

1. Shemot 21:1

וְאֵלֶּה הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁיִם לִפְנֵיהֶם:

And these are the laws that you shall set before them:

2. Rashi on Shemot 21:1

ואלה המשפטים. כל מקום שנאמר "אלה" פסל את הראשונים, "וְאֵלֶּה" מוסיף על הראשונים, מה הראשונים מסיני, אף אלו מסיני...

Wherever the המשפטים, "אלה", is used it cuts off (פוסל) the preceding section from that which it introduces; where, however, "וְאֵלֶּה" is used it adds something to the former subject (i. e. forms a continuation of it). So also here: "And these are the judgments (i. e. these, also)": What is the case with the former commandments (the הדברות)? They were given at Sinai! So these, too, were given at Sinai! (Mekhilta; Shemot Rabbah 30:3; cf. also Midrash Tanchuma, Mishpatim 3).

3. Maimonides, Mishneh Torah Laws of Teshuvah 3:8

שְׁלֹשָׁה הֵן הַנִּקְרָאִים אֶפִּיקוֹרְסִין. הָאוֹמֵר שֶׁאֵין שָׁם נְבוֹאָה כָּלֵל וְאֵין שָׁם מִדַּע שְׁמַגִּיעַ מִהַבּוֹרָא לְלֵב בְּנֵי הָאָדָם. וְהַמְכַחֵשׁ בְּבוֹאָתוֹ שֶׁל מֹשֶׁה רַבְּנוֹ. וְהָאוֹמֵר שֶׁאֵין הַבּוֹרָא יוֹדֵעַ מַעֲשֵׂה בְּנֵי הָאָדָם. כָּל אֶחָד מִשְׁלֹשָׁה אֵלֵינוּ הֵן אֶפִּיקוֹרוּסִים. שְׁלֹשָׁה הֵן הַכּוֹפְרִים בַּתּוֹרָה. הָאוֹמֵר שֶׁאֵין הַתּוֹרָה מֵעַם ה' אֶפְלוּ פָּסוּק אֶחָד אֶפְלוּ תִּבְּהָ אַחַת אִם אָמַר מֹשֶׁה אָמְרוּ מִפִּי עֲצָמוֹ הָרִי זֶה כּוֹפֵר בַּתּוֹרָה. וְכֵן הַכּוֹפֵר בְּפְרוּשָׁה וְהוּא תּוֹרָה שֶׁבְעַל פִּה וְהַמְכַחֵשׁ מַגִּידָהּ כְּגוֹן צְדוּק וּבִיתוֹס. וְהָאוֹמֵר שֶׁהַבּוֹרָא הִחְלִיף מִצְוָה זוֹ בְּמִצְוָה אַחֶרֶת וּכְבָר בְּטִלָּה תּוֹרָה זוֹ אִף עַל פִּי שֶׁהִיא הֵיטָה מֵעַם ה' כְּגוֹן הַהֲגָרִים. כָּל אֶחָד מִשְׁלֹשָׁה אֵלֵינוּ כּוֹפֵר בַּתּוֹרָה:

Three individuals are described as Epicursim: a) one who denies the existence of prophecy and maintains that there is no knowledge communicated from God to the hearts of men; b) one who disputes the prophecy of Moses, our teacher; c) one who maintains that the Creator is not aware of the deeds of men. Each of these three individuals is an Epicurus. There are three individuals who are considered as one "who denies the Torah": a) one who says Torah, even one verse or one word, is not from God. If he says: "Moses made these statements independently," he is denying the Torah. b) one who denies the Torah's interpretation, the oral law, or disputes [the authority of] its spokesmen as did Tzadok and Beitus. c) one who says that though the Torah came from God, the Creator has replaced one mitzvah with another one and nullified the original Torah, like the Arabs [and the Christians]. Each of these three individuals is considered as one who denies the Torah.

4. Devarim 34:10

וְלֹא-לָקָם נִבְיָא עוֹד בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל כְּמֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר יָדָעוּ יְהוָה פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים:

Never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses—whom Hashem singled out, face to face

5. Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, Confrontation

In any [interfaith] confrontation we must insist upon four basic conditions in order to safeguard our individuality and freedom of action.

