

JOHN PAUL II AND HANS URS VON BALTHASAR:  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE JEWS  
AND THE CHURCH.<sup>1</sup>

---

---

**Bevil Bramwell OMI**  
**Ave Maria University**

*The views of two modern Catholic figures, John Paul II and Hans Urs von Balthasar, on the Jewish religion and the State of Israel are informed by their theological reflections that go back to the Christian Scriptures. There they identify the radical newness of Christianity and at the same time its profound roots and continuing debt to the Jewish Scriptures and to the continuing existence of the Jewish people and the Jewish religion. The tortured past history of relations between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people and their religion apparently turned on the political exigencies of 'protecting' the daily exercise of Catholicism. In the modern historical period where on the one hand, the independent State of Israel exists and where on the other hand, Catholicism has no intrinsic need of a specific land, the theological principles of the need of and debt to Israel as the 'elder brother' and as the 'stock' onto which Christianity is inescapably grafted, has come to the fore and has led to a number of agreements, under John Paul II, between the Vatican and the State of Israel.*

**I. Introduction: The Mystery of the Existence of Israel**

The question of the meaning of the Jewish people for the Catholic Church and the history of the salvation of the world is a highly complex topic that is worthy of study for a number of reasons. There are the theoretical reasons that have a lot to do with the self-understanding of the Church. The practical reason is the continuing existence of the Jewish religion alongside the Catholic Church. The reflections of the two figures Pope John Paul II and the theologian Hans Urs von Balthasar span both the theological and the practical elements of the question.

An initial comment: Perhaps von Balthasar best sums up the situation of Israel and the Jewish people when he says: "The fact that Israel survives Christ and continues to exist in history beside the Church remains a mystery that cannot be unveiled."<sup>2</sup> However, given the theological nature of a mystery, the reflection does not stop there; both

the Pope and von Balthasar are aware that the mystery has to be approached. The question is not closed, but from the outset, one has to appreciate that “all we can do is approach [the mystery] from different angles, being aware that our lines of approach do not meet in some center.”<sup>3</sup> So not surprisingly, neither author offers a complete explanation for the relations between the Jewish religion, Catholicism, and the State of Israel!

What then are some of the lines of approach in the work of John Paul II and von Balthasar? The pope and the theologian have had very different experiences, and that, to some extent, shapes their expressions. But there are certain common elements. Most basically, at the anthropological level, in the words of John Paul II, when he was speaking to a gathering of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim representatives in Jerusalem: “We all agree that religion must genuinely be centered on God, and that our first religious duty is adoration, praise, and thanksgiving.”<sup>4</sup> Then there are three key theological principles in the work of John Paul II and Hans Urs von Balthasar, namely, the promise of the Old Testament is fulfilled by the New Testament; the Messiah of the Old Testament is found in Jesus Christ; and the Jewish people have a continued significance for the Church. And then finally but not insignificantly, both authors are repelled by the crime of anti-Semitism.

These principles will reappear as we examine three major themes that appear in the works of both of the figures under consideration. (It is von Balthasar who suggested these three themes.<sup>5</sup>)

## **II. The Three Themes**

### ***1. The Obduracy of Israel***

The word ‘obduracy’ is von Balthasar’s.<sup>6</sup> He holds that Israel’s hardness of heart is a definite part of salvation. The Holy Father couches the same thought in more diplomatic terms. For example, in his address to the synagogue in Sydney, Australia, he said that: “the most fundamental difference [between the Church and Judaism] is in our respective views on the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth.” Both John Paul II and von Balthasar know that the heart of the mystery of the Church is Jesus Christ, and so there is a fundamental difference between the Church and Israel and the Jewish religion that is not going to go away.

