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I am very grateful to the organizers of this event; I am particularly delighted to be able to meet with members of the Jewish Community here in Melbourne and I thank Rabbi Fred Morgan to have accepted to be the respondent to this lecture.

“Nothing substantively new”? The latest Vatican document “The gifts and calling of God are irrevocable” and the future of Jewish-Catholic relations’.

Recent Jewish-Catholic relations are indeed one of the most amazing gifts of our time, they have been called “without parallel in the human history” and I am very happy to be able to participate in this wonderful, ongoing gift as director of a Centre of Judaic Studies and Jewish-Christian Relations, the Cardinal Bea Centre, which is part of the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome where students from around 120 nations are trained to become priests, teachers, judges or administrators in the Catholic Church in the entire world.

Nevertheless, the choice of this conference’s title “Nothing substantively new?” is also - at least indirectly - reflective of a certain concern that the Catholic Jewish rapprochement which began with Vatican II’s declaration “Nostra Aetate” is currently going through a phase of a certain fatigue, quite different from the vague of interest and invigoration that accompanied and followed the promulgation of the Council’s Declaration 50 years ago. Certainly, I do not think we can speak of weariness at the sight of regular and even frequent encounters between top level representatives of both traditions, continuously working in partnership to intensify and promote quantity and quality of the mutual exchange and to give more and more strength to the ties of this still young friendship. Nor
can we speak of tiredness in the entirely uncompromising expressions of commitment to this dialogue, pronounced, on numerous occasions, by Pope Francis.

But I believe we can admit to the sensation of fatigue concerning the Jewish-Christian dialogue when referring to a new generation of Christians and Jews in schools and universities, parishes and congregations who would very often not understand the special place that the Jewish-Christian relations signify in Catholic theology and Catholic life, but also in the Western Culture as a whole, nor marvel at the sheer sight of its very existence after almost 2000 years of contempt and marginalization, rejection, violence, and persecution.

In fact, as this phenomena of fatigue can be linked to a variety of causes which deserve a much more detailed and complex analysis than I will be able to present here, it seems to me that one of the major causes would simply be that what was once perceived as “ground-breaking”, capable to generate a radical move in the Catholic Church, has acquired today, in our time, the taste of the ordinary, a kind of “déjà vu” that makes it hard to see the possibility of setting free renewed genuine energy and enthusiasm.

Thus, to ask the question is there something “new” in this document, is at the same time expressing the hope that we may find good reasons in there to rekindle the spirit of joyful hope that we are moving forward and not standing still.

Whilst there is certainly a number of statements in the document “The gifts and calling of God are irrevocable” which was released on December 10th 2015 that had not been made ever before in an official release from the Holy See (we will get to some of them, in a short while) and in this sense there are without doubt elements of novelty to be attested, it strikes me, however, as even more important to realize that we are confronted in there with two “tendencies”, tendencies which permeate the whole document throughout, and it is those tendencies which in my view set indeed a “new” tone and introduce a new flavour to the Jewish-Christian dialogue, compared to previous statements. As I see it, these two tendencies furthermore open a path to develop yet something even “newer” for the future, which may not be here yet, but is prepared in it.

It is these two tendencies plus a sketch of the future path that I would like to expose here.

1st Tendency: Jewish-Catholic Dialogue is associated with the basics features of Christianity.
The subtitle of “The gifts and calling of God are irrevocable” states that this is “A Reflection on Theological Questions.” While the word “reflection” certainly surprises in an official Vatican text, reflection seems to hint at a progressive nature of its content and thereby admitting to a somewhat provisional character of the doctrine - I will get back to this in a short while - it is without any doubt the ‘theological aspect’ which right from the beginning is taking centre stage. Thus, “theological” will be repeated time and again: “it is on current theological questions that have developed since the Second Vatican Council” (Preface), its intention is “to be a starting point for further theological thought with a view to enriching and intensifying the theological dimension of Jewish- Catholic dialogue.” (Preface).

As the same Preface explicitly acknowledges that “Nostra Aetate” of 50 years back already presented “the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people in a new theological framework,” one wonders if here we are indirectly told that much of the dialogue after Nostra Aetate has been not sufficiently theological. Anyway, “Theological” here is not the result of a theological exchange between Catholics and Jews, we are dealing with “Catholic reflections” (Preface), yet in a way that “their significance may be deepened for members of both faith traditions.” (Preface).