First, we must state, in unequivocal terms, the following. We are a totally independent faith community. We do not revolve as a satellite in any orbit. Nor are we related to any other faith community as “brethren” even though “separated...”

Second, the logos, the word, in which the multifarious religious experience is expressed does not lend itself to standardization or universalization. The word of faith reflects the intimate, the private, the paradoxically inexpressible cravings of the individual for and his linking up with his maker. It reflects the numinous character and the strangeness of the act of faith of a particular community which is totally incomprehensible to the man of a different faith community...The confrontation should occur not at a theological level, but at a mundane human level. There, all of us speak the universal language of modern man. As a matter of fact, our common interests lie not in the realm of faith, but in that of the secular orders.*

Third, we members of the community of the few should always act with tact and understanding and refrain from suggesting to the community of the many, which is both proud and prudent, changes in its ritual or emendations of its texts. If the genuinely liberal dignitaries of the faith community of the many deem some changes advisable, they will act in accordance with their convictions without any prompting on our part. It is not within our purview to advise or solicit...

Fourth, we certainly have not been authorized by our history, sanctified by the martyrdom of millions, to even hint to another faith community that we are mentally ready to revise historical attitudes, to trade favors pertaining to fundamental matters of faith, and to reconcile “some” differences. Such a suggestion would be nothing but a betrayal of our great tradition and heritage and would, furthermore, produce no practical benefits.

*The term “secular orders” is used here in accordance with its popular semantics. For the man of faith, this term is a misnomer. God claims the whole, not a part of man, and whatever he established as an order within the scheme of creation is sacred.

6. Abraham Joshua Heschel, No Religion is an Island

The religions of the world are no more self-sufficient, no more independent, no more isolated than individuals or nations. Energies, experiences, and ideas that come to life outside the boundaries of a particular religion or all religions continue to challenge and affect every religion.

Horizons are wider, dangers are greater... *No religion is an island.* We are all involved with one another. Spiritual betrayal on the part of one of us affects the faith of all of us. Views adopted in

one community have an impact on other communities. Today religious isolationism is a myth. For all the profound differences in perspective and substance, Judaism is sooner or later affected by the intellectual, moral, and spiritual events within the Christian society, and vice versa.

We fail to realize that while different exponents of faith in the world of religion continue to be wary of the ecumenical movement, there is another ecumenical movement, worldwide in extent and influence: nihilism. We must choose between interfaith and internihilism. Cynicism is not parochial. Should religions insist upon the illusion of complete isolation? Should we refuse to be on speaking terms with one another and hope for each other's failure? Or should we pray for each other's health and help with one another in preserving one's respective legacy, in preserving a common legacy?

What divides us? What unites us? We disagree in law and creed, in commitments which lie at the very heart of our religious existence. We say no to one another in some doctrines essential and sacred to us. What unites us? Our being accountable to God, our being objects of God's concern, precious in His eyes. Our conceptions of what ails us may be different, but the anxiety is the same. The language, the imagination, the concretization of our hopes are different, but the embarrassment is the same, and so is the sigh, the sorrow, and the necessity to obey.

We may disagree about the ways of achieving fear and trembling, but the fear and trembling are the same. The demands are different, but the conscience is the same, and so is arrogance, iniquity. The proclamations are different, the callousness is the same, and so is the challenge we face in many moments of spiritual agony.

Above all, while dogmas and forms of worship are different, God is the same. What unites us? A commitment to the Hebrew Bible as Holy Scripture. Faith in the Creator, the God of Abraham; commitment to many of his commandments, to justice and mercy; a sense of contrition; sensitivity to the sanctity of life and to the involvement of God in history; the conviction that without the holy the good will be defeated; prayer that history may not end before the end of days; and so much more.

There are moments when we all stand together and see our faces in the mirror: the anguish of humanity and its helplessness; the perplexity of the individual and the need of divine guidance; being called to praise and do what is required.

