

Anti-Semitism: A Catholic Critique

JOSEPH CARDINAL BERNARDIN

Anti-Semitism is a modern term, having first appeared only in the nineteenth century. But it is rooted in the reality of suspicion, contempt, hostility, and hatred toward Jews that goes back to ancient times. As Father Edward Flannery has shown in his classic work on anti-Semitism, *The Anguish of the Jews*,¹ the early Christian community inherited cultural traditions from the Graeco-Roman civilization that included a prejudicial outlook towards Jews. They were disliked in pre-Christian Greece and Rome for their general unwillingness to conform to prevailing social mores.

There were other factors that also likely contributed to the development of anti-Jewish feelings among Christians in the first centuries of the Church's existence. For one, the

overwhelming number of early Christians came from Graeco-Roman communities with little personal acquaintance with Jews and Judaism. We now know from scholars dealing with early Christianity, such as Robert L. Wilken² and Anthony Saldarini,³ that the final break between Judaism and Christianity was a far more gradual process than we once imagined, extending into the third and fourth centuries in some areas of the East. Nevertheless, the *effective* influence of Jewish Christianity upon the Church at large dwindled rapidly after the pivotal decision reached by Paul and the representatives of the Jerusalem Church at what is often called the Council of Jerusalem. As a result, there ceased to exist any countervailing positive identification with Jews and their religious heritage that could overcome the new converts' inbred cultural prejudices. This tendency towards separation from anything Jewish was further enhanced by the desire to avoid any linkage between the Church and the Jewish community after the disastrous Jewish revolt against the Roman imperial authorities (66-70 C.E.) which, besides the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, resulted in continued post-war retribution by Rome against the Jewish community.

Another factor contributing to the emergence of anti-Semitism in early Christianity may be the image of Jews that emerges from the New Testament itself. There are texts that remain open to anti-Semitic interpretation, and there is ample evidence that such interpretations emerged in the first centuries of Christian history. What is not so certain is whether any of the texts themselves can be legitimately termed "anti-Semitic." Scholars differ significantly in their judgments on this point and will likely do so for the foreseeable future. Some feel that much of the conflict can be understood as internal Jewish polemic, which was not uncommon in that period, as we know from certain Jewish documents, the Talmud in particular. Others believe that, for one reason or another, imprecise language was

introduced by New Testament translators, rendering, for example, the pivotal term *hoi Iudaioi* in the Gospel of John as “the Jews” rather than in a more restricted sense of “Jewish leaders.” Retranslation, where scholarly consensus can be achieved, ought to be a goal we pursue in the effort at eradicating anti-Semitism. But such consensus does not appear to be on the immediate horizon.

With little hope for a scholarly resolution of the question of anti-Semitism in the New Testament, we need a pastoral approach to the issue. Father Raymond Brown, S.S., a renowned scholar on the Gospel of John, has suggested the basis of such an approach, at least with respect to the Fourth Gospel, which is generally considered among the most problematic of all New Testament books in its outlook towards Jews and Judaism. In commenting on John’s use of the term “the Jews,” Brown expresses his conviction that, by deliberately using this generic term (where other gospel writers refer to the Jewish authorities or various Second Temple Jewish parties), John meant to extend to the Synagogue of his own day the blame that an earlier tradition had pinned on the Jewish authorities. Although John was not the first to engage in such extension, he is the most insistent New Testament author in this regard. Brown attributes this process in John to the persecution that Christians were experiencing in that time at the hands of the Synagogue authorities. Jews who professed Jesus to be the Messiah had been officially expelled from Judaism, thus making them vulnerable to Roman investigation and punishment. Jews were tolerated by Rome, but who were these Christians whom the Jews disclaimed?

