

The Christian-Jewish dialogue has been thriving in the last few decades, gaining both public and scholarly attention. In most cases, this **dialogue** has taken place between representatives of more open flanks of both Christianity and Judaism, and involved participants who have a religious attitude typically termed “liberal”, in a sense that both parties are united by a similar political and cultural vision that transcends the differences between them. **Dialogue** seems to be an outcome of the weakening of radical voices, who allegedly regard relations with another religion with hostility, and to the growth of moderate religious approaches, which enables rational and pragmatic inter-faith discussions. Jewish-Christian dialogue, in other words, is judged to be a phenomenon pertaining to the secular/liberal setting of the postwar Western world, and is carried out through the means of a modernized and moderated universal religious language.

"More open flanks" is awkward and unclear.

I would rewrite this sentence to "...representatives of more "liberal" Christian and Jewish leaders, who are united by a similar political and cultural..."

enable, not enables

Post War? I believe you mean post WWII, but you need to be clear about this.

"seems to be" is a weak phrase. You should stand tall in your writing. "Dialogue is an outcome..."

You have over-used the word "dialogue." Please consider: interchange, exchange, debate, conversation, discourse

"their" is vague. Here it seems to reference other landscapes or dialogue. Neither of which is appropriate.

However, this common understanding of the nature and scope of Jewish-Christian **dialogue** is limited in two respects. First, it does not cover the entire range of **dialogical** phenomena. As the studies discussed at the workshop suggest, several **dialogical** initiatives do not adhere to liberal criteria, which assume a rational agreement about the place of religious commitment and its contribution to a diverse society. In fact, one can find **dialogical** inclinations in surprisingly illiberal settings. Second, the liberal narrative of the Jewish-Christian **dialogue** focuses mainly on the geographical and political settings of Europe and North America; it omits other types of **dialogue** that stem from other landscapes and their unique concerns. These non-western initiatives are grounded on alternative religious grammars and are oriented towards other sets of political agendas, which often explicitly rejects the liberal program.

inter-religious exchange

conversational

conversation

interaction

What is an "alternative religious grammar"?

In order to overcome a narrow approach to religious **dialogue**, our workshop shall focus on two topics. First, an empirical examination of a variety of projects that have been performed in contexts that are normally not deemed amenable to the **dialogical** logic (narrowly understood). Shedding light on such initiatives, often neglected by the liberal framework of **dialogue**, contributes in and of itself to the understanding of the Christian-Jewish **dialogue** in its variety. Second, a critical inquiry of the variety of **dialogical** initiatives enables us to interrogate the logic behind the very concept of **dialogue** itself. Through this workshop we formulate a grammar suitable for the variety of interactions that will help with a way to communicate befitting this **dialogical** variety, and to think anew, with a theoretical language befitting of this

the more liberal actors

just delete this "dialogue"

dialogue discourse

Through this workshop we formulate a grammar suitable for the variety of interactions that will help with a way to communicate befitting this dialogical variety, and to think anew, with a theoretical language befitting of this

multiplicity, even phenomena that up until now have been narrowly understood through the liberal grammar of **dialogue**.