

A CHRISTIAN-JEWISH DIALOGICAL MODEL
IN LIGHT OF NEW RESEARCH ON
PAUL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH JUDAISM

John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, Ph.D,

Professor & Director, Catholic-Jewish Studies Program
Catholic Theological Union
Chicago

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Leuven, Belgium

September 2009

The last decade or so has witnessed considerable evolution in terms of models for the Jewish-Christian relationship. As Christian theologians began to reflect on the relationship between the Church and the Jewish People in light of Vatican II's Decree *Nostra Aetate* and parallel Protestant documents their first proposals tended to fall within two basic categories usually termed the "single covenant" and the "double covenant" models. These models exhibited a variety of approaches. (1)

The "single covenant" model generally 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 holding this viewpoint maintain that the decisive features of the Christ Event have universal application, including to the Jews. The statement on the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament released in 2001 by the Pontifical Biblical Commission (2) appears to argue that within historical times Jews legitimately await the Messiah through their own covenant. There is no need for Jews to convert to Christianity. Cardinal Walter Kasper has articulated this position in some of his writings a few years ago when he insisted that the Jewish-Christian relationship is *sui generis* because Jews share in authentic revelation from the standpoint of Christian theology. Hence they do not need to convert and they will achieve salvation if they remain faithful to their particular path. (3) Kasper, however, has not returned to this perspective in more recent times. It is clear that the prevailing Vatican position is that of a "single covenant" without the nuances added by Kasper.

The "double covenant theory," favored by some theologians (4), begins at the same point as its "single covenant" counterpart, namely, with a strong affirmation of the continuing bond between Christians and Jews. But then it prefers to underline the distinctiveness of the two traditions and communities, particularly in terms of their experiences after the final separation between 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 distinctly new in terms of some of its central features. Even though there may have been important groundwork laid for this emergence in Second Temple of Middle Judaism, especially in Jewish mystical literature, what came to be understood regarding the divine-human relationship as a result of Jesus has to be regarded as a quantum leap.

Many scholars, including myself, now feel dissatisfied both with the single and double

covenant options. This dissatisfaction 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 resulting from what has been termed the “parting of the ways” scholarship. (5)

The scholarship continuing to emerge from the “Parting of the Ways” research is doing much to reintegrate Jesus and the early church within the wide tent that constituted the Jewish People in the first and second centuries of the Common Era. It has clearly tended to push back the date for significant separation between church and the Jewish People well beyond the end of the first century and even later as we move to the Christian East. And even when the separation did occur this scholarship has brought forth evidence of some continuing constructive interaction. To emphasize this point one important collection of essays looking at this question has been titled *The Ways That Never Parted*. (6)

Early on in the “Parting of the Ways” research my former colleague in the cluster of theological schools at the University of Chicago Dr. Robin Scroggs offered a concise summary of the directions in which this research was taking us. (7) His analysis was favorably quoted by the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago, an episcopal leader in the Christian-Jewish dialogue, in his own writings on the relationship between the Church and the Jewish People. (8)

Scroggs made the following affirmations in his distillation of the new scholarship on Jesus’ relationship with Judaism and on the Jewish setting of early Christianity. 1. The movement begun by Jesus and continued after his death in Palestine can best be described as a reform movement within Judaism. There is little extant evidence during this period that Christians had a separate identity from the Jews. 2. The Pauline missionary movement, as Paul understood it, was a Jewish mission which focused on the Gentiles as the proper object of God’s call to his people. 3. Prior to the end of the Jewish war with the Romans which ended in 70 C.E., there was no such reality as Christianity. Followers of Jesus did not have a self-understanding of themselves as a religion over against Judaism. A distinctive Christian identity only began to emerge after the Jewish-Roman war. And 4. the later sections of the New Testament all show some signs of a movement towards separation, but they also generally retain some contact with their Jewish matrix.

