously the discussion is open. To be more precise, it was open.

The regime of the Torah, which had proved itself so salutary for the Jewish community in the Persian period and at the beginning of the Greek period, was found insufficient, at least according to its letter, ever since the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. Each sect had its own interpretation: that of the Hasmonceans, the Sadducees, the Herodians, the Pharisees, the Essenes, the Zealots, and the Christians. All these groups had the rights and privileges of Judaism; in the same way, the disciples of Hillel and Shammai were allowed to differ widely from one another. Gamaliel, too, could still say to the men of the Sanhedrin who wanted to condemn the Apostles: "If their
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design (eza?) or its execution (ergon, derek?) comes from men, it will collapse; but if it comes from God you will not be able to break it" (Ac 5:38–39). After the terrible affliction of the year 70 and the fall of the Temple, two "ways," two interpretations, alone remained: the Christian and the Pharisaic; the others dissolved little by little. Any reflection that bases itself on the God of Scripture must keep this fact in mind.

The interpretation of the Torah remains open. Neither the magisterium of the Church, for those who recognize it, nor the labors recorded in the Mishnah and the Talmuds have closed it. All that can be said is that the Torah, as we see it, is more than a code and more than a history. The Jewish teachers of the Talmuds saw in it, above all, a law. In the climate created by the jurists of Byzantine Rome, those masters analyzed its juridical and moral content. The Fathers of the Church saw in it the first stages of salvation history. Since the Middle Ages, other paths have been opened and modern discoveries have profoundly renewed the approach to the sacred text. It remains to be seen whether, along with historical as well as juridical and philological research of the present time, the notion of the Law as "pedagogue" suggested by Paul in Galatians 3:24 would not correspond to a rabbinical principle.

As Christians, we have often interpreted the word as signifying the historical preparation for the total gift of God, "toward Christ," says Paul in his concise statement, which the Vulgate translates oddly as "in Christ." But Paul adds at once "in order to be justified by faith." In its terseness, the Pauline formula points to that divine sonship which is given to the believer. Did not the rabbis—successors of the wise, of the author of Sifra, Ben Sirach, and the collector (or collectors) of the Proverbs—also see in the Torah a guide by which the believer passed from his own wild and undisciplined will to the knowledge of the Divine Will, so wise and beneficent? Even in our days, Abraham and Moses are teachers of living and active faith, among Jews as well as Christians.

If the Torah is the necessary guide for revealing the gift of God

to man, we must keep the expression "the sons of the nation of Israel prior to 9:4, the first one translated in it by the rabbis like Akil and not for the Exodus 4:22: 'Peated with var as such is that since the Chri...t the faithf as well as the Sif...t as that even sin not seem that
men, it to break the expression "sons of God" means, but also the other privileges of Israel prior to the work of Christ. According to Paul, in Romans 9:4, the first of the gifts that the Israelites possess is *huiothesia*, translated in the Vulgate as *adoptio filiorum*. It is the adoption practiced by the patriarchs (Gen 48:5) but unknown in the Mosaic law, and the Hebrew has no corresponding term. In the New Testament, the word appears only five times, always in Paul, and four of these references indicate the fatherhood of God in relation to us (Rom 8:15, 23; Gal 4:5; Eph 1:5). Paul uses it here for the Jews, and not for the pagans. It is a sort of commentary on the formula in Exodus 4:22: "Thus spoke the Lord: Israel is my first-born," repeated with variations by Hosea and Isaiah. Rabbi Meir echoed it, as well as the *Sifra* of the Deuteronomist. It is not only the people as such that is the "son of God," but the Israelites themselves. If some rabbis like Akiba, Judah, Eliezer, wished to recognize as sons of God only the faithful Israelites, others along with Rabbi Meir thought that even sinners and rebels were God's sons (Kid. 36a). It does not seem that the metaphysical aspects of the question were much