Had the text been redacted in a Jewish-Christian dialogue and explicitly addressed also to the Jewish community, it could be presumed that certain issues would have been framed differently.

At any event, what I find remarkable and indeed to be listed as a first tendency that deserves the qualification “novelty” is that “theological” will not translate into “high-strung theology-formulas” - not at all. It will not result in a “scholarly” or academic language, “intended rather for subject matter experts”, nor resort to metaphorical “biblical-allegorical” imagery, but very much in the likes of a class in catechism, it will cut through to the issues which interest indeed every Catholic or rather every Christian, insofar those issues form the very core tenets of the Christian being and of the Christian self-understanding. In this way, we arrive at three main affirmations of this document which I would like to briefly summarize in three points:

A) the two separate Covenants, the one with Abraham and his descendants in the Hebrew Bible (Torah) and the one through Christ in the New Testament (the “Old” and the “New”) are both eternally valid (especially n. 33 and 34)

B) Catholic mission work dissociates from activities directed towards Jews (especially n. 40 and 41)
C) lack of Jewish belief in the divinity of Jesus no longer bars Jews from salvation (especially n. 36)

Now let me illustrate to you what I mean by this fresh, new way of speaking with a short comparison of excerpts referring to those chief statements contained in this latest document with extracts of the Council Declaration “Nostra Aetate”, referring to those issues, as well: The fourth chapter of Nostra Aetate reads

“The Church professes that all who believe in Christ - Abraham’s sons according to faith - are included in the same Patriarch’s call (...) that the Church draws sustenance from the root of that well-cultivated olive tree onto which have been grafted the wild shoots, the Gentiles” (N.A. 4),

now our document reads:

“The Church does not replace the people of God of Israel, since as the community founded on Christ, it represents in Christ the fulfilment of the promises. This does not mean that Israel can no longer be considered to be the people of God.” (The gifts and the calling, n. 23)

and later it concludes from this:

“In concrete terms this means that the Catholic Church neither conducts nor supports any specific institutional mission work erected toward Jews. While there is a principled rejection of an institutional Jewish mission, Christian are nonetheless called to bear witness to their faith in Jesus Christ also to Jews, although they should do so in a humble and sensitive manner, acknowledging that Jews are bearers of God’s Word, and particularly in view of the great tragedy of the Shoah.” (The gifts and the calling, n. 40).

Back to Nostra Aetate: “Indeed, the Church believes that by His cross Christ, Our Peace, reconciled Jews and Gentiles, making both one in Himself” (N.A. 4), our document now reads as follows:

“From the Christian confession that there can be only one path to salvation, however, it does not in any way follow that the Jews are excluded from God’s salvation... such a
claim would find no support in the understanding of Saint Paul…” (The gifts and the calling, n. 36).

It seems to me that the claim of “originality” as such of the main affirmations of our document can indeed be debated and at any rate would necessarily have to be negotiated within the context of the whole Tradition of the Church. We are all aware that the Church’s faith, built on the faith received from the Apostles, can never theologically argue in favour of something entirely disjointed from the Tradition. My contention is, however, that those main affirmations of this document are now clothed in an immediacy that provides a new potential of relevancy, capable of sending out a wake-up call for all drowsy Catholics who are still settling down in the lazy illusory world of substitution theology.

**2nd Tendency: The Paradoxical**

This leads me to the second tendency in the document which on the surface may come across as quite ostentatious, but is, in fact, a carrier of quite a subtle message. I am referring to the presence of paradoxical language, referring ultimately to what is classically termed “Apophatic Theology”. “Mystery”, mentioned 4 times in a key position in this document is Apophatic Theology’s “open sesame” call.

Thus, for instance, on the one hand, the text says that the Torah is sufficient for “a successful life in right relationship with God” (n. 24); on the other, that Christ is “the universal and therefore also exclusive mediation of salvation” (n. 35). While the text concedes that the theological work of reconciling these paradoxical views, requires further theological reflection, it nevertheless supports them already now precisely in their polarities, and concludes that that how these two positions can be reconciled “remains an unfathomable divine mystery.” (no. 36).