The meaning of this difference becomes more explicit in John Paul II’s historic address to the Synagogue of Rome in 1986. There he said that: “the Church of Christ discovers her bonds with Judaism ‘by

examining her own mystery”(art. 4).<sup>7</sup> John Paul is acknowledging that the intrinsic meaning of the Church is at least partly uncovered by the Church’s response to Judaism. He did not elaborate further in the address. However, the last part of his sentence (above) is borrowed from the *Decree on Relations with Non-Christian Religions (Nostra Aetate)* issued by the Second Vatican Council. That decree offers perhaps the finest *theological* summary of the issue, and I will offer just the relevant sentences from the decree. The council first stated the positive theological elements:

1. “the beginning of her [the Church’s] faith and election is to be found in the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets” (art. 4).
2. “All Christ’s faithful, who as men of faith are sons of Abraham (cf. Galatians 3:7) are included in the same patriarchs’ call” (art. 4).
3. “the salvation of the Church is mystically prefigured in the exodus of God’s chosen people” (art. 4).

Then the document continues by saying that these three points mean that the Church does not forget:

1. “that she received the revelation of the Old Testament by way of that people with whom God . . . established his ancient covenant” (art. 4).
2. “that she draws nourishment from that good olive tree onto which the wild olive branches of the Gentiles have been grafted (cf. Romans 11:17-24)” (art. 4).
3. Also that St. Paul said that “to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises” (art. 4).
4. And that “of their race according to the flesh, is the Christ. (Romans 9: 4-5)” (art. 4).

However, the decree then continues:

1. “As holy Scripture testifies, Jerusalem did not recognize God’s moment when it came (cf. Luke 19:42)” (art. 4).

2. “Jews for the most part did not accept the Gospel” (art. 4).
3. “Many opposed the spreading of it (cf. Romans 11:28)” (art. 4).

So that in conclusion, the decree explains that:

Even so, the Apostle Paul maintains that the Jews remain very dear to God, for the sake of the patriarchs since God does not take back the gifts he bestowed or the choice he made (art. 4).

Because this is so, even though the council did not explain how, the council taught that:

Together with the Prophets and that same Apostle [St. Paul], the Church awaits that day, known to God alone, when all people call on God with one voice (art. 4).

John Paul II is very much in harmony with the council’s teaching. He has noted the fundamental nature of “the eternal truths contained in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in the irrevocable covenant made with Abraham.”<sup>8</sup> The parallel existence of Catholicism and the Jewish religion, in history, rests on this heritage. In John Paul II’s words, here is “the spiritual patrimony shared by the Jews and the Christians.”<sup>9</sup> Von Balthasar would also agree that the Church that sprang from the Jewish people and is the new People of God sprung from the old.

This theological formulation must be appreciated to grasp the significance of the various *political* expressions of the Church through the ages. Quite simply, the political expectations of the Church are meant to be at the service of the theological truths. This topic is worthy of a study in its own right! Crudely put, the political considerations are to make it possible to live life as a Catholic. Just to take one example, in 1227, the Council of Narbonne stated that:

The Jews are forbidden from oppressing the Christians through excessive rates of interest, or to have Christian slaves, or Christian foods; to eat meat publicly or to sell it on the days forbidden by the Church. They have to wear a mark on their breast to indicate who they are (the figure of a wheel). They are forbidden from working in public on feast days and Sundays, and they must not leave their houses unnecessarily during the whole of Holy Week. To avoid the abuse of the Christians, from which the prelates will have to protect them, the Jews

will pay six deniers to the local parish, each year, on Easter Sunday, in the form of an offering.<sup>10</sup>

As the text indicates, the council was responding to social (political) circumstances. Francis E. Gigot's article on the Jews in the 1917 *Catholic Encyclopedia* is a notable example of this kind of explanation.<sup>11</sup> For examples he says that:

The obligation of wearing a distinguishing badge was of course obnoxious to the Jews. At the same time, Church authorities deemed its injunction necessary to prevent effectively moral offences between Jews and Christian women. The decrees forbidding the Jews from appearing in public at Eastertide may be justified on the ground that some of them mocked at the Christian processions at that time.<sup>12</sup>

The mindset of the period needs much further study since it still remains somewhat opaque, but it certainly cannot simply be adjudicated according to twenty-first century standards. The Council of Narbonne did not express a theological vision because that was not its purpose. The great teaching Council of Trent (1545 - 1563) did not mention the Jews at all. The next mention of the Jews by an ecumenical council occurred in the teaching of Vatican II, summarized above.