to man, we must examine, not only what the gift of God is, what the expression "sons of God" means, but also the other privileges of Israel prior to the work of Christ. According to Paul, in Romans 9:4, the first of the gifts that the Israelites possess is *huiothesia*, translated in the Vulgate as *adoptio filiorum*. It is the adoption practiced by the patriarchs (Gen 48:5) but unknown in the Mosaic law, and the Hebrew has no corresponding term. In the New Testament, the word appears only five times, always in Paul, and four of these references indicate the fatherhood of God in relation to us (Rom 8:15, 23; Gal 4:5; Eph 1:5). Paul uses it here for the Jews, and not for the pagans. It is a sort of commentary on the formula in Exodus 4:22: "Thus spoke the Lord: Israel is my first-born," repeated with variations by Hosea and Isaiah. Rabbi Meir echoed it, as well as the *Sifra* of the Deuteronomist. It is not only the people as such that is the "son of God," but the Israelites themselves. If some rabbis like Akiba, Judah, Eliezer, wished to recognize as sons of God only the faithful Israelites, others along with Rabbi Meir thought that even sinners and rebels were God's sons (Kid. 36a). It does not seem that the metaphysical aspects of the question were much

8. On chapters 9-11 of Romans, see especially G. Baum, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-215; J. Munck, *Christus und Israel* (Aarhus, 1956); also Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 309-364, which contests the "privileges" of Israel. It seems to me that these "privileges" are real gifts given by God before the Christ, but for and through Christ, who had the nations share in them.

9. See Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, p. 359, for important elements of the discussion.

10. Paul presents an analogous point of view in Romans 9:6: "Not all those who come from Israel are Israelites, nor are all those of the race of Abraham his sons."

11. It might be useful to quote more fully the talmudic passage referred to by the author which records the rabbis' varied interpretation of the deuteronomic saying: "You are sons of the Lord your God" (Dt 14:1). R. Judah's view was: "When you act as sons, you are called sons; but if you do not act as sons, you are not called sons." R. Meir, however, said: "In either case, you are called sons, for it is said, 'Senseless children they are' (Jer 4:22), and it is also said, 'Sons they are with no loyalty in them' (Dt 32:20), and it is said further, 'An evil seed, corrupt sons' (Is 1:4), and again, 'It shall come to pass that in place of what was said to them, You are not my people, it will be said to them, You are the sons of the living God' (Os 2:1)." The Talmud goes on to ask why so many quotations are given to make the point that Israel always remains God's son. It answers that should anyone say—Yes, the Israelites are called sons when they are foolish but not when they are disloyal; or: They are considered sons when they have no faith, but not when they worship idols; or again: They are called corrupt sons but not good sons—may he come and hear the words from Hosea: "... You are the sons of the living God" (See B. Talmud, Soncino ed., *Kiddushin*, p. 177).
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studied. The Epistle to the Ephesians sees in it an adoption, a participation in the life of wisdom that reigned before all the ages (1:4f); as a first-born, Israel enjoys this adoption which will be communicated by the Spirit (Rom 8:15-16).

The Israelites also have the glory. Strack and Billerbeck remind us that the rabbinical writings do not use the word in an absolute sense, that is, without mentioning God. The term is always associated with God and His effective and efficient presence on earth, whether it be in the Bible, the Qumran, or the apocalyptic writings.

The wise man, Ben Sirach, in a passage whose Hebrew text has not yet been found, tells us of the "people of glory," of "the portion of the Lord," together with the "holy tent" and the "beloved city," which is Jerusalem (Ecclus 24:10-16). All the liturgical images in this passage (incense, Lebanon, and others) show that this glory is the supernatural presence of God who had filled the Tabernacle under the form of a cloud (Ex 40:35) as it did the Temple of Solomon (1 Kg 8:10-11). Ezekiel had seen the glory of the Lord leave the Temple (10:18) and return there (43:4).

At the time Paul was writing, the Temple and its liturgical service still existed. After the fall of the second Temple, the Fourth Book of Ezra scarcely mentions the glory, but refers instead to the "humiliation" of the holy house (12:48). In the days when the theology of God's absence was being tentatively worked out by some thinkers, we should see if the great rabbinical teachers, the Amoraim and Tannaim, kept the attribute of glory for Israel. Texts like Abot 6, 8, where the glory, kabod, is one of the seven attributes of the wise in this world, would favor this idea; but other texts, including the latter, use the term in a very human, even pejorative sense (see also Abot 4, 21).

The third gift made to the Israelites is the Covenant, though in many important manuscripts Paul has the word in the plural, covenants. One is apt to think of the covenants with Noah, Abraham,

and Moses, which Strack speaks of as "privileges." The one in the book of the Law at Gerizim. Mesha and David were several of the covenants. But, to be precise, who were the beneficiaries of these covenants? 