With the reference to “Mystery”, the Commission picks up and develops a theological insight which proved paramount at Vatican II leading to a renovated, more integral understanding of the Church. In fact, in the aftermath of the time of the Reformation in the 16th century, it had been of chief importance for Catholic Theology to emphasize the visibility, meaning the concrete realness of the church as God’s covenantal partner. In 19th and 20th century, Catholic Theology passed on to point out that this partnership is ultimately rooted in God’s Eternity, in God’s love and God’s freedom. But God’s freedom and love, God’s justice and mercy, in their co-presence, are mysterious for humans to grasp and if the toilsome history of the Jewish and Christian striving for understanding God’s freedom and love proves anything, it surely proves this: the attempt to reduce God to the
scope of our own comprehension leads to false conclusions. This is certainly true in the absolute sense when referring to God: if we were to deny God’s transcendence, we would create an idol.

However, Catholic Theology has been realizing more and more— and this document is a proof of it - that this ultimate mysteriousness regards God also insofar as he has drawn near to us, insofar as God has revealed Himself to us. In fact, how are we to understand God’s actions? How are we to understand the ultimate reason, for instance, that God first creates all humankind, becomes the father of all and only subsequently, calls one special person, Abraham? Why, from the Christian perspective, did Jesus come only at a later stage, when so many things had already been established, which indeed made a split within the people of the Covenant so highly likely? What does this all mean?

Both Jews and Christians believe that God is Eternal Truth and Eternal Love who has drawn near to us, authentically, which is equivalent to saying that God does not show himself to us in such a way that he himself is not. On this assertion certainly rests the Jewish and the Christian Tradition. Yet the “authenticity of God’s love” towards us does not fully coincide with its transparency for us. In this context, it is often noted that “metaphysical coincidences of opposites” are a Christian specialty. After all, Christianity’s essentials bring about new syntheses, a synthesis of Unity and Plurality in in the Trinitarian God, a synthesis of absoluteness and relativity in Jesus Christ. We may notice that the Talmud seems to be following a different path, keeping distinct records of various, not coinciding solutions to questions that arise from the Bible and the Rabbinical Tradition. Thus, the rabbinical Tradition appears more inclined to promote the idea that tensions are to be maintained and to be left open, contrapositions are invitations to look further, to keep human research going and to refrain from definitive answers. At this point, I am tempted to detect in this document which places paradoxical claims side by side, a certain endorsement of a Talmudic approach - obviously, without making this approach explicit.

3rd Tendency: A New hermeneutic

With this, I have come to my last point I mentioned above, a new path for which this text in my view is laying the ground. In Jewish-Christian Dialogue – just as in the Commission of this text – it is customary to compare notes between the two traditions on specific topics, often painful or difficult topics that may constitute an obstacle for one towards the other. Like the topics of “covenant” and the topic of “salvation”. (Interestingly enough, the document has been subsequently criticized for not having tackled with yet other difficult topics, as, for example the meaning of the “land”.) Proceeding in this fashion, we, in fact,
receive a very streamlined, monochord and static idea of what the Jewish and the Christian Tradition mean and stand for.

I believe that the time has come (and with it a very inspiring challenge) to start asking where each tradition (Christianity, on the one hand, and Judaism on the other) have been consistently “developing” through time, negotiating data of its Tradition with knowledges which came along in the historical progress. New balances have been reached within each tradition, and there has been a complex combination of continuity and discontinuity, Tradition and Reform within each. Exchanging on those hermeneutical developments, maybe even shaping a new hermeneutic which grows out of a common hermeneutical exchange to give answers together to a growingly secular world, would in fact mean to shift the Jewish-Christian dialogue from “Face to Face” to a dialogue “Side by Side”. In this approach, it would not be the differences between Judaism and Christianity that constitute the main source of reflection and dialogue, but rather it would be the development that has taken place within each tradition would become an inspirational source for the other.