Although pronouncements regarding the Jews disappeared from conciliar teaching, there is the encyclical *A Quo Primum* issued by Benedict XIV in 1751 to the Church in Poland.<sup>13</sup> Once again, it is political rather than theological. Benedict decries the negative results of the Jews and Christians intermingling, and he notes that "they gain as many defenders of their synagogues and themselves as they have creditors" (Art. 3). Benedict listed both those who have preached the continued punishment of the Jews (e.g., Randolph) and those like St. Bernard who said, "the Jews are not to be persecuted" (Art. 4). Furthermore, St. Bernard thought that "they [the Jews] are eminent reminders to us of the Lord's suffering" (Art. 4).

Benedict XIV also gives a long list of popes from Alexander III (1159 - 1181), Innocent IV (1243 - 1254), Paul IV (1555 - 1559), St. Pius V (1566 - 1572), Gregory XIII (1572 - 1585), and Clement VIII (1592 - 1605) who issued restrictions on Jewish activities and in some cases supported their expulsion, as in the case of Innocent IV and the expulsion of the Jews from France. Alexander III evidently forbade the raising of Jews to public office. Benedict apparently saw his encyclical as an exhortation to reinstate the regulations. He told the bishops of

Poland, “the task of your office requires that you carefully encourage their implementation” (Art. 7). In addition, the bishops were to take care that neither “[their] property nor [their] privileges are hired to Jews; furthermore [they were] to do no business with them and . . . neither lend them money nor borrow from them. Thus you will be free from them”(Art. 7). The bishops were to act “to remove this stain of shame from Poland” (Art. 9).

The only defensible foundation for the attitude of Benedict and of those whom he lists might be, and this requires historical study beyond the scope of this paper, that in the Middle Ages and in fact since Constantine, Catholicism has been very much tied to the concrete daily life of the nation. This is the political aspect mentioned earlier. One consequence was the sense that Catholicism was seen to be disrupted by the overt public presence of other religions. The Catholics were citizens of Christendom and so expected social and business relationships to be defined by this religious character.

Consider the specific prohibitions against the Moslems. The Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) forbade sale to the Moslems of arms, iron or wood for building galleys; it forbade Christians to act as “patrons or pilots” in Moslem enterprises; and it demanded that Christians be protected when going about their legitimate commerce.<sup>14</sup> The strong ties of Catholicism to the daily life of various nations broke down as nations developed governments with no links to and even real hostility to the Church. Just to be clear, theologically Catholicism never was conceived in terms of a theocracy, that is, a form of government where God is head of the government and the laws of the state are the commandments of God. The various Jewish states (such as the Jewish Commonwealth in the first century) and Moslem states (with the exception of modern Turkey) have followed this model. The Constantinian Empire would be the closest to a theocracy that has arisen in the history of Catholicism. Now we must turn to the second aspect of the theological—I emphasize the theological—understanding that we are exploring.

## ***2. The Fulfillment of the Promise to Israel***

The ‘no’ to Christ of some of the Jews forms a step in the fulfilling of the promise to Israel through Christianity. Osterriecher is adamant that “it was misleading to say ‘the Jews’ had rejected Christ [because] . . . long before the Lord’s coming, millions of Jews were living in the diaspora.”<sup>15</sup> Then secondly, it was some of the Jews who indeed welcomed Christ and formed the nucleus of the new People of God (Romans 11:5). However, the theological reflection on those who

did reject him can be found in the teaching of Jesus. See, for example, the *Parable of the Great Feast* (Luke 14:15-24) or the *Parable of the Tenant Farmers* (Luke 20: 9-19). Both parables indicate God's handing over of something to a different group from the ones who were originally intended to receive what was being offered.

