

21 世紀 COE プログラム 公開講演会

何のための対話か？

—オランダにおけるキリスト者とユダヤ人—

● 講 師 ●

エリック・オッテンハイム

Eric Ottenheim

(ユトレヒト大学 神学博士)

● 日 時 ●

2006 年 1 月 14 日 (土) 午後 2 時～4 時

● 場 所 ●

同志社大学 今出川校地 神学館 3 階礼拝堂

○共 催：同志社大学一神教学際研究センター
同志社大学神学部・神学研究科

○お問い合わせ

同志社大学一神教学際研究センター (CISMOR)

TEL. 075-251-3972 E-mail: staff@cismor.jp HP: <http://www.cismor.jp/>

《スケジュール》

2 : 00－3 : 30 講演 「何のための対話か？

ーオランダにおけるキリスト者とユダヤ人ー」

講師：エリック・オッテンハイム/**Eric Ottenheijm**

(ユトレヒト大学 神学博士)

3 : 30－3 : 40 コメント：ミシェル・モール/**Michel Mohr**

(同志社大学言語文化教育研究センター非常勤講師)

3 : 40－4 : 00 質疑応答

司会：石川 立 (同志社大学神学部教授)

《講師紹介》

エリック・オッテンハイム／Dr. Eric Ottenheijm

1961年生まれ。2004年にカトリック神学大学（ユトレヒト）にて神学博士号取得。

現在、ユトレヒト大学にてユダヤ学と新約聖書学の講師をつとめ、またキリスト教とユダヤ教との対話のための活動を行なっている。「キリスト教徒とユダヤ教徒のためのオランダ宗教会議委員会（The Board of the Dutch Council for Christians and Jews）」の前事務局長・現常任顧問。タルムード研究を目的とした B. Folkertsma 財団の特別研究員。

主な著作および論文：

‘Impurity Between Intention and Deed: Purity Disputes in First Century Judaism and in the New Testament’, *Purity and Holiness. The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. By M.J.H.M. Poorthuis& J. Schwartz, *Jewish and Christian Perspectives II*, Leiden Brill 2000, pp. 129-147.

‘Genezen als goed doen. Halachische logica in Mt 12:9-14’, *Bijdragen* 63/3 (2002) 335-366.

Disputen omwille van de Hemel. Rol en betekenis van intentie in de controverses over sjabbat en reinheid tussen de Huizen van Sjammai en Hillel, dissertaion, with a Summary in English, Amphora Books Amsterdam, 2004 (336 pp.)



Doshisha University

同志社大学

一神教学際研究センター

C I S M O R

Center for Interdisciplinary Study of Monotheistic Religions

A Dialogue for Heavens Sake: Historical and Theological Axes of Christian-Jewish Relations in the Netherlands

Structure of the Lecture of Dr. Eric Ottenheijm, University of Utrecht, Netherlands

Introduction: interreligious learning and identity.

Quotation is from J.Sacks, *The Dignity of Difference. How to Avoid the Clash of Civilizations*, Continuum London/New York 2002

Part 1: History and Historical Sensitivities: Christian attitudes toward Jews in the Netherlands before 1948

-A glimpse in a conference Room, april 1945: chiliastic theology and missionary politics.

-Christian ambivalence: Christianity has its roots in Judaism but Judaism should have been ended with Christ. Explanation 1: Contemporary Judaism testifies as to the consequences of stubbornly refusing Gods grace (Augustin) or , Explanation 2: Contemporary Judaism still has a special role in the end of times (eschatological and chiliastic theology).

-Explanation 1 is dominant in catholicism and reformed protestantism before 1948. Social antisemitism in catholic circles before WW II: maintaining a pure, catholic social identity.

-Explanation 2 became popular in nineteenth century protestant circles (Isaac DaCosta (1798-1860) and Abraham Capadose (1795-1874).

-Both explanations rooted in 'substitution theology': the Divine promises have been taken away from the Jews and transferred to the Church.

-Jewish presence in the Netherlands: feeling relatively safe and assimilated until 1940: German occupation and start of the policies of the Shoa, the Holocaust.

-1948 as a watershed: establishment of the Jewish State of Israel as a direct denial of the teaching of Augustin, that Jews were compelled to live forever in a diaspora.

-After 1948: Dialogue and Learning instead of mission: 'Learning Houses'.

-In the late seventies and middle of the eighties: new Reflections on the Holocaust. The Jewish trauma: 103.000 of a populage of about 135.000 Jews murdered. How is that possible in a supposed liberal country like the Netherlands? Did christian antijewish teachings influence society in a negatieve way?

Part 2: The Church and the Jewish People: defining oneself as the 'people of God'

-Nostra Aetate (Second Vatican Council, 1965): Church breaks with substitution theology.

-Ambiguities in current theology.

-Case of the *Improperia* of the Good Friday Liturgy, rite of the Veneration of the Cross.

Text and translation of the first parts:

Popule meus, quid feci tibi? Aut in quo contravisti te? Responde mihi.

Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti: parasti crucem Salvatori tuo.

Agios o theos. Sanctus Deus. Agios Ischyrios.

Quia eduxi te per desertum quadraginta annis et manna cibavi te, et introduxi te in terram satis bonam: parasti Crucem Salvatori tuo.

Agios o theos. Sanctus Deus. Agios Ischyrios.

Sanctus fortis, agios athanatos, eleison imas. Sanctus immortalis, miserere nobis.

My people, what have I done to you? Or in what did I contravene you? Answer me.

Because I took you out from Egypt, you have prepared a cross for your Savior.

Holy God, Holy God, Holy Stronghold.

Because I have led you through the desert for forty years and fed you with the bread from heaven, and led you into a Land filled with good, you have prepared a cross for your Savior.

Holy God, Holy God, Holy Stronghold, Holy Stronghold, Holy Immortal One, have mercy upon us. Holy Immortal One, have mercy upon us.

-Is the text antijewish or not? Conclusion: both the 'correct' non-antijewish as the possible antijewish interpretation are both rooted in a substitution theology!

-Hermeneutical problem: how does the church define itself without negating the intimate identification of the Jewish partner?

Epilogue:

-A biblical theology of pluralism: the words of Gamaliel/Rabban Gamliel in Acts 5:38-39: if it is a work from God, no man can contravene it.

(Tokyo, Doshisha University, 2006-01-14)