Thus, I am certain that we would see how much the Christian and the Jewish tradition, in fact, have been able to realize changes through time in such a way that it continues to faithfully witnessing God’s presence in this world. Possibly, we might be able to find elements, how each tradition has integrated in its own insights which it received from the other. Topics which would be particularly apt to be looked at insofar as their “development” within their own tradition is concerned are in my opinion those which deal with the intersection of the Divine Action and the Human Realm: in other words, the areas of grace and human freedom, justice and mercy. The understanding of the Ten Commandments would be a suggestion, the development of social and financial ethics another. But all that indeed would constitute material for a whole different conference.
I want to thank the Ecumenical and Interfaith Commission for inviting me to appear here with Fr Philipp Renczes of the Gregorian University. It’s a great honour to respond to Fr Philipp’s paper. My approach to this task has been rather curious; I actually composed my response before reading Fr Philipp’s paper. For some time I’ve wanted to address the document which provides the heading for this seminar. I felt this would be a worthwhile opportunity. I believe that my remarks compliment Fr Philipp’s in many places. Where we differ, it is generally because he is approaching the topic from the Christian viewpoint while I am adopting a Jewish perspective. Clarifying where our viewpoints differ is, of course, the purpose of this interaction, and I hope you’ll find it interesting and beneficial.

Jewish-Christian relations have changed dramatically over the 50 years since the publication of Nostra Aetate in 1965. My standing today on this podium is testimony to that; it would never have been able to occur in decades past. So, too, is the position I hold as a Jewish commentator on Jewish-Christian relations in the Faculty of Theology and Philosophy at the ACU. But there is still far to go in normalising our relationship. In some respects, the Reflection produced by the Vatican’s Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, entitled (after St Paul in Romans 11:29) “The Gifts and the Calling of God are Irrevocable” (abbreviated here as Gifts and Calling) recognises that more changes are necessary; and in other respects, it seems to stop well short of them.

My starting point for a Jewish response to Gifts and Calling as it aims to capture the changes in Jewish-Christian relations over the past 50 years is the document’s paragraph n. 4. This paragraph refers to the first official document published by the Vatican to elucidate Nostra Aetate, “Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate (No.4)”, which appeared in December 1974. In the Preamble the
“Guidelines” state, “On the practical level in particular, Christians must therefore strive to acquire a better knowledge of the basic components of the religious tradition of Judaism: they must strive to learn by what essential traits the Jews define themselves in the light of their own religious experience.” This passage from the “Guidelines” of 1974, quoted favourably in Gifts and Calling, calls upon Christians to encourage Jews to speak for themselves about their view of the world, and to listen to Jewish views. Presumably these views include the way in which Christianity fits into the Jewish picture of the universe of faiths. According to the Gifts and Calling the Jewish portrayal of Christianity needs to be taken seriously by Christian scholarship, and not only by “specialists” but by all Christians (see n. 44-45).

From the Jewish perspective, then, Christianity is not viewed as Judaism recast in the image of Jesus or interpreted through the prism of Christology. Though the two faiths may have “co-emerged,” as some scholars suggest, from the cauldron of Roman sovereignty in Judea, once a few centuries passed (or even sooner) they grew into separate religious traditions. Christianity took a completely different course from rabbinic Judaism, so that, once the “parting of the ways” happened, Christianity was no longer considered to be relevant in any sense for the religious development of the Jewish faith and people. It was not deviant, heretical or schismatic, but simply irrelevant theologically and halakhically (legally) speaking. That’s not to deny that the two religious movements did, from time to time and sometimes for long periods, inhabit the same political and social worlds; and of course, in this sense, their interactions were highly relevant to both of them. But, despite possible borrowings and influences in culture and in liturgy over many centuries, there was no direct or acknowledged theological impact of Christianity on Judaism. I say “direct influences” because, insofar as theological reflection is a part of our cultural heritage, there may well have been indirect impacts; for example, when Shabbatai Zvi was declared messiah by a large segment of Jewry in the 16th century, both supporters and deniers may well have had the messianic model of Jesus in mind. But no Jew would have described Shabbatai Zvi’s appearance as the “second coming”. On the contrary, belief in Jesus as Messiah or Christ was then, and continues to be, the defining boundary for Jews between Judaism and Christianity.

As a result, the observation in Gifts and Calling n. 3, that it makes sense to attach the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews to the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity (my italics), is wrongly conceived, though I understand there are historical reasons for this; as is the rationale given for this association of the two bodies, namely, “since the separation between Synagogue and Church may be viewed as the first and most far-reaching breach among the chosen people” (my italics). That statement may work from a Christian perspective, but not from a Jewish perspective. On the contrary, from the point
of view of Jewish self-definition (see Gifts and Calling n. 4), Christianity represents not a “breach among the chosen people” but the birth – we might say, by Caesarean section – of a distinctive religion which, in terms of its belief in Jesus as Christ and its rejection of the religious duties of circumcision, kashrut and the Sabbath, gave up any claim to being part of the “chosen people”.