This is the point: the move from the centrality of Israel is a stage in the establishment of another entity in the unfolding of God's plan. However, there is a continuing link between the two entities. St. Paul expanded on this relationship in his *Letter to the Romans*. This letter was referred to in the quotation from the Second Vatican Council above. St. Paul wrote to the Romans:

But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, a wild olive shoot, were grafted in their place and have come to share in the rich root of the olive tree, do not boast against the branches (Romans 11:17).

Then Paul goes on: "If you do boast, consider that you do not support the root, the root supports you" (Romans 11: 18).

Hans Urs von Balthasar finds the distinctiveness and the unity of the old and new People of God not only in the *Letter to the Romans* but also in the work of the Protestant theologian Karl Barth. Both theologians recognize that the distinctiveness of the two parts of the People of God lies in the fact that Israel and the Church "represent two sides of the one redemptive mystery of the Cross: the side of judgment and the side of grace" respectively.<sup>16</sup> For von Balthasar, expressing the relationship in this way overcomes a purely intra-historical interpretation where the relation is reduced to mere phases in the education of mankind.<sup>17</sup> However, there is much more because, "It is God himself who is interpreting himself in this form—not the God of an idealist world-process, but the God of supreme freedom and supreme love."<sup>18</sup> It is in the exercise of this love and freedom that von Balthasar concludes that "this God is so free that he can reject the election that had apparently been definitive, breaking the sealed covenant and replacing it with a new one."<sup>19</sup>

In another theological reflection, von Balthasar likens the relationship of Christ to the Church and Judaism, to the Lukan crucifixion scene where Christ is crucified with two malefactors, one on a cross on Jesus' right and one on a cross on his left (Luke 23: 33 - 43).<sup>20</sup> Thus, in von Balthasar's view, Jesus is "in solidarity" with both malefactors, even with the one representing the old People of God, who rejects him (Luke 23: 39). The solidarity of Jesus, with the latter, lies in

Jesus' taking on the role of the Suffering Servant (Isaiah 52) of the Old Testament, who exemplifies the suffering role that Israel was to take.<sup>21</sup> The other malefactor symbolizes the new People of God, who embrace Jesus and receive the promise of Paradise (Luke 23:43).

The situation of the two malefactors in von Balthasar's theology shows that the suffering of the Jews is not redemptive. However, von Balthasar does turn to Jewish writers such as Max Brod, to indicate that their suffering is part of the mysterious plan of God who has given them the privilege of suffering.<sup>22</sup> The 'no' of some of the Jews to Jesus Christ was necessary within the plan of salvation.<sup>23</sup> Their rejection of Christ set up the complex formed by the existence of the two entities, the continuing Jewish religion and the Church of Jesus Christ. Here we have to be clear: the one entity, the Church, is the new People of God in a dialogical relationship with the old People of God, which is the "root" mentioned by St. Paul.

The dialogical nature of the relationship was highlighted by John Paul II.<sup>24</sup> For him, the Church is in a permanent dialogue with Judaism, and thus it is learning about itself. He explains that the Church has learned the liturgy of the hours and the structures of the Eucharistic prayers from the old People of God. Even some of the Church's feasts such as Easter and Pentecost are reminders of the Jewish liturgical year. The Pope also referred to the encounter between Jesus and the disciples at Emmaus (Luke 24) to show the "intrinsic value" of the Old Testament. He could show this value because Jesus himself showed this value.

I would suggest that the bare notion of dialogue needs to be modified by considering that the relationship between the old and the new People of God is much like the relationship between the Old Testament and the New. Only this understanding retains the nature of the New Testament as the *fulfillment* of the Old and yet recognizes the continued existence of the Old. Only this understanding sustains the special composite nature of God's people (old and new) in history.