7. Eleanor Stump, Atonement

There are non-Christian people in other cultures who have never had much or any contact with Christian views. There are those who have considered Christianity and rejected it. There are small children who die before the age of reason and who lack Christian beliefs for that reason. And then there is the problem of Judaism. On traditional Christian views, the patriarchs and other heroes of the Hebrew Bible had some theological beliefs about the importance of a Messiah in Israel's history. But it is hard to suppose that these beliefs included beliefs about the incarnation, passion, and death of Christ. Nonetheless, in biblically based orthodox Christian doctrine, the patriarchs and other notable people of faith in the Hebrew Bible found their way to the love of God, and they are among the saved in heaven...

To begin to resolve the problem generated by Christian exclusivism, it helps to see that what Christ identifies as necessary for salvation is actually not knowledge of a set of propositions that need to be believed. Instead, it is knowledge of a person. Christ says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

But, clearly it is possible to know a person and know that that person exists, but to know that person under only one description and not under other relevant descriptions. One might know the pauper, for example, and not realize that he is the prince in disguise. For that matter, it is possible to be in relation to a person without much propositional knowledge about that person... One [therefore] can have a loving relationship with the person who is Christ, even while one rejects the theology about Christ. Karl Rahner thought that there are anonymous Christians, that is, people who are not self-acknowledged Christians but who are even so within the community of the saved in virtue of having a relationship of love with Christ. Aquinas himself thought that some pagans before the time of Christ may have had implicit faith in Christ in virtue of trusting God to be a rewarder of those who seek him.

... It is Christ that is essential and not belief in theological propositions about Christ. Furthermore, as the second person of the Trinity, Christ is God; and so love of what really is God is also love of Christ. It can therefore be true both that no one comes to the Father but by Christ and that some people who lack propositional beliefs mentioning Christ nonetheless come to the Father by Christ.

8. Rabbi Akiva Weisinger, Comparing R. Soloveitchik and R. Heschel's Views on Interfaith Dialogue

[While] Heschel seems to be more forward-thinking and modern in his more positive orientation towards interfaith dialogue, that is only on the surface. When examined critically, Heschel's position is shown to exist within a dated paradigm of the genesis of oppression and the relationships between powerful groups and disempowered groups, one that fails to properly recognize the importance of the autonomous identity of the disempowered. Heschel's position is motivated primarily by the desire to justify Jewish identity in the eyes of the Church, and attempts to do so through the argument that Jews ought to be recognized as human beings due to their similarity with Christians, a position which merely reinforces the notion that Jews are only human beings to the extent they are recognized as such by Christians. R. Soloveitchik, on the other hand, is much more sensitive to the dehumanizing assumptions made by a powerful group about a disempowered group and the way in which the powerful group can set the terms of the debate as to who ought to be recognized as human, in a way that is remarkably ahead of his time. R. Soloveitchik's position is to refuse to yield on the question of the legitimacy of Jewish identity, refuse to construct Jewish identity in terms of Christian identity, and instead demand recognition of the legitimacy of Jewish identity as something wholly different from Christian identity as the starting point for any dialogue. Thus, R. Soloveitchik is able to demand a more complete and more comprehensive tolerance than Heschel is able to, demanding respect for Jews as Jews rather than as similar to Christians.

9. Pinchas Lapide (1922-1997), The Resurrection of Jesus: A Jewish Perspective

The resurrection belongs to the category of the truly real and effective occurrences, for without a fact of history there is no act of true faith... In other words: Without the Sinai experience — no Judaism; without the Easter experience — no Christianity. Both were Jewish faith experiences whose radiating power, in a different way, was meant for the world of nations. For inscrutable reasons the resurrection faith of Golgotha was necessary in order to carry the message of Sinai into the world.

10. Cal E. Braaten, Introduction to Lapide

When an Orthodox Jew writes a book on the resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth... It is an event without precedent in the long history of Jewish-Christian relations. But when the author's main thesis favors the historical facticity of Jesus' resurrection, based on a critical examination of the documentary evidence, then we are witnessing some kind of ecumenical miracle.