Raymond Brown holds that this teaching of John about the Jews, which resulted from the historical conflict between Church and Synagogue at that time, can no longer be taught as authentic doctrine or catechesis by contemporary Christianity. This is the key pastoral point. Christians today must come to

see that such teachings, while a realistic part of the biblical heritage, can no longer be regarded as authentic teaching in light of our improved historical understanding of developments in the relationship between early Christianity and the Jewish community of the time. As Brown says in his book, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, "It would be incredible for a twentieth-century Christian to share or justify the Johannine contention that 'the Jews' are the children of the Devil, an affirmation which is placed on the lips of Jesus (8:44)."⁴ Negative passages such as these must be evaluated in the light of the Second Vatican Council's strong affirmation in its Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions (*Nostra Aetate*) that Jews remain a covenanted people, revered by God. The teaching of recent Popes has also emphasized this. Pope John Paul II, in particular, has often highlighted the intimate bond that exists between Jews and Christians who are united in one ongoing covenant.

The formal expulsion of Christians from the Synagogue, which seemingly lay behind the Fourth Gospel's negative attitudes towards Jews, was only the beginning of trouble for the Jewish community. Unfortunately, there soon developed within the teachings of the early Fathers of the Church a strong tendency to regard Jews as entirely displaced from the covenantal relationship because of their unwillingness to accept Jesus as the Messiah, despite the clear teaching to the contrary on the part of St. Paul in Romans 9-11 (which served as a basis for the Second Vatican Council's renewed constructive theology of the Christian-Jewish relationship).

This belief, that the Jews had been totally rejected by God and replaced in the covenantal relationship by the "New Israel," led to the emergence of another widespread doctrine in patristic writings; namely, the so-called "perpetual wandering" theology, which argued that the fate of the Jews, as a consequence of their displacement from the covenant, was to

live forever among the peoples of the earth in a miserable state without a homeland of their own as an enduring sign of sinfulness and a perpetual warning to others of what they could expect if they failed to accept Christ. This theology became so deep-seated in popular Western culture that even a familiar houseplant took on its name. This was the prevailing theology among the Church Fathers with only a few exceptions.

We can illustrate this theology of “perpetual wandering” with references from certain central figures in the patristic era. Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 265-339 C.E.), for example, speaks of how the royal metropolis of the Jews (i.e., Jerusalem) would be destroyed by fire and the city would become inhabited no longer by Jews, “but by races of other stock, while they [i.e., the Jews] would be dispersed among the Gentiles throughout the whole world with never a hope of any cessation of evil or breathing space from troubles.”⁵ St. Cyprian of Carthage (c. 210-58 C.E.), relying on various prophetic texts, which suggest desolation and exile as a result of sin, envisioned Israel as having entered its final state of desolation and exile. Following in the same vein, St. Hippolytus of Rome (fl. 217-35 C.E.) insisted that, unlike the exilic experiences suffered by the Jews at the hands of the Egyptians and the Babylonians in earlier times, the postbiblical exile would continue throughout the course of human history. In the East, St. John Chrysostom (344-407 C.E.) clearly linked the now permanent Jewish exile condition with the “killing of Christ.” And St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430 C.E.) in his classic work, *City of God*, speaks several times of the Jews as having “their back bent down always.”

While the patristic writings were far more than an extended anti-Jewish treatise, Christians cannot ignore this dimension of their thought, this “shadow side” of their theology, which in other aspects remains a continuing source of spiritual richness. Jews know this theology very well. Unfortunately, it has been

omitted in our basic Christian teaching texts far too often. Yet, we cannot understand the treatment of Jews in subsequent centuries without a basic understanding of this theology. The history to which it gave rise is filled with persistent forms of social and religious anti-Semitism, which brought upon the Jewish community continual humiliation as well as social and political inequality. On occasion, this further degenerated into outright physical suffering and even death, especially in such periods as that of the Crusades.

This legacy of anti-Semitism, with its profoundly negative social consequences for Jews as individuals and for the Jewish community as a whole, remained the dominant social pattern in Western Christian lands until the twentieth century. While we can point to some notable breaks in this pattern on occasion in such countries as Spain and Poland, as well as for individual Jews in the liberal democracies created in parts of Europe and North America, the respite was sometimes short-lived and, as in the case of Spain, followed by even more flagrant forms of attack on the Jewish community.