Perhaps von Balthasar has hit upon a singularly useful term for moving along the analysis of the relationship between the two peoples: the ancient concept of the form.<sup>25</sup> In a quote that reveals the distinction between the Jewish religion and Catholicism, he says:

For us [Catholics], this means that the particular mode of formlessness which is Israel's transcends itself objectively in such a way that it comes truly into its own in the particular mode in which the Christian Church knows that it is a form, and is also legitimated as such on the basis of Israel.<sup>26</sup>

First, it is the form of Judaism and the Christian religion taken together (which means respecting the integrity of the form) that has meaning. As an illustration of what he means, von Balthasar turns to the Church's use of the psalms in prayer. To quote him:

The Church would not have been right to make such wide employment of Israel's hymns of praise for its own prayer if it had not been ready to pray the psalms of penitence, judgment and confession with Israel too, and this means knowing and feeling that it is guilty and subject to failure along with Israel.<sup>27</sup>

So the elements of the Old Covenant do not dissolve in the New, as if they have simply been replaced. Instead the New Covenant only has its historical form through its retention of the elements of the Old. They are retained even though they are only types of the fulfillment to come. They are retained because the nature of time itself has changed with the coming of Christ. In the Old Testament, "every deed and every word of God signifies both fulfillment (because it is God who is present) and promise (because God addresses and acts in the time which continues)."<sup>28</sup> However the new time ushered in by Christ "begins its promise with the fulfillment of the old time." Any lesser claim would miss the significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

One consequence of this view is that faith is required to see this structure of promise and fulfillment. The result of this apparently simple insight is that the merely historical view and the merely diplomatic view, cannot hope to grasp the truth of this relationship between the old People of God and the new.

These are some of the theological consequences of a Jewish rejection of Christ. Turning to the third theme . . .

### ***3. Salvation History has an Eschaton, a Conclusion that Embraces Both the Church and Israel***

The canonization of Edith Stein gave the Holy Father an opportunity to express his prayer for a particular conclusion to the tension between the Church and Judaism—in the words of Edith Stein, "that the Lord may be received by his own."<sup>29</sup> In his prayer at the canonization, John Paul II prayed that "by her prayers, bring all to recognize their Savior in the crucified Christ and through him, to arrive at the vision of your glory."<sup>30</sup> I think that it is at this point, that von Balthasar sees that the conclusion of history is where "rejection and

election are brought into equilibrium.”<sup>31</sup> They are in equilibrium because Israel’s ultimate hope is in some way the same as that of the Church.

The Second Vatican Council saw that the Jewish religion has a distinct existence alongside the Church, but it also had the expectation that “a single voice” would arise to give glory to God, at some time in the future (NA, 4). Significantly, the Council did not say whether this “one voice” would occur in history or only at the end of time.

This means that the complex of the Church and the Jewish religion will continue. But what exactly does ‘continue’ mean? It is not as simple as Europe and Africa continuing to exist in juxtaposition. The Church is of a different order of reality compared to the existence of Judaism. The different orders are indicated in von Balthasar’s argument that it is John the Baptist who “is ‘the greatest’ of all who point and yet it is only as ‘the least’ that he penetrates the time of fulfillment.”<sup>32</sup> John the Baptist encapsulates the relationship between the Old Covenant People of God and the New. In sum then, speaking of Judaism:

Even if it [Judaism] cannot or will not fill out the form [by acknowledging Christ], the form remains standing nevertheless, as the requirement of the ‘law’ to love God above all things and one’s neighbor as oneself, and as the requirement of the cult to pour out again and again before God the blood that had been withheld.<sup>33</sup>