Another pioneering scholar in the initial phase of the “Parting of the Ways” discussion was the late Saldarini. In various essays he underlined the continuing presence of the “followers of the Way” in the wide tent of Judaism over the first few centuries. Saldarini especially underscored the ongoing

nexus between Christian communities and their Jewish neighbors in Eastern Christianity whose theological outlook is most often ignored in presentations about the early church within Western Christian theology. (9)

As the profound re-evaluation of the church's origins begun by scholars such as Scroggs and Saldarini has continued we see further development of its initial themes. The biblical scholar John Meier in the third volume of his comprehensive study of New Testament understandings of Jesus argues that from a careful examination of the New Testament evidence Jesus must be seen as presenting himself to the Jewish community of his time as an eschatological prophet and miracle worker in the likeness of Elijah. He was not interested in creating a separatist sect or holy remnant along the lines of the Qumran community. But he did envision the development of a special religious community within Israel. The idea that this community "within Israel would slowly undergo a process of separation from Israel as it pursued a mission to the Gentiles in this present world—the long-term result being that his community would become predominantly Gentile itself—finds no place in Jesus' message or practice." (10)

In a more recent study David Frankfurter adds further to the notion of significant intertwining between Christians and Jews for a period well after Jesus' own lifetime. He has insisted that within the various "clusters" of groups that included Jews and Christians there existed a "mutual influence persisting through late antiquity. There is evidence for a degree of overlap that, all things considered, threatens every construction of an historically distinct 'Christianity' before at least the mid-second century." (11)

The growing number of biblical scholars who have become engaged in this "Parting of the Ways" discussion all stress the great difficulty in locating Jesus within the ever-changing Jewish context in the first century. Some speak of "Judaisms" and "Christianities" in this period, almost all involving some mixture of continued Jewish practice with new insights drawn from the ministry and preaching of Jesus. For scholars such as Paula Fredriksen even speaking of "the parting of the ways" is unhelpful because it implies two solid blocks of believers. (12) The various groups in fact were entangled for at least a couple of centuries. So, as Daniel Boyarin has rightly insisted, we cannot speak of Judaism as the "mother" or "the elder brother" of Christianity.(13) These are essentially "linear" images that this new scholarship has discredited as superficial in terms of the actual reality. Rather what eventually came to be known as "Judaism" and "Christianity" in the Common Era resulted

from a complicated, parallel “co-emergence” process over an extended period of time during which various themes became predominantly associated with one or two major focal points. Many factors contributed to this eventual differentiation including Roman retaliation against “the Jews” for the late first century revolt against the occupation of Palestine and the development of a strong “against the Jews” teaching during the patristic era. The “conversion” of Emperor Constantine also proved decisive for the eventual split into two distinctive religious communities.

Within the overall “Parting of the Ways” scholarship one of the most important results has been the significant re-evaluation of Paul’s outlook on Judaism. Traditionally Paul has been viewed both in popular and scholarly circles in Christianity as in many ways its founder. He has been credited with bringing about the decisive break with Judaism through his rejection of any Torah obligations for Gentile converts in the first century at the so-called Council of Jerusalem. Paul has often been portrayed as espousing a view in which Christianity clearly holds a position of theological superiority over Judaism.

Much of this fundamentally anti-Jewish perspective on Paul has been due to the dominance of a master narrative in Christian circles rooted in the book of Acts. This master narrative begins with Stephen’s decisive break with Judaism in chapter seven of Acts. So-called Jewish Christians then begin to disappear from this master narrative until chapter eleven when they are totally removed from the story following Peter’s revelatory vision whereby he is convinced to abandon his previous adherence to continued Jewish observance. From that point onwards the master narrative focuses exclusively on Gentiles as the new people of God and moves the geographic center of Christianity to Rome in place of Jerusalem. Thus in the account of Christian origins that has tended to dominate Christianity’s perspective Judaism is superseded and even annulled with Paul being viewed as the primary messenger for this teaching. This master narrative from Acts has been especially pronounced during the Easter season in the Catholic liturgy where readings from Acts are used extensively.

This classical perspective on Paul and Judaism was significantly reinforced in the mid nineteenth century in the writings of F.C. Baur. In his classical work *Paul the Apostle* written in 1845 (14) Baur argued for the existence of only two factions in the early church. One was the Jewish Christians whose leader was Peter and the other Gentile Christians who looked to Paul for spiritual guidance. The Jewish Christians, in Baur’s perspective, stood mired in a narrow legalism that blinded them to the universalistic elements in Jesus’ teachings supposedly championed by Paul.