At the dawn of the twentieth century the theology of perpetual divine judgment upon the Jewish people did not vanish overnight. Rather, it continued to exercise a decisive role in shaping Catholicism's initial reactions, for example, to the idea of restoring a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. It also had a central role in shaping popular Christian attitudes towards the Nazis and their stated goal of eliminating all Jews from Europe and beyond through deliberate extermination. While we shall return to this question of classical anti-Semitism and its role during that period, there is little question that this persistent tradition provided an indispensable seedbed for the Nazis' ability to succeed as far as they did in their master plan. They would not have secured the popular support they enjoyed were it not for the continuing influence of traditional Christian anti-Semitism on the masses of baptized believers in Europe.

It is only in the three decades or so since the beginning of the Second Vatican Council that this negative theology of the Jewish people has lost its theological foundations. For, in Chapter Four of its historic document on non-Christian religions, the Council clearly asserted that there never was a valid basis either for the charge of collective guilt against the Jewish community for supposedly "murdering the Messiah" or for the consequent theology of permanent Jewish suffering and displacement. With its positive affirmation (following St. Paul in Romans 9-11) of continued covenantal inclusion on the part of Jews after the coming of Christ, the Council permanently removed all basis for the long-held "perpetual wandering" theology and the social deprivation and suffering that flowed from it.

My predecessors in the U.S. Catholic hierarchy played a central role in the development and passage of *Nostra Aetate*. They worked hand-in-hand with European bishops and theologians, who had played an important role in Catholic resistance movements to the Nazis in France and the Netherlands, as well as with pioneer thinkers in the United States, such as the late Msgr. John Oesterreicher of the Institute for Judaean-Christian Studies at Seton Hall University. As a result, the U.S. bishops helped overcome initial hesitation on the part of some Council Fathers regarding the proposed document. This conciliar declaration represents one of the most important contributions made by U.S. Catholicism to the Council.

The strong support given *Nostra Aetate* by the U.S. bishops must be seen in the context of a developing relationship between Catholics and Jews (together with some Protestant groups as well) that dates back to the twenties. It was at this time that Catholics and Jews, in particular, with a shared experience of exclusion from important facets of national life, began to forge coalitions through labor unions and other social organizations to wage a joint struggle against discrimination in

such areas as employment and housing. Both had seen the signs in the large metropolitan areas of the country: "Neither Catholics nor Jews need apply."

These social bonds grew even closer in the following decades. As a result Catholic and Jewish leaders cooperated on promoting the passage of major new social legislation during the period of the New Deal.⁶ While this unprecedented cooperation in the social sphere did not immediately lead to wholesale changes in the way Catholic religious materials presented Jews and Judaism, it resulted in a sense of new trust and commitment between Catholics and Jews. This had a decidedly positive impact on the U.S. bishops when they took up consideration of the proposed text of *Nostra Aetate*. Their experience left them convinced of a basic compatibility between the Christian and Jewish traditions, despite what "displacement" theology had maintained. The human bondedness forged out of three decades of intensive social cooperation eventually was translated at the Council into support for *Nostra Aetate's* sense of theological bondedness.

The U.S. bishops at the Second Vatican Council and their official consultants had the advantage of recent studies on the teaching materials most widely used in Catholic schools and CCD programs. These studies were undertaken by a team of Catholic researchers at St. Louis University: Sisters Linus Gleason, Rita Mudd, and Rose Thering. The first two studies, covering literature and social studies texts, basically revealed a minimal focus on Jews and Jewish history. So, Catholic students would learn little, if anything, about Jews and Judaism from these texts.