What we have here is what von Balthasar would call the “logic of revelation” where the chronologically earlier events provide “the indispensable access to understanding the mystery of Christ.”<sup>34</sup> But the ‘events along a timeline,’ to crudely characterize the historical structure of the Old Testament, are now ‘arranged,’ they are given their full meaning, by the New Testament event of Jesus Christ. It is as if the events of the Old Testament are a circle pointing to the center, although the ‘center’ could not be deduced from the Old Testament events (which is where the metaphor breaks down). The time-bound is pointing to the timeless, the fullness of the Christ-event. Hence there is an inescapable tension between the Old Covenant and the New, and this is maintained by the continuing coexistence of the old and the new People of God. This coexistence is suggested by the Holy Father’s reference to the “elder brother” who by the fact of being a brother is still part of the dynamic of the family.<sup>35</sup> This vision of the form of the Jewish religion (the relevance of its relationship with the land—the State of Israel) and Catholicism does recognize the unique features of the old stock and the

new graft (to borrow terms from Paul) as well as their unity. It also grounds the relations between the Church and the state of Israel. The latter only regained its existence in the twentieth century, and the Vatican (as representing and heading up the Catholic Church) has recognized its role of cooperation and support in the Holy Land, where the Vatican, understanding itself as a “member of the international community,” calls for peace and the recognition of the existence of two states, Israel and Palestine.<sup>36</sup> Clearly, the State of Israel must continue to exist.

In conclusion, consider this statement of Marshall Breger:

Any student of modern Christianity will understand immediately the extraordinary changes that have taken place in recent Vatican thinking towards Judaism and the Jewish people.<sup>37</sup>

Statements like this need to be the occasion for further study. It is crucial to note the distinction between the theological and political realms as well as their interrelationship.

The theological themes have been sketched out above. The Church has also made political decisions through the ages, some good and some bad. The Commission for Relations with the Jews has studied this issue and says for example that “despite the Christian preaching of love for all, even for one’s enemies, the prevailing mentality down the centuries penalized minorities and those who were in any way ‘different.’”<sup>38</sup> The latter actions have been the subject of apologies by the Catholic Church.

I would further submit that while the theology is not new, the political thinking shifted because of the establishment of the State of Israel. The Church was now dealing with a new entity, a state that could control its borders and control access to the holy places so dear to Christians. This is a shift from the political situation of 1904 when Pius X said that:

we cannot prevent the Jews from going to Jerusalem-but we would never sanction it...The Jews have never recognized our Lord and therefore we cannot recognize the Jewish people.<sup>39</sup>

It must also be noted that the positive diplomatic developments have led amongst other things to the *Fundamental Agreement* between the Vatican and the State of Israel. In 1993, the two signed an accord and exchanged ambassadors. This is an instance of what Breger calls

‘comparative religious diplomacy.’<sup>40</sup> By naming ‘diplomacy,’ he has in fact indicated the distinction between theology and politics that I have been emphasizing, namely the distinction between theology as the theoretical religious principles and politics as the practical application of those principles to specific situations in states and between states.

In fact, there is a theological note in von Balthasar’s work that brings the theological and the diplomatic together, namely, Judaism still has some ties to the land which Catholicism developed after the end of the persecutions and then lost. In von Balthasar’s words, the specific quality of Israel is that:

It is never possible in Israel to abstract from time and place, or to relativise the holy land and later, the holy city, the temple as God’s dwelling place, the sacrifices which are to be offered only there, and the whole world of the ceremonies.<sup>41</sup>

The Vatican’s recognition of the State of Israel sets this principle as a concrete reality. In this way, the concrete elements of the theological form (the complex of the old and the new People of God) are maintained even as the precise nature of the relationship between Catholicism and Judaism is not delineated because the form is not completely defined; it remains mysterious. However, the theological foundations of this form have been indicated, and as events in the last century have witnessed, they have been revisited by the Church and applied to the practical relations between the Church and Judaism and the State of Israel.