Increasingly Paul is being seen as an integral part of the complicated Jewish-Christian scene brought to the surface through the “Parting of the Way” scholarship rather than someone who stood totally apart from this scene and repudiated its basic orientation. Shortly before his death the prominent New Testament scholar Raymond Brown said in a public speech in Chicago that he had now become convinced that Paul had a very high regard for Torah, including its ritual dimensions, and that, if he had had a son, would likely have had him circumcised. Even Paul’s “Christological” reflections are now seen by some as having links to parts of the Jewish mystical tradition of the time, a view first propounded in a scholarly conference held at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago in 1991 under the direction of Hayim Perelmuter of CTU and Wilhelm Wuellner of the Lutheran faculty at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. (15) This Jewish “mystical” approach to Paul has been furthered developed in recent years, including in a forthcoming volume by Benjamin D. Sommer of Jewish Theological Seminary in New York titled *The Bodies of God in Ancient Israel and Its World*. (16)

The new thinking on Paul’s outlook on Judaism in terms of the Christian faith began with the late Harvard biblical scholar and subsequently Lutheran bishop of Stockholm Krister Stendahl. In a seminal article in the *Harvard Theological Review* in 1963 entitled “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” (17) Stendahl began to undercut the dominance of the Baur perspective in Christian scholarship, a perspective that depicted Paul as fundamentally anti-Torah. This interpretation played a central role in Christian theological self-definition in Protestant theology in particular. Stendahl persuasively argued that such an anti-Torah understanding of Paul bears little resemblance to what Paul actually believed about the continued practice of Jewish ritual by Christians. His work has been picked up by an impressive list of scholars who include, among others, E.P. Sanders, Peter Tomson, James D.G. Dunn, John Lager, Daniel Harrington, Jerry L. Sumney and Lloyd Gaston. They have been joined of late by several Jewish scholars, most notably Alan Segal.

What is beginning to emerge in important sectors of Pauline scholarship is the picture of a Paul still very much a Jew, still quite appreciative of Jewish Torah with seemingly no objection to its continued practice by Jewish Christians so long as their basic orientation is founded in Christ and his teachings, and still struggling at the end of his ministry to balance his understanding of the newness implied in the Christ Event with the continuity of the Jewish covenant, something quite apparent in the famous chapters 9-11 of Romans which Vatican II used as the cornerstone of its declaration on continuing Jewish covenantal inclusion in chapter four of *Nostra Aetate*. A few of the biblical scholars

involved in this new Pauline research even go so far as to maintain that Paul regarded Torah observance so highly that he feared that if Gentiles tried to practice it they would only corrupt its authentic spirit. Such a view admittedly pushes the envelope of scholarly evidence a bit far, but it is presently under discussion in some scholarly circles.

One of the scholars at the center of the new picture of Paul is John G. Gager. He is founder of the important Oxford-Princeton continuing study group on the "Parting of the Ways." In a essay Gager (18) has summarized the new vision of Paul that in his judgment must replace the dominance of the picture from Acts that has dominated Christian theology and worship for very long. Gager's summary includes the following points: 1. He strongly emphasizes the plurality of practice among followers of Jesus who continued to observe Torah. They were far from uniform in their continued observance of Jewish practices. 2. Jewish Christians in fact did not disappear from the scene after Peter's so-called revelatory vision as the author of Acts would have us believe. They remained a significant force in Christian churches for many centuries, especially in the regions of Syria and beyond where they were far from a tiny minority and were not seen as heretical in their outlook or practices. 3. Early Christianity, unlike what is presented in Acts, did not simplistically reorient its geographic focus uni-directionally towards Rome. Rather it moved multi-directionally into every area of the Mediterranean region and beyond. In places such as Syria Jewish Christianity appeared in fact to occupy the dominant position in the church. 4. Together with other scholars such as Brown, Gager repudiates any notion that Paul rejected Judaism and those we term Jewish Christians. Rather he chose to devote his energies to the outreach to Gentile believers whom, for whatever reason, he felt did not have the obligation to pick up on Torah observance in their faith expression. The author of Acts, Gager insists, enlisted Paul in the effort to downgrade Jewish Christianity. Gager thus implies, though he does not say it explicitly, that the author of Acts rather than Paul is in fact the founder of the anti-Jewish form of Christianity that has been so powerful (and negative) a force throughout Christian history. Paul in fact advocates a "two door" policy in terms of salvation with distinctive paths for Jews and Gentiles, and 5. largely due to the image of Paul created by the author of Acts, Paul became known as the arch-enemy of Jewish Christians, as the person who totally undermined their legitimacy as an authentic expression of Christianity. This image also infected Jewish circles where Paul also traditionally has been regarded even by scholars favorably disposed towards Jesus and his teachings as the founder of a Christian church that became anti-Jewish at its core. The Jewish philosopher Hannah Arendt once spoke of the