Sister Thering's study of catechetical texts showed quite a different result from the first two. Jews were the most visible among the religious, racial, and ethnic minorities about whom she gathered data. Moreover, they and their religious practices and beliefs were presented in a very unfavorable light, including

widespread denunciations of the Pharisees, continued collective accusations against the Jewish community at large for direct involvement in Jesus' execution, and the Jewish "inheritance" of a permanent divine curse as a consequence of murdering the Messiah.⁷ Confronted by this data from their own teaching materials, and conscious of a growing consensus among Catholic scholars that such a picture of Jews and Judaism had little basis in fact, the U.S. bishops took a leadership role at the Council. They pressed for a substantial reformulation of the theology of the Church's relationship to the Jewish People, one that, unlike its predecessor "displacement/perpetual wandering" perspective, set the relationship on a fundamentally positive course.

The Second Vatican Council's removal of the classical "displacement/perpetual wandering" theology from contemporary Catholic catechesis has been enhanced in subsequent documents from the Holy See and Pope John Paul II. The Holy See's 1985 *Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church*, issued in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of *Nostra Aetate*, made two very important constructive affirmations, especially when these are set over against the history of Catholicism's traditional approach to Jewish existence after the coming of Christ. Both occur in paragraph #25 where the *Notes* maintain that "the history of Israel did not end in 70 A.D. [i.e., with the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple by the Romans] . . . It continued, especially in a numerous Diaspora which allowed Israel to carry to the whole world a witness. . . . while preserving the memory of the land of their forefathers at the heart of their hope" and, subsequently, that "the permanence of Israel (while so many ancient peoples have disappeared without a trace) is a historic fact and a sign to be interpreted within God's design."⁸ These statements clearly repudiate the "displacement" theology.

Pope John Paul II, who has contributed significantly to the development of the Church's new theological outlook on Jews and Judaism,⁹ wrote the following in his 1984 statement *Redemptionis Anno*:

For the Jewish people who live in the State of Israel and who preserve in that land such precious testimonies of their history and their faith, we must ask for the desired security and the due tranquillity that is the prerogative of every nation and condition of life and of progress of every society.¹⁰

The statement clearly exhibits on the part of the Holy Father a sense of the deep intertwining of faith and continued attachment to the land on the part of the Jewish People, a sense that further draws out the profound implications of the renewed theology of the Christian-Jewish relationship put forth by the Second Vatican Council.

Two recent documents of the Holy See further seal the coffin of the biblically unfounded "displacement" theology. The first is the text of the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church* which reaffirms the two major points on which the Council built its new theological approach to the Jews. In paragraph #597 the Catechism rejects any idea that all Jews then or now can be charged with the responsibility for Jesus' death. It reminds Christians that their sins were largely responsible for the need for Jesus to die on the Cross in order to save the human family. And paragraph #839 speaks of the distinctiveness of Jewish faith as an authentic response to God's original revelation and underlines the permanence of the divine promises made to the people Israel.¹¹

The second document is the recent Holy See-Israeli Accords, which led to the establishment of a full diplomatic

relationship between the Holy See and the State of Israel. While this is fundamentally a political document that develops a framework for dealing with concrete issues, there is an underlying theological significance to this document, recognized in its Preamble, given the longstanding theological approach to Jewish political sovereignty on the part of the Catholic tradition. The Preamble has set this essentially political document within the overall context of the Catholic-Jewish reconciliation underway in the Church since the Second Vatican Council,

aware of the unique nature of the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people, and the historic process of reconciliation and growth in mutual understanding and friendship between Catholics and Jews.

Various Catholic leaders, in commenting on the Accords' significance, have made similar connections. William Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore, President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, has described the Accords as providing "a major step forward in the dialogue of reconciliation between the Roman Catholic Church and the Jewish people emphasized by the Second Vatican Council." And John Cardinal O'Connor of New York, episcopal moderator for the U.S. Bishops' Committee on Catholic-Jewish Relations, has said that the signing of the Accords represented "an historic moment in the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people in this country." He added that, for him, they serve as a concrete expression of the intimate bond between Jews and Christians and of the Church's rootedness in Judaism.