The old rabbinical teachers, the Amoraim and Tannaim, use the term in a very human, even pejorative sense (see also Abot 4, 21).

The third gift made to the Israelites is the Covenant, though in many important manuscripts Paul has the word in the plural, covenants. One is apt to think of the covenants with Noah, Abraham,

and Moses, which Strack speaks of as "privileges." The one in the book of the Law at Gerizim. Mesha and David were several of the covenants. But, to be precise, who were the beneficiaries of these covenants? 

The old rabbinical teachers, the Amoraim and Tannaim, use the term in a very human, even pejorative sense (see also Abot 4, 21).
and Moses. Yet, the covenant with Noah is not one of Israel's "privileges." The Mekilta too, in connection with Exodus 23:19, speaks of three alliances with Israel: the one concluded at Horeb, the one in the land of Moab (Dt 28:69), and the one of Ebal-Gerizim. Moreover, the Sifra of Deuteronomy reckoned that there were several "covenants," beritot, for each legal prescription (on Dt 14:21). By the plural, Paul seems to have wanted to emphasize God's repeated pledges to His people. Like the rabbis, he could not but be struck at seeing that the Torah itself took up every theme of the Law several times (feasts, tithes, and others) with some modifications. It goes without saying that, if one accepts the variants of manuscripts no less important than the Vaticanus and Papyrus 46 which have the word in the singular, the problem is made simpler. But, to be precise, modern commentators think that it is the copyists who were the simplifiers and that Paul was familiar with the rabbinical teaching of the plurality of covenants. We may add that the Greek translator of Ben Sirach rendered the Hebrew singular three times with a plural (Ecclus 44:12, 18; 45:17; ed. Rahlfs); thus plural seems to mean no more than a plurality of the commandments that are part of the Covenant.

Then comes the nomothesia. In its grammatical form, this word resembles huirothesia which precedes it. The Greek-speaking Jews had already used it to refer to the "holy legislation of divine origin (theoktistou)" (2 Mac 6:23). They especially used the verb in the sense of revealing, giving the Torah (Ex 24:12). Consequently, Strack and Billerbeck seem right in thinking that nomothesia is equivalent to the rabbinical term mattan Torah, "gift of the Torah." A baraita attributed to Rabbi Akiba and consigned to the talmudic treatise Berakot (58a) reviews the attributes of the Lord. Commenting on 1 Chronicles 29:11, Akiba says that His glory, isfe'ret is the mattan Torah, just as victory refers to Jerusalem and majesty to the Temple bet mikdash.

Was it an analogous train of thought that led Paul to quote next latreia, the liturgical service? This is undoubtedly avodah, as translated by the Septuagint; essentially, it is the liturgical service of the Temple. But the texts insist more and more on the prayer that

15. Ibid., p. 355.
accompanied the sacrifices. One can even wonder if the avodah mentioned by Simeon the Just, who opens the sayings of the Fathers in Pirke Aboth, is not the prayer that the Synagogue was to continue to say. But Simeon, who was the high priest of the Temple, does not seem to have asked himself the question. In the Mishnah, avodah is always the Temple service. It is probable, not to say certain, that Paul takes the word here in the same sense, while in Romans 12:1 he "philonizes" in speaking of the devout Romans as logikos latriea, "a meaningful worship." For Philo, to be sure, Moses himself was a psuchikos kai logikos nomos, "an animated and intelligent law" (Life of Moses, i, 28), and elsewhere he uses the term for virtuous men in general, thinking of the patriarchs (Abraham, 5).

In fact, it is to them that Paul now turns when he adverts to the promises and the fathers as gifts belonging to the Israelites. The "promises," in Greek epaggeleiai, is a term that appears but rarely in the Septuagint and has no real equivalent in biblical Hebrew. The rabbis certainly knew the promises under the name havotachot, as far back as Judah ben Bathyra at the beginning of the second century, in the Mekilta. The corresponding verb is found under the names of the rabbis Eliezer and Joshua of the school of Yavneh. Havtachah implies more than a promise, it is a security, an assurance. The fact that Paul uses the term with regard to the Israelites, his brothers by birth, and that he uses it while speaking of their incredulity in the face of Christ, is an important indication of the subject that concerns us here.