chasm she felt between the teachings of Jesus in the gospels and the Christ of the Pauline texts.

Gager also adds a point relative to the revelatory experience which, according to Acts II, led to a change of heart on the part of Peter regarding the continuation of Jewish practices by followers of Jesus. He questions the actual historicity of this account, believing it was a story developed by the author of the text to buttress his own anti-Judaic perspective. Gager argues this view from a section in the later Pseudo-Clementine writings where Peter complains that “some have undertaken to distort my words, by certain intricate interpretations, into an abolition of the Law, as if I myself thought such a thing-God forbid! For to take such a position is to act against the Law of God which was spoken through Moses and whose eternal endurance was attested to by Our Lord.” (19)

In light of this new research on Paul the question arises, was he the founder of Christianity or merely a faithful Jew? In some ways the answer is 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 mode of application. (20) He himself likely continued to adhere to many of its provisions and 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 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 recognize Jesus as the Messiah of Israel as well of the nations. But for Paul this did not mean any 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 identify the law with the gospel of God’s acts in Jesus Christ.

Paul’s battle with the so-called “Jewish Christians” which Baur erroneously built into a fundamental confrontation was in fact a much more limited dispute restricted to those Jewish Christians who refused to accept Paul’s view of a fundamental reorientation for believers in Christ. For Paul the Jewish Torah genuinely mattered; but Christ mattered more. And this was why he felt he could extend covenantal membership to Gentiles without requiring of them a commitment to Jewish ritual practices as highly as Paul regarded those practices. For Paul Israel will ultimately be saved through God’s eschatological Messiah. Romans 9-11 clearly shows that Paul expected all Israel to

attain salvation. He appeared to regard the present “disobedience” of the Jewish People as in fact an integral part of the divine plan for human salvation. There was even a way in which the Jewish rejection of Jesus as the expected Messiah of Israel could be seen as a “Christological sacrifice,” paralleling Jesus’ separation from God the Father on Calvary. In this sense Paul can be termed the founder of Christianity, but in a far different way than the classical portrayal of him in this regard as one who expunged Judaism and its practices from Christian faith, who favored Christ over Torah in an absolute sense.

In light of this analysis of Paul and Judaism, the question remains, what does this scholarship have to say to us today regarding an understanding of the relationship between the Church and the Jewish People. In terms of more recent attempts to move the discussion away from the earlier “single covenant-double covenant” categories to a model where exclusivism, inclusivism and pluralism are the dominant motifs we can say that Paul’s view brings us to an “inclusivist” model in terms of the Christian-Jewish relationship without settling the tensions that such a model continues to generate. Paul clearly asserts some revelatory “newness” through his understanding of Christ. But he equally asserts continued Jewish covenantal inclusion after the Christ Event as well as a root connectedness between the two religious communities.