I endorse the perspective on the Accords of my brother bishops. I also point out that article #2 of the Accords contains a very strong and unequivocal condemnation by the Holy See

of “hatred, persecution, and all other manifestations of anti-Semitism directed against the Jewish people and individual Jews.” I welcome this forthright statement as well as the accompanying pledge by the Holy See and the State of Israel to cooperate in every possible way

in combating all forms of anti-Semitism and all kinds of racism and of religious intolerance, and in promoting mutual understanding among nations, tolerance among communities, and respect for human life and dignity.

(article #1)

This makes concrete the renewed theological vision of the Christian-Jewish relationship developed at the Second Vatican Council. It also solidifies the notion that all forms of racism, including anti-Semitism, are fundamentally sinful, as first expressed in the 1989 Holy See document on racism.¹²

The Holy See’s action in formally recognizing Israel through the Accords represents a final seal on the process begun at the Second Vatican Council to rid Catholicism of all vestiges of “displacement theology” and the implied notion of perpetual Jewish homelessness. By so doing, it has refocused the Jewish-Christian conversation. The Accords represent the Catholic Church’s full and final acknowledgment of Jews as a *people*, not merely as individuals or of Judaism as a religion. For the vast majority of Jews, Israel signifies their ultimate tie to Jewish peoplehood, their central point of self-identity. And, as the Holy See’s 1974 *Guidelines* on Catholic-Jewish relations pointed out, authentic dialogue requires that all partners come to understand and respect one another as they define themselves. As Arthur Hertzberg has shown very well in his classic work, *The French Enlightenment and the Jews*,¹³ even democratic societies that were prepared to grant Jews a measure

of individual and civil freedom were unable to accept the Jewish notion of peoplehood.

Let us now return to the issue of Nazism and anti-Semitism which continues to elicit considerable discussion today. Some perspectives on this question draw virtually a straight line from classical Christian anti-Semitism to the Nazi effort to annihilate all the Jews of Europe. They point, for example, to Hitler's often-quoted remark to Church leaders, who came to see him to protest his treatment of Jews, that he was merely putting into practice what the Christian churches had preached for nearly two thousand years. These perspectives also highlight the acknowledged impact of Martin Luther's writings on the Jewish question as well as the close similarity between much of Nazi anti-Jewish legislation and laws against Jews in earlier Christian-dominated societies.

As I have already pointed out, there is little doubt that classical Christian anti-Semitism was a central factor in generating popular support for the Nazi undertaking, along with economic greed, religious and political nationalism, and ordinary human fear. For many baptized Christians, it constituted the primary reason for their personal collaboration with the Nazi movement. Some even went so far as to define the Nazi struggle against the Jews in explicitly religious and theological terms. In the Church today, we must not minimize the extent of Christian involvement with Hitler and his associates. It remains a moral challenge that we must continue to confront.

Nevertheless, in the final analysis, I have come to accept the perspective of those Jewish and Christian scholars who argue for the ultimate distinctiveness of the Holocaust. It was not simply the final and most gruesome chapter in the long history of Christian anti-Semitism. Rather, it was rooted in modern theories of inherent biological and racial inferiority coupled with the escalation of bureaucratic and technological

capacities. The Nazi leadership coalesced several important modern strains of thought into a master plan for the supposed advancement of humanity.

To bring this plan to realization required, as the Nazis envisioned it, the elimination of the “dregs” of society. These they defined as first and foremost the Jewish people, but the category also was extended to embrace the disabled, Gypsies, the Polish leadership, homosexuals, and certain other designated groups. Proper distinctions need to be maintained between the wholesale attack on the Jewish people, for whom there was absolutely no escape from Nazi fury, and the others subjected to systematic Nazi attack. But there is also a linkage with the victimization of these other groups whose suffering and death were integral, not peripheral, to the overall Nazi plan. This is what makes the Holocaust *sui generis*, even though the fate of its primary victims had important ties to classical Christian anti-Semitism.