Finally, it must be kept in mind that the Church is in an ongoing reflection for past wrongs, initiated by John Paul II. In his letter to Cardinal Cassidy, President of the Holy See’s Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, John Paul II wrote of his hope “that the document [entitled “We remember the Shoah”] will help to heal the wounds of past misunderstandings and injustices.”<sup>42</sup>

## Notes

1. My deep thanks to the people who posed questions on this theme and made suggestions when the paper was presented and when I circulated it in the theology department.
2. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theodrama III: Dramatis Personae*, *Graham Harrison trans.*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992). Volumes in this series will be referred to by the abbreviation TD and the volume number.
3. *TD*, III, 391
4. John Paul II, *Interreligious Meeting at the Notre Dame Pontifical Institute*, Jerusalem, Thursday, 23rd March 2000, art. 2, [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va).
5. Hans Urs von Balthasar, "The Church and Israel," *Explorations in Theology II: Spouse of the Word*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 289ff.
6. "The Church and Israel," 290.
7. John Paul II, *Address to the Synagogue of Rome*, 13th April 1986. "Il primo è che la Chiesa di Cristo scopre il suo 'legame' con l'Ebraismo 'scrutando il suo proprio mistero'."
8. John Paul II, *Address to the Synagogue in Sydney*, 26 November 1986, 4.
9. John Paul II, *Speech to the Chief Rabbis at Hechal Schlomo*, Thursday, 23rd March 2000, [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)
10. Mgr Paul Guérin ed., *Concile de Narbonne, L'an 1227, Les Conciles - Généraux et Particuliers*, Athur Savaète ed., (Paris: 76 Rue de St. Pères, 1868), 441. (My translation.)
11. See for example Francis E. Gigot, "The Jews (as a Religion)", in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1910. [www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)
12. Gigot, "The Jews (as a religion)."

13. Claudia Carlen IHM, *The Papal Encyclicals 1740 - 1878*, (New York: McGrath Publishing Co., 1981).

14. Mgr. Paul Guerin ed., *Les Conciles 2*, 367 (my translation).

15. John M. Oesterreicher, *Introduction and Commentary on The Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, III*, Herbert Vorgrimler gen. ed. (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 24.

16. *TD*, III, 398.

17. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord I: Seeing the Form*, Erasmo Leiva Merikakis trans., (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 655. Henceforward this series will be referred to by the abbreviation GL followed by the volume number.

18. *GL I*, 655.

19. *GL I*, 656.

20. *TD*, III, 398.

21. *TD*, III, 398.

22. *TD*, III, 398.

23. See also Roy H. Schoeman, *Salvation is from the Jews*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2003).

24. John Paul II, *General Audience*, Wednesday 28 April 1999. [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)

25. For a complete history of the term see Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord IV: The Realm of Metaphysics in Antiquity*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989) and *The Glory of the Lord V: The Realm of Metaphysics in the Modern World*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991).

26. Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Glory of the Lord VI*, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 403. Volumes in this series will be referred to by the abbreviation GL followed by the volume number.

27. *GL*, VI, 409.
28. *GL*, VII, 413.
29. Schoeman, 162.
30. Schoeman, 162.
31. *Church and Israel*, 295.
32. *GL* VI, 411.
33. *GL* VI, 412.
34. *GL* VI, 412.
35. John Paul II, *Address at the Synagogue of Rome*, 13 April, 1986.  
[www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)
36. John Paul II, *Address of the Holy Father John Paul II to H.E. Mr. Oded Ben-Hur, new Ambassador of Israel to the Holy See*, Monday 2 June 2003. [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va)
37. Marshall Breger ed., *The Vatican Israel Accords: Political, Legal, and Theological Contexts*, (Notre Dame IN: Notre Dame Press, 2004), 1.
38. Commission on Relations with the Jews, *We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah*. [www.vatican.va](http://www.vatican.va).
39. Quoted in Breger, 2.
40. Breger, 3.
41. VI, 411. See also Schoeman, 65.
42. John Paul II, 12 March 1998.

