

when Christian bodies find themselves working together by necessity, *The Theology of The United Church of Canada* reveals what the UCC brings to the table.

*Morgan Bell*, M.Div. candidate, Emmanuel College, University of Toronto.

George Hunsinger, ed. *Karl Barth, the Jews, and Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018.

All but three of the essays in this volume were originally delivered at “Karl Barth, the Jews, and Judaism,” a conference held at Princeton Theological Seminary in June 2014. This publication is one of two arising from the conference that George Hunsinger edited and contains essays by senior scholars. The other, *Karl Barth: Post-Holocaust Theologian?* (T&T Clark, 2018), includes essays by younger scholars.

David Novak’s provocatively titled essay, “How Jewish Was Karl Barth?” takes Barth’s interpretation of Micah 6:8 (“It has been told to you, O mortal, what is good...”) as its starting point. Novak aims to show “*how* Barth thought *like* a Jewish thinker thinks” (1), finding parallels in Barth’s exegesis of Micah 6:8 with rabbinic interpretations of the same passage. The second essay, “Karl Barth and the Jews: The History of a Relationship,” is by Eberhard Busch, Barth’s assistant for many years. Busch notes that a primary consequence of Barth’s theological affirmation of the unity of “gospel and law” was his affirmation of the “inseparable bond” between Jews and Christians (27). Busch shows how this was an especially significant affirmation to give in the 1930s and how Barth’s opposition to many forms of German Protestant anti-Judaism was a direct result of this theological starting-point.

The third essay is a transcript of a dialogue between Novak and Busch (moderated by Hunsinger). The dialogue is an example of how a Jewish theologian/philosopher and a Christian theologian, both heavily influenced by Barth, respond to questions on themes Barth prioritized, including divine election, Law and Gospel as revelation, the question of Jewish and Christian unity, and natural theology.

Hunsinger's essay, "After Barth: A Christian Appreciation of Jews and Judaism," argues for a form of Christian philo-Semitism or Judaeophilia that is grounded in Christ. Hunsinger claims that such an argument can in part be built from Barth's theology. Barth affirmed God's irrevocable covenant with Israel, spoke out against antisemitism as a form of disobedience, and discouraged Christian missions to the Jews. In spite of that, he confessed in a 1967 letter to a former student that he was "decidedly not a philosemite," and he did reproduce negative caricatures of Jews in his theology. Hunsinger attempts to appropriate what gains Barth made while expunging the negative elements.

Peter Ochs's "To Love Tanakh Is Love Enough for the Jews," is a reflection on the impact of *Dabru Emet*—a Jewish statement on Christians and Christianity—published in 2000 in the *New York Times*. The statement was co-authored by Novak and Ochs among others. Affirming claims like "Jews and Christians worship the same God," the statement was a response to the positive efforts of postliberal theologians, who were highly indebted to Barth, to address historic anti-Judaism and show "Christian concern for the Jews" (77). Ochs outlines key characteristics of postliberal theology and ends by asking how one might read *Dabru Emet* in relation to Barth's theology.

The sixth essay, by Victoria J. Barnett, is a very helpful historical account of Barth's interfaith encounters from 1945 to 1950. She talks about three different occasions when Barth met with Jews over that period, once in the Swiss village of Seelisberg in 1947 and twice in 1950 with young Swiss Jews to discuss his theology of Israel. Barnett points out the significant challenges that Jews and Christians faced in conducting interreligious dialogue in the immediate aftermath of the Holocaust. Following Barnett's piece are three essays by scholars of an earlier generation who were influenced by Barth: Thomas Torrance, C.E.B. Cranfield, and Hans Küng. While thematically appropriate to the question of Christian theologies of Israel and Judaism influenced by Barth, these essays could have used additional framing by the editor.

Ellen Charry's "Toward Ending Emnity" closes this volume with a spirited and inspiring essay. Arguing that Jewish and Christian traditions need to rethink their "theological assessment of the other for the sake of its own theological well-being" (147), she lays bare the theological tendencies

that prevent such re-thinking for both communities and recommends an alternative theological trajectory of spiritual friendship. For this essay alone, this volume is of great value not only to Barth scholars but also to communities—such as Mennonites—who continue to reckon with our own history of involvement in the history of anti-Judaism and seek a theological way forward.

*Zacharie Klassen*, Ph.D. student, Religious Studies, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.