Confronting the legacy of anti-Semitism will not prove easy, but confront it we must. The Catholic Church's continued moral integrity demands it. There are several ways in which this needs to be done. First, a history of anti-Semitism and of anti-Judaic theology must be restored to our Catholic teaching materials. Innocence or ignorance is not a pathway to authentic virtue in this regard; courageous honesty is. In our religious education programs we should be prepared to tell the full story of the Church's treatment of Jews over the centuries, ending with a rejection of that history and theology at the Second Vatican Council. We can and should highlight moments of relative tranquillity and constructive interaction, but these stories should never be allowed to obscure the more pronounced history of hostility and subjection.

What is true of the history of anti-Semitism in general applies even more strongly to the Holocaust. While defending the Church and Church leaders against unwarranted

accusations, we must be prepared to deal with the real failures of the Christian churches during that critical period and to allow a full scrutiny of Church activities by reputable scholars. Education about the Holocaust should also become a prominent feature in Catholic education at every level.

Above all, in light of the history of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust, as a Church we need to engage in public repentance. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, with whose members Catholics in several parts of the country, including Chicago, are united in covenant, has recently provided the entire Christian family with a fine example of how this may be done. Its sensitive, yet decisive, rejection of Martin Luther's later teachings on Jews and Judaism, which proved so attractive to Hitler, stands as a model for all Christians. Hopefully, the time may not be too far off when the ecumenical body of Christian believers can take equal responsibility for those parts of the Christian tradition shared by all the baptized that have led over the centuries to disastrous consequences for the Jewish people.

In this context we need to take very seriously the challenge recently presented to the Church at large by Pope John Paul II, in his Apostolic Letter on the approaching third millennium of Christianity. The Holy Father calls upon the Christian community, in preparation for the millennial celebration, to foster a genuine spirit of repentance for "the acquiescence given, especially in certain centuries, to intolerance and even the use of violence in the service of truth." The Church, he adds, bears an obligation "to express profound regret for the weaknesses of so many of her sons and daughters who sullied her face, preventing her from fully mirroring the image of her crucified Lord, the supreme witness of patient love and of humble meekness."¹⁴

We must also attend still further to the quality of our educational materials relative to the Christian-Jewish

relationship. A recent study by Dr. Philip A. Cunningham has reported very significant progress in most areas in a large majority of the currently available materials.¹⁵ However, it is important that teachers fully understand the scope of the changes introduced by *Nostra Aetate* in its repudiation of Christian claims about Jewish collective responsibility for Jesus' death and its reaffirmation of the Pauline vision of Jews as continuing members of the covenanted family of believers. To that end, I encourage efforts, such as those of the Institute of Catholic-Jewish Education, co-sponsored by the Sisters of Zion and the American Jewish Committee in Chicago, which bring the new Catholic teaching on Jews and Judaism directly to teachers in Catholic parochial and Jewish day schools. Similar efforts are required throughout the country.

The new Catechism, as I have already indicated, has fundamentally incorporated the perspective of *Nostra Aetate* on the Church and the Jewish people into its basic plan for Catholic catechesis.¹⁶ Nonetheless, we must continue to exercise sensitivity regarding the proper interpretation of certain statements in the Catechism lest they be misunderstood, and we should continue to note some continuing concerns raised by Jewish leaders in the dialogue, like Rabbi Leon Klenicki.¹⁷

Liturgy and preaching are additional areas that require continued attention by the Church. In 1988, the U.S. Bishop's Committee on the Liturgy released a set of guidelines for the presentation of Jews and Judaism in Catholic preaching.¹⁸ They offer directions for implementing the vision of *Nostra Aetate* and subsequent documents of the Holy See in the Church's ministry of the Word during the various liturgical seasons. Especially highlighted are the seasons of Lent/Holy Week and Easter, whose texts can serve to reinforce classical Christian stereotypes of Jews and Judaism if not interpreted carefully. The great challenge of these liturgical seasons is that they become times of reconciliation between Jews and Christians

rather than conflict and division as they were in past centuries. Christians need to recognize their profound bonds with the Jewish people during these central periods of the liturgical year in accord with the vision expressed by the Second Vatican Council and Pope John Paul II.