... The result of Lapide's re-Judaizing of Jesus is to debunk some common misconceptions that die hard in the popular tradition. One is that the people of Israel rejected Jesus, and another is that Jesus rejected his people. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the mother church in Jerusalem, the earliest believers, and all the original apostles were Jews, and "multitudes" in his day gave him an enthusiastic reception; never once did any imagine that their belief in Jesus

constituted a break with the Hebrew faith. Nor did Jesus reject his people. As Lapse examines the evidence, he points out that the harshest words of Jesus against the “scribes and pharisees” indicate only that he had opponents among some of the leaders at the time. That Jesus stood in conflict and contrast with his age places him in the great line of Jewish prophets, and rather than it being a sign of his un-Jewishness or rejection of Israel, it stands as the most telling proof of his greatness. Moses was in constant conflict with his own people, and yet there has never been a greater Jew than he.

The first principle of crucial significance is that the Hebrew Scriptures are part of the biblical canon...

...The second principle is that Israel continues to be the chosen people of God post-Christum and to have meaning in the salvation-historical scheme of things...

...The third principle holds that in the end “all Israel will be saved.” (Rom. 11:26). This means that not only those Jews who are now individually converted to the gospel one by one will be saved in the end, namely, the Jewish Christians, but in the context of the parousia there will be a mass conversion of Israel to the Messiah of God.

...The fourth principle is that “salvation is from the Jews,” (John 4:22). This means that God’s promises are mediated to universal history through the particular history of Israel...

From the history of Israel’s first election as a special people, the world has received its prophetic insistence on monotheism, the hope for universal salvation, a messianic and eschatological interpretation of history, the doctrine of the world as creation and utterly other than the Creator, and finally the name of Jesus the Jew as the incarnation of the Son of God.

The fifth principle is that the fact of Israel reminds the eschatological community of Christ that it lives “between the times,” between the “already now” and the “not yet” of the history leading from promise to fulfillment. History is not yet the match for the hopes of Israel. There is an overdose of hope in the history of promise that drives both Israel and the church to be moving forward restlessly with an incurable case of “messianitis.”

11. Rabbi Mark Gottlieb, *A Jewish Theology of Resurrection*

... Lapidé invites Jews to see all of world history, the many nations and peoples shaped by the Christian confession, as part of Jewish history, as part of “our” narrative, driven by both divine providence and human initiative. Too many students of history, some motivated by animus against Jews, others just reading history through a materialist lens, have placed the Jewish people on the periphery of the human drama. (In some accounts, that changed in the twentieth century when Auschwitz—or the state of Israel—became a focal point of Western self-examination.) Lapidé, without succumbing to a false triumphalism, reverses the narrative, aligning the divine drama of world history with the Jewish story of salvation. For contemporary Jews living in either an ahistorical mode of reality or one dominated by a secular narrative, Lapidé’s rich providentialism offers an antidote to modern and theologically minimalist ways of thinking about history.

Lapidé’s political theology is arguably more significant in a post-Christian world than in the culturally Christian world he worked and lived in. For it’s surely the case that today’s greatest threats to both the state of Israel and the Jewish people living outside Israel emanate from extremes on the political right or left that are radically secular, Islamist, or neo-pagan in origin. Specifically Christian anti-Semitism, though not completely eradicated, is far less of a threat than in previous generations. Indeed, one might plausibly argue that in our post-Vatican II world, the stronger a Gentile’s commitment to traditional Christianity, the greater the likelihood of his support for Israel and, broadly speaking, the Jewish people, a support often rooted in positive theological appraisals of Judaism. Simply put, as Lapidé might see it, a strong and traditional Christianity can help to safeguard Jews and Jewish interests in important ways.

For this reason, Jews, while certainly not ascribing to Christianity’s dogma, have good reason to offer real but qualified support for Christian belief in the resurrection. Without that belief, Christianity quickly demythologizes its own narrative and turns into a milquetoast universalist ethic. Not only does the historicity of the resurrection account for the rapid rise of Christianity, but it also preserves the salvational story still being written by Jews and Gentiles alike, together, nearly two millennia after those world-historic events. For Lapidé, the ancient Palestinian Jew who was miraculously raised from the dead, instead of being a snare and stumbling block for Jews and Christians, can be a bridge and a shared legacy of theological coherence, fraternity, and mutual care.