Cardinal Walter Kasper some years ago began to bring these tensions to the surface without offering any clear resolution. He argued on one hand for the continued salvific validity of the Jewish path to salvation: “If they (i.e., the Jews) follow their own conscience and believe in God’s promises as they understand them in their religious tradition they are in line with God’s plan.” (21) Hence, Kasper has insisted, there is no need to proselytize Jews because they are already in a covenantal relationship with God. The theological justification for such a position lies in the fact that Jews are the only non-Christian religious community with authentic revelation from the Christian perspective. Hence, the Christian-Jewish relationship is *sui generis*. (22) For Kasper, and he strongly insists on this, there are two distinctive but not totally distinct paths to salvation. The paths remain integrated, particularly with respect to their eschatological conclusion. What Kasper has failed to do is offer any explanation of how his equally strong insistence on the universality of Christ relates to this vision of two distinctive paths. He does not say that Jews in the end must give an explicit recognition to Christ. But neither does he eliminate such a possibility. Hence his position remains ambiguous and in definite need of further development. I suspect that the current climate in the church, particularly the late Cardinal

Avery Dulles' direct challenge to much of post-*Nostra Aetate* theological reflection, may be responsible for the lack of any further development of Kasper's thinking much of which comes from the first period of his tenure as President of the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with Jews.

Trying to build on what we have learned from the "Parting of the Ways" scholarship, including that related to the Paul-and-Judaism question and from Cardinal Kasper I would want to maintain several key notions as building blocks for a model of the Christian-Jewish relationship. Speaking of distinctive, but not totally distinct, paths to salvation seems to me to be the best current linguistic option, far better than the earlier "single and double covenants." This option depends fundamentally on a "parallel" understanding of the emergence of Judaism and Christianity rather than the older linear understanding. The relationship ought to be seen as *sui generis*. But Kasper's argument from "authentic revelation" with regard to Judaism remains incomplete for it relies solely on biblical Judaism. And, as Jewish scholars such as Reuven Firestone have persuasively argued, biblical Judaism was in serious decline at the time of Jesus and the Judaism that emerged from the religious revolution within the Jewish community in this period produced a new Jewish religious reality still linked to biblical Judaism but significantly transformed in many areas. (23) This new model can best be placed in the "inclusivist" category but still remains open to some "pluralistic" redirection, at least with regard to Islam.

In my current, still evolving, theological perspective I would want to argue that Jews will not be required to explicitly pick up Christological language, even at the end time, as part of their redemptive process. Hence I would make it clearer than Kasper that the distinctive paths followed by Jews and Christians stand on an equal footing. The Christian path is not inherently superior to the Jewish one. This seems the implication of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's assertion (explicitly endorsed by Cardinal Ratzinger in his Introduction to that document) that Jewish messianic hopes are not in vain. (24) And though the PBC document later speaks of the eschatological Messiah of the Jews as the One who will exhibit traits Christians have already seen and acknowledged in the Jesus who has already come and remains in the Church, there is an opening, albeit small, for arguing that "the One" need not be spoken of in expressly Christological terms.

With Paul I would want to argue for significant "newness" in the revelation in Christ. This "newness" as I have argued in previous writings, (25) relies heavily on an incarnational approach to Christology whereby humanity saw with greater transparency than before the intimate link between humanity and divinity. We will need to continue to explore whether such incarnational awareness has

any resonance in Jewish theology. A few years ago the response might have been absolutely *not*. But scholars such as Michael Wyschograd, Elliot Wolfson, and Benjamin Sommer have begun to explore this question in recent years. (26)

In addition, in the lengthy process of emergent separate paths for Christianity and Judaism, Christianity as it became an essentially Gentile religion without much appreciation of its Jewish roots and saw its theology translated into Greek philosophical language lost an important revelatory dimension rooted in Torah which Jesus himself manifested and which Paul struggled to maintain even though it was a struggle that he would eventually lose thanks in part to the author of Acts. Thus Judaism as well preserves a distinctive revelation rooted in history and creation, something that R. Kendall Soulen has correctly identified as the hallmark of the Jewish covenantal tradition. (27) Christians will need to recover this Jewish revelation as part of eschatological completeness.

The Jewish and Christian revelatory cores cannot be merged all that easily. That is why we speak of distinctive paths. In the pre-eschatological age I see the 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 I do think it responds to some of the questions left unanswered by Cardinal Kasper. Certainly we shall have to continue its development, including whether there is a possibility of opening up the essentially inclusivistic Christian-Jewish relationship to a wider pluralistic model without endangering the former.