Paul takes a deep breath before making one last affirmation: "Those to whom the fathers [belong] and from whom Christ [comes] according to the flesh" (Rom 9:5). It is from the fathers that the promise and the divine heritage come. But for Paul, as he had said in Galatians, it is in the Messiah that this promise and this heritage are realized; without Him, the blessing remains only an unrealized right, a line without a conclusion, an expectation without real contribution to life (3:21-22). And so he will go on with his development, no longer commenting on what the Israelites possess, but on what they lack. He

17. With many other commentators, Cerfaut (op. cit., p. 361) insists on the provisional aspect of worship, but one should never minimize the faith of Paul and his generation in the worship of the Temple.

18. Simeon the Just used to say: The world is based on three things, the Torah, divine service, and the practice of kindliness. See, Pirke Aboth, trans., ed: R. Travers Herford (New York, 1945), p. 22.
The solemn affirmation that what Israel has will not be taken away must be our guide in understanding Paul's other affirmations. He does not canonize all Israelites. Not all are sons of Abraham, he says (Rom 9:6). He knows that in Judea some participated in the crucifixion of Christ just as they had persecuted the prophets (1 Thess 2:14-15). There are still Judeans who make the disciples of Christ suffer, and in Thessalonica some Israelites, too, bring suffering to those of their tribes (ibid.). Paul is up against a powerful and redoubtable activity that prevents him from accomplishing his evangelizing mission.

Only six years separate the Epistle to the Romans from the murder of James in Jerusalem by the high priest Anan, a murder that earned, moreover, the condemnation of many Jews. These groups were powerful in Rome, especially in the entourage of Poppaea, the mistress and, later, second wife of Nero, and it was through them that the disastrous nomination of Gessius Florus took place. Paul was anxious about his people, his "brothers, kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom 9:3), and this anxiety runs through the entire three chapters. He does not set Christians and Israelites against one another, rather he fears for Israel, which seems to have missed the road to salvation and to have exposed itself to the castigations of the prophets, as did the men who lived when Samaria or Jerusalem fell.

Yet, for Paul, the root remains holy (see Rom 11:16). Those who believe, above all the gentiles who received a new gift of God, are not to glorify themselves at the expense of the others. If the Judeans were misled—Paul's reference to the hardened heart of Pharaoh shows that he is thinking of the leaders (Rom 9:17)—it is by way of a divine act of mercy toward the gentiles. Does Paul mean by this that the religious laws of the Roman Empire were such that the times were not ripe for pagans to be able to understand the gift of God in the

19. Josephus calls those who condemned the murder, "the most moderate and the most attached to the Law" (Antiquities, xx, 9).
same way as the Jews? He does not say and, in other Epistles, he sees the wall of separation already knocked down. He insists that there has been "incredulity," ἀπίστευσιν, on the part of the Israelites that cuts them off from the sap of life at a time when they particularly needed it (Rom 11:20; cf. 3:3). Yet, for him God has shut up all in incredulity (11:32). I shall return later to the problem of "faith - infidelity."

In concluding this section, let us keep in mind that Paul wrote between the resurrection of Christ and the fall of the Temple. He was aware that he lived in "the latter days" (cf. Heb 1:2), in the fullness of time (Gal 4:4), the definitive economy in which, thanks to the gift the Son made of His life, believers could participate in this sonship. In his time, the Temple was still standing—Paul in no way proclaimed the abolition of its worship and religious economy. As mentioned by Mark (15:38) and Matthew (27:51), the veil of the Temple had been torn. According to the Testament of Levi (10:3)—a verse that may be a Christian interpolation—this is a sign of disgrace and shame for the Aaronite priesthood (see Testament of Benjamin, 9, 4). The gifts of God are without repentance. Since some of the gifts of God mentioned by Paul were independent of the sacrificial worship of the Temple, did the others continue to exist in another form? Was the sacrificial economy to be abandoned or would such action betray a lack of faith? This is what deserves to be studied and discussed. In anguish over his brothers by descent, Paul did not resolve all these problems but he founded them precisely on faith. This, then, is the direction the dialogue must take if the Council is to bear fruit.

FAITH AMONG JEWS AND AMONG CHRISTIANS

Faith is an object of reflection among Jews and among Christians; many of our contemporaries, however, have difficulty in recognizing this fact. For many, to believe is to adhere to certain truths or formulations of truth. There was a period when Judaism, in the person of Maimonides, tried to formulate the intellectual content of its faith. Later, Judaism became distrustful of this orientation and now seeks a total fidelity that allows admitting others, while orthodoxy, while admitting others, also prefers a Protestantism, after having been directed against Hasidism.