This is because, for Jews, the “chosen people” is defined by the covenant, brit, between God and the Israelites at Sinai which enjoins the Jewish people to keep the obligations of God, or mitzvot. I understand that Christians who see themselves as “new Israel” or “true Israel” arrogate to themselves the status of “chosen people” and so can see their separation from Judaism in terms of a breach that seeks reunification (as Gifts and Calling says, “promoting Christian unity”). But Jews who see Israel in terms of a people who are in covenantal relationship with God through the mitzvot recognise no such “breach among the chosen people.”

In sum, Gifts and Calling reveals that its own requirement, to see the Jewish people in the light of their own religious experience, is still far from being realised. And this is for very good reason. It is hard to see how Christianity can do that, if it continues to view its own religious mission in terms of its Jewish origins; that is, if at every point it is pulled back to the understanding that Christians have somehow claimed all that is real, timeless and enduring in Torah for themselves, including their own status as Israel, and assigned the dispensable and time-bound features to the Jewish people. Yet, only those Christians who truly reject the view of Judaism as insufficient, incomplete and wanting in crucial respects can listen seriously to Jews when they relate their own religious narrative (contra Gifts and Calling n. 22-23, which tries but fails to remove the patronising reading of the OT as a kind of “pre-history” of Jesus’ fulfilment).

This discussion reveals a significant asymmetry in Jewish-Christian relations which is not sufficiently explored in Gifts and Calling, though there are Christian scholars such as Mary Boys who have addressed it. Gifts and Calling does refer to a political asymmetry between Judaism and Christianity, in that Jews have throughout history lived as a minority among a Christian majority, victims of persecution and forced conversion, etc.; Gifts and Calling mentions this already in n. 1. But the significant theological asymmetry relates to Christianity’s reliance on its Jewish background in the Bible as the prefiguration of Jesus, so that Jesus is seen to complete Biblical prophecy. Judaism has no such reliance on the texts of the NT or the figure of Jesus to complete its picture of the world. From the Jewish angle, there is no need for Jesus to renew or replace the covenant with Abraham, which was reiterated with the whole of the Jewish people at Sinai. In Jewish terms, the covenant is singular and complete in the Hebrew Scriptures. It requires an appropriate hermeneutic to
enable Jews to live by it in every age, and this hermeneutic or mode of interpretation is called “Oral Torah”. The “Written Torah” or Pentateuch is insufficient without the Oral Torah, because without interpretation the Pentateuch cannot be applied within the terms of the covenant. But the NT, the life and teachings of Jesus, are not relevant to this process of covenantal living for the Jew. The Christian, however, requires the OT in order to make sense of the NT and its “newness,” its function as fulfilment of a covenantal promise.

In a curious way, this asymmetric relationship between Judaism and Christianity rebounds on the notion of dialogue itself. Gifts and Calling says in n. 13, “dialogue is not a choice but a duty as far as theology is concerned.” This may be true of Christianity (though, if experience is anything to go by, interfaith dialogue is hardly acknowledged as a duty in local parishes or theological seminaries). But until very recently it has not been a part of Orthodox Jewish understanding. Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik, the doyen of 20th century Modern Orthodox teachers in America, said just the opposite, as did his colleague, the great halakhist Rabbi Moshe Feinstein. Both Soloveitchik and Feinstein excluded theological dialogue with Christians from the Orthodox Jewish agenda. This position has shifted today. Dialogue with Christians is acceptable even in Israel (see n. 11; Fr Philipp has been part of such dialogue) but it is not seen as a “duty” (Hebrew, mitzvah). Rather, it is seen as a means to promote common ethical and social concerns. It is noteworthy that Gifts and Calling eschews the language of theology in this context, speaking instead of “the common spiritual heritage of Judaism and Christianity” (my italics), that is, what we might call shared normative religious attitudes in the face of the relativistic impulses of secular society. Regarding Jewish-Christian relations, this is a pronounced move forward since Nostra Aetate, but it is more about diplomacy than theology.