NOTES

1. For a description of these varied approaches, cf. John Pawlikowski, *Jesus and the Theology of Israel* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989).
2. Pontifical Biblical Commission, *The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002). For a discussion of this document, including my reflections, cf. a special issue of *The Bible Today*, May/June 2003.
3. Walter Cardinal Kasper, "The Good Olive Tree," *America* 185:7 (17 September 2001) and "Christians, Jews and the Thorny Question of Mission," *Origins* 32:28 (19 December 2002), 464. Also cf. Avery Cardinal Dulles, "Evangelization and the Jews," with a response by Mary C. Boys, Philip A. Cunningham and John T. Pawlikowski, *America* 187:12 (21 October 2002), 8-16 and Christoph Schonborn, "Judaism's Way to Salvation," *The Tablet*, 29 March 2008.
4. I personally subscribed to this position initially.
5. Cf. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texts and Studies in Judaism #95 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Matt Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).
6. *Ibid.*
7. Robin Scroggs, "The Judaizing of the New Testament," *Chicago Theological Seminary Register*, (Winter 1986), 1.
8. Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, *A Blessing to Each Other. Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and Jewish-Catholic Dialogue* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1996), 78-79.
9. Anthony J. Saldarini, "Jews and Christians in the First Two Centuries: The Changing Paradigm," *Shofar* 10 (1992), 32-43; "Christian Anti-Judaism: The First Century Speaks to the Twenty-First Century," The Joseph Cardinal Jerusalem Lecture 1999. Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago, The American Jewish Committee, Spertus Institute of Jewish Studies and the Jewish United Fund/Jewish Community Relations Council, 1999.
10. John P. Meier, *Companions and Competitors* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 251.
11. David Frankfurter, "Beyond 'Jewish-Christianity': Continuing Religious sub-cultures of the second and third centuries and their documents," in Becker and Reed, 132.
12. Paula Fredriksen, "What 'Parting of the Ways'? Jews, Gentiles and the ancient Mediterranean City," in Becker and Reed, 35-64.
13. Daniel Boyarin, "Semantic Differences on 'Judaism/Christianity'," in Becker and Reed, 65-86.
14. F. C. Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003).
15. Cf. *Proceedings: Conference on the Question of the Letters of Paul Viewed from the Perspective of The Jewish Response Mode*, eds. Hayim Goren Perelmuter and Wilhelm Wuellner, Chicago: Catholic Theological Union, 15-18 November 1991.
16. To be released soon by Cambridge University Press. 17. 56 (1963), 199-216.
18. John Gager, "Did Jewish Christians See the Rise of Islam?" in Becker and Reed, 366-367.
19. Cf. the translation and discussion in Wayne Meeks, ed., *The Writings of St. Paul* (New York: Norton, 1972), 178ff. Gager interprets this passage as "Peter's wrath" against the author of Acts.
20. As Emmanuel Nathan of the Catholic University of Leuven's Pauline Project rightly pointed out to me, if we retain an understanding of Paul as a faithful Jew, we shall have to deal with his critique of Judaism as well.
21. Cf. n. 3
22. This was also the clear position of Pope John Paul II. Also, Archbishop Michael Fitzgerald when he served as President of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue also supported the *sui*

generis view of the Christian-Jewish relationship. The Church's relationship to Islam he regarded as the first among the other relationships with world religions.

23. Reuven Firestone, *Who Are the Real Chosen People? The Meaning of Chosenness in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths, 2008), 60-62.
24. Cf. n. 2.
25. Cf. John Pawlikowski, *Christ in the Light of Christian-Jewish Dialogue* (New York: Paulist, 1982; rpr Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001); and "Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue: A Personal Theological Journey," *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 72:2 (2007), 147-167.
26. Cf. Michael Wyschograd, *The Body of Faith: God and the People Israel* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1995); Elliot R. Wolfson, "Gazing Beneath the Veil: Apocalyptic Envisioning the End," in John T. Pawlikowski and Hayim Goren Perelmuter, eds., *Reinterpreting Revelation and Tradition: Jews and Christians in Conversation* (Franklin, WI: Sheed & Ward, 1997), 77-103. On Sommer, cf. n. 16.
27. R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).