The Catholic Church, holding the faith explicitly, however, she prefers a trinitarian doctrine excluding the faith themselves can be life, a life that can be God all the books the thought by which they can advance that they not clearly know what faith itself, whence faith among Jews as well as that is granted the "the justice of God" an affirmation he suffices man lives by faith"

It has been noted that just man will live by faith. In any case, the faith is not subjective faith. The Catholic Church, a traditionalist proposition and insists on respect for the faith of Paul at least a participation of the word and the message.

On this point Bub...
In the Epistles, he sees that Paul wrote between the Temple. He was in the Temple (1:2), in the fullness which, thanks to the people, participate in this sonship—Paul in no way religious economy. As (2:51), the veil of the Temple after the (10:3)—is a sign of disgrace to the testament of Benjamin, (11:3). Since some of the adhering firmly to the definitions of the first councils, also prefers a liturgical expression of faith to a dogmatic one. Protestantism, after having had various professions of faith, courageously returned, at the Synod of Bremen, to this kind of witness directed against Hitler's neopaganism.

The Catholic Church has always held firmly to the need of rendering the faith explicit and clear through dogma; at the last Council, however, she preferred to revert to a broad presentation of her doctrine, thereby excluding the exactness of anathemas. The formulas of faith themselves cannot grasp all that the virtue of faith means. Faith is life, a life that can be understood and made explicit. But if it took God all the books of the Bible to attest to all the richness of the thought by which He thinks Himself and thinks of the world, one should not expect men to do better than He, even if, at a given period, they can advance the understanding of faith. In our day, men do not clearly know any more what their faith is; the formulas of faith seem almost more difficult to understand and accept than the life of faith itself, whence the cleavage between believers and unbelievers among Jews as well as among Christians. Faith is the life with God that is granted the intelligent being man is, and Paul tells us that "the justice of God is revealed from faith unto faith" (Rom 1:17), an affirmation he supports by a quotation from Habakkuk: "The just man lives by faith" (2:4).

It has been noted that the Hebrew text of Habakkuk says, "the just man will live by his faith." Is there a considerable difference or does the Hebrew only engage in a play of suffixes? This is debatable. In any case, the faith of Habakkuk and of his just man is not a purely subjective faith. The content of his message, on the contrary, reveals a traditionalist prophet who shares the faith and hope of his people and insists on respect for the Torah in his curses (2:6–20). As for the faith of Paul and the Christians, that faith is inconceivable without a participation of the heart and mind of the believer in both the word and the message.

On this point Buber could write:

The crisis of our time is then the crisis of two types of faith, \textit{Emunah} and \textit{Pistis}. In their nature as in their origin they are fundamentally different, and consequently their crisis is different. The origin of the Jewish \textit{Emunah} is in the history of a nation, that of the Christian \textit{Pistis} is in the history of the individuals. . . Christian \textit{Pistis} is born outside of the historical experiences of nations, that is to say, apart from history, in the individual souls who have been roused to believe that a man crucified in Jerusalem was their saviour.\footnote{22}

Buber’s juxtaposition of \textit{Emunah} and \textit{Pistis} is very much open to criticism. It was conceived with a certain liberal Protestantism in mind, but does not correspond to the attitude of either Protestants or Catholics today. The reason is simply that Paul’s \textit{Pistis} is based on the \textit{Emunah} of Abraham (Rom 4:18–25) and that, according to Paul, the just man’s life of faith builds up that organism which is the Body of Christ. Moreover, as Father Congar says, “The Church is the nursery and school of our faith,”\footnote{23} a reality that is far from being individualistic. Christian faith has very precise historical origins in the faith of the Apostles, those twelve Galilean Jews who were disciples of Jesus of Nazareth—a town that, as late as the third century, A.D., was the seat of the priestly class of Happizzez.\footnote{24}

Even though we cannot follow Buber in his presentation of Christian \textit{Pistis}, he has, at least, the great merit of directing our discussion to this point. Indeed, the problem of faith is not expressed in the same terms for Jews and Christians; this is true to such an extent that Father Bonsirven could write:

What place does this virtue hold in ancient Jewish piety? At first sight one would be tempted to think that the place is very slight or non-existent. . . However faith is one of the essential elements of the Jewish religion.\footnote{25}

Faith appears differently to Jews and to Christians: A Jew is a Jew because he was born so, a man becomes a Christian when he is baptized. The baptism of infants has become quite general in “Christian”


\textit{Le Judaisme Palestinien} (Paris, 1935), II, p. 48.\footnote{25}
nations, but it is stoutly challenged among Protestants. Among Catholics today, infant baptism meets with some real obstacles of a practical rather than theoretical nature. A child, for instance, cannot be baptized by its parents so that he may participate in the life of the believing family unless death threatens. Again, in our day, non-believing parents want to have their child baptized, and it is hard to understand their motives; it is but one example of the problems arising from modern unbelief. No doubt, this unbelief obliges us to raise the problem of faith and its nature among Jews as well as among Christians.

Hitherto, in their encounter, Jews and Christians have not dealt with this point. They have discussed dogmas and concepts, but not faith as such. In the remarkable book by Elie Benamozegh, *Israel et Humanité*, for instance, faith plays no role. With Chouraqui, many speak of "Jewish thought" rather than "Jewish faith." In his recent dialogue with Jean Daniélou, the discussion deals indeed with the contents of faith, here and there with hope and even with the "fidelity" which is still nearer to faith, but not with faith itself, its phenomenology and metaphysics.

We have here a subject for common research on which we would have many things to say to each other, because the problem is now acute for every Jewish and Christian conscience. In principle, the Christian who loses his faith, or has none, becomes the pagan he was at birth, yet there is no change in his life as a citizen. In fact, the situation is less simple because our contemporaries do not think of faith as something perfectly clear-cut, that is accepted or refused as one might accept or refuse black or white. Catholic theology declares that faith is a non-evident certitude; but in order to discern such non-evident certitude in full liberty of spirit, one must pursue an intellectual and moral path that may take a long time and follow many detours. One Christmas day, Paul Claudel recovered faith as a reality; he needed several years, however, to see how this reality was compatible with his rational demands. At present, Christian ecumenism has accustomed us to living in an atmosphere of common faith, hope,
and love, even though our theologies and our creeds differ, and each one of us faithfully lays great stress on keeping the edges of our respective creeds sharp and luminous.

Judaism knows problems that are no less interesting for the life of the spirit and for the deepening of our faith. One may be a Jew and an atheist; one may be a Liberal, a Conservative, or an Orthodox Jew; but to no Jew is the chosen attitude a matter of indifference. Is it without meaning that very remarkable minds like those of Georges Friedmann and Albert Memmi offer formulas that seem to favor assimilation? Being Jewish has, no doubt, two sides—the people's will to live and fidelity to earlier generations and their observances—which may be separable at times. Is it without meaning that there where Judaism has the greatest political responsibilities, in the United States and in Israel, the most decided detachment from tradition is shown? I think that the problem is in no way insoluble, but I think, too, that it cannot be resolved without a full examination of what the life of faith is in the life of a believer.

This study will be linked to that of hope. Chouraqui has some beautiful pages on Jewish hope and, at a conference of Amitié Judéo-Christian, Rabbi Chekroun rightly called the attention of Christians to the fact that one could not consider the messianic hope of the prophets as having been entirely realized by the coming of Jesus of Nazareth. This we readily admit. The Epistle to the Hebrews defines Christian *Pistis* precisely as the "pledge" or "assurance," *hypostasis*, of things hoped for, the "proof" or "conviction," *elegebos*, of realities that are at present unseen (Heb 11:1). The Greek terms, difficult to translate and the subject of many commentaries, show how much Christian faith is turned toward the future. For us, Jesus of Nazareth is the cornerstone with which and on which the future city, wished for and proclaimed by the prophets of Israel, can be built. In fact, laymen are already at work, but it may not always be clear to them that they can do this effectively only in the name of their faith. The Catholic theologian Juan Alfaro defined one of the components of faith as "man's free entrusting of himself to the absolute as love."29

To be sure, there are other components for us; Jews and Muslims may well wish to contest this formula which may seem to them

couched in a language too Christian. But this is not certain and it might help to pursue what the Council initiated on solid historical, philosophical, and psychological grounds. In knowing better what the faith is to Israel, Catholic theologians will know better how to assign Israel her proper place and how to respect that place.
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