Unfortunately, too few of those commissioned to preach the word of God are as yet acquainted with this key document. This must change if we are to remove all possibility of the liturgy serving as a source of continued anti-Semitism within the Church. There is also need for a group of liturgical scholars and experts in the Christian-Jewish dialogue to meet on a sustained basis in order to examine how well the current liturgical texts measure up to the constructive theological vision of the Jewish-Christian relationship set forth by the Second Vatican Council and Pope John Paul II.

In the more than three decades since the close of the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church has made significant progress in overcoming the legacy of anti-Semitism. But our work is far from complete. The words of the Holy Father, spoken on a visit to Hungary in 1991, continue to serve as our guide, as the basis for a renewed commitment to the urgent task of repentance and reconciliation:

In face of a risk of a resurgence and spread of anti-Semitic feelings, attitudes, and initiatives, of which certain disquieting signs are to be seen today and of which we have experienced the most frightful results in the past, we must teach consciences to consider anti-Semitism, and all forms of racism, as sins against God and humanity.¹⁹

Notes

1. Edward Flannery, *The Anguish of the Jews* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985).

2. Wayne A. Meeks and Robert L. Wilken, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), and Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

3. Anthony Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1988), and *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

4. Raymond Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), pp. 41-42; see also "The Passion According to John: Chapters 18 and 19," *Worship*, 49 (March 1975), pp. 130-31.

5. Eusebius, *Demonstration of the Gospel*, I, 1.

6. John T. Pawlikowski, "A Growing Tradition of Ethical Critique," in John T. Pawlikowski, O.S.M. and Donald Senior, C.P., ed., *Economic Justice: CTU's Pastoral Commentary on the Bishops' Letter on the Economy* (Washington, D.C.: Pastoral Press, 1977), pp. 43-45.

7. John T. Pawlikowski, O.S.M., *Catechetics and Prejudice: How Catholic Teaching Materials View Jews, Protestants and Racial Minorities* (New York: Paulist Press, 1973), pp. 75-86.

8. Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, *Notes on the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church*, #25. The text can be found in Helga Croner, ed., *More Stepping Stones to Jewish-Christian Relations* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), pp. 230-31.

9. Eugene J. Fisher and León Klenicki, ed., *John Paul II on Jews and Judaism* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Catholic Conference, 1987).

10. See *The Pope Speaks*, 29:3 (1984), pp. 219-20.

11. See *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1994), #597, #839.

12. Pontifical Justice and Peace Commission, "The Church and Racism: Toward a More Fraternal Society," *Origins: CNS Documentary Service*, 18, No. 37 (February 23, 1989), pp. 613, 615-26.

13. Arthur Hertzberg, *The French Enlightenment and the Jews: The Origins of Modern Anti-Semitism* (New York: Schocken, 1968).

14. Pope John Paul II, "As The Third Millennium Draws Near," *Origins: CNS Documentary Service*, 24, No. 24 (November 24, 1994), p. 411.

15. Philip A. Cunningham, *Education for Shalom: Religion Textbooks and the Enhancement of the Catholic and Jewish Relationship* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995).

16. Eugene J. Fisher, "The New Catholic Catechism and the Jews: an Interfaith Jewish Reading," *SIDIC*, 27, No. 2, pp. 2-8.

17. Leon Klenicki, "The New Catholic Catechism and the Jews: an Interfaith Jewish Reading," *SIDIC*, 17, No. 2, pp. 9-18.

18. Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, *God's Mercy Endures Forever: Guidelines on the Presentation of Jews and Judaism in Catholic Preaching* (Washington, D.C., U.S. Catholic Conference, 1988).

19. Pope John Paul II, "The Sinfulness of Anti-Semitism," *Origins: CNS Documentary Service*, 21, No. 13 (September 5, 1991), p. 204. The Holy Father sounds a similar theme in reflecting on the meaning of Auschwitz in his new book, when he calls anti-Semitism "a great sin against humanity." See *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, ed. by Vittorio Messori (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1994), p. 96.