Yet, this level of dialogue may be the best place for us to be, at least under present circumstances. It expects Christians to be the best Christians they can be, without aggressively foisting their theological views on others through mission; and Jews to be the best Jews they can be, without portraying Christians as the enemy. This religious rapprochement is called in Gifts and Calling n. 37 “the mystery of God’s work.” This state of affairs must, I imagine, be difficult for some Christians to accept, if they are seeking “the Truth” and see their religious purpose as bringing all peoples under a single banner. In my reading of his talk, Fr Philipp acknowledges the difference between Christian and Jewish paths in this regard. Jews, who seek fidelity and justice more than they seek Truth, are less driven by this universalising impulse, this metaphysical move to synthesise opposites into a single unity. In the rabbinical tradition, to quote Fr Philipp, “tensions are to be maintained.” As long as the other person doesn’t interfere with a Jewish person living a Jewish life, whatever the difference in their religious beliefs, there is no problem.
The pursuit of peaceful living has certainly advanced since Nostra Aetate, but not in every respect. There is still anti-Semitism in the Church, much of it disguised as anti-Zionism because of the failure of Christian doctrine to give appropriate acknowledgement to the Jewish connection with the Holy Land. There is great ignorance of Judaism and Jewish values, including our spiritual attachment to the Land (not unlike that of Aboriginal peoples towards country, as has often been noted), among both clergy and parishioners in the Catholic Church and indeed in the other churches. The instruction for priests that Gifts and Calling n. 45 calls for is simply not there; I know this personally from my frustrated efforts over several years to introduce interfaith engagement as a subject in Christian seminaries in Melbourne, especially through the MCD University of Divinity; these efforts are coming to fruition finally next year in the form of two units being offered through Trinity College on “Interfaith Engagement”. Gifts and Calling praises the value of familiarising Christians with Rabbinic hermeneutics (n. 31, following Evangelii Gaudium, speaks of the “complementarity” between Christian and Jewish interpretations of the Bible); yet only once does it refer to a rabbinic passage (n. 49 refers to Babylonian Talmud Sotah 14a on imitatio dei), so it doesn’t really take advantage of its own status to practice what it preaches. In Fr Philipp’s view, Christian attention to Talmudic learning would amount to “a new hermeneutics,” a new way of doing Jewish-Christian dialogue, and Gifts and Calling isn’t there yet.

Ultimately, the stumbling block in Jewish-Christian dialogue at the theological level is the Christian belief that Christianity transmits a “universal message” that will lead to unity among human beings, reflecting God’s unity, and thus establishing a single “Kingdom of God” on earth. This is, in Jewish eyes, a metaphor that conflates religious and political thinking. It is fine for an indefinite future, leaving us to live today in the most helpful, productive way we can but not expecting us to complete the task (Mishnah Avot 2:21). But when this pursuit of universalism is taken too literally and translated into a theocratic political agenda, inevitably involving inquisitions and forced conversions, then, as Rabbi Jonathan Sacks argues in his brilliant book The Dignity of Difference and, more recently, in Not in God’s Name, it is bound to end in violence. Sacks tells us that Judaism’s greatest gift to humanity is a sense of the worth of the individual: the distinct person, the particular cultural unit, the self-defined group. To honour and respect those who are different, not for their sameness but precisely for their difference, is the messianic ideal towards which Judaism aspires.

It may be beyond Christian doctrine to replace a single-minded pursuit of the universal, what Sacks calls “Plato’s ghost,” with respect for the particular. It represents a major theological shift. But it would maintain the integrity of Christian life without imposing that life on others who are content with their own sets of religious practices and values.
Otherwise, Christianity will continue to feel frustrated by the survival of the Jewish people, not only because Jews historically haven’t accepted Jesus but because they don’t feel any need to accept Jesus or the Christianity that divinises Jesus as Christ. The Jewish people, the people Israel, view Judaism and Christianity as two distinct religions, valuable diplomatic partners in a secular society. Perhaps this is also the place where Fr Philipp ends up when he suggests that, in order to escape “fatigue,” to renew itself, Jewish-Christian dialogue should shift from a dialogue “face to face” to a dialogue “side by side.”

+++++++++

(Nb. After Rabbi Morgan’s response, Fr Renczes offered a short unscripted reply. This reply can be heard on the audio or video recording of the Public